Conflated Constructs: Disentangling the Educative and Evaluative Functions of Preservice Teacher Supervision

Amy B. Palmeri
Vanderbilt University, Department of Teaching & Learning, amy.palmeri@vanderbilt.edu

Jeanne A. Peter
Vanderbilt University Department of Teaching & Learning, jeanne.peter@vanderbilt.edu

Conflated Constructs: Disentangling the Educative and Evaluative Functions of Preservice Teacher Supervision

Amy B. Palmeri[1] & Jeanne A. Peter[1]

Abstract

University mentors require specialized knowledge and skill to support teacher candidate learning in the context of fieldwork. Without such knowledge and skill, interactions between university mentors and teacher candidates is often evaluative, thus undermining the educative potential of mentoring. We focus on mentoring practices employed in the context of the post-observation conference. Findings from a year-long implementation study show that when university mentors are introduced to an educative mentoring protocol and are provided with sustained professional development, their mentoring practices shift from an evaluative to an educative focus. University mentors indicate that this shift, initially perceived as unnatural, was supported through the scaffolding provided by the protocol and on-going professional development. Shifts in university mentors' practices supported teacher candidate reflection and growth. By foregrounding the educative function, this work adds to the theory-based conceptualization of the knowledge and skills needed for the effective mentoring of those learning to teach.

Keywords

preservice teacher supervision; educative mentoring; field-based instruction; post-observation conference

[1] Vanderbilt University, USA

Corresponding Author:
Amy B. Palmeri (Vanderbilt University Peabody College; The Department of Teaching and Learning; PMB 230, GPC; 230 Appleton Place; Nashville, TN 37203-5721, USA)
Email: amy.palmeri@vanderbilt.edu

Introduction

At the center of our work as teacher educators is the learning and development of teacher candidates. In this paper, we focus on the work of the University Mentor who closely interacts with teacher candidates during clinical field experiences. University Mentors (UMs) typically have expertise around effective teaching and PK-12 student learning. However, like Zeichner (2005), we recognize that those who supervise are not typically grounded in the specialized knowledge of *how one learns to teach*. Therefore, supporting the development of initial teacher learning requires the application of pedagogical knowledge and skill that is different from that required to teach PK-12 students. Teacher candidates (TCs) must have access to UMs who understand the complexities involved when teaching one how to teach.

To examine this access we attend to the UMs as they imagine themselves, not as experienced educators, but as teacher educators learning how to teach TCs. This shift is both one of audience and purpose. Teaching TCs in the context of supervision requires more than the sharing of wisdom seasoned teachers bring with them to the supervisory role and requires specific pedagogies to support TC learning (Levine, 2011). We examine long-standing practices foregrounding the evaluative nature of TC supervision where UMs draw on their experience to tell, rather than to teach, the TC what they need to do to improve their practice (Burns & Badiali, 2015).

It is well documented that the mentoring of teacher candidates is often conflated with evaluation (Burns & Badiali, 2015; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014). While supervision and evaluation are fundamentally different processes, the multifaceted nature of the work of mentoring TCs necessarily includes both an educative and evaluative function (Nolan & Hoover, 2010). In the context of field-based teacher preparation, we argue that a focus on TC growth and development can be best supported when interactions between a TC and UM have clearly defined educative purposes as well as separate and clearly defined opportunities for evaluation.

We appropriated the post-observation conference (POC), a routine feature of supervision, as a productive teaching space to foreground the educative function of the mentoring of TCs. When UMs clearly establish an interaction as educative, TCs can be confident that the focus is on their developing practice rather than on the evaluation of that practice. This clarity of purpose supports TCs' learner stance that is critical in the context of mentoring. When re-envisioned as a context for teaching, the UM (during a POC) is primed to focus on the mediating role they play in scaffolding TCs' sense-making regarding complex practice. We consider the tensions that emerge when UMs shift toward an educative approach to the mentoring of TCs, moving from teller to teacher, by employing pedagogies reflecting what UMs know about effective teaching to build upon the current thinking and skill of TCs.

To foreground the educative focus during a POC, we designed a protocol that leveraged the provision of effective and actionable feedback as an essential pedagogical practice for UMs to employ as they scaffolded TC learning (Palmeri & Peter, 2019). Following several iterations of revision (informed by our use of the protocol) we introduced the POC protocol to all UMs supervising fieldwork within our undergraduate early childhood and elementary education program. We examined whether or not UMs' use of the protocol contributed to a shift from an

evaluative to an educative perspective during a POC and whether such a shift supported changes to long-standing supervisory practice. We address the following research questions:

1. What tensions emerge as UMs shift from long standing supervisory practices toward educative mentoring?
2. What shifts in TC learning do UMs perceive as a result of employing an educative mentoring model?

Literature Review

As teacher education places more attention on learning through clinical experience (AACTE, 2010) and practice-based teacher educators focus on "helping novices develop and refine a set of core practices" (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009, p. 276) there is a need for more systematic and higher quality supervision of TCs (Darling-Hammond, 2014). However, supervision within teacher education has been undervalued and underconceptualized (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Given the demands of clinical practice based teacher education, it is time to shine a spotlight on the intellectual contribution of UMs and their work supporting TC learning and development (AACTE, 2018).

Supervision of Teacher Candidates as Undertheorized Practice

While the terms university supervision and university supervisor are common in the literature, we choose to refer to the university faculty working with TCs in clinical settings as University Mentors (UMs). This term highlights that the university is the primary home of the UM and their primary role is that of mentor. A major distinction between supervision and mentoring is that supervisors are often task-oriented (e.g. successful completion of this particular clinical experience) whereas mentors are both task- and person-oriented, focusing on TCs' long-term development (Acker, 2011). By thinking beyond the immediate task, the UM sees the TC as a developing professional and therefore responds pedagogically by utilizing the "right" mix of explicit teaching, scaffolded support, educative feedback, and independent learning to address the specific needs of a particular TC (DeWelde & Laursen, 2008). The mentor role therefore requires a knowledge base and skill set that includes understanding of trajectories of TC development and a set of pedagogical skills that can be employed to support TC growth over time.

Historically, the labor-intensive work of supervision is delegated to graduate students, adjunct faculty, retired teachers or principals, and teachers who have temporarily left the classroom to raise young children (NCATE, 2010; Zeichner, 2005). The knowledge base of UMs includes teaching experience (of varying years) and knowledge of classrooms and teaching (of varying degree). Too often we assume that if one has knowledge and experience in classrooms, then one can effectively mentor TCs in clinical settings. Such an assumption is evidence that the mentoring of TCs is undertheorized. In most cases, UMs have limited knowledge of key details of the teacher education program (required university coursework and assignments) and they operate with limited professional development and support from the University. In order to focus on the long-term development of TCs, UMs need additional knowledge of the teacher education

process - including not just what is happening in teacher educational coursework but also details regarding the process of how one learns to teach.

To do this work, one must be able to teach *about* teaching while working in the field with TCs (Burns & Badiali, 2016). Even experienced teacher educators find the work of mentoring TCs to be complex and challenging (Cuenca, Schmeichel, Butler, Dinkelman, & Nichols, 2011; Martin, Snow, & Franklin-Torrez, 2011). Therefore it is imperative that we learn more about the knowledge and skills needed to teach about teaching in clinical practice and to think seriously about the professional development needed to do this work (Burns & Badiali, 2016).

The Conflated Nature of Supervision

A primary intention of clinical supervision is the cultivation of TC learning (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016). However, UMs fulfill a wide variety of additional roles ranging from serving as a liaison between the university and clinical settings to evaluating TC performance (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016; Dangel & Tanguary, 2014; Range, Duncan, & Hvidston, 2013). Within initial teacher preparation, where the TC is *learning* to teach, it is imperative that the need to evaluate progress toward a benchmark **not** undermine opportunities for learning. Since the purpose of mentoring is to foster learning (Nolan & Hoover, 2010) it is important to intentionally and explicitly frame the work of mentoring TCs as an educative process and consider questions regarding when, where, and how the UM has opportunities to engage in teaching the TC. Therefore, our work focuses on the role of *teaching* where the UM is providing the TC with targeted feedback and support to enhance the development of their practice.

Establishing the Educative Function when Mentoring Teacher Candidates

TCs learn about teaching and how to teach in both university and clinical contexts. In their status as novices learning to teach, TCs should not be expected to engage (on their own) in the developmentally sophisticated work of connecting abstract theoretical principles learned in university courses with the practical and concrete applications learned in the field (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). Like others, we find the oscillation between thinking about and applying theory, research, and practice within clinical settings is one way to help make what teachers do both visible to and learnable by the TC (Ball & Forzani, 2009, 2010; Grossman, Compton, Shahan, Ronfeldt, Igra, & Shiang, 2007).

We argue it is the teaching and learning that happens within clinical practice where the TC most needs the assistance of a UM who understands teacher education. However, because teaching *looks* simple to the novice (Bransford, Darling-Hammond, & LePage, 2005), TCs may not recognize the need for scaffolding provided by the UMs to help them make the critical connections needed for a robust conceptualization of teaching. To navigate this terrain, UMs need to possess pedagogical knowledge and skills best suited to supporting TC learning (Korthagen, Loughran, & Lunenberg, 2005). UMs must draw on what they know about how *students of teaching* learn and develop and they must utilize teacher educational pedagogies that are sensitive to the TCs developmental trajectory (Hundley, Palmeri, Hostetler, Johnson, Dunleavy, & Self, 2018; Swennen, Volman, & vanEssen, 2008). In the absence of these targeted

supports provided by the UM, TCs have difficulty linking their nascent understandings of teaching to their developing pedagogical skills (Berry, 2009; Loughran & Berry, 2005).

In order to shift UMs toward a focus on TC learning and development, we identified and claimed an instructional space suited for that purpose. The POC provides an explicit structure around which to tailor professional development opportunities for UMs where they develop the unique knowledge and skills of a teacher educator who teaches TCs within clinical settings.

A Tool and Scaffolded Support for University Mentors

We provide a brief overview of a protocol designed to support the educative function of mentoring TCs within the context of a POC. The theoretical rationale that informed the design of this protocol is justified in earlier work (Palmeri & Peter, 2019). We then describe the professional development created to support UMs in using the new educative tool and in building a repertoire of practices consistent with this educative stance.

A Post-Observation Conference Protocol as an Educative Tool

The POC protocol (Palmeri & Peter, 2019) (see Figure 1) was designed to reflect three key principles that guide the mentoring of teacher candidates: 1) The primary intention of mentoring TCs is the cultivation of TC learning (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016); 2) Teacher educators explicitly mediate the learning of complex practice (Lampert, 2010); and 3) Teacher educators employ principles of educative feedback (Bronkhorst, Meijer, Koster, & Vermunt, 2011).

Specifically, the protocol provides an intentional structure (as articulated in the instructional purpose column) and a set of prompts for the UM to choose from in order to accomplish each of the purposes articulated. In order to immediately direct the teacher candidate's attention on their teaching rather than their performance we foreground superordinate elements of teaching (SET) which include *subject matter, teacher language, student engagement, and lesson flow* and are a part of every teaching and learning interaction. Consistent with the learning of complex practice, a limited number of SETs are appropriate for a TC initially learning to teach and the multifaceted nature of each SET allows the TC, with the support of the UM, to build a robust and nuanced understanding of the SETs over time (Burns & Badiali, 2016). These design elements situate the POC as an educative space that ensures the UM is focused on teaching during the conversation and is supported in providing feedback that is generative for the next teaching opportunity (Palmeri & Peter, 2019).

University Mentor Meetings as On-Going Professional Development

During the 2017-2018 academic year, we launched a program-wide use of the Palmeri & Peter (2019) POC protocol in the undergraduate early childhood and elementary education program. Like Williams (2014) we recognized that teacher educators must provide support and professional development for UMs. This is especially important when one is trying to shift the primary role of the UM from an evaluative to an educative one (Burns & Badiali, 2016). In addition to providing UMs with initial training in the protocol during August 2017 (prior to the

start of the academic year) we hosted a series of 8 workshops for UMs (four in the fall 2017 semester and 4 during the spring 2018 semester).

Figure 1. The Palmeri & Peter (2019) Post-Observation Conference Protocol

Instructional Purpose	Running Time	Potential Instructional Prompts
Invite the TC to **reflect** on his/her teaching as related to the specific lesson observed	0-3 min.	In light of this lesson (*reflect on; talk to me about; or tell me what you think about*) the (choose one) ● **flow of**, ● **subject matter** *(introduced, explored, covered, applied, assessed etc.)* during ● **teacher language** you made use of during ● **students' engagement** during, the lesson and how this influenced student learning.
To **elaborate** on instances that increase the variation and provide contrast for analysis that supports productive connections	3-8 min.	Build on the TCs opening response: ● Thinking about what you had planned for this lesson (perhaps refer to lesson plan) how does this teaching segment compare or what do you notice about your planning and enactment? ● Let's consider ways in which [summarize what the TC said] impacted opportunities for student learning. ● Let's generate some instances or examples from the lesson where [summarize what the TC said] came into play in ways that did or didn't move your lesson forward Another instance that I noticed related to [restate chosen focus]was… ● How do you think this impacted opportunities for student learning? ● How do you think this did or didn't move your lesson forward? ● What was similar or different about the instances that seemed more effective than other instances?
Leverage the analysis across instances to help the TC make productive **connections** between theory, research, and practice	8-11 min.	Some stems to help the TC begin to make connections: ● Why is this (name/describe the element of practice that needs to be improved) important? ● Why is it helpful to remember that (name the focus) is multifaceted? ● What are the elements of good/effective…? ● What happens when you…? ● Do you remember in… when we… how might that help us think about this? ● Is there a resource you might revisit, seek out, or tap into that would be helpful? Now try to articulate a generalization or general principle from what you are learning here that will help keep you focused as you plan future lessons.
Based on the analysis of practice, the TC articulates an **action plan** for future planning and/or instruction	11 - 15 min.	Ways to encourage TC to begin to generate an action plan: ● So what might you try tomorrow or within the next week that you think will help your practice and improve upon …? ● What are you thinking about right now in terms of improving or refining your practice? ● How might we see evidence of your attention to … in your future plans? Teaching? Invite TC to write out their action plan.

Initial training for UMs, in the form of a 90 minute workshop, provided an overview of the work of mentoring, justified the shift to an educative approach, provided a rationale for establishing the POC as a learning and teaching space, engaged in a deep examination of the protocol itself, and provided an overview of the year-long professional development we would engage in together. In taking a deep look at the protocol we elaborated on each instructional purpose, provided a rationale for each purpose, and reinforced that the structure of the protocol mirrored that of a lesson plan in order to solidify the idea that the UMs' primary role in a POC was that of a teacher educator. As we discussed the purpose of the instructional prompts, we reinforced that the protocol was not a script to be followed but rather an educative structure designed such that UMs could make informed decisions to personalize the prompts.

Monthly professional development sessions consisted of 90 minute workshop style meetings. A week prior to an upcoming UM meeting we sent a reminder about the meeting and asked UMs to answer questions in a Google form. Each monthly meeting followed the same general structure that began with a brief sharing and discussion of patterns emerging from responses to the form. This was followed by a discussion of a particular element of the protocol that was chosen as a foci in the previous meeting. For example, in the September 2017 meeting UMs brought a transcript of the first 2 talk moves (the UMs launch and the TCs response) so we could deconstruct how we were launching the POCs. Following a discussion of our practice, we shared tools we were generating to help us do this work (e.g. templates for recording observation notes). Finally, we discussed issues that served to build a knowledge base to help UMs make informed pedagogical decisions.

Methodology

This study examined shifts in long-standing practices of University Mentors who agreed to participate in a series of monthly training sessions across an academic year designed to foreground educative mentoring. Two research questions guided the inquiry: 1) What tensions emerge as UMs shift from long standing supervisory practices toward educative mentoring and 2) What shifts in teacher candidate learning do UMs perceive as a result of employing an educative mentoring model?

Participants

Participating UMs mentored TCs in practica and/or student teaching in a diverse metropolitan school district, agreed to use the protocol during each POC, and agreed to participate in monthly professional development meetings. In addition, all of the UMs working in our early childhood and elementary education program agreed to participate in this research with us. Participants included seven UMs working with TCs in clinical settings (e.g. early field experiences through student teaching). The variety of backgrounds and experiences of the UMs reflect what is typical in the current landscape of teacher education. One UM was a graduate student (working on an M.Ed. in reading education) who was a certified teacher with minimal teaching experience. Two UMs were retired elementary school principals who had been experienced teachers prior to moving into administration. Another UM was a retired teacher with over 40 years of experience. A fifth UM was an experienced teacher who had chosen to take a break from teaching while raising a family but planned to return to the classroom. Finally, two were full-time university

faculty who taught methods courses in the Early Childhood and Elementary Education program, were experienced UMs, and whose mentoring was a part of both their instructional load and their scholarship. Six of the mentors were female and one was male. In addition to the full-time faculty, two of the UMs had experience mentoring TCs for the university while 3 UMs were new to the work of mentoring other than what they had experienced themselves as teacher candidates or in working with student teachers in their prior teaching or administrative experiences.

Researchers' Roles

The authors, as boundary spanning teacher educators (AACTE, 2018), are engaged in successful clinical partnerships, regularly mentor TCs, and are deeply committed to building stronger connections between learning and teaching within and across university courses and clinical settings. We conceptualized translating our mentoring work from our courses to a program-wide, coherent system of mentoring and designed professional development to support this endeavor. We collaboratively scheduled and facilitated meetings and collected and analyzed emerging data. However, when launching the professional development for UMs, we intentionally positioned ourselves as members of the group who were focused on learning how to be more effective mentors of TCs.

Data Sources

Data included monthly Google form responses, a year-end reflection completed at the last monthly meeting by all seven participants, and artifacts from monthly meetings. The 3 questions on the monthly form were: 1) what are your impressions about using the new protocol; 2) what are you noticing about your mentoring practice as you utilize the protocol; and 3) what are you learning about teacher education in the process? The year-end reflection consisted of 5 questions that prompted the UM to consider their conceptions of the work of mentoring before becoming a part of this study and after spending a year engaged in professional development. All UMs provided handwritten responses to these questions.

Finally, data included a formal interview with two of the UMs at the end of the academic year. We chose to interview these two UMs because we knew they had already been contracted to mentor teacher candidates in the upcoming academic year. The first had a number of years of experience working as a UM and the second was new to the work of mentoring but had previously hosted student teachers in her classroom. Together they represented the range of experiences of our participants. Both agreed to participate in an audio-taped, hour-long interview on the university campus and were given the interview questions in advance. The interview launched with, "Tell me about your typical [mentoring] practice prior to being introduced to the protocol" and ended with, "How, if at all, will this way of thinking about [mentoring] permeate other aspects of your future teaching/[mentoring]?"

Data Analysis

Responses to the monthly Google forms were compiled and entered into an individual spreadsheet for each UM. This matrix provided the possibility to look across rows to see responses to separate questions and down columns to look across a single UM's responses at the

beginning of the year, mid-year, and at the end of the year. In the first round of analysis, these responses were coded by each of the authors independently using open coding, which according to Saldana (2009), is an acceptable first-round coding method. In the second round of analysis, the authors compared these codes in a joint analysis revealing consistencies that could be grouped into categories. These categories became structural codes for analyzing year-end reflections and interview data and we engaged in the constant comparison of codes (Glaser, 1969). Triangulation across different data sources revealed a consistency of findings.

Findings were shared with UMs to increase trustworthiness (Page, Samson, & Crockett, 1998; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998) and to validate the work of UMs. Participants did not correct facts in this account, however they did confirm key findings and expressed enthusiasm toward continuing to mentor the following year.

Findings and Discussion

Our findings tell a story of UM learning and development across year one of implementation and indicate that UMs shifted their mentoring practice to foreground the educative nature of their work. Further, UMs provided insight into factors that contributed to these shifts and shared their perceptions of the impact on the TCs they were mentoring.

Mentoring is Unnatural

Six of the seven UMs spoke repeatedly about how unnatural it was, in practice, to foreground the educative function of mentoring. In part, the educative function of mentoring was counter to UMs prior experiences and their perceptions of the more traditional work of university supervision. For example, both UMs who were retired principals explicitly talked about the shift in their roles. In the monthly Google form Joy wrote, "This is a paradigm shift for me. My evaluations [observations in the past] have been just that...evaluations." This initial belief was reiterated in Joy's year end reflection when she said, "I used to think this was just a new protocol - another way of "evaluating." I know it wasn't evaluative, but that was pretty much all I knew."

Another UM, Julie, elaborated on the incongruence between her initial perceptions of her role as a mentor and what she knew about good teaching. In her year end reflection she elaborated on her initial perception that her value to the TC would be her experience by saying, "My role would be to give feedback based on what I saw and what I knew…and my value was what I was able to verbalize to them." Julie's initial perception of her role as evaluator felt natural to her even though she knew (when teaching children) her primary role was educative. In many of her monthly reflections and during the monthly meetings, Julie often talked about her struggles to have the TC assume more of the intellectual load by talking less during conferences.

All seven UMs found the work of mentoring to be unnatural because they erroneously assumed that their prior experiences as principals, classroom teachers, and even teacher educators would be sufficient preparation. Overtime, UMs began to internalize the protocol used to facilitate POCs suggesting the process of mentoring was becoming more familiar and natural to them.

Shifting Mentoring Practice

We present a brief case of one UM's practice to illustrate the kinds of shifts that were typical across UMs. Initially, the unnaturalness of the mentoring process led Ruth to stick verbatim to the protocol and, like Julie, Ruth's mentoring practice was initially characterized by a lot of mentor talk. Ruth indicates, "Last time I strayed from the protocol a bit… and I notice that I give a lot of suggestions." By November Ruth notes that she was beginning to allow more time for the TC to talk, "I am starting to allow TCs to figure out solutions to their problems on their own by just using prompting statements." This is a shift from telling, through the provision of suggestions, toward using prompting statements to get the TC to think and talk their way to generative insights. By December, Ruth begins focusing more on her mentoring practices stating, "I am learning to be more reflective about the ways that I can get the TC thinking about their practice." This is an important shift for two reasons: 1) Ruth is no longer using the protocol as a script and 2) she is expanding the repertoire of strategies used to prompt TC thinking and reflection. At the start of the new semester, Ruth reflects, "I haven't used [the protocol] yet this semester, but I am thinking about how I can give good educative feedback and allow the [TCs] a chance to talk as well." Here, Ruth is grounding herself in the overall purpose of mentoring - to support the development of the TC - by reminding herself to leverage the TCs thinking and reflection as she provides educative feedback. In her year end reflection, Ruth writes, "I used to think the role of a [UM] was to give suggestions and evaluative feedback. Now I think the role of a [UM] is to ask carefully crafted questions and to give educative feedback.

All seven of the UMs described shifts in practice that were consistent with the educative purposes we established for the mentoring of TCs. The two most prevalent shifts identified across the majority of UMs were evident in Ruth's case. First, nearly all UMs started the year using the protocol almost as a script. As UM's began to internalize the protocol they were able to develop a range of pedagogical mentoring practices that felt more natural to them. Second, for five of the eight UMs, the most significant shift they noted in their practice was related to their increased capacity to carefully craft questions and probing statements that served to reduce the amount of their talk and required the TC to assume more of the intellectual work of thinking and talking. The protocol was identified as a productive lever in supporting these shifts.

A Lever Supporting Shifts in Mentoring Practice

While UMs as a whole embraced the explicit shift toward educative mentoring, the retired principals and experienced teachers were initially skeptical that limiting the focus of the POC to one of four superordinate elements of teaching would be productive. This was evident in Dawn's responses in the Google form early in the academic year when she states, "[The protocol] is still very new to me. I'm not yet feeling confident in using it. It is hard for me to focus on one thing when I see others that need attention as well." Dawn continues to struggle with the narrow focus of the POC launch even as she begins to recognize the utility of the structure of the protocol when she states, "I think the action plan encourages the [TC] to focus on an area of practice that needs to be improved. It is still difficult for me to focus only on one area as there are others also needing attention." For Dawn, the action plan was a critical component of the POC and knowing that an action plan needed to be targeted and specific allowed her to more fully embrace the need to launch the POC with similar focus and intention.

In the end, all UMs acknowledged the value and importance of the four SETs for launching the POC and for enhancing the educative function of the POC. Joy writes in her year end reflection, "I am noticing that I'm not evaluating [TC's] teaching… I am focusing on a specific element of their teaching and we discuss what worked and didn't work…and talk about ways to improve the next time." In essence Joy has summarized the key components of the POC protocol, from the SET to elaborating on examples, all in service of improving practice through the generation of an action plan. In addition to supporting changes in UM practice, shifts in TC thinking were also attributed to the protocol.

University Mentor Perception of Teacher Candidate Learning

A final shift evident in the data was the UMs perception of the deeper level of critical thinking engaged in by the TC during a POC. UMs contrasted previous supervisory practices, where a TC would hear the UM talk about the many areas in a lesson that needed attention, with the rigor and intentionality provided by the protocol to support TC thinking about teaching. UMs noted that the initial prompts in the protocol provided an opportunity for the TC to focus on a SET thereby shifting from an initial evaluation of the lesson to a careful consideration of how the TC was *making sense* of a key facet of teaching. UMs observed that their questions, requiring TCs to make connections and provide elaborations, were important in order to understand TCs' decisions during teaching. For example, in a Google form Jaci notes that, "Student responses are so thoughtful when I ask the right questions and let them think and talk." UMs noted that asking these types of questions was neither easy nor natural and required careful consideration and planning. As Dawn noted, "[The protocol] requires more thinking and responses from the TC." Dawn later comments, "The TCs' reflection has become more thoughtful and through this process is becoming more generative. More questions are asked, action plans are made and worked toward." Across the data set, a consistent pattern emerged where UMs indicated that through their shift from an evaluative to an educative mentoring model, TCs demonstrated a deeper level of critical thinking and reflection on their own teaching as well as an ability to determine next steps for their growth as teachers.

Together, these four patterns provide compelling evidence of the tensions that emerged as UMs shifted toward educative mentoring. While initially unnatural, over time shifts in mentoring practice were attributed to the structure of the protocol itself which was also perceived to positively impact TC thinking and learning. Being able to internalize a protocol that foregrounds the educative function of mentoring as opposed to viewing the protocol as a script allowed UMs to tap into their background experience, expertise, and knowledge of effective teaching as they taught TCs in the context of the POC.

Implications

There are four main contributions of this study and each leads to related implications and further questions. First, UMs can be shifted to foreground their role as teacher educator. Each UM confirmed that approaching their work through an educative lens and using the protocol was difficult and unnatural in the beginning. By the end of the first year, all participants were able to identify a shift in their mentoring practices and gave examples to support how they were able to

focus on TC learning during a POC. However, even as the UMs in this study shifted toward an educative mentoring model that was perceived to impact TC learning, the perspective of the TC is missing. Future work should include an opportunity for TCs to provide their insight into the ways in which educative mentoring did or did not have an effect on their teaching ability.

Secondly, a protocol designed to facilitate critical reflection on the part of the TC, can act as a lever shifting UMs toward scaffolding TC reflection and sense-making regarding complex teaching practice. Yet this study also highlights a need for future work on developing additional tools that might further strengthen this shift. Historically, UMs were provided with observation forms that encouraged scripting of the lesson being observed with little information about what to focus on and record as they were observing. As UMs learned how to use the POC protocol which provides a clearly articulated focus on the SET, they realized it was critical to develop an observational tool that would support them in preparing for the POC. UMs were encouraged to experiment with creating observational tools, to use and refine them in the field, and to bring drafts to share in future meetings. Three UMs developed observational tools and shared these artifacts of practice in the next monthly meeting. Following this sharing, these tools were taken up by other UMs and critiqued in subsequent meetings. In general, UMs found it necessary to personalize observational tools to meet individual needs and the demands of different observational contexts. Additionally, UMs created a template for a follow up email to the TC that documented feedback provided in the POC and formalized the action plan. UMs found the template enabled them to provide consistent written feedback to the TC and made it easier to hold the TC accountable for implementation of the action plan. This collaborative investment in generating new tools to support the work of mentoring indicates a high degree of intellectual engagement in the work of mentoring. However, work is needed to develop a more complete set of tools supporting an educative mentoring model. Additionally it will be important to determine which tools should be relatively universal across UMs and which can be adapted to reflect the needs of individual UMs.

A third contribution highlights the critical nature of on-going professional development to support educative mentoring. Monthly meetings included opportunities for UMs to 'deprivatize practice' (Levine, 2011). Mentors were able to take an educative stance toward their work as they critically identified and reconceptualized taken-for-granted practices and beliefs with other UMs. The professional development reported here highlights one possible way in which support may be provided to UMs. Julie noted in her final interview that, "Our meetings once a month and talking to other people about how they [used the protocol].... that helped me." Consistent with recommendations proposed by Levine (2011) we shared audio recordings of POCs, discussed tools being created to support the work, and continued to highlight a vision that would allow us, as UMs, to continue to learn and grow as professionals. However, which of these experiences was most influential is not evident in the data and therefore warrants additional study.

Finally, this study points to the necessity of UMs knowing and understanding the trajectory of TC learning and development. The UMs in this study were engaged in mentoring across clinical practices (from the first field experience through student teaching) so questions regarding TC development across time surfaced during monthly meetings. For example, early in the semester Dave mentions, "I have to remember that our practicum students are taking 'baby step' one." Even as he built his educative mentoring practice he recognized, "I am good at reflective

listening, but not as good at making the appropriate response that will encourage the [TC] to dig deeper into their teaching and learning" suggesting his knowledge of the TCs' developmental trajectory lagged behind his knowledge of effective mentoring practices. Similarly, Julie talked about this in her final interview:

> I was thinking that [TCs] just don't know . . . .'cause they haven't had that experience. The coursework is there but I guess I was afraid of them just not having the knowledge but they do. When we are doing all the talking it's all about us and we are supplying information. When we stop and ask questions and they have to pause and think about it, it draws on what they know.

UMs in this study recognized the need to understand how TCs learned to teach over time and at the same time recognized that being a well-qualified educator was insufficient preparation to engage in educative mentoring. Currently, teacher education lacks a widely accepted and comprehensive developmental trajectory that would be useful to the situated work of UMs.

Conclusion

It is often assumed that clinical practice helps TCs connect theory and practice yet we fail to appreciate the important role of the UM in mediating this process. By foregrounding the educative role, the work reported here adds to the theory-based conceptualization of the knowledge and skills needed to effectively mentor those learning to teach. Clarifying the knowledge UMs need and helping them develop pedagogies that support educative mentoring creates a more coherent system of clinical practice based teacher education. This answers the call to improve teacher education and TC preparation with the intention of promoting deeper PK-12 student learning (AACTE, 2018). Honoring the work of UMs inspires them to critically engage in the challenging work of "unlearning" long-established practices (Cochran-Smith, 2003) and energizes them for the challenging work of learning to teach teachers.

References

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief.* Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://oacte.org/pdf/ClinicalPrepPaper_03-11-2010.pdf.

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation: A report of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission.* Retrieved from http://aacte.org/resources/clinical-practice-commission.

Acker, S. (2011). Advising and mentoring graduate students. In B. Bank (Ed.), *Gender and Higher Education* (pp. 330-336). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2010). Teaching skillful teaching. *Educational Leadership, 68*(4), 40-45. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec10/vol68/num04/Teaching-Skillful-Teaching.aspx

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 6-19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001002

Berry, A. (2009). Professional self-understanding as expertise in teaching about teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 305-318. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875365

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 1-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bronkhorst, L.H., Meijer, P.D., Koster, B. & Vermunt, J.D. (2011). Fostering meaning-oriented learning and deliberate practice in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(7), 1120-1130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.05.008

Burns, R.W., & Badiali, B.J. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher Candidates' perceptions of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2015.1078757

Burns, R.W., & Badiali, B.J. (2016). Unearthing the complexities of clinical pedagogy in supervision: Identifying the pedagogical skills of supervisors. *Action in Teacher Education, 38*(2), 156-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1155097

Burns, R.W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016). The changing nature of the role of the university supervisor and function of preservice teacher supervision in an era of clinically-rich practice. *Action in Teacher Education, 38*(4), 410-425. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1226203

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(1), 5-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x(02)00091-4

Cuenca, A., Schmeichel, M., Butler, B.M, Dinkelman, T., Nichols, J.R. (2011). Creating a "third space" in student teaching: Implications for the university supervisor's status as outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(7), 1068-1077. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.05.003

Dangel, J.R., & Tanguay, C. (2014). "Don't leave us out there alone": A framework for supporting supervisors. *Action in Teacher Education, 36*(3), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2013.864574

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547-561. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956x.2014.939009

DeWelde, K., & Laursen, S.L. (2008). The "ideal type" advisor: How advisors help STEM graduate students find their "scientific feet". *The Open Education Journal, 1*, 49-61. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874920800801010049

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Glaser, B. (1969). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. In G. McCall & J. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader* (pp. 216-228). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2014). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Shahan, E., Ronfeldt, M., Igra, D., & Shiang, J. (2007). Preparing practitioners to respond to resistance: A cross-professional view. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 13*(2), 109-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600601152371

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 273-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340

Hundley, M., Palmeri, A., Hostetler, A., Johnson, H., Dunleavy, T.K., & Self, E.A. (2018). Developmental trajectories, disciplinary practices, and sites of practice in novice teacher learning: A thing to be learned. In D. Polly, M. Putman, T.M. Petty, & A.J. Good (Eds.), *Innovative Practices in Teacher Preparation and Graduate-Level Teacher Education Programs* (pp. 153-180). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-3068-8.ch010

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Lunenberg, M. (2005). Teaching teachers – studies into the expertise of teacher educators: An introduction to this theme issue. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 107-115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.007

Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 21-34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347321

Levine, T. H. (2011). Features and strategies of supervisor professional community as a means of improving the supervision of preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(5), 930-941. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.004

Loughran, J. & Berry, A (2005). Modelling by teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 193-203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.005

Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L., & Franklin Torrez, C. A. (2011). Navigating the Terrain of Third Space: Tensions With/In Relationships in School-University Partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(3), 299–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110396096

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student

Learning. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from:
http://www.highered.nysed.gov/pdf/NCATECR.pdf

Nolan, J., & Hoover, L.A. (2010). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into Practice* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Page, R., Samson, Y. J., & Crockett, M. D. (1998). Reporting ethnography to informants. *Harvard Educational Review, 68*(3), 299-333. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.68.3.4270327254w5871v

Palmeri, A.B., & Peter, J.A. (2019). Pivoting from evaluative to educative feedback during post-observation conferencing: Supporting the development of preservice teachers. In T. Hodges, & A. Baum (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Field-Based Teacher Education*. (pp. 495-517). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-6249-8.ch021

Range, B., Duncan, H., & Hvidston, D. (2013). How faculty supervise and mentor pre-service teachers: Implications for principal supervision of novice teachers. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 8*(2), 43-58. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1016279.pdf

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swennen, A., Volman, M., & vanEssen, M. (2008). The development of the professional identity of two teacher educators in the context of Dutch teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(2), 169-184. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760802000180

Taylor, S., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130-178. https://doi.org/10.2307/1170752

Williams, J. (2014). Teacher educator professional learning in the third space: Implications for identity and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(4), 315-326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533128

Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 117-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.001

Author Biographies

Amy B. Palmeri is an Assistant Professor of the Practice of Early Childhood and Elementary Education at Vanderbilt University. Her research focuses on teacher candidates' learning and development within the context of initial teacher preparation. Her work focuses on teacher educator pedagogy across instructional contexts including the mentoring of teacher candidates in both subject specific practicum (science and social studies) and student teaching.

Jeanne A. Peter is a Principal Senior Lecturer in the Department of Teaching and Learning at Vanderbilt University. She teaches literacy content and methods courses and mentors teacher candidates in early field experiences and student teaching. Her scholarly interests focus on the developmental trajectories of teacher candidates specifically related to early literacy development and on the development and training of university mentors.