[All Graduate Projects](#)   [Graduate Student Projects](#)

Summer 1999

Review of the 1998/1999 Wenatchee Masters with Certification Teacher Preparation Program

William Patrick Fillman

John Morton Tuttle

REVIEW OF THE 1998/1999
WENATCHEE MASTERS WITH CERTIFICATION
TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

A Project Report

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

Teacher

by

William (Rick) Patrick Fillman

and

John Morton Tuttle

August, 1999

ABSTRACT

REVIEW OF THE 1998-99 WENATCHEE MASTER OF EDUCATION CERTIFICATION TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

by

Rick Fillman and John Tuttle

August, 1999

The Wenatchee Master of Education Certification Teacher Preparation (WMECTPP) was an intensive year long field and performance-based program designed to enable its participants to become modern educators with mastery level competence. The purpose of this study was to document the efficacy from a participant/observer perspective, and to create a blueprint for others interested in a similar program.

The ethnographic study of the 1998/99 WMECTPP was performed by two program participants. The authors analyzed and described the philosophical foundation, structure, candidate pool, and completion requirements of the WMECTPP. Authors concluded, based on an extensive review of related literature, that the WMECTPP was consistent with successful alternative certification programs across the country. The young WMECTPP continues to evolve and improve based on constant reflective analysis and review of current research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND OF PROJECT

Introduction

The Wenatchee Master of Education with Certification Teacher Preparation

Program (WMECTPP) was inaugurated in the 1997-98 school year. This post-

baccalaureate program arose out of a need to prepare tomorrow's teachers using methods

of performance-based, student-centered instruction. As our understanding of how the

human brain learns increases, we must adapt our methods of teaching to reflect this

knowledge. John Dewey's belief that learning results from reflective inquiry was the

heart of the WMECTPP (Dewey, 1929). This was demonstrated by the reliance on

reflective journals to meet several learner outcomes.

It was also recognized that many potential teachers reside in the business sector.

For many of these time and/or place bound learners, the traditional route to teacher

certification was no longer a viable option. Time and place elements required by the

traditional route were the primary impediment. Many of these candidates had

dependents and financial obligations for which moving to a college campus and/or taking

courses during the day were out of the question. Additionally "these potential teachers

were generally more mature than traditional beginning teachers, and their real-world

experiences can be valuable to the teaching profession" (Littleton and Holcomb, 1994,

p.37). These nontraditional adult teacher candidates are defined as preservice teachers

over twenty-five years old with varied life experiences, including participation in the

workforce, child rearing, military service, or postsecondary training (Rodriguez and

Sjostrom, 1998).

The faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of

Education and Professional Studies at Central Washington University recognized this fact

and so conceived the WMECTPP. The WMECTPP is an intensive, 12-month, field and

performance-based program. This unique design creates a partnership between the

University and local schools for the advancement of the program participants' knowledge

and experiences.

This approach is considered an alternative to traditional routes of teacher

certification. Alternative certification is defined as any significant departure from the

traditional undergraduate education major. It may include holding at least a bachelors

degree in the subject to be taught, passing score on a certification test, or a variety of

pedagogical workshops as established by school districts or state certifying agencies or

taking prescribed courses as mandated by a state board (Rubino et al., 1994). Traditional

teacher certification on the other hand is defined as the completion of a four year college

program in education to include student teaching and demonstration of basic skill

competencies rated through performance on written examinations as mandated by the

individual state (Rubino et al., 1994).

Need for the Project

The 1997/98 program was documented in order to create a manuscript of the

initial year of the WMECTPP. The 1998/99 program has incorporated many of the

recommendations generated from last year's experiences as a part of a continuous

improvement goal. The need this year is to create a blueprint of an performance-based, hands on, student centered teacher preparation program for other universities and interested parties to implement.

As teacher preservice prepares future teachers in student-centered environments, classroom atmospheres will be created with the student first and foremost in mind. Since the WMECTPP is on a relative forefront of the performance-based/field-based teacher certification programs, a blueprint of the program is needed so that other institutions, as well as the one under current study, can benefit from what works well and make adjustments where required.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this study was to document the efficacy of the program from a participant/observer perspective, and to create a blueprint for others interested in a similar program. Because of the newness of the WMECTPP an expected tertiary result for this study was discovering areas needing improvement.

Limitations of the Project

The limitation of this project is that it only encompasses the WMECTPP. So while the success of the WMECTPP may not be generalizable to other alternative certification programs, this study will develop a blueprint of an effective and successful program.

The WMECTPP is a complex venture involving Central Washington University's main campus, the Wenatchee satellite campus, and Wenatchee area public schools. This arrangement poses several problems not the least of which are communication and

coordination. Several members of the 1998/99 cohort had difficulties determining what additional classes they needed to take to be certified by the University. At least one of these interns was told that he needed additional classes before enrolling, but the exact classes were not specified until Winter Quarter of the program year. There have also been negative statements made by main campus faculty in regards to the WMECTPP.

The authors believe that these types of problems would not exist if this program were located on the main CWU campus. The reason for this belief stems from the personal experiences of the authors and from conversations with other members of the WMECTPP cohort. These experiences indicate that several departments (that oversee endorsement certification) share the perception that they are expected to rubber stamp for certification all WMECTPP learners. One cohort member relayed to one of the authors that a main campus faculty member complained that "those people in Wenatchee want everything given to them." This notion is detrimental to the WMECTPP and to the University itself. Therefore recommendations and possible solutions will be addressed in chapter 5.

The Wenatchee Masters Program is located in Wenatchee, Washington. This small city has a population of 30,000 and is the commerce center for all of north central Washington. The area industries are primarily agriculture, logging, retail, and tourism. Seattle, Washington is the nearest major city located just over 100 miles to the west, across the Cascade Mountains. School districts participating in the WMECTPP range in size from A to AAAA (State of Washington size classifications), rural to small city, and include: Wenatchee School District, Eastmont School District, Waterville School District,

Cashmere School District, Cascade School District, Entiat School District, Manson

School District, and the Methow Valley School District.

Twenty-three learners started the 1998/99 version of the WMECTPP, of whom

sixteen finished. The originating membership consisted of twelve males and eleven

females ranging in age from twenty-three to fifty-five. All members were Caucasian

except one who was a naturalized citizen of Japanese descent. The background of these

learners ranged from recent college graduate and military serviceperson, to businesspeople

and homemakers.

Finished Product

The final product will be produced in text format complete with appendices

containing: program handouts and materials, syllabi, reflective seminar journal notes,

calendar of topics and events, performance indicators, and other information relevant to

the study.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Many programs exist offering adult learners the opportunity to earn a teaching certificate through alternative means. There is a growing amount of literature devoted to these types of alternative programs. Most alternative programs have certain characteristics in common. They are post-baccalaureate programs which attract mature, adult learners. They focus on a yearlong internship, which pairs teacher candidates with mentor teachers. They are performance-based and constructivist in nature. The programs also necessitate a strong bond between university and school district.

Post-baccalaureate Teacher Education Programs

Post-baccalaureate teacher education programs have existed since the 1980s. New Jersey, Texas, and California set the trend for these types of programs due to teacher shortages. These programs admit students who have earned a degree in an endorsable area, and expedite receiving certification for people already employed in shortage fields (Chang, 1997).

Since candidates for post-baccalaureate programs have earned a degree, they naturally tend to be older, more mature students. Research shows that many candidates enter these programs having gained experience in a variety of careers. "Previous work histories include business, military, social service, and homemaking" (Etheridge, et al.,

1987, p.5). Given their life experience and maturity, these candidates may better reach

students from wide ranging backgrounds and diversity (Shannon & Bergdoll, 1998).

> Kyle (1997) noted that nontraditional students have the following characteristics:
> They attend more than one institution for a degree, attend part-time, have multiple
> family and professional commitments, are not financially dependent on parents,
> reflect no predominant socioeconomic status, and represent all facial groups (Eifler
> & Potthoff, 1998).

Post-baccalaureate programs have adapted to accommodate adult needs of

learners. One such need of adult learners is going through the program with a cohort that

supports one another. This is an example which appears frequently in literature and has

added to the success of programs (Kelly & Dietrich, 1995; Fitch, 1999). Shannon and

Bergdoll (1998), however, described a program "designed to let candidates move in and

out at certain times" (p.7). These examples show how post-baccalaureate programs tailor

their curriculum to best serve their students.

There currently seems to be a movement in education toward post-baccalaureate

programs. Michael Andrew of the University of New Hampshire pointed out that more

research is needed. Reports say over 300 graduate level programs have been created since

1986; however, many programs have met with resistance from traditional teacher

education colleges.

> The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and NCATE have
> been extremely reluctant to take any actions promoting a movement to extended
> programs because the membership of both organizations represents a majority of
> 4-year undergraduate teacher education programs, many of which have been
> adamantly opposed to extended programs. The concept and practice of extended
> programs again stands ready to be examined, debated, and carefully advanced
> (Andrew, 1997).

<u>Yearlong Internship</u>

Yearlong internships are one of the prime differences between traditional teacher certification (TC) and alternative teacher certification programs (AC). Literature reveals that nearly all AC programs have a yearlong internship, yet internships vary greatly one from another. Most often there are stages in the internship. Interns begin the school year with little responsibility and time in school. Then interns receive increasingly more responsibility and spend more time in the classroom as the year progresses. Finally toward the end of the year, they assume total responsibility for the classroom (Etheridge & et al., 1987; Thompson, 1997). The length of full-time teaching varies from five to ten weeks.

There are programs where interns work full-time the entire school year. In some cases, as in Chicago, interns receive pay and health benefits for their teaching time and a stipend to cover tuition expenses (Hawk, 1997, Thompson, 1997). Jivelekas et al. (1991) described the University of Tennessee's interns as being "considered unpaid staff and are given a year's credit in the statewide school system" (p. 4). Goodlad (1994) used the medical model to support interns receiving compensation for their work.

Not only do interns benefit from their immersion in schools, but, Goodlad says, teachers benefit from having interns in class because they gain time to pursue educational renewal. "In cohort groups aspiring teachers become essentially junior members of the faculty. They should be able to relieve regular staff members so that the latter may fulfill their responsibilities as teacher educators" (Goodlad, 1994, p.170).

Literature shows most programs favor internships that progressively allow interns increased responsibility. The reason they favor this appears to be because there are problems associated with giving interns too much responsibility too soon.

> The program model which placed the total responsibility of acquiring basic skills in teaching on the intern beginning in September was taxing to mentors as well as risky to the university and to the school. Under this program structure, neither the university nor the school had sufficient knowledge before the opening of school of whether an intern would be capable of assuming teaching responsibility for a classroom of children. Also at risk is the possibility of an intern leaving the program during the school year because of poor classroom management or the personal discovery that teaching was not the right choice (Jablonski, 1992, p.5).

Research shows a majority of internships take place concurrently with university course work (Jablonski, 1992). Students learn foundations and philosophies of education, human growth and development, classroom management, etc. Then interns can immediately put these concepts and skills into practice (Kelly & Dietrich 1995).

In some programs, the internship takes place in the same school or even the same classroom for the entire year. In other programs, internships take place in different grade levels or schools, with different teachers. "The actual structure of the internship vary according to the school district" (Jablonski, 1992, p.6).

Administrators who have observed or hired interns support such programs. Principals are more likely to hire interns from their school. "One current high school principal rated the internship graduate in his or her building as the same as any first year teacher... Most agreed the internship graduates had strengths in sophistication, organization, insightfulness, confidence, and had a faster learning curve" (Fitch, 1999, p.9).

Mentor teachers also had similar praise for interns from AT schools. The NEA interviewed mentors who stated AT teachers "were better prepared than other preservice professionals with whom they had worked. Preservice teachers demonstrated greater comfort level in schools, were more confident, and behaved more like first-year teachers" (Seidel, 1997, p.4).

Performance-based

A common characteristic of post-baccalaureate programs is that they are performance-based. Since teacher candidates spend so much of their time in internships, performance assessments have been geared toward what is relevant and practical in the classroom. This aspect of teacher education allows candidates to be involved with school trends and issues first hand, thus enhancing their knowledge. "To measure minimum standards of performance, both NCATE and INTASC are advocating performance-based assessment models" (Andrew, 1997, p.3). This is different than in traditional settings where students learn via lecture and are assessed based on the quality of their seatwork. Teacher candidate must "demonstrate accountability for both knowledge and skill acquisition in the various areas of professional education" (Burch, 1985, p.2).

Along with alternative assessment for performance-based programs come alternative methods for developing new teachers. The focus shifts from the Instruction Paradigm to the Learning Paradigm.

> In the Learning Paradigm, a college's purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems. The Learning Paradigm does not limit institutions to a single means for empowering students to learn; within its

framework, effective learning technologies are continually identified, developed, tested, implemented, and assessed against one another (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p.15).

The Learning Paradigm follows the tenets of Constructive educational philosophy. An example of this is a program in California "conceptualized of modules rather than course work. Each module would have three interconnected components, a common content core, specialization coursework, and field experiences" (Burstein et al, 1999, p.109).

Reflective journals appear as a key component in performance-based teacher education. Journals are used as a learning tool for the teacher candidate and also as an assessment tool for mentors and program directors. Research shows that reflective analysis of field experiences helps teacher candidates gain valuable insight and develop as professionals (Wilson, 1996, Pike 1996, Rodriguez & Sjostrom, 1998).

The creation of portfolios is also addressed in the literature. A portfolio is a collection of work documenting student internship progress and academic learning achievements. They are a means for instructors students to assess their performance. Portfolios have been used as a tool for learning based on self-reflection, peer and instructor feedback (Taylor & Nolen, 1996).

Action research is one other component of a performance-based program, which is not frequently documented. Keating et al (1998) contend that research helps teachers broaden their inquiry skills, deepens their knowledge of the profession, creates a platform to disseminate knowledge, and enables them to pass on research and problem-solving

skills to their students. However, few programs require active research from their participants.

Teacher Mentors

A component of alternative teacher education is the teacher who acts as mentor for the intern. Mentors work closely with interns. Their role is to facilitate a supportive learning environment. They guide, provide feedback, encourage, and model excellent teaching practices for interns. Mentor teachers are chosen for their exemplary teaching and mentoring skills. Some alternative programs train teachers to become mentors. The CREST program is one example (Eifler & Pothoff, 1998; Duhon-Haynes et al., 1996; Wilmore, 1996). The literature does not directly address the role of the mentor teacher in relation to planning lessons and activities, classroom management, student discipline, etc.

Mentors are also important in determining whether an alternative teacher candidate will stay in the teaching profession longer than a few years. Alternative teacher candidates may have experienced success in prior careers. Administrators may look at those successes and assume they would translate to success in the classroom. Research shows that without strong mentor support for novice teachers, they tended to become frustrated and drop out of teaching early.

Mentors facilitate interaction between faculty, students, and administration. These bonds enable interns to fully integrate into the school setting. "Older novice teachers in these studies complained that their preparation included sparse contact with students, models of teaching, or interactions with colleagues, which would have helped them in their first-year experiences" (Eifler & Potthoff, 1998).

University Partnership

Literature supports the need for a strong partnership between public school

districts and universities. This partnership enhances all parties involved. "The unit

should formally include clinical or 'teaching' schools operated jointly by school districts

and the teacher preparing institutions for the renewal of schools and the education of

those who work in them" (Goodlad, 1991, p.9). Ultimately the quality of the partnership

and desire to improve education determines the success of alternative programs.

Some literature suggests that school administrators and educational centers be

involved in designing the teacher education programs. One such program in Texas

demonstrates this model.

> Rather than dismiss this important training as "too much trouble for the district",
> we sought ways to support interns by collaborating with regional service centers
> and universities. Colleges of education, regional education service centers, and
> school districts sit down together to generate all aspects of the teacher education
> program (Dill & Stafford, 1992, p.73).

There must be a partnership between the college of education and other university

colleges as well as between the college of education and the school districts and

educational service districts. This partnership relies on clear communication between all

parties. All need to work collaboratively. Only then will programs successfully evolve.

Wilson (1996) described such a program in Kansas.

> To better prepare future elementary educators, a project team of faculty from the
> College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences at Kansas State University,
> working in partnership with the local school system, developed an innovative
> model for the preparation of future science, mathematics, and technology teachers
> (p.54).

Students in alternative programs tend to be older and have more life experiences than traditional students. They must be educated according to their needs.

> "College and university supervisors must work more closely with cooperating teachers in providing them with background information about the differences in the process for the two groups in order to coach them differently toward professional development" (Rodriguez & Sjostrom, 1998, p.185).

Howey and Zimpher (1994) would like to see supervising teachers take on an expanded role in teacher education programs. They say, "their roles should be expanded from that of 'supervising' student teachers to being fully engaged in all aspects of preservice preparation, including recruitment, selection, curriculum development, instruction, and evaluation" (p.156). This scenario necessitates full coordination between education entities.

Other articles discuss the need for cooperation between universities and school districts, but not to the degree Howey and Zimpher suggest. Most programs ask supervising teachers only to instruct, evaluate, and supervise interns.

There needs to be effective communication between the university college of education, other university colleges, and public schools in order to have effective teacher education programs. Although much has been written suggesting the need for strong bonds and communication between entities, little has been written to address how this is to be accomplished.

Alternative vs. Traditional Teacher Education Programs

Recent studies comparing alternative certification programs (AC) and traditional certification (TC) programs add to the growing body of literature regarding teacher

education. Miller and McKenna (1998) studied differences in teaching practices between those educated in TC and AC programs. They reported on behavioral differences of teachers in relationship to training differences.

The subjects of the study included 41 AC and TC teachers with three years teaching experience. Researchers studied effective lesson components and effective pupil-teacher interaction components. Trained observers were instructed how to convert findings into usable ratings. Observers visited both teachers in each pair on the same day.

Results of the study show that any differences that occurred in the study between the AT and the TC groups were due to "sampling variability" rather than differences in the populations of those who participated in the study. Researchers found, "no reliably important differences between the alternative and traditional teaching groups for the behaviors examined in this study" (p.5). Researchers also found when comparing the two groups that, "Alternative certification did not lead to inferior practice among teachers evaluated 3 years into their careers" (p.5).

A second study by Miller and McKenna (1998) looked at the achievement of students in classes of AC and TC teachers. In this study, among the 41 teachers, only teachers in self-contained classrooms were observed. Researchers looked at the achievement of students in classrooms where students were taught the basic subject matter by a single teacher. They analyzed student scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Based on the student scores on this test, they found no difference between scores of students in a classroom with an AC teacher or TC teacher.

Miller and McKenna (1998) conducted a third study, "to gain insight into AC and TC teachers' perceptions of their teaching abilities" (p.7). Trained interviewers discussed with teachers their "perceptions of their preparation level when they began teaching 3 years previously, their perception of their current level of competency, and their perception of problems encountered across their 3-year careers" (p.7). The results showed that any differences between AC and TC teachers had more to do with individual differences than to do with the type of program (alternative or traditional) in which they had participated.

> Neither AC not TC teachers felt particularly well prepared. TC teachers sometimes tried to explain this more as the natural tendency to feel inadequate at the beginning of a career, whereas AC teachers felt that something was missing (p.7).

Miller and McKenna found in all three studies that "no major differences exist between AC and TC teachers" (p.9). They also argued that the studies "support carefully constructed AC programs with extensive mentoring components, post-graduation training, regular inservice classes, and ongoing university supervision" (p.9).

In another study comparing AC and TC teachers, Wise et al. (1994) examined the difference in stress levels between AC one year Interns and TC Student Teachers. They also considered the source of stress for student teachers and interns enrolled at the local university for the spring semester and teaching in various school districts. They attempted "to determine if there was a significant difference between Job Context Stress experienced by AC Interns and Student Teachers, and also to determine what specific stressors contributed to the stress. Data was then analyzed to determine which specific

stressors were significant" (p.8). The results of their study showed that interns had a

higher degree of stress than student teachers and that conflict and uncertainty appeared to

be highly significant stressors for both groups.

> A possible explanation for the higher degree of stress found in the Interns may be the fact that a large percentage were enrolled in 6 to 9 hours of college courses while at the same time working full-time as a classroom teacher. On the other hand, student teachers had 0-3 hours of course work at the same time as working full-time. Consideration may need to be given to limiting the number of college hours Interns are allowed to take while teaching full-time (p. 11).

Having children may also be a contributing factor to stress for interns and student

teachers.

Rodriguez & Sjostrom (1998) conducted a one academic year study comparing

nontraditional adult and traditional student teachers. They found some differences in

approach to teaching between nontraditional and traditional teacher candidates.

> Nontraditional teacher candidates generally entered student teaching with a higher degree of self-confidence or acquired it early in the semester, as demonstrated by the assumption of responsibility and the development of collaborative professional relationships with the cooperating teacher. The nontraditional adult teacher candidate generally focused on learners and their needs and development rather than on how they were doing. The traditional candidates focused on themselves or their performance. Evidence of the learner-centeredness was abundant in the nontraditional data (p. 180).

Nontraditional candidates were more willing to take risks with teaching strategies,

etc. and viewed their mistakes as simply part of the learning process. Traditional

candidates took fewer risks and were more focused on themselves and their performance

rather than on student learning.

After looking at studies by Miller and McKenna (1998), Wise et al. (1994), and

Rodriguez and Sjostrom (1998) that compare teachers and teacher candidates of

nontraditional with teachers and teacher candidates of traditional programs, it is apparent

that no major differences exist between the two groups. This is based on studies which

looked at many different aspects of teachers coming from both types of programs.

Conclusion

Literature shows that there exist many post-baccalaureate teacher education

programs throughout the United States. These programs provide an alternative to

traditional teacher education programs. The number of existing alternative programs and

literature about these programs supports their need and viability. Alternative programs

offer adult learners the ability to receive teacher preparation in an expedient manner

through yearlong internships with mentors, performance-based experiences, and reflective

teaching and learning.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURE FOR THE PROJECT

Procedure

The authors chose to take an ethnographic approach to the study of WMECTPP

through their direct participation in the program. This involved recording reflective

journal entries after each seminar session, participating in group discussion and activities,

and obtaining feedback from the cohort and faculty. The reflective journal served as

documentation for seminar activities and procedures.

An ethnographic study is one in which the authors examine how the program

actually transpires. "The goal of an ethnographic study is to identify routine practices,

problems, and possibilities for development within a given activity or setting"

(McCleverty, A., 1997, p.2). We performed this study to document the efficacy from a

participant/observer perspective, and to create a blueprint for others interested in a

similar program.

The study relied on reflective journals used to document topics as well as monitor

the authors' thoughts and perceptions of the program (see Appendix A). The authors

shared reflective journal duties throughout Winter and Spring quarters. Every seminar

was not recorded Fall Quarter due to the authors' undertaking the study beginning Winter

Quarter 1999. The authors learned, through seminar discussions, that reflective

journaling enhances learning, introspection, and synthesis and application of information.

The authors compiled all handouts and related information packets used

throughout the program. These packets were filed in appendices organized according to

19

each quarter and applicable standard. The authors created a calendar displaying seminar

topics to clearly show the classes, seminars, and events of the program (see Appendix B

for calendar).

Chapter 4

THE PROGRAM

<u>Overview</u>

The WMECTPP consisted of a three pronged approach to preparing tomorrow's teachers: seminars and structured classes, the internship, and the culminating Master's Thesis or Project. The seminars decreased in length as the year went on and were primarily responsible for the formal portion of the cohorts learning (see appendix C). In these sessions, the cohort was introduced to educational topics, provided the opportunity to participate in thought provoking activities (with educational themes), and given feedback on experiences and wonderment's from the internship portion of the program. These sessions also provided much of the information necessary to complete mastery of the twenty-six standards of learner outcomes required for Master's Certification in Teaching. Standards are based on twenty-four Washington Academic Code (WAC) standards along with a standard of oral and written communication and a standard of service learning.

Internships established for each cohort member took place concurrently with seminar work. The internships increased in length as the year progressed and were responsible for the "hands on" portion of the cohorts knowledge. Each member of the cohort worked closely with a mentor teacher during their internship, and through these relationships program participants discovered the day-to-day activities of a secondary

teacher, and taught classes themselves. Some knowledge necessary for the learner outcomes was also gained during internship.

The Master's Thesis or Project was the third prong of the program. An educational research project is designed to review current information and redesign or rearrange the data for practical use in schools, as well as, to instill a career long desire to continue educational research and renewal. Each member of the cohort was responsible for each of the three prongs of the program.

Admission Procedure

Recognizing that the success of any program is directly related to the quality of its participants, the founders of the WMECTPP designed entrance qualifications accordingly. The following requirements were established for entry into the WMECTPP: acceptance by the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) on the Ellensburg Campus into the Teacher Preparation Program; acceptance into the Central Washington University Graduate school; a G.P.A. of at least 3.0 on a 4 point scale for the last 45 quarter credits (2.75 G.P.A. would allow provisional acceptance); acceptance by a content area discipline department; and a baccalaureate degree in an endorsable major (according to the State of Washington's list of teaching certificate endorsements).

Application to the Graduate School required four steps. A completed admission packet included the following materials to be submitted: a complete admission application, a statement of objectives, three letters of recommendation, and official transcripts from all universities and colleges attended by the applicant. Letters of recommendation were to be "written by professors or others capable of assessing your

potential for success in a graduate program" (CWU Graduate Studies information

pamphlet, 1998). An undergraduate G.P.A. of at least 3.0 for the last 45 credits was also

required to gain admittance into the Graduate School.

The CEPS Teacher Preparation Program requirements were the same as the

Graduate School with the exception of the statement of objectives. For each endorsement

in which students sought University certification, they were required to have a

representative from that department sign off on their coursework. If an applicant needed

to take additional courses to meet the University's requirements for certification in a

particular endorsement, it would be noted. It was the applicant's responsibility to

complete the courses before they could successfully complete the program.

Fall Quarter

The cohort first met on August 31 and September 1, 1998 for an orientation to the

program and begin the team-building process. Members of the cohort designed nametags

for themselves out of paper plates, stickers, and felt pens that identified something about

their personality. Additional information sharing and icebreakers facilitated team-building

and the creation of a peer support group.

Two assignments were presented at this time: the Portraiture Paper and the

reflective journal. The Portraiture Paper was a written document describing the total

ecology of the school in which each intern spent the month of September. Entries in this

paper ranged from the physical plant of the building to the interactions of the faculty and

students. This assignment was based on the book *The Good High School: Portraits of*

Characters and Cultures by Sarah Laurence-Lightfoot.

The second assignment was to keep a running journal of reflective thoughts from each day's internship experiences. Three questions were to be answered for each noted experience: What happened?; How did I respond?; and What did I learn/How might I respond in a similar situation in the future/How did my response impact the situation?. Students turned in journals at the end of each month for faculty review.

Beginning September 2, 1998 the interns spent the next two and a half weeks in their assigned school paired with a mentor teacher. It was recommended that each intern spend at least some time in both middle and high school. There was some flexibility to the assignments, and at the end of the observation, some interns switched to an alternate school for the remainder of the year. The purpose of this first field experience was to introduce the interns to the profession of teaching and to allow them to observe master teachers at work.

September 21, 1999 welcomed the interns back to seminar and launched the format for the remainder of Fall Quarter. Seminar days were Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. During these meetings, interns participated in required academic learning for teacher certification. Tuesdays and Thursdays were internship days in which the interns spent the whole day with their mentor teacher. The lone exception to this scheduled occurred during December 10th through the 18th. During this period, interns remained in their schools everyday as seminars ended on December 9th. Interns used their time in schools to integrate knowledge, theory, and skills learned during seminar sessions.

Students were enrolled in the following courses fall quarter: EDF 501-Educational Foundations; EDCS 444-Educational Issues and Law; PSY 552-Human Growth

Development/Advancement; EDF 510-Educational Research/Development; and EDCS 598-Internship. The focus of learning, however, remained aimed at successfully completing the cluster of twenty-six standards required for teacher certification in Washington. For each standard selected for Fall Quarter, congruent sets of learner outcomes broken into performance indicator components had been developed. While the field based internship is the cornerstone of the WMECTPP an equally important performance-based component existed within the program. The performance indicators revolved around standards of oral and written skills, service learning, and twenty-four WAC standards. Interns satisfied these learner outcomes through products produced on paper or video or through demonstrations in seminar or in the secondary classrooms. The internship coupled the performance indicators to both the field-based aspect and the academic learning aspect of the WMECTPP. Mentor teachers verified and signed off performance indicators met in the secondary classrooms. This responsibility provided a means of professional development for the mentors, thereby promoting educational renewal. Each performance indicator was arranged in a Standard: Learner Outcome: Indicator format (see appendix D for the Fall Quarter Performance Indicators).

All coursework was held at the Central Washington University's Wenatchee site on the Wenatchee Valley College campus. The only exception was EDCS 598-Internship, which took place at area middle and high schools. PSY 552 met from 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 A.M. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday while the other courses were presented in seminar format and were covered to the extent deemed appropriate. Seminars ran from 10:00 A.M. until 12:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M. depending on content covered. The cohort

was divided into four groups of five to six interns to facilitate cooperative learning and hands on activities within the seminar format.

In partnership with WMECTPP, the Wenatchee School District and North Central Educational Services District (ESD) provided seminars to enhance academic learning. The Wenatchee School District Superintendent led a seminar reinforcing the importance of student centered learning and reflective teaching. The ESD informed participants of its own role with regional schools, resources, procedures, and changes in state educational policy.

The internship for fall quarter was designed for interns to gradually immerse themselves into the school's culture. Depending on interns classroom development and comfort level, they could teach some classes Fall Quarter; however, only two university observed teaching exercises were required for each intern. It was left up to each intern and their mentor teacher to decide how many, if any, classes the intern would teach above the required two for Fall Quarter.

When not teaching, interns observed mentor teachers and helped out whenever appropriate. Intern activities could include, but not be limited to, tutoring students, leading short activities, assisting students on assignments, assisting mentors in laboratory exercises, interacting with students during activities, taking attendance, preparing activities and exercises for mentors, assisting mentors in planning, assisting in test preparation, and administering tests and quizzes. The goal of the observations was to allow the intern to see a master teacher at work on a regular basis. The observations would give the intern ideas on how to present material and topics while also providing

opportunities for questions and discussion with the mentor after class. Discussion and reflection periods allowed interns to relate pedagogical theories to real life teaching and learning.

At the end of fall quarter, interns met with the core faculty to present a portfolio. The portfolio consisted of each Fall Standard and corresponding evidence of competency at either the Exemplary or Competent level of achievement. There was also opportunity for interns to expand on lessons learned over the course of the quarter and for faculty to ask questions of interns related to their field experiences. The performance indicators were assessed and graded by faculty based on completeness and for Graduate quality.

The final requirement for fall quarter involved the research based Master's Thesis/Project. Interns were not only expected to have selected a topic for their Master's Thesis/Project, but they were also expected to turn in the first three chapters of the Thesis/Project before winter break. All Thesis/Projects were to be of interest to the particular intern and were to have application to the secondary classroom.

Winter Quarter

Winter Quarter expanded the internships for the WMECTPP cohort to three days a week. The schedule looked like this: seminar Monday and Friday; internship all day Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. Coursework for winter quarter was EDF 507-St/Pr Intercultural Education, EDCS 516-Media Utilization/Advanced Theory, EDCS 598-Internship, PSY 559- Advanced Educational Psychology, and EDF 598-Planning Learning. Seminars ran from 9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M. and from 1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M. every Monday and Friday, and were led core faculty (see appendix A for a journal of

seminar topics with some accompanying reflective thoughts). Psychology 559 ran from 11:00 A.M. to 12:40 P.M. on Monday and Friday, and was led by Phil Diaz Ph.D. via satellite from the Central Washington University's Ellensburg campus. The cohort attended PSY 559 lectures in an audio/video room in the Media Services building of the Wenatchee Valley College campus.

As in fall, several topics were covered by expert personnel partnered with the WMECTPP. These topics were Washington State's educational improvement efforts, Teacher Expectations & Student Achievement (TESA), Master's Thesis requirements and format, and placement file requirements. Washington State's improvement efforts have led to the adoption by the state of a mandated set of Essential Academic Learning Requirements (E.A.L.R.'s) for every subject and for each grade. Immersion into this topic set the stage for the interns as they would be concerned about E.A.L.R.'s the rest of the year and throughout their careers as educators in the State of Washington. History of the improvement efforts and reasoning behind the adoption of the E.A.L.R.'s was explained to help add clarity to the learner based outcomes mandated by the State for all its children.

The cooperative learning groups were rearranged this quarter. The reason for this was that some members in the cohort felt that they were not able to maximize seminar projects and activities because of the personality of their particular group.

Internship requirements intensified as interns assumed responsibility for one class on a full time basis. They were expected to leave substitute notes for their mentor teacher covering the days interns were in seminar. Expectations of the intern were all those of the

teacher of record. Mentors were available for feedback and assistance. This gave the

interns a safety net for which they could develop their educational philosophy and

experiment with their pedagogical style. Only being responsible for one class allowed the

interns to concentrate on the coursework requirements, as well as their internship,

without the WMECTPP placing unrealistic expectations of required work on them. They

participated within the other internship classes similarly to Fall Quarter, observing and

assisting their mentors.

As with Fall Quarter, the interns were expected to complete a set of performance

indicators relating to their work within and knowledge of the field of education (see

appendix E for Winter Quarter Performance Indicators). Performance indicators were

graded on completeness and a more exacting standard of Graduate level work than Fall

Quarter's. The end of quarter standard review meetings also featured more reflective

questions from the faculty concerning interns' experiences and thoughts. This reflected

interns' expanding knowledge, experience base, and ability to communicate effectively.

Spring Quarter

Spring Quarter brought a greatly reduced seminar load and a greatly increased

internship experience. Classes for Spring Quarter were: EDF 598-Learning

Methodology; EDF 598-Designing a Learning Environment; EDCS 598- Internship. As

with the previous two quarters, all seminars were led by WMECTPP faculty. Also, as

with the previous two quarters some topics were led by experts partnered with

WMECTPP faculty. One such session pertained to practical job search information and

interviewing tips led by Mr. Mike Brophy, principal of Eastmont High School. Two

seminars were held at the North Central Educational Service District (NCESD). These two sessions covered web page development and Powerpoint instruction (Powerpoint is presentation software created by Microsoft). Interns were able to actually practice the steps and concepts as they were taught using the NCESD's computer lab.

For the first five weeks of the quarter, seminars were held on Wednesday nights from 4:00 P.M. to 6:30 P.M. Thereafter seminars were held on Thursdays from 9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M. After the first five weeks, Fridays could either be spent in internship, or they could be spent receiving faculty help on the Master's Thesis/Projects.

Interns took over all full time teaching responsibilities in their classrooms spring quarter. For the first five weeks, each intern spent five days a week at their school teaching every class. After the first five weeks and until the end of the public schools' year, interns spent three or four days a week in the classroom (this depended on whether the interns chose to use their Fridays for WMECTPP faculty assistance or to further their internship experiences). Mandatory internship days were Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesday's. Interns were expected to teach for the entire day, each day spent in the classroom, either solo or in a team approach with their mentor. Each intern's teaching skills were formally evaluated once per quarter by WMECTPP faculty. Interns also received continuous feedback from their mentor teachers.

As the internship responsibilities increased, the coursework responsibilities decreased (see Appendix C graphic). This is evident in the reduced number of performance indicators required for Spring Quarter (see appendix F for Spring Quarter Performance Indicators). The quarter ended with a performance indicator review and

discussion between core faculty and each intern. Grades were again based on the completeness and quality of these indicators. In addition, interns were involved in a collaborative teaching evaluation with their mentor and core faculty. These evaluations were entered into each intern's personnel file and placement file.

Summer Quarter

Summer Quarter priorities centered first and foremost on completing the Master's Thesis/projects. Other coursework required were: EDCS 424-Reading in Content Fields; EDF 598-Teacher as Learner; and EDCS 700-Thesis/Project Study/Exam. EDCS 700 was largely independent study with guidance from WMECTPP faculty, and EDF 598 consisted of a summer school internship. EDCS 424 was a more traditional "seat-time" formatted class. Summer internship consisted of only four hours per week (or more if the intern desired), with the schedule to be arranged by individual interns allowing increased flexibility.

Interns voted to have EDCS 424 begin in spring and conclude in summer to allow more time in the summer for Master's Thesis/Project consideration.

The only other seminar dates Summer Quarter were June 24th from 1:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. and July 22nd from 1:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. The purpose of the June 24th seminar was to view, as a cohort, each intern's video of themselves teaching a class. Segments were limited to ten minutes each and were followed by observations, positive feedback, and questions. July 22nd's seminar was to prepare interns for their Master's Thesis/Project oral presentations, and discuss and reflect on the summer school internship experience. Core faculty led these seminars.

Performance Indicators were again required for Summer Quarter although the number was greatly reduced compared with prior quarters (see appendix G for Summer Quarter Performance Indicators). This followed the program design of gradually increased internship and decreased seminar responsibilities and maximized time to finish Master's Thesis/Projects. Interns met with core faculty for end of quarter and end of program performance indicator reviews.

Master's Thesis/Project oral presentations needed to be scheduled by July 23rd to be completed by August 6th in order for the Master of Education degree (M.Ed.) to be posted on interns' transcript for Summer Quarter. The quarter ended on August 20th with all other coursework, performance indicators, and the final review meeting needed to be complete for a Summer Quarter posting of the Teaching Certificate and M.Ed. degree.

Chapter 5

Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Summary

We performed this study to document the efficacy from a participant/observer perspective, and to create a blueprint for others interested in a similar program. The premise behind the WMECTPP was that there were many potential teachers for whom the traditional route to the classroom did not work. The rationale for alternative certification was varied but primarily revolved around the fact that many candidates were older with dependents and financial obligations. One of the most important strengths of these time-bound/place-bound learners is the plethora of experiences they have accumulated beyond an undergraduate education. By shortening the time required to obtain teacher certification, through intensive seminars, extensive internships, educational research, and performance based indicators, this diverse and rich pool of potential teachers can be tapped. The WMECTPP serves the needs of these candidates by allowing certification with a Master's of Education degree in twelve months.

Extensive research of a large body of knowledge on alternative certification demonstrates the soundness of this model of teacher preparation. With a three-pronged approach: internship; seminar; and inquiry/action research, graduates came out well prepared to lead their own classroom. Four out of the five principals who have hired pilot program graduates stated that they would give hiring preference to graduates of the WMECTPP over graduates of a traditional teacher certification program (Fitch, 1999).

33

The format of the WMECTPP allowed participants (interns) to gradually become acclimated to the secondary school atmosphere. Classroom responsibilities gradually increased over the course of the year, so by spring the intern had total responsibility for the classroom. At the same time, seminar responsibilities decreased. This model allowed interns to integrate theory learned in seminar immediately into their classroom experience. This provided opportunities to question, modify, reevaluate, and incorporate theory based on actual teaching experiences.

Assessment of each intern was based on their ability to complete a rigorous set of performance indicators related to academic learning and on their ability to lead a classroom. The final requirement to complete the WMECTPP and obtain teacher's certification with a M.Ed. was the successful completion of a research thesis/project and oral presentation of said thesis/project.

Recommendations

The study of a program cannot be complete without reflections on areas for improvement. With this in mind, the authors have some recommendations. As was pointed out in the study of the 1997/98 WMECTPP the success of this alternative certification program is dependent on the quality of the students it attracts. There are three recommendations to help maintain and ensure this quality and help reduce stress levels on some interns.

The authors strongly recommend adding a personal interview to the application process. Because the WMECTPP takes an intensive, rigorous approach to teacher certification, participants must be sufficiently mature and self disciplined for successful

completion. Of the twenty-three interns who started the program in August 1998, only sixteen finished. That is a loss of 30% of the participants. An interview would allow WMECTPP faculty to better ascertain the commitment level of applicants as well as to reinforce the nature of the program. An additional benefit to an interview would be to the applicants. There are several necessary components to being a teacher that may not stand out on paper but that would come across well in a personal interview. This would provide candidates an opportunity to highlight those strengths and to reconfirm their commitment to education.

The second recommendation to help ensure student quality relates to the necessity of an application deadline. The reason for this is twofold. It would allow WMECTPP faculty sufficient time to properly and thoroughly evaluate each application packet. Another benefit of an application deadline would be to the applicants themselves. If applicants needed to take too many courses for a content area endorsement to be able to complete the program, they would know this fact ahead of time.

Criterion that establishes realistic endorsement area coursework must be created. Before acceptance, each applicant must know precisely what classes in addition to the WMECTPP classes are required by CWU. This would eliminate interns having to take an excessive number of additional credits beyond those required by the WMECTPP. The WMECTPP is intensive and as such generates enough stress on its own without having the added requirements of an excessive number of credits necessary to complete the program. Candidates wishing to pursue the WMECTPP option for teacher certification

who did not have the minimum number of endorsement credits could spend the year fulfilling those requirements and reapply the following year.

In addition, to help ensure the high quality of the students for the WMECTPP, the authors also have recommendations to help strengthen the program functionally. Better communication with Central Washington University's Ellensburg campus is critical. One way to facilitate this would be to include an appropriate content area faculty member from Ellensburg to each intern's triumvirate of evaluators. Currently each intern is evaluated by their mentor teacher and two other core faculty. By adding a content area professor to this group, the communication gap between the Wenatchee branch campus and the Ellensburg main campus would be closed. This would ameliorate the endorsement area departments' concerns about WMECTPP candidate preparation. To alleviate the burden this would place on main campus faculty (both in time and inconvenience for driving to Wenatchee), they should be required to visit their appointed intern(s) no more than once a month.

A hidden benefit to this addition would be the content area professors' opportunities to get back out into the secondary schools. This would allow the professors to view how the theories they teach work in the "real world." Tying theory to practice is important and is one of the strengths of the WMECTPP. If modifications need to be made, the intern and content area professor could discuss particular events, theories, and possible changes.

Mentor teachers would also benefit. Having University professors visit their classrooms would provide valuable opportunities for renewal. Not only would this open

dialogue of current ideas and practices, but the professors could bring with them exciting new theories and research to share with mentor teachers. Everyone would benefit from this, especially the secondary students.

Another recommendation is more of a modification. The class EDCS 424-Reading in Content Fields ought to be moved from late spring/summer to the fall. The learner outcomes from this course were valuable and provided strategies which the interns could experiment with during their internship. The knowledge, theory, and ability to integrate the practices provided from these learner outcomes would have more value throughout the internship, rather than only near the end.

Another class-oriented recommendation refers to PSY 559. The Program Director, Class Instructor, and the WMECTPP interns felt that this class did not relate well to the art of teaching. This class was designed with school counselors and school psychologists in mind, not teachers. The course instructor did his best to make the content applicable to teachers, but this was extremely difficult within the confines of the course content. The authors and WMECTPP faculty recommend that PSY 559 be replaced with PSY 315-Educational Psychology. The course content of PSY 315 was designed with teachers in mind and would be much more applicable to their needs.

The authors also recommend that the University Field-Supervisor position be changed from part-time to full-time. This position is vital, not only in helping to assist in the assessment of each intern's teaching, but also as a liaison between the schools and the University.

For the 1998/99 program year the University Field-Supervisor formally evaluated each intern's teaching skills and assessed areas of need once per quarter. While this may be adequate, interns enrolled in a program of this caliber should expect at least three formal visits per quarter from the Field-Supervisor for assessment and feedback. Seminar topics and discussions may even be generated from the Field-Supervisor's increased observation of how the field portion of the program is progressing. This, in combination with the interns' daily interactions with their mentor teachers, would serve to strengthen the internship portion of the WMECTPP through increased opportunities for constructive feedback of the interns' strengths and weaknesses.

Through personal experiences and informal conversations with members of the 1998/99 WMECTPP cohort, the authors have come up with the following recommendation. This would be to lengthen the program in the front end. Either an intensive one-month unit or an entire summer session at the beginning of the program year could accomplish this. The purpose of this extra session would be to enhance the spring internship. Summer Quarter should have PSY 552, EDF 501, EDF510, and EDCS 444. Then Fall Quarter, with the addition of EDCS 424, would offer the courses currently taken Winter Quarter. Winter Quarter would then offer the courses taken Spring Quarter in the 1998/99 WMECTPP format, minus EDCS 424 which was moved to Fall Quarter. Spring Quarter would be entirely devoted to Internship. Summer Quarter would remain the same. EDCS 598-Internship would run throughout the year in a format identical to the 1998/99 format with the exception of Spring Quarter.

Currently the internship is full time for five weeks then three to four days per week for the remainder of the quarter. The authors propose making the internship the entire Spring Quarter with no University courses required. Seminars would still be held weekly, but their purpose would be slightly different than the 1998/99 Spring seminars. Under this proposal during the Spring seminars, interns would have an opportunity to discuss experiences, thoughts and ideas, and seek feedback from fellow interns and WMECTPP faculty regarding teaching. Each seminar could also feature a guest faculty member or administrator from one of the local schools to offer feedback and advice. These seminars would be mandatory, held in the late afternoon or evening, and limited to one to two hours. This is in acknowledgement of the time demands placed on interns when teaching full time. However interns should have the opportunity to stay late and share experiences, seek advice, visit with each other, and continue to strengthen the bonds between them on an optional basis.

The recommendation just stated would retain the strength of the twenty-six performance indicators while enhancing the internship experience. It is acknowledged that the performance indicators would need to be rearranged somewhat, but every attempt should be made to maintain the current course/performance indicator alignment. While lengthening the time required by and adding an additional expense to the WMECTPP, the authors believe that the WMECTPP would still be an attractive and effective option for place-bound/time-bound learners.

Finally the authors recommend that a study be conducted of the 1999/2000 WMECTPP by two members of the 1999/2000 cohort. One member of this team should

be responsible for building the WMECTPP webpage while the other should be responsible for the WMECTPP study. The webpage would take advantage of current and future technology to produce an electronic document capable of growing with the WMECTPP. A webpage would serve several functions: provide information to prospective applicants; detail the program's rich history and foundational beginnings; and serve as a blueprint for parties interested in emulating this approach to teacher certification.

The authors envision that this webpage would include the philosophical tenets of the program as well as more mundane information such as application procedures. Additionally digital photographs of each program class, program faculty, mentor teachers, and all others involved in the WMECTPP, from its inception to the current program year, would be included. Video clips and still photographs of various cohort members leading their classes and attending seminars would enhance the quality of this product. This web page should be updated semiannually and would grow with the program. Due to the great amount of time required (setting up webpage, traveling for photo and video segments, researching program history and philosophy, and locating past participants for photo inclusion, etc.) and the expense of equipment necessary (digital camera, digital video camera, and webpage software), the authors recommend that the university purchase the equipment and that the initial creation of the webpage meet the requirement of a Master's project.

The 1997/98 study documented the initial year of the WMECTPP and proposed changes as part of a continuous improvement goal, and the 1998/99 study investigated the

philosophical and foundational tenets of the WMECTPP (with recommendations to further the continuous improvement goal). The 1999/2000 study should have a different focus. This should answer the following two questions: A) Does the WMECTPP (a performance-based/field-based program) better prepare teachers than traditional course oriented teacher preparation programs? B) Does mastery of the twenty-six standards of learner outcomes better prepare teachers than enrollment in a series of classes?

Conclusions

The WMECTPP is built upon a solid base of educational theory and research. This is a cutting edge teacher certification program preparing tomorrow's teachers for the new paradigm of education. It did an excellent job combining traditional core educational courses with the modern philosophies of field and performance-based learning. The strengths of this program are the internship and the flexibility of the seminars.

Like all programs old and new, the WMECTPP had areas to improve, and like all new programs it had kinks to work out. The WMECTPP core faculty and staff were committed to working out the kinks and addressing the areas of improvement. That commitment was a promising and positive start and demonstrated that principles the program seeks to instill in its participants were practiced by its faculty: reflection; change; growth. According to the study of the 1997/98 program, changes have already occurred to address many of the concerns raised during the pilot year. This trend was expected to continue as the WMECTPP made its way from a pilot program to a fully mature alternative teacher preparation program.

The research reviewed indicated that there were no differences between traditionally trained teachers and alternatively trained teachers. If differences were found between the two types of trained teachers these differences were statistically insignificant after one year of contractual teaching. This illustrated that alternative teacher certification programs were at least as effective as traditional teacher certification programs. This was important, as these intensive programs provided a viable alternative to traditional teacher certification programs for place-bound/time-bound candidates interested in teaching by providing an equitable route in a greatly reduced timeframe.

One indicator of the WMECTPP's success would be the study of the 1997/98 cohort's hiring principals (Fitch, 1999). Of the five principals who hired graduates of the program, four indicated that they would give hiring preference to WMECTPP graduates as compared to traditionally trained teachers. This is a valid and important indicator of the WMECTPP effectiveness including the substitute of performance indicators for seat time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrew, M. D. (1997). What matters most for teacher educators. Journal of Teacher Education. 48 (3), 167-176. [Online]. Available: http://proquest.umi.com.

Barr, R. B. and Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. Change, November/December, 13-25.

Boser, J. A. (1990). The effect of a year-long internship on first-year teaching performance: Studying the effectiveness of the internship. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 521).

Boser, J. and Wiley, P. (1990). The principals' perceptions of the effect of a year-long internship of first-year teaching performance: "They really get to know what is going on." (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 521).

Bradshaw, L. K. (1998). Policy, politics, and contradictions of alternative teacher certification. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422 388).

Brown, P. A. (1984). Teacher education. Forum for Liberal Education. 7(2), 2-25. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 719).

Burch, B. and James, T. (1985). Early field experiences: A collaborative model for induction, mentoring, and integration of theory and practice. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 097).

Burstein, N. et al. (1999). Redesigning teacher education as a shared responsibility of schools and universities. Journal of Teacher Education. 50(2), 106-118.

Chang, W. (1997). Teacher education in Hawaii: The story of a successful collaboration. Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, 1-6. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420 646).

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. Educational Leadership, February, 6-11.

Dewey, J. (1929). The quest for certainty. New York: Minton, Balch & Co.

Dill, V. and Stafford, D. (1994). School-based teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, April, 620-623.

Dill, V. and Stafford, D. (1992). The alternate route: Texas finds success. Educational Leadership, September, 73-74.

Duhon-Haynes, G. et al. (1996). Post-baccalaureate teacher certification programs: Strategies for enhancement, improvement, and peaceful-coexistence with traditional teacher certification programs. 1-13. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404 334)

Eifler, K. and Potthoff, D. (1998). Nontraditional teacher education students: A synthesis of... Journal of Teacher Education, 49(3), 187-196. [Online]. Available: http//gw4.epnet.com/fulltest.asp.

Etheridge, G. et al. (1987). Graduated teaching internships: An overview and major findings. 1-22. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 724).

Fitch, L. (1999). Master's/Certification intern pilot evaluation.

Goodlad, J. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. Educational Leadership, November, 4-10.

Hawk, P. (1997). An accelerated alternative licensure program to recruit minorities. 1-10. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 380).

Howey, K. and Zimpher, N. (1994). Nontraditional contexts for learning to teach. Educational Forum, 58 (20), 155-162.

Jablonski, A. (1992). A fifth year professional training program for elementary school teachers: Its development through mentoring and internship. 1-22. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 418 062).

Jablonski, A. (1992). Learning to teach by teaching: The preparation of post-baccalaureate candidates for elementary teaching through a year-long mentored internship. February, 1-23. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 418 061).

Jiveledas, P. et al. (1991). Intern/Student teachers at the University of Tennessee College of Education as perceived by their cooperating teachers: A pilot study. 1-29. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 658).

Jonson, K. and Jones, E. (1998). Promoting teacher excellence: A comparison of two performance-based teacher assessment frameworks. Education, 118(4), 499-515. [Online]. Available: http//gw4.epnet.com.

Keating, J. et al. (1998). A collaborative action research model for teacher preparation programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(5), 381-390. [Online]. Available: http//proquest.umi.com.

Kelly, S. and Dietrich, A. (1995). The infuence of program structure and learner characteristics on teacher training outcomes. 1-15. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 392 787).

Laurence-Lightfoot, S. (1983). The Good High School: Portrait of characters and Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

McCleverty, A. (1999). Research methodologies in HCI Ethnography [Online]. Available:http://FSD.CPSC.UCALYARY.CA/RED/RECT/grouplab/saul/681/ 1997/amy/ethnography.html

Miller, J. and McKenna, M. et al. (1998). A comparison of alternatively and traditionally prepared...Journal of Teacher Education, 49(3), 165-177. [Online].Available: http//gw4.epnet.com/fulltext.

Pike, B. (1996). Adult learning theory increases the success of teaching interns. Adult Learning, 7(5), 13-14.

Ragland, J. and Grow, J. (1997). Truman State University's bold teacher education transformation: The M.A.E. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 373).

Rodriguez, Y. and Sjostrom, B. (1998). Critical reflection for professional development: A comparative study of nontraditional adults and traditional student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(3), 177-186.

Rubino, N. et al. (194). Alternative teacher certification: An avenue for quality and diversity in public education. 1-35. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 609).

Shannon, I. and Berdall, C. (1998). ASEP: A model for professionalism in a

successful postbaccalaureate secondary certification program for career changers.

1-18. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 148).

Seidel, S. (1997). NEA's teacher education initiative: The first year. Douts

Certainties, Spring, 1-7.

Shen, J. (1994). Study in contrast: Visions of preservice teacher education in the

context of a professional development school. 1-27. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED 368 677).

Steinegar, M. (1997). Constucting lifelong learners one teacher at a time.

Northwest Education, 2(4), 24-26.

Taylor, C. and Nolen, S. (1996). A contextualized approach to teaching teachers

about classroom-based assessment. Educational Psychologist, 31(1), 77-88.

Thompson, J. (1997). Integrating the mentorship factor into the clinical

supervision model. 1-28. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411 235).

Wilmore, E. (1996). Brave new world: Field-based teacher preparation.

Educational Leadership, 53(6), 59-63.

Wilson, J. (1996). An evaluation of the field experiences of the innovative model

for the preparation of elementary teachers for science, mathematics, and technology.

Journal of Teacher Education, 47(1), 53-59.

Wise, B. et al. (1994). Teacher education in transition: Alternate certification,

Texas-style. 1-17. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 443).

APPENDIX A
REFLECTIVE SEMINAR JOURNAL

Monday January 4, 1999

Central Washington University Wenatchee Center Master of Education Program

Reflective Journal for Seminar

Today only 11 of the 19 people in the program attended class. CWU's class schedule does not start until tomorrow. I think that in the future a little better clarification needs to be made in circumstances such as these, as many of the missing students were unaware that we had class. We heard from Jane about her vacation and Steve urged us to call our legislators in support of education.

The winter quarter schedule is as follows: Monday 9:00A.M. to 11:00A.M.- seminar with additional seminar from 12:00P.M. to 2:00P.M. as needed, and 11:00A.M. to 12:00P.M. Psychology 552 via video conference, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday we will be in our schools interning, Friday 9:00A.M. to 11:00A.M. viewing videos from Tuesday and Thursday's Psychology class, 11:00A.M. to 12:00P.M. with Psych. 552 and 12:00P.M. to 2:00P.M. in seminar. Some possibilities for the Psych. class in the future would be to take the class via the internet.

The rest of the day was spent doing some exercises, being assigned some homework and going over winter quarter's Standard Learner Outcomes in small groups.

EXERCISES

Answer the following three questions:

1. What was your anticipation of today? (first day of winter quarter)

2. What is your anticipation of tomorrow? (first day back interning)

3. What is your anticipation of the winter quarter Standards?

Answer the following four questions regarding fall quarter internships:

1. What was your most positive experience?

2. What was your least positive experience?

3. What experience did you learn the most from?

4. What would you do over again if given the opportunity?

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Know State Legislators for our area--Names, Addresses, Phone Numbers

Due Monday January 11, 1999

2. Set up an individual conference time with Jane--to meet before the 26th of January

3. Have an energizer for class participation by Monday January 11, 1999

4. Make a commitment to each other to help one another to succeed in this program

5. Work with and through each other.

6. To realize that Steve expects more of us winter quarter than he did fall quarter

7. Bring individual goals for winter quarter internship

Due Monday January 11, 1999

8. Reread the reflective journalizing handout (event, episode, analysis)

9. Reading--Foundations text by Jan. 25, 1999--chapter on multicultural education,

Feb. 1st, 1999 chapter on Curriculum development, Feb. 8, 1999 chapter on Delivery of

Instruction.

Steve needs John and I to make a roster of everyone's e-mail address (home or university)

We will have new groups for winter quarter.

PARTING TACIT KNOWLEDGE FOR THE DAY

Do not Leave Your Classroom--if something happens while you are gone (as the teacher) you open yourself up to negligence lawsuits.

Friday   January 8, 1999

We observed the videos from Psych. 559 and then attended the class at the W.E.T.S. lab. I thought it was exceptionally flexible and magnanimous of Phil Diaz PhD. to switch the class to a Monday Friday schedule meeting from 11:00A.M. to 12:40 P.M. (same amount of class time) so that we do not have to watch two days worth of video taped classes on Friday (from the four days a week format) before class on that Friday. This will be very nice as today we all decided we much preferred interacting with the class live much better than simply watching the video. I have to admit that before today I had serious reservations about this class (Psych. 559) because of the video format (two recorded hours and one hour live all on Fridays), now I feel very positive about it and feel that we will be able to get everything possible out of it.

The only other thing about today's seminar was a continuation of covering winter quarters standard learner outcomes. We organized them and schematized them with in our small groups. Steve Schmitz Ed.D. and Jane Lloyd rearranged our working groups within the larger cohort. This was done because some members felt that the old groups were not allowing them to get all they could out of the projects. So a mix of personalities was in order. In Monday's journal I will write the old groups and the new groups as I forgot to get that information all written down today and I cannot remember with 100% certainty. Our groups standard outcome schematics were then hung on the wall and explained by each group. The schematics represented how we felt we could meet the

outcomes required for winter quarter. This was the only exercise we did today (it did take quite a bit of time) and I feel it was beneficial in helping to outline the upcoming quarter through the construction of a plan of attack. We have planned the work now we must work the plan.

I am feeling very positive right now. We seem to be moving with a little better idea of where we are heading. This is probably the result of having successfully negotiated the first quarter. While there is still an extremely large amount of work to do the knowledge that we made it through one quarter will hopefully carry us through the next three quarters one step at a time.

Monday   January 11, 1999

Judy McCutchen from the North Central E.S.D. (Educational Service District) spoke with us today concerning Washington State's educational improvement efforts. This relates directly to the Certificate of Mastery requirement for graduation beginning in the year 2006 and the E.A.L.R.'s (Essential Academic Learning Requirements). I found this seminar to be particularly interesting as Judy outlined the reasoning behind the reform movement as well as some of the expectations of students and teachers.

House Bill 1209 mandated the establishment of statewide learning goals. These goals are as follows: 1. Read with comprehension, write with skill, and communicate effectively and responsibly in a variety of ways and settings.

2. Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical and life sciences; civics and history; arts; and health and fitness.

3. Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate experience and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems.

4. Understand the importance of work and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect career and educational opportunities. This reform has also created a perspective shift "It is not what the **teacher does**, but rather, what the **learner knows and is able to do** as a result of the learning environment that the **teacher creates**." to focus on learning rather than on teaching.

Talking about the transition from the current educational climate to the era of increased expectations consumed a large proportion of Ms. McCutchen's time. After listening to her I agree that we needed to do something to help ensure that our youths were learning more then they are currently learning. This has been debated for decades now and I feel as if we as a society are finely making some positive headway. The problem that stands out however is how to get the message to the public and how to train our teachers. After all this is a fairly large directional change and with all changes of such magnitude there are concerns, uncertainties, and questions (as well as resistance). if these issues can be worked through and satisfied then the future indeed does look bright. (The major change is teaching students how to think and solve problems not simply spit out facts by rote) One piece of advice from Ms. McCutchen to all teachers: know the E.A.L.R.'s and how they are being tested.

In Psych. 559 we are continuing to have technical difficulties (fade in and out, distracting auditory feedback, and today the cutout of the Ellensburg class entirely for over five minutes) This is distracting greatly from the experience and the quality of our

learning. It is not fair to us or to professor Diaz. This is something that should be looked into for next year's cohort and other options explored. Professor Diaz is great and he has gone above and beyond the call of duty to accommodate us. I feel that someone needs to correct the technical aspects of the class or if unfixable then other options for this class should be explored. If it turns out that this is the only option then these difficulties should be taken into account when grading the Wenatchee cohort.

Seminar part two for today covered our internships. Jane Lloyd covered the pathwise domains that we will be responsible for in our internships as we student teach. These domains are A: Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning, B: Creating an Environment for Student Learning, C: Teaching for Student Learning, and D: Teacher Professionalism. We worked in small groups doing exercises regarding situations and what domain the situation fell under. This was excellent to get us refocused on what we would be responsible for (other then curriculum content) during our student teaching.

This quarter's small groups are group A: Pam, Joe, Tarne, and Ron, group B: Marc, Geoff, Claudia, Chizuko (who will be spending seminar days in Ellensburg so we will not see her this quarter), and Peggy, group C: Shaila, Rex, Greg, Jenny, and Rick, and group D: Evelyn, Tony, Barb, John, and Chris.

Friday   January 15, 1999

Judy McCutchen came back today to finish her seminar from Monday. Today she covered three ways to feature thinking in the classroom. The three ways are

Model for them   In what ways will I demonstrate thinking

Engage them   How can I get my students thinking

Hold them accountable   How can my students assess their thinking

TACIT KNOWLEDGE FOR THE DAY

Ask students "What are your questions?" not "Do you have any questions?". If a person

does not have any questions then that person is not learning. Conversely if a person has

questions then that person is learning. The group also divided up into subgroups of four

or five to participate in an exercise. This exercise contained a problem which the group

had to brainstorm solutions for. See appendices for the complete description of the pipe

and ping pong ball dilemma. After this project and the subsequent sharing of ideas we

discussed the benefits to group projects such as they are generally high interest and fun

exercises, they teach cooperation and teamwork, and also stimulate creative/critical

thinking. Finally Ms. McCutchen led the class in a game of "Jeopardy" to assess the

amount of information retained from the last two seminars.

Professor Diaz's class went so much better today. The technical difficulties were

fixed (at least for today) and class ran smoothly. There is so much information in this

class that it is difficult to follow if there are continuing technical problems. Today's class

benefited from a flawless broadcast and this was extremely beneficial to the Wenatchee

cohort. I enjoyed today's class as I could follow from start to finish.

Friday   January 22, 1999

Today we started to fulfill the requirements for Standard 9 Learner Outcome A

Indicator 1. In our teams we met to strategize how we would meet this outcome. On

Monday we will draft a strategy proposal on the best practices of multicultural teaching. Team C left for the weekend with each member being responsible for reading chapter 6 in the Foundations text and for reading one other article on multicultural teaching for Monday's exercise. We are meeting an hour before seminar to finalize our group's portfolio of this project.

As a cohort we also went over the internship seminar topics that will be covered this quarter. These are the topics that we as a cohort voted on in the surveys Jane took last week. The top seven topics will be covered this quarter with a workshop covering five additional topics that are important to understand as a teacher. I will cover these more in depth as we cover them in seminar.

One final note on our cohort. we choose to sit in a traditional style (facing forward in rows) as opposed to a more common seminar style of a u-shaped pattern of chairs with instruction going on in the middle. We do not see each other as much our way. One also wonders if this is a reflection of our teaching philosophies or if we just do not feel like moving the tables and chairs each morning from the more traditional classroom format.

Psychology 559 went really well today. Professor Diaz facilitated a group discussion with both the Ellensburg and Wenatchee groups. The discussion was dynamic and much more enjoyable and informative than the straightforward lectures we have been receiving the last few weeks. We in Wenatchee got much more out of this lecture than any of the previous ones. Hopefully we will have more such sessions.

Monday   January 25, 1999

Psychology went well, the technology problems are still present though greatly

minimized. In Seminar we finished a project we started on Friday. This project

concerned our teams best practices for multicultural education. I was very happy with

my team's finished product. We collaborated very well, were respectful of each other's

thoughts, and built upon each other's ideas. Our major practices included getting to know

one's students in any manner deemed appropriate as quickly as possible and to

incorporate their experiences into the lesson's whenever and wherever possible. Another

excellent trait of good multicultural teaching is incorporating "teachable moments" into the

lesson plans as they arise (if appropriate) from the students cultural experiences.

One aspect of the overall exercise that turned out differently then I anticipated

was the large group portion. As a cohort we engaged in a group discussion on best

practices for multicultural education. Sadly this was not nearly as productive as it could

or should have been. The discussion quickly disintegrated into diatribes that went well

beyond the pale (beating a dead horse springs to mind) and minor defensive squabbles

about individual's practices. In this setting simply asking a question about another's

practice was taken as an assault to one's integrity and character (that was the impression

given). We spent too much time on nonconstructive topics. We did agree that getting to

know one's students was the first and most important step to multicultural education.

Getting to know yourself and your own biases is also important. Working in one's

students experiences and cultures was the other practice we agreed on. All of this was

predicated on the basis of the students having a workable grasp of the English language (one topic beaten to death).

I was expecting each group to go over their ideas in a report or presentation format. In retrospect I think the format of the original project was very good (and better then individual report format) we just did not take advantage of it. These types of group interactions need people to take a little less ownership of their ideas and to be open to other's comments, questions, and critiques as well as to be open to new ideas. Overall I would grade the concepts and ideas that came out of this exercise as an A, but the interaction as a cohort would be given a C.

As a cohort we seem to operate better in our small groups than we do as a whole cohort. In our small groups we are cooperative and concerned about the rest of the members of our group. When we move to the large group we sometimes become territorial and each group forms a defensive attitude about its ideas. From this perspective it appears that we have to many chefs in the kitchen and each one wants to make its own soup. With this in mind strategies for effective group dynamics depend entirely on the makeup of the group.

For a group to work effectively however their are some basic needs that must be met. First a leader must evolve. Someone with a strong vision of what the group is trying to accomplish and who can turn that vision into reality. The leader must also be aware of the resources and personnel at their disposal. It is an asset if the leader gets along well with every member of the team and should do all within their power to maintain strong positive relationships between and among every member of the group. Good leaders are

not afraid to relinquish their position when it is in the best interests of the group and the vision to do so.

While a good leader is important the rest of the group members are equally important. Each member of the team must be willing to cooperate with the whole team, do their fair share of the group's work. Actively listening to and seriously analyzing every idea, no matter who or where it came from, is also a key ingredient for each team member of an effective group. In fact the ability to be open-minded and a willingness to let one's own ideas go is probably one of the most important characteristics of each member of a highly effective team. Sometimes if we had more of the latter in our cohort we might get more accomplished.

In the absence of these characteristics in the membership a strong leader can still meld the group into an efficient machine it just takes a lot more work on their part. Another way the group can overcome some of its inability's to release personal agendas is if the group has an intense desire to accomplish something. That is if the goal is important enough many people will put aside their personal agendas until the goal has been reached. After that though watch out. So if one wants to form effective groups they must evaluate the personnel they will be grouping. From that they can decide if the group will accomplish the task on its own or if the reward needs to be great enough to drown out petty bickering.

I think in the case of our cohort it is a mixture of the two. We each have a strong desire to reach the end and obtain our Masters Degree. At the same time we do care

about what the other members have to say it just takes awhile to come across once in awhile. all in all though I would have to say that we are supportive of each other.

Jane talked about the State E.A.L.R.'s (the four basic categories-Reading, Writing, Communication, and Mathematics and then the content area E.A.L.R.'s). The four basic sets of E.A.L.R.'s permeate all of the content area ones. We then located the E.A.L.R.'s that we met through our multicultural team and cohort exercises. I think today went pretty well with some valuable information gained.

Friday   January 29,1999

We covered Stiggins book "Student-Centered Classroom Assessment". Each member of each team was responsible for reading chapter one and two other chapters (plus two more for this Monday). Each team member covers different chapters then the other members of the team. New groups are then formed by chapters read with the chapters discussed within these groups to reach a consensus on what is important from each chapter. The original teams then got back together with each person reporting to their whole team what was important from each chapter that they were responsible for. I had chapter 6 as one of my chapters. Unfortunately the other members of the chapter 6 club (one from each of the other teams) were all absent today--Marc, John, and Barb.

Professor Diaz went into lecture mode again today but that was okay. However the technical difficulties returned with color of his skin and jeans fluctuating from green to blue to normal and back again in a continuous cycle of rotating colors. This was very distracting to everyone and made it hard to concentrate at times on what was being said

(especially over the chuckles at Professor Diaz's newfound chameleon traits). I wonder if it is a recessive or dominant trait? Ha ha. Other than these continuing problems the class is going very well and is interesting.

In the afternoon we watched Stiggins' video workshop relating to his book. He needs to practice talking in front of large groups as he stuttered constantly, which was very distracting. I found myself at times listening to how he was talking and not to what he was saying. I also think that it was not all that useful. Either reading the book and discussing it in our teams (like we did) or watching the video are excellent exercises, but I think both become redundant and unnecessary. The video just repeated what was in the book. The afternoon seminar time could be spent covering another topic. This is a suggestion for the future.

Monday   March 1, 1999

Seminar went from 1-4 today at the E.S.D. after Psych. We had professor Diaz up again to lecture from Wenatchee. it is so much better having him in person. I think the satellite is a good idea but the technology is not up to par in its current incarnation. We get so much more out of class when we can interact with the professor in person, plus the technology does not cut us off. Going over the expectations teachers, counselors, and school psychologists have of each other and defining the job descriptions of each was very helpful and informative.

The seminar session covered our placement files with the Central Washington University career center and resume writing. It lasted the full three hours and was still not enough time to cover everything. This could easily have been an eight hour session. The information was interesting, the three hours flew by, and timely. These are the types of sessions we definitely need mixed in with the more formal stuff. Lisa Stowe and Rosalind Lister presented the session and it was filled with a wealth of knowledge. Outstanding!!

Friday   March 5, 1999

I have to confess that I was not really emotionally and mentally intuned to class at all today. We were told last night that my uncle (my Dad's younger brother) would probably not live to see tomorrow. My Father raced down to Vancouver, WA. today in hopes of seeing him before his death. I went to seminar even though I really did not feel like it. It was one of our more informal seminars as we talked about our internship; what was working, what was not, styles of classroom management, and the importance of keeping balance in our lives. Psychology discussed further the interactions of counselors, school psychologists, and teachers. We managed to make it through a whole class without technical difficulties. After psychology (we did not have an afternoon session) I talked with one of my fellow cohort members about their frustration with the grading system. They feel that there are inconsistencies to whether or not a person is given credit for Standards. To clarify, they feel that there work is of equal quality to others

who have turned the same standards in but that they are told to redo them while others are given credit for completion of the Standard. This frustration was quite strong and they needed someone to listen. I was happy to hear them out as I would like to be there to help any of my classmates out in anyway I can. I also must confess that I and others in addition to this individual share concerns over the vagueness of what exactly constitutes mastery of some of these Standards and what does not. I wonder if that might be something that we can work on to clarify or if it is slightly vague of necessity (do to the nature of the standards themselves and to provide flexibility in completing them). If this is the case then it might be a good idea to stress that in the beginning of the year.

Another prevailing perception is that the internship (admittedly the strength of this program) is much more demanding and time-consuming yet the seminar has not compensated by relaxing its requirements, indeed the seminar seems to be demanding more also. A simple remedy to this would be to point out fall quarter that winter quarter will be much more demanding of the cohort then fall will be. Most of this years cohort had the impression that the seminar would be greatly reduced. I am not advocating that it should be I am simply pointing out perceptions and the need for constant communication. I think people respond more positively to adverse or stressful conditions if they are prepared and expecting them. Communication does this and could easily occur in advance of current practices.

I feel very strongly that this program (Teacher Certification with Masters at Central Washington University Wenatchee Center) has a superb skeletal structure, musculature, and organ system, it just needs to be fleshed out and dressed. That is the

goal of Steve Schmitz EdD. and everyone else associated with the program. John Tuttle and I (Rick Fillman) would like to help from the standpoint of students enrolled in the program. We feel that this program, that we are in the infancy of, could be the premier teacher preparation program in the country, a model for other universities to follow.

Along that vein if we are to be given the flexibility to attend any school district in the area (which I think is a necessity for several reasons) then the standards need to reflect that. In other words several of the standards refer to Wenatchee School District policies specifically. These need to be modified and flexible or the Wenatchee School District policies provided to the students in seminar for their review and use. It is very difficult for students in outlying areas to obtain these policies on their own. The reasons I believe multiple school districts for the cohort are a must are several; it provides more flexibility to the program participants, it allows other school district to benefit from the program and the internship, it allows varied perspectives in seminar (students in different districts encountering different situations and bringing varying experiences from the internship to seminar), and it does not tax the ability of one school district to try and place so many student teachers especially if there are a lot in one broad endorsement area such as science.

Friday March 12, 1999

Our cohort took another hit today. We lost Peggy Burbidge. She decided not to come back for spring quarter and told us today since today was the last day of classes for

winter quarter. Next week is standard review week and internship. I am saddened by Peggy's departure more than any of the others (we have lost Tom, Joy, Katie, and Mike since the beginning) because she was in my group last quarter (I miss that group by the way as it was much more comfortable than this quarter's group has been-our group last quarter acted more like a team than this quarter's group has) and because she went through two quarters with us. Because of these two factors I knew Peggy better than I knew the other cohort members who left the program. Even though I want what is best for her I feel sad because it is like losing a dear friend. Even keeping in touch will never quite be the same. She brought a lot of maturity and quiet confidence to the group. Her input will be missed.

Today was also the last day of class with Professor Diaz. I really enjoyed his class and would have loved to have been able to have him here on campus. Several members of our cohort grumbled about the course but I thought he did an outstanding job! He bent over backwards to accommodate us. I will miss him and his class too! This is supposed to be therapeutic I am told but all it is doing for me is to make me sadder as I dwell on our losses.

Wednesday, March 31, 1999

The group dynamics in today's seminar were interesting. It took a long time for

the cohort to settle down and start the session. Many of the members had a lot to talk

about with each other and were content to make Steve wait to begin.

Once underway, we discussed what we had learned in our internships. Some

responses were: the importance of fostering a relationship with students; the principal

does set the tone for learning and discipline in the school; if students know what is

expected, they will generally rise to meet those expectations; teaching is a difficult job;

etc.

Wednesday, April 21, 1999

This is the first seminar of Spring Quarter. Only eight people in attendance. This

could be because we are only meeting once a week now and some people have a long

way to drive.

The cohort was asked if the three week observation in September was valuable.

We were also asked what changes we would recommend.

Generally the cohort felt the three week observation period was a good

opportunity to get to know teachers and the school in which they would most likely work.

We discussed how teaching was going. What was going well? What was causing

problems? Most students had stories about classroom management and how to deal with

tough kids. Some members were quite tired and looking forward to the end of the school

year. By and large, members had positive experiences student teaching. We felt well

prepared to take over the classes.

We went over the schedule for the rest of the quarter. Steve said Dr. DePaepe

would be coming to Wenatchee to assist with our projects. He also told us about the class

Reading in the Content Fields that we would need to take.

Wednesday, April 28, 1999

Mr. Mike Brophy the principal of Eastmont High School spoke about

interviewing. He gave us tips of do's and don'ts for interviewing for a teaching job. He

spoke about researching the history of a district, knowing its mission statement, being

prepared with questions, and arriving early, etc.

The cohort seemed impressed by Mr. Brophy's talk and found the information valuable

and appreciated his time. This lead to further discussion.

After talking about interviewing, we discussed how teaching was going for

everyone. Each person related a story – positive or negative about his/her experiences.

Thursday, May 6, 1999

In today's seminar, we talked about Summer Quarter and the class: Teacher as

Learner. This class will give us the opportunity to work with a diverse population. Steve

wants a written description of the summer school program in which we will participate.

Many of the cohort are concerned about time to finish their thesis or project.

Steve said a completion goal should be July 1. That is when we should have the rough

draft finished. Then we can schedule the oral presentations to be completed by August 6.

There is a lot of anxiety. The reading class was unexpected and requires much

time. Summer will be very busy for all of us.

Steve asked us to ponder three questions. 1. If your philosophy is different than

your mentor's, how has that effected you? 2. Explain in what ways you have been and

still are agents of change. 3. How important is your relationship with your mentor?

Wednesday, May 19, 1999

This afternoon we met at the ESD for a demonstration on building webpages.

The facility allowed each student to work on either a Mac or PC and were led step-by-

step through the webpage building procedure.

The potential for classroom use of these skills is great. Students could work

together to build webpages for themselves, their classes, or their school. This skill could

lead some students to lucrative job opportunities. The cohort was excited about our

learning opportunity, but by the end of the presentation all were very tired. We realized

this was a good introduction, but like most projects would take time to learn well.

Thursday, May 27,1999

Dr. Sledge led us through some assignment related activities and explained more

about the Reading Response Journals. The content of class is applicable to teaching.

Many of us are frustrated that the class was not scheduled in Fall Quarter when we could

apply what we are learning now. The timing for the class is poor. By this time in

program, we should be able to concentrate on our thesis or project, endorsement area

classes required by Central, and summer school.

Thursday, June 10, 1999

Some of us have finished the school year. This will give us more time to

complete our remaining standards and do our standard reviews with Jane and Steve.

Being done with school is a good feeling. We all worked hard and look forward to

completing Summer Quarter. Some of the cohort have already secured jobs for the

upcoming school year. Others have not looked because they have some endorsement

classes to finish at Central before they will be ready for employment.

Reading in the Content Area met today. Again, frustration was expressed about

the work-load of the class at this juncture of the program. No one complained about the

quality of the class.

My final thoughts about the year are positive. I felt the strength of the program was the internship. We got to put into practice the theories and techniques we learned in seminar as soon as we had the chance. Since we were placed in schools immediately, we had the opportunity to find out if we really wanted to be teachers after all. Two of my friends went all the way through a school of education only to find out at the very end they did not like teaching.

I think the program has terrific potential, and hopefully the suggestions we made will be addressed. My hope is that Central fully commits to the Wenatchee program and strives to maintain open lines of communication. The success of Wenatchee reflects on the success of Central. This rural part of the state needs for the Wenatchee program to continue to improve.

APPENDIX B
WMECTPP CALENDAR

August-September 1998

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
31 Orientation Icebreakers Team Building	1 Orientation Team Building Portraiture Paper Assingment	2 School Observation Internship	3 School Observation Internship	4 School Observation Internship
7 School Observation Internship	8 School Observation Internship	9 School Observation Internship	10 School Observation Internship	11 School Observation Internship
14 School Observation Internship	15 School Observation Internship	16 School Observation Internship	17 School Observation Internship	18 School Observation Internship
21 Seminar: Fall quarter orientation	22 Internship	23 Psy 552 Human Growth and Dev./Adv. Seminar: EDF 501 Educational Foundations	24 Internship	25 Seminar: EDF 501
28 Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501	29 Internship	30 Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501	October 1 Internship	2 Seminar: EDF 501

October 1998

5	6	7	8	9
Attended Jerry Conrath Inservice	Internship	Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501 EDCS 444 Ed. Issues in Law	Internship	Team Building at Ropes Course
12	13	14	15	16
Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501	Internship	Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501	Internship	Seminar: Met at ESD: Introduction to services provided
19	20	21	22	23
Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 510 ED. Research and Dev.	Internship	Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 510	Internship	Seminar: EDF 510
26	27	28	29	30
Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444	Internship	Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444	Internship	Seminar: EDCS 444

November 1998

2 Seminar: EDCS 444	3 Internship	4 Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 510	5 Internship	6 Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 510
9 Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444	10 Internship	11 Veterans Day	12 Internship	13 Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444
16 Psy 552 Seminar: Issues in Special Education	17 Internship	18 Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444	19 Internship	20 Seminar: EDF 501 EDF 510 Expert Speakers: Indiviuals with Disabilities Ed. Act
23 Psy 552 Seminar: Expert Speaker: local Teacher's Assoc. Rep.	24 Internship	25 Independent Study/Research	26 Internship	27 Independent Study/Research

December 1998

30	1	2	3	4
Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 510	Internship	Psy 552 Seminar: EDF 501	Internship	Independent Study/Research
7 Seminar: Introduction to District Administration Roles and Responsibilities	8 Internship	9 Psy 552 Seminar: EDCS 444 EDF 501 EDF 510	10 Internship	11 Independent Study/Research
14 Scheduled Standard Reviews. Independent Study/Research	15 Internship	16 Scheduled Standard Reviews. Independent Study/Research	17 Internship	18 Scheduled Standard Reviews. Independent Study/Research . Finish Fall Quarter

January 1999

4	5	6	7	8
Seminar: Winter Quarter Orientation EDCS 598 Planning for Leaning	Internship	Internship	Internship	Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDCS 516 Media UT: ADV. Theory EDF 507 Intercultural ED.
11 Psy 559 Seminar: Expert Speaker: Educational Reform	12 Internship	13 Internship	14 Internship	15 Psy 559 Seminar: Expert Speaker: Educational Reform
18 Martin Luther King Jr. Day	19 Internship	20 Internship	21 Internship	22 Psy 559 EDCS 598
25 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDF 507	26 Internship	27 Internship	28 Internship	29 Psy 559 EDCS 598

February 1999

1 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598	2 Internship	3 Internship	4 Internship	5 Psy 559 Seminar: EDSC 598 EDSC 444
8 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDF 507	9 Internship	10 Internship	11 Internship	12 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDF 507
15 Presidents Day	16 Internship	17 Internship	18 Internship	19 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDF 507
22 Psy 559 Seminar: Expert Speakers EDF 510	23 Internship	24 Internship	25 Internship	26 Psy 559 Seminar: Expert Speaker EDCS 598

March 1999

1 Psy 559 Seminar: Expert Speakers: Career Placement	2 Internship	3 Internship	4 Internship	5 Psy 559 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDCS 516
8 Independent Study/Research	9 Internship	10 Internship	11 Internship	12 Psy 559 Scheduled Standard Reviews
15 Scheduled Standard Reviews	16 Internship	17 Internship	18 Internship	19 Scheduled Standard Reviews
22 Internship	23 Internship	24 Internship	25 Internship	26 Internship
29 Internship	30 Internship	31 Internship Seminar: EDCS 598 Designing Leaning Environments EDCS 598 Learning Methods	1 Internship	2 Internship

April 1999

5	6	7	8	9
Spring Break	Spring Break	Spring Break	Spring Break	Spring Break
12 Internship	13 Internship	14 Internship	15 Internship	16 Internship
19 Internship	20 Internship	21 Internship Seminar: EDCS 598 EDCS 598	22 Internship	23 Internship
26 Internship	27 Internship	28 Internship Expert Speaker: Interviewing Seminar: EDCS 598 EDCS 598	29 Internship	30 Internship

May 1999

3 Internship	4 Internship	5 Internship	6 Seminar: EDCS 598	7 EDCS 700 Thesis/Project
10 Internship	11 Internship	12 Internship	13 Seminar: EDCS 598	14 EDCS 700 Thesis/Project
17 Internship	18 Internship	19 Internship Seminar: EDCS 516	20 Seminar: EDCS 424 Reading in the Content Fields	21 EDCS 700 Thesis/Project
24 Internship	25 Internship	26 Internship Seminar: EDCS 516	27 Seminar: EDCS 424	28 EDCS 700 Thesis/Project

June 1999

31 Memorial Day	1 Internship	2 Internship	3 Internship EDCS 598 EDCS 598	4 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	5
7 Internship	8 Internship	9 Internship	10 EDCS 424	11 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	12
14 Internship EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	15 Internship EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	16 Internship EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	17 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	18 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	19 EDCS 424
21 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	22 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	23 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	24 Seminar: EDCS 598 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	25 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	26 EDCS 424
28 EDCS 598 Teacher as Learner	29 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	30 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project			

July 1999

			1 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	2 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	3
5 EDCS 598	6 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	7 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	8 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	9 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	10 EDCS 424
12 EDCS 598	13 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	14 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	15 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	16 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	17
19 EDCS 598	20 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	21 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	22 Seminar: EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	23 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	24
26 EDCS 598	27 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	28 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	29 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	30 EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	31

August 1999

2	3	4	5	6
EDCS 598	EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project	EDCS 700 Thesis/ Project
9	10	11	12	13
EDCS 598	EDCS 598	EDCS 598	EDCS 598	EDCS 598
16	17	18	19	20
EDCS 598	EDCS 598	EDCS 598	EDCS 598	End of WMECTPP

APPENDIX C
WMECTPP SCHEMATIC

MASTER'S WITH CERTIFICATION
WENATCHEE
1997 - 1998

FALL Foundations	WINTER Planning for Instruction	SPRING Instructional Methodology	SUMMER Evaluation & Reflection

Classroom Experience

Formalized Learning Opportunities

Portfolio presentation

Professional Development Plan

↑

Performance benchmark check point

↑

Performance benchmark check point

↑

Performance benchmark check point
Research topic identified

APPENDIX D
FALL QUARTER PERFORMANCE INDCATORS

Name:_____

Standard 1: Acquire the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education, including an understanding of the moral, social, and political dimensions of classrooms, teaching, and schools.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies major tenets

_____ Indicator 1) *Develop a written or oral presentation of your philosophy statement by doing the following:*

    a. *Describe major educational philosophies, including the proponents and the major ways of knowing, of explaining reality and establishing truth for these theories:* *Essentialist/Idealist-Realist*
                                    Progressive/Experimental-Pragmatic
                                      Existentialist
                                      Reconstructionist
                                      Constructivist

    b. *Identify school subjects and learning strategies of choice for each philosophy.*

    c. *Identify philosophies demonstrated by local educators, the school curriculum, and national educational practice and relate them to major trends or issues.*

    d. *State own philosophy tentatively, with rationale based on* a, b, c.

Learner Outcome B: Articulates current philosophy.

_____ Indicator 1) *See* S1A.1d

Learner Outcome C: Analyzes various educator's philosophies.

_____ Indicator 1) *See* S1A.1c

_____ Indicator 2) Maintain a daily reflective journal, including:

    a. *observation of practice in classrooms.*
      • *teacher-student interactions*
      • *teacher-teacher interactions*
      • *student behavior on task and off task*

- *teacher techniques for motivation and correction of student behavior*

b. *observation of school settings.*
   - *classrooms*
   - *offices*
   - *faculty room*
   - *hallways*
   - *school grounds*
   - *meetings*

c. *practices and materials recorded for future use.*

d. *questions raised by observations and answers or responses, as they may be provided.*

e. *adjustments you might make to classroom practice or the school setting in order to align them with your philosophy*

Learner Outcome D: Identifies trends in education.

_____ Indicator 1) *See* S1A.1c

Learner Outcome E: Adjusts/adapts instruction to fit foundations.

_____ Indicator 1) *See* S1B.1e

Learner Outcome F: Identifies the philosophical foundations of special education.

_____ Indicator 1) *See* S6A.1

Standard 3: Theories of human and development learning.

Learner Outcome A: Demonstrates understanding of the stages of human development.

_____ Indicator 1) *Complete the course requirements for PSY 552.*

Learner Outcome B: Assesses, identifies and develops appropriate responses to the developmental level and learning style of individual students.

_____ Indicator 1) *Give a presentation that is developmentally appropriate for two or more different stages and styles.*

<u>Learner Outcome C</u>: Applies the tenets of the major educational theories to educational settings

_____ Indicator 1) See S1A.1

Standard 4: Inquiry and research

<u>Learner Outcome A</u>: Explains various models of educational research.

_____ <u>Indicator 1</u>) *Compare and contrast different methods of research (experimental, historical, phenomenological, qualitative, quantitative, descriptive, inferential, etc.), describe an appropriate research question for five different types, and explain how answers to such questions can be applied. Demonstration may be by report, group presentation, panel, or seminar discussion. (See scoring rubric.)*

<u>Learner Outcome B</u>: Explains how educational research is applied.

_____ <u>Indicator 1</u>) See S4B.1

<u>Learner Outcome C</u>: Appropriately accesses, evaluates and applies educational research.

_____ <u>Indicator 1</u>) *Prepare a proposal, including:*
        a. *problem statement*
        b. *hypotheses if appropriate*
        c. *related literature, including a minimum of ten sources*
        d. *method of research or production*
        e. *anticipated result or product*
Present proposal to committee at a scheduled prospectus meeting.

<u>Learner Outcome D</u>: Uses observation strategies as research tool.

_____ <u>Indicator 1</u>) *Report on observation of learner or leaning environment.*
        Include: a. *setting*
                        b. *participants*
                        c. *subject(s) of observation*
                        d. *data collected*
                        e. problems of data collection
                        f. conclusions or description of situation

Learner Outcome E: Conducts observation and analyzes data.

_____ Indicator 1) See S4D.1

Standard 5: School law and educational policy

Learner Outcome A: Articulates how the legal system impacts the educational system.

_____ Indicator 1) Give a written or oral presentation of one of the following:

a.   *In a law brief, analyze a significant civil or criminal law case affecting education. Include:*
   - *participants*
   - *complaint or situation*
   - *decision*
   - *any appeals and their decisions*
   - *immediate effects*
   - *local effects in educational practice, if any*

   or

b.   *In a case study, identify and describe a major federal educational law. Follow one section through enactment, inclusion in the US Code, the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and local practice in the Wenatchee School District.*

   or

c.   *Complete the same assignment using a major state educational law. Follow one section through enactment, inclusion in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) to application in the Wenatchee School District.*

Learner Outcome B: Articulates and acts in accordance with laws and regulations (federal, state, local) that govern educational practices.

_____ Indicator 1) *See S5A.1*

_____ Indicator 2) *Pass 100 item objective test at least the competent level (see scoring rubric) over legal rights and responsibilities of Washington educators.*

Learner Outcome C: Differentiates among laws, policies, procedures and ethics.

_____ Indicator 1) *See S5A.1*

Learner Outcome D: Describes legislation and litigation related to special education.

_____ Indicator 1) *In a written or oral presentation, describe legislation and litigation related to special education.*

_____ Indicator 2) *See S5B.2*

Learner Outcome E: Explains the processes involved in assessing the learner's eligibility for and receiving special education services.

_____ Indicator 1) *In a presentation on assessment and referral, report on the legal requirements to be met and the methods of testing (evaluating appropriate to establish eligibility for five different special education services.*

Standard 6: Issues related to abuse.

Learner Outcome A: Describes the referral process related to abuse as required by the state and district.

_____ Indicator 1) *Document the referral process required by law in cases of child abuse. Include:*
   a. *signs of abuse that may be observed.*
   b. *educator's responsibility*
   c. *school's responsibility*
   d. *possible involvement of appropriate agencies for potential cases of abuse to be suggested by core faculty*

Standard 7: Professional Ethics

Learner Outcome A: Explains and acts in accordance with the professional code of ethics.

_____ Indicator 1) *Reflect in journal about situations, if any occur, that identify or illustrate ethical dilemmas. Include:*
   a. *situation(s)*
   b. *persons involved (not named)*
   c. *issue*
   d. *resolution, if any*
   e. *relationship to generally accepted ethical behavior*

_____ Indicator 2) *In a written or oral presentation, compare and contrast codes of ethics of American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Education Association (NEA), and codes of at least two other organizations.*
Include:

        a. definition of ethics
        b. how they were developed
        c. how they are (might be) enforced
        d. who they bind
        e. how effective they may be
        f. how any aspect is apparent in Wenatchee School District educational practice

Standard 8: Responsibilities, structure, and activities of the profession.

Learner Outcome A: Delineates and performs the range of duties and responsibilities of the teacher.

_____ Indicator 1) *Keep journal accounts that document learning of students' names, attendance taking, correcting papers and copying/duplicating materials. See checklist on pg. 7 of Wenatchee High School Student Teacher Packet.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Keep journal account of committees, department meetings, parent contact, student conferences, WenEA meetings, school board meetings, any district level meeting, etc. Attend a minimum of nine different meetings.*

Learner Outcome B: Identifies and describes the roles of professional organizations, including those related to special education.

_____ Indicator 1) *Become familiar with the national organization that aligns with subject area of greatest interest, i.e. National Council Teachers of English, National Council of Math Educators, etc. Show awareness by reading some of the organizations publications and talking with other teachers. Complete an abstract that includes the organization's Mission Statement, qualifications for membership, benefits and number of members in the organization.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Meet all district personnel at a Team Administrators' meeting to learn about their responsibilities and how each contributes to the district operations. (Identify title and function)*

_____ Indicator 3) *Report in journal on duties and responsibilities of mentor or other teachers observed. Description may be of observations of a typical day at school as well as at other sites, a summary of reading, discussions or a combination.*

_____ Indicator 4) *Compare and contrast the roles and responsibilities of the local collective bargaining agent, of the academic area of personal endorsement, and one other education related organization.*
Include:
a. *purposes of the organizations*
b. *responsibilities of members*
c. *responsibilities to members*
d. *membership criteria*
e. *membership numbers*
f. *dues*
g. *organizational structure*
h. *method of attaining membership*

Standard 10: Different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies commonly accepted definitions of learning style variations.

_____ Indicator 1) *Use the seminar group after doing assigned reading with a focus on learning styles and multiple intelligence.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Complete a personal learning style inventory. Report to seminar group and include the data in portfolio.*

Standard 22: Classroom management and discipline.

Learner Outcome A: Demonstrates knowledge of WAC/RCW related to district discipline model.

_____ Indicator 1) *Review Wenatchee School District "Sanctions Chart" and identify the appropriate WAC/RCW of 10 discipline consequences as identified by mentor.*

Learner Outcome E: Develops strategies to ensure proper responses to learners.

_____ Indicator 1) *Participate in a least three hours of Teacher Effectiveness Student Achievement (TESA) instruction. Practice as verified by mentor.*

Standard 26: Oral and written communication skills

Learner Outcome <u>A</u>: Communicates effectively in writing.

_____ <u>Indicator 1)</u> *Provide at least three examples of scholarly papers written in APA format.*

Learner Outcome <u>B</u>: Communicates effectively orally.

_____ <u>Indicator 1)</u> *Lead at least three lessons/presentations.*

APPENDIX E
WINTER QUARTER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

EDCS 516 Technology

Standard 2: Impact of technological and societal changes on schools.

Standard 20: Educational technology, including the use of computer and other technologies used for instruction, assessment, and professional productivity.

EDCS 598 Planning for Learning

Standard 9: Research and experience-based principles of effective practice for encouraging the intellectual, social and personal development of students.

Standard 17: Collaboration with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger community for supporting students' learning and well-being.

Standard 18: Effective interactions with parents to support student learning and well-being.

Standard 21: State goals and essential academic learning requirements.

Standard 25: Service Learning.

EDF 507 Intercultural Learning

Standard 10: Different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.

PSY 559 Psychology of Learning

Standard 12: Individual and group motivation for encouraging social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Standard 13: Effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication for fostering active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Standard 16: Formal and informal assessment strategies for evaluating and ensuring the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Standard 23: Strategies for effective participation in group decision making.

EDCS 598 Internship

Standard 22: Classroom management and discipline.

Name:_____

Standard 2: Impact of technological and societal changes on schools.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies changes that have occurred.

_____ Indicator 1) *Trace and review the application of technology to education and specifically to the classroom. Identify the major technologies and their influence on teaching and learning in the 20th Century. i.e. computer and Internet. Compare the current application of technology with the technology available in the greater society.* *

Learner Outcome B: Evaluates the impact of societal changes within the context of classroom instruction.

_____ Indicator 1) *Trace and review societal changes and their implications on education and specifically the classroom. Identify the major changes and their influence on teaching and learning in the 20th Century. i.e. automobile, working moms, television.* *

* Indicators Al and B2 can be met individually or in a group written or oral presentation.

Learner Outcome C: Demonstrates knowledge of resources.

**Indicators for Learner Outcome C are met with indicators from Learner Outcomes A and B.

Standard 9: Research and experience-based principles of effective practice for encouraging the intellectual, social and personal development of students.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies best practices in general and special education.

_____ Indicator 1) *Be a part of an organized seminar group of 5-7 students who meet 4-5 times after doing assigned reading about a various of approaches. Students will keep a reading journal and will be an active participant of each seminar indicating their understanding of the assigned reading. Develop a learning plan per group to present and model best practices.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Show a total understanding of the instructional materials used in classes to which the intern is assigned. Be familiar with and has used supplemental materials and has designed an activity that shows an understanding of effective practices.*

_____ Indicator 3) *Read an Individual Educational Plan (I.E.P.) for an assigned student and modify a learning activity to accommodate the I.E.P.*

Learner Outcome B: Utilizes principles of effective practices from research, observation, and interviews.

_____ Indicator 1) *Demonstrate knowledge of effective practices with students in the classroom.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Plan and implement a three day unit plan for each class integrating ideas for individual student needs, Gardner's multiple intelligences, or learning styles. See WHS Student Teacher Handbook pg. 10.*

_____ Indicator 3) *Plan and carry out a three-week unit in at least one class that shows a thorough knowledge of the essential academic leaning requirements. Compile a notebook of plans, assignments, materials, and adjustments, with Gardner's intelligences highlighted. Include samples of student work done, student evaluations of their own work, and unit evaluations.*

Learner Outcome C: Summarizes how personal and observed experiences or interviews reflect principles of effective practice.

_____ Indicator 1) *Keep a reflective journal and participate in discussions with seminar group.*

Standard 10: Different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.

Learner Outcome B: Describes ways in which culture, ethnicity, gender, personality, and exceptionality can affect the learning situation and demonstrate ways the academic and social challenges can be accommodated.

_____ Indicator 1) *Do a class profile indicating the different factors mentioned in the outcome. Analyze the data and plan for three different class activities that would generate active participation from all individuals.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Attend the classes available to English as a Second Language (ESL) students and understand what is offered to meet ESL needs.*

Learner Outcome C: Adapts instruction and designs accommodations and modifications to positively impact learning for students with diverse learning styles, cultural backgrounds, and exceptionalities.

_____ Indicator 1) *Compile two student profiles to create a composite of each student using permanent records, interviews with other teachers, interview with the student, and samples of student work.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Design and implement a personalized assignment to teach the same EALRs for each of the two students accommodating each of their interests, skills, and personal strength and weaknesses.*

Standard 12: Individual and group motivation for encouraging social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies instructional strategies that promote positive social interaction.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome B: Designs a student centered learning environment

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome C: Integrates interactive strategies into the sign of learning environments.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation of at least five different activities with a brief description and dates.*

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

Standard 13: Effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication for fostering active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Learner Outcome A: Incorporates successful verbal and nonverbal communication strategies appropriate for the classroom.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation.*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome B: Incorporates successful media strategies appropriate to the classroom.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation.*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome C: Develops a learning environment that fosters collaboration among students.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation.*   _____ date _____

_____ Indicator 2) *Evaluation of collaborative activities by students in the classroom.*

Standard 16: Formal and informal assessment strategies for evaluating and ensuring the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies formal and informal assessment strategies and instruments, their strengths and weaknesses.

_____ Indicator 1) *Discussion in seminar*

Learner Outcome B: Develops assessment strategies for measuring progress in instructional areas.

_____ Indicator 1) *Examples included with unit development*

_____ Indicator 2) *Mentor observation and discussion.*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome C: Uses formative assessment to monitor and adjust learning opportunities.

_____ Indicator 1)   *Provide for assessment opportunity in lessons (i.e. check for understanding every 4 or 5 days). Adjust instruction and re-teach when necessary.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Mentor observation.*   _____ date _____

Learner Outcome D: Regularly and systematically assesses the teacher's impact on
     student learning.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation and discussion.*   _____ date _____

_____ Indicator 2) *Reflect in Journal (Three-part Reflection Framework).*

**Standard 17: Collaboration with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger
community for supporting students' learning and well-being.**

    Learner Outcome A: Identifies and applies effective strategies for group/team planning
      and collaboration.

_____ Indicator 1) *See Standard 17, Learner Outcome D, Indicator 1 (S17D.1).*

    Learner Outcome B: Develops learning opportunities collaboratively.

_____ Indicator 1) *See S17D.1.*

    Learner Outcome C: Identifies school and community resources (i.e. Wenatchee
      Downtown Association, Chelan County Juvenile System, Chelan/Douglas County
      Health Depts. Solutions Program, Valley Academy of learning, Running Start,
      Learning Improvement Day, etc.)

_____ Indicator 1) *See S17D.1.*

    Learner Outcome D: Participates in collaborative teams to support student learning.

_____ Indicator 1) *Collaboratively develop and carry out a learning plan experience
      that will improve student learning, directly or indirectly, using available
      community resources and assistance from community groups and
      agencies.*

*Completion of this indicator meets performance indicators for all Learner Outcomes in

Standard 18: Effective interactions with parents to support student learning and well-being.

Learner Outcome B: Develops effective strategies to communicate with parents.

_____ Indicator 1) *Role play in teams with a least 4 scenarios taken from observations and reading. (Learner Outcome A.)*

Learner Outcome C: Conducts positive or negative formal and Informal parent conferences.

_____ Indicator 1) *Prepare and conduct formal parent conferences observed by mentor.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Prepare and conduct informal parent conferences observed by mentor.*

_____ Indicator 3) *Prepare and conduct 3 follow-up conferences*

Standard 20: Educational technology, including the use of computer and other technologies used for instruction, assessment, and professional productivity.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies, accesses and evaluates existing technologies.

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor discussion.*   _____ date_____

_____ Indicator 2) *Catalogue those programs that are available in subject area, note usage and evaluation.*

Learner Outcome B: Integrates effective technology into the learning process

_____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation*   _____ date _____

_____ Indicator 2) *Include materials used in lesson plans.*

Learner Outcome C: Engages students in the use of technology

_____ Indicator 1) *Extension of S20B: have student examples included in portfolio.*

Learner Outcome D: *Accesses technology-based resources supporting the education of learners with disabilities.*

_____ Indicator 1)   *Interview with school personnel who know about such resources. (check-off sheet)*

_____ Indicator 2)   *Attend seminar meeting with special education resource personnel.*

Standard 21: State goals and essential academic learning requirements.

*The indicators in Standard 21 can be articulated with S9B.3 (3-week unit plan).

    Learner Outcome A: Articulates curriculum across grade levels 6-12 in assigned curricular area.

_____ Indicator 1) *Be familiar with the syllabi of a curricular area. Be familiar with how the syllabi aligns with EALRs in a curricular area.*

    Learner Outcome B: Designs or selects a curriculum that incorporates state EALRs and district goals.

_____ Indicator 1) *Specify EALRs addressed in the teaching lessons.*

    Learner Outcome C: Develops appropriate assessment tools.

_____ Indicator 1) *Develop unit plan with corresponding EALRs, benchmarks, and rubrics (scoring guide).*

Standard 22: Classroom management and discipline.

    Learner Outcome C: Maintains a positive learning environment by creating a clearly articulated preventative management system.

_____ Indicator 1) *Become familiar with Wen.School District/WenEA evaluation section of the Bargaining Agreement.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Be evaluated by mentor and CWU core faculty.*

    Learner Outcome D: Develops strategies to enhance and protect student self-esteem and mental health.

_____ Indicator 1) *Participate in a least three hours of Teacher Effectiveness Student Achievement (TESA) instruction. Practice as verified by mentor.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Participate in peer observation for feedback (at least two).*

_____ Indicator 3) *Enter in reflective journal.*

Learner Outcome E: Develops strategies to ensure proper responses to learners.

_____ Indicator 1) *See S22D.1.*

Learner Outcome E: Develops strategies to learners self-management.

_____ Indicator 1) *See S22D.1.*

Standard 23: Strategies for effective participation in group decision making.

Learner Outcome A: Identifies strategies for effective group dynamics.

_____ Indicator 1) *Using assigned reading and observations, research identify strategies for effective group dynamics. (Enter in journal)*

Standard 25: Service Learning.

Learner Outcome A: Plans and engages in service leaning to achieve specific teacher preparation programs learner outcomes.

_____ Indicator 1) *Documentation*

      A. *Identify a community need.*
      B. *Incorporate this need into a planned project within the curriculum demands.*

Learner Outcome B: Creates learning opportunities that involve student service learning to achieve student learning outcomes.

_____ Indicator 1) *Document application*

APPENDIX F
SPRING QUARTER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

1998-99 Spring Quarter Performance Indicators

Name:_____

Standard 7: Professional Ethics

> Learner Outcome A: Explains and acts in accordance with the professional code of ethics.

> _____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation*   _____ date_____

> Learner Outcome B. Integrates ways in which culture, ethnicity, gender, personality, and exceptionality can affect the learning situation and demonstrates ways in which the technological and social challenges can be accommodated.

> _____ Indicator 1) *Mentor observation*   _____ date _____

Standard 8: Responsibilities, structure, and activities of the profession.

> Learner Outcome A: Delineates and performs the range of duties and responsibilities of the teacher.

> _____ Indicator 1) *Keep journal accounts that document learning of students' names, attendance taking, correcting papers and copying/duplicating materials. See checklist on pg. 7 of Wenatchee High School Student Teacher Packet.*

> _____ Indicator 2) *Keep journal account of committees, department meetings, parent contact, student conferences, WenEA meetings, school board meetings, any district level meeting, etc. Attend a minimum of nine different meetings.*

> Learner Outcome B: Identifies and describes the roles of professional organizations, including those related to special education.

> _____ Indicator 1) *Prepare and present/direct a simulation which includes representation of four major categories of instructional and non-instructional aspects of teaching, followed by discussion to identify categories of responsibility*

Standard 11: **Variety of instructional strategies for developing critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.**

Learner Outcome A: Demonstrates and justifies specific teaching strategies for individual, small group, and whole group instruction

_____ Indicator 1) *Develop a learning plan to meet an educational goal through a variety of instructional strategies:*

a. *to involve students in critical thinking,*
or
b. *to involve students in sequential styles of problem solving,*
or
c. *to involve students in all facets of performance skills, i.e., psychomotor, music, drama.*

Learner Outcome B: Develops activities that promote higher level thinking skills, critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

_____ Indicator 1) *Develop and implement plans that involve students in critical thinking, sequential styles of problem solving, and all facets of performance skills (i.e., pschomotor, music, drama).*

Learner Outcome C: Analyzes learning opportunities from multiple perspectives

_____ Indicator 1) *Identify in lesson plans the variety of styles to be used in a unit. Consult with mentor prior to doing the unit.*

Learner Outcome D: Develops activities to enhance the learner's ability to take advantage of learning

_____ Indicator 1) *Demonstrates at least five activities to enhance the learner's ability to take advantage of instruction.*

_____ Indicator 2) **Mentor** *observation with a brief description of the act.*

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

_____ date _____   _____ date _____

Standard 14: **Planning and management of instruction based on knowledge of the content area, the community, and curriculum goals.**

Learner Outcome A: Develops a plan and rationale based on school curriculum, community needs, and essential learnings.

_____ Indicator 1) *Produce a written learning plan (lesson plan) to meet community need. Include:*

- a. *goal(s)*
- b. *objective(s)*
- c. *content concept outline*
- d. *procedures*
  - *1. student activities*
  - *2. teacher activities*
- e. *evaluation proof of learning*
- f. *materials*

_____ Indicator 2) *Develop a community profile of the Wenatchee School District. Include:*

- a. *population demographics*
  - *1. income*
  - *2. employment*
  - *3. occupations*
  - *4. educational level*
  - *5. ethnicity*
- b. *business activity and major employers*
- c. *school population*
  - *1. numbers*
  - *2. test scores*
  - *3. completion rates*
  - *4. post high school activity*
- d. *social and public safety agencies which serve the community*

_____ Indicator 3) *Evaluate the formal and informal school program and suggest modifications to the curricular and extra-curricular program to meet one perceived unmet need identified in the community survey*

Standard 16: **Formal and informal assessment strategies for evaluating and ensuring the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.**

Learner Outcome B: Develops assessment strategies for measuring progress in instructional areas.

_____ Indicator 1) *Examples included with unit development*

_____ Indicator 2) **Mentor** *observation and discussion.* _____ date _____

Learner Outcome C: Uses formative assessment to monitor adjust learning opportunities.

_____ Indicator 1) *Provide for assessment opportunity in lessons (i.e. check for understanding every 4 or 5 days). Adjust instruction and re-teach when necessary.*

_____ Indicator 2) **Mentor** *observation.* _____ date _____

Learner Outcome D: Regularly and systematically assesses the teacher's impact on student learning.

_____ Indicator 1) **Mentor** *observation and discussion.* _____ date _____

_____ Indicator 2) *Reflect in Journal (Three-part Reflection Framework).*

Standard 18: Effective interactions with parents for supporting students' learning and well-being.

Learner Outcome A: Conducts formal and informal parent conferences.

_____ Indicator 1) *Keep records of parent contact record changes or effectiveness of outcome for intern, the student and the parent.*

_____ Indicator 2) **Mentor** *discussion with written comments by the mentor and reflections by the intern.*

_____ date _____

Standard 22: Classroom management and discipline

Learner Outcome B: Establishes a positive learning environment

_____ Indicator 1) **Mentor** *assistance, suggestions, and observation.*

_____ date _____

<u>Learner Outcome G</u>: Identifies and implements district model.

_____ <u>Indicator 3)</u>   ***Mentor*** *observation.*   _____ date _____

<u>Learner Outcome H</u>: Develops plans for corrective action

_____ <u>Indicator 1)</u>   *Identify classroom rules and establishes such with students.*

_____ <u>Indicator 2)</u>   *Identify corrective action options..*

_____ <u>Indicator 3)</u>   ***Mentor*** *observation.*   _____ date _____

<u>Learner Outcome I</u>: Establishes a clearly articulated preventive management system.

_____ Indicator 1)   *Write a clear and total explanation of the Make-Your-Day program
used in the middle schools.*
or
*Write a short paper explaining the system that the intern has
developed and applied during the teaching assignment.*

_____ Indicator 2)   ***Mentor*** *observation.*   _____ date _____

APPENDIX G
SUMMER QUARTER PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

EDCS 598 Teacher as Learner

Standard 19: The opportunity for candidates to reflect on their teaching and its effects on student growth and learning.

Standard 24: Standards, criteria and other requirements for obtaining professional certificate.

EDCS 700 Thesis/Project

Standard 26: Oral and written communication skills.

1998-99 Summer Quarter Performance Indicators

Name:_____

Standard 19: **The opportunity for candidates to reflect on their teaching and its effects on student growth and learning.**

_____ Learner Outcomes A: Develops a set of strategies to assess teacher effectiveness in the learning environment.

_____ Indicator 1) *Participate in seminar discussion with colleagues to share ideas, problems, and solutions.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Produce a tentative set of strategies for use in the classroom.*

_____ Indicator 3) *Peer observation of video, followed by feedback on the following:*

A. *atmosphere in the classroom,*

B. *student on task,*

C. *teacher-student interaction.*

_____ Indicator 4) *Document pre and post testing of skills or concepts taught.*

_____ Indicator 5) *Provide results of a student survey.*

_____ Indicator 6) *Reflect in journal.*

Learner Outcome B: Applies set of strategies to one's own teaching

_____ Indicator 1) *Reflect in journal.*

Learner Outcome C: Designs strategies to involve students in the assessment of the learning environment.

_____ Indicator 1) *Design an evaluation instrument for student response to activities and lessons used in a unit.*

_____ Indicator 2) *Evaluate student feedback.*