# **TEP-II**

# THE LONGITUDINAL EFFECTS OF TEACHER PREPARATION ON THE PRACTICES AND BELIEFS OF NEW TEACHERS AND THE LEARNING OF THEIR STUDENTS

### FINAL PROJECT REPORT

**Teaching Research Division** Western Oregon University

September 30, 2003

Mark D. Schalock Director



# **Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
Executive Summary	i
Part 1. Organization and Project Information	1
Name and address of organization	
Name and title of contact person and of person preparing report	
Name of project funded (if applicable)	
Time period covered in the report and time period of the project	
Part 2. Assessment of Work	2
Introduction and background	2
Work carried out through the project	4
Achievement of intended outcomes	16
Part 3. Impact of Project	25
Local	26
State/Regional	27
National	28
Part 4. An elaboration of findings from analyses completed thus far	30
Teacher preparation effects	30
The development of expertise (classroom performance)	32
The development of effectiveness	34
Part 5. An elaboration of findings from analyses completed thus far	37
Analysis strategy	37
Analyses completed	38
Analyses planned	39
<b>ATTACHEMENTS: Foundations on which the project rested</b>	43
A. The emergence of teacher work sampling as a means of connecting	43
teaching and learning (1965-1986)	
B. The emergence of Oregon's design for standards-based schools (1975-1994)	45
C. An invitational conference leading to the TEP-I project (October, 1994)	48
D. The TEP-I project (1995-1998)	50

# **Executive Summary**

The Teacher Effectiveness Project Phase II (TEP-II) was funded to: 1) Improve our understanding of teacher preparation and its extended effects on teacher practice and student learning; 2) Improve our understanding of the development, effectiveness and productivity of early career teachers who work within our public schools; 3) Expand and refine methodology for linking teaching and learning that can be used with practicing teachers; 4) Disseminate information and products pertaining to all of the above in venues selected to further the national policy debate around the assurance of quality in teachers and teaching; and, 5) Make a significant and continuing contribution to theory, method, and knowledge pertaining to standards-based teaching and learning.

# **Outcome Achievement**

	Achievement Rating				
Intended Project Outcomes	Poor	Moderate	Cood	Very	Fycellent
An improved understanding of	1 001	Mourate	0000	Guu	Excenent
teacher preparation and its extended				XXX	
effects on teacher practice and				MAA	
student learning					
An improved understanding of the					
development effectiveness and					
productivity of early career teachers				XXX	
who work within our public				11111	
schools					
An expanded and refined					
methodology for linking teaching					
and learning that can be used with					XXX
practicing teachers.					
The dissemination of information					
and products pertaining to all of the					
above in venues selected to further					
the national policy debate around			XXX		
the assurance of quality in teachers					
and teaching.					
A significant and continuing					
contribution to theory, method, and					
knowledge pertaining to standards-				XXX	
based teaching and learning					

On a 1-5 scale, we rate our success in achieving these outcomes as follows:

# Impact

As a research study the full impact of the project will take years to determine fully. Findings

will need to be evaluated for their worth, and their implications for theory, further research, practice, and policy will need to be articulated. From preliminary reactions to the project nationally, however, and the local and state impacts already observed, we anticipate the overall impact of the project to be large, as research projects go. Observed and anticipated impact at the local, state and national levels are described in the body of the report.

- ✓ To date, TEP-II is one of the few studies available that traces the effects of large scale policy related changes in teacher preparation to effects on teacher thinking, dispositions, classroom practices and impact on student learning. Related findings and limitations of the study are described in detail in the body of the report.
- ✓ To date, TEP-II is one of the few studies available that traces the change in teacher thinking, dispositions, practices and impact on learning occurring during the first three years of teaching and relates change to dimensions of the classroom and school contexts in which they work. Related findings and limitations of the study are described in detail in the body of the report.
- ✓ To date, TEP-II is one of the few studies available on teachers and teaching effects on student learning that "gets inside the black box" of explanatory variables. The range of variables attended to in the study, and the conceptual/theoretical contexts in which they rest, are contrasted in the body of the report to those found in most related research.
- ✓ One of the first studies of teaching and teacher preparation carried out explicitly within the context of standards-based teaching and learning. All variables pertaining to teaching learning attended to in the study are defined and assessed from this perspective.
- ✓ The study has just been completed so extensive dissemination of findings and methods has not yet occurred. A number of national conference reports on the project have been given, however, and eighteen "research briefs" describing preliminary findings have been prepared and shared with members of the teacher preparation community in Oregon and elsewhere. These and subsequent plans for dissemination are described in the body of the report.

# PART 1. ORGANIZATION AND PROJECT INFORMATION

### Name and address of organization

Teaching Research Division Western Oregon University 345 N. Monmouth Ave. Monmouth, Or 97361

### Name and title of contact person and of person preparing report

Mark D. Schalock, Associate Research Professor Director (503) 838-8777

### Name of project funded

Teacher Effectiveness Project -Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practices and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students

# Time period covered in the report and time period of the project

This report is a summary of the four and one half years of the project from January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2002, and for a no-cost extension period from January 1, 2003 through June 30, 2003.

# PART 2. ASSESSMENT OF WORK

# **Introduction and Background**

The TEP-II research project was funded to address questions around whether teacher preparation—in its design, structure, and character - makes a difference in the practice, beliefs and characteristics of beginning teachers, and, importantly, in the learning of their students.

Specifically the project set out to determine whether teachers prepared in programs such as Western Oregon University's standards-based program (in part developed through support from TEP-I) thought and practiced differently and had different effects on their student's learning than teachers prepared in programs with different emphases.

Throughout its 140-year history, Western Oregon University had been an acknowledged leader in teacher education. Its NCATE-accredited program prepares the largest number of new teachers in Oregon. At Western Oregon, with funding support through the Teacher Effectiveness Project (TEP), faculties from the School of Education and Teaching Research Division had spent the previous three years, in part, developing and implementing a "proficiency-based" teacher preparation program. The new program has been constructed around the following central features:

- ✓ Overt alignment of the program with Oregon's standards-based design for schooling;
- ✓ Consistent, strong focus on the explicit connection between teaching and learning through the use of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as both an instructional and assessment tool;
- ✓ Ongoing, developmental assessment of teacher candidates grounded in clear content and performance standards, embodied in 14 "Western teacher proficiencies."

The set of fourteen (14) proficiencies deemed critical for teaching within a standards-based approach to schooling provided a stable scaffold for the new program. Built around this scaffold, and grounded in a standards-based philosophy of schooling, was an assessment system designed to gauge the development of each preservice teacher in the program. The assessment system featured a well articulated, growth oriented, six-point scale of development accompanying each proficiency, with benchmarked standards of performance established for progress through, and successful exit from, the program. A major source of evidence for 7 of the 14 proficiencies was *teacher work samples*, the expansion, refinement, and validation of which formed an important focus for TEP over the past three years.

Thus, the major and tangible impact of the first phase of the Teacher Effectiveness Project (September, 1995—December, 1998) was the redesign of teacher preparation at Western Oregon University. There was now in place a program and a supporting set of conditions at Western that were thought unique in teacher education and that respond directly to many of the concerns expressed nationally about the troubling state of teacher preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, 1996).

Given this accomplishment, as well as the pressing national need and focus on issues of teacher preparation and quality, the second phase of the Teacher Effectiveness Project (TEP-II) was designed to answer the question "What difference does such a program make?" That is, did early career teachers prepared in programs that vary in the above characteristics (Western graduates vs. graduates of other Oregon institutions vs. graduates of institutions outside of Oregon, i.e., high, moderate, and low exposure to such features) differ in their effectiveness and practice in standards-based classrooms?

The proposed study was also the first in the nation designed to research what difference teacher preparation programs make by tracking the practice of differently prepared new teachers in a standards-based system of schooling. Most importantly, the study would address the long-term success of these beginning teachers in fostering the kind and level of learning desired in their students.

By carrying out the research and dissemination activities of this project we anticipated five outcomes. These included:

- 1. An improved understanding of teacher preparation and its extended effects on teacher practice and student learning;
- 2. An improved understanding of the development, effectiveness and productivity of early career teachers who work within our public schools;
- 3. An expanded and refined methodology for linking teaching and learning that can be used with practicing teachers (a streamlined TWS);
- 4. The dissemination of information and products pertaining to all of the above in venues selected to further the national policy debate around the assurance of quality in teachers and teaching; and,
- 5. A significant and continuing contribution to theory, method, and knowledge pertaining to standards-based teaching and learning.

In achieving these outcomes we believed that this research would contribute to three levels of policy and practice related to the initial preparation and licensure of teachers, as well as to the development and support of early career teachers.

- At the <u>local level</u>, the results of the study would feed back on the design and operation of Western's teacher preparation program, with clear indications of where it needs to be strengthened or refined.
- At the regional or <u>state level</u>, the study's findings would inform state policymakers and practitioners on issues related to teacher preparation and practice, as well as on issues relevant to the support and continued professional development of early career teachers.
- At the <u>national level</u>, the project would actively and aggressively disseminate its work to

further pursue the conversation, initiated through TEP, with stakeholders in the education and teacher education communities as to the centrality of student learning in efforts to reform K-12 education and teacher preparation, licensing, and professional development.

This final report summarizes the work carried out through the project, some of its unexpected strengths and limitations, the extent to which we achieved our intended outcomes, and our sense of its current and potential impact on policy and practice.

# Work Completed Through the Project

As conceptualized the work of the project centered around a set of inter-related tasks. These included: recruitment, development, data collection, data management and analysis, and dissemination and networking. With the requirement of matching funds, an additional significant task was securing funding in years two, three and four of the project.

### **Recruitment Activities**

Recruitment activities included both research participants and impartial third party classroom observers, as stipulated through negotiations with APS staff.

### **Recruitment Activities – Research Participants.**

Our original research design called for three approximately equal sized groups of beginning teachers to form the basis of our comparative analyses; 25 from Western Oregon University, 25 from other Oregon teacher preparation programs and 25 from out-of-state. The sample of research subjects we were able to recruit and retain did not fully conform to this original proposal.

In recruiting participants for the study we originally worked directly with Oregon teacher preparation programs to recruit their graduates. This recruitment approach was only marginally successful.

However, through David Myton, Executive Director of the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), we were subsequently able to contact every Oregon school district and have them identify for us their new teachers. We sent recruitment letters to all 250 teachers identified through this process that met the dual criteria of 1) being a beginning teacher, and 2) working in an Oregon elementary school.

Through this process a total of 75 early career elementary teachers signed informed consent forms to participate in the research project. Of these 75, sixty-seven maintained some level of participation throughout the first year. Our initial distribution of participants for our proposed groupings were 12 from Western Oregon University, 47 from other Oregon preparation programs, and 8 from out of state.

During the summer an additional sixteen participants dropped out of the project due to many reasons, including: moved to another state; felt the project involved too much work (especially

the Teacher Effectiveness Portfolio); changed jobs and now teaching in a middle school; left teaching; was not rehired; and, unknown.

Careful review of program information indicated that the program characteristics of interest were not unique to Western Oregon University, nor necessarily even to Oregon preparation programs. For example, we had participants from programs outside of Oregon that were rated as "high" on one or more of the selection characteristics. We have several participants from Oregon programs that were rated "low" on all of the characteristics. Our original *a priori* categorizations did not hold.

To address this issue we chose to form groups based on actual attributes of their preparation programs rather than the nominal, program-based groupings we proposed. The three groups of participants would be from low, moderate and high "dose" programs. This grouping conformed to our original three group design and did tend to equalize group sizes to some extent.

As a result of the initial sample distribution, study attrition, and design considerations we determined that we needed to recruit additional out-of-state prepared teachers.

A second round of participant recruitment activities took place in year two. Through David Myton of the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) we again contacted every Oregon school district and have them identify for us all their new teachers holding a Transitional License. Letters were sent to every teacher identified through this process that met the criteria of being a beginning teacher on a transitional license working in an Oregon elementary school. A second cohort of beginning teachers was added to our total sample through these efforts: nine from out-of-state and one from instate who requested to join the study.

Our final sample can be categorized in three ways:

1) Teachers prepared at the undergraduate vs. graduate level; 2) Teachers prepared out-of-state vs. teachers prepared at Oregon Public and Oregon Private institutions; and, 3) teachers prepared in programs that had more or less focus on the characteristics of interest within the research project; the main focus of investigation in this study. These were referred to as:

*Low dose programs:* those categorized as having only a minimal focus on two of the three program characteristics of interest (Orientation to Oregon's Standards-Based Model of Schooling; A clear and overt means of connecting Teaching and Learning [Teacher Work Sample Methodology]; and, a developmental assessment system for teachers).

*Moderate dose programs:* those categorized as having only a moderate focus on two of the three program characteristics of interest.

*High dose programs:* those categorized as having a clear and strong focus on all three of the program characteristics of interest.

Table 1 presents our sample with the second round of recruitment activities.

	Year in Teaching		
Sample	First Year Teachers*	Second Year Teachers*	Third Year Teachers**
Undergraduate Level Programs	40	31	25
Graduate Level Programs	36	29	20
Out-of-State	16	13	6
Oregon Public	32	24	20
Oregon Private	28	23	19
Low Dose Programs	13	10	6
Moderate Dose Programs	36	29	22
High Dose Programs	27	21	17
Total	76	60	45

# Table 1. TEP-2 Sample

\* First and second year teachers are from both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> cohorts.

\*\* Third year teachers are from the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort only.

The resulting unequal distribution of participants within each group as well as the significant attrition across years, posed problems in conducting some of the comparative analyses we had originally proposed.

# **Recruitment Activities - Classroom Observers.**

We worked through the Oregon Education Association (OEA) to recruit, train and retain parttime or recently retired master teachers on a regional basis to act as independent observers. Thirteen such teachers were used to collect on-site observational data on research participants during the first year of data collection. During the second year of data collection seventeen such teachers acted as onsite classroom observers of our research participants. In the final year of data collection we made use of sixteen such teachers.

# **Development Activities**

Development activities primarily centered on data collection instrumentation, especially with regard to a number of instruments specifically related to "standards-based" teaching and schools, including:

- Survey On Teacher Beliefs About Accountability For Student Learning
- Individual Interview Protocol: Teacher Preparation, Practice, Student Learning
- Teacher Effectiveness Portfolio (TWS) Protocol And Assessment Rubric
- Classroom Demographic Information Form
- Support And Professional Development Questionnaire
- Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol
- Focus Group Protocol: Changes In Practice, Changes In Beliefs, Support, Continued Influence Of Teacher Preparation.
- Third Year Summative Reflection Questionnaire

Several of these instruments were the eventual subject of presentations at national conferences, selected as part of the core assessment system for continuing licensure in Oregon, and/or adopted by teacher preparation programs throughout the state.

The most significant of these was the Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol, which was the subject of a year-long development process, detailed in the paper *Developing an instrument for observing standards-based teaching*, presented at AERA in 2001.

The development and refinement of the Teacher Effectiveness Portfolio (TWS) Protocol and Assessment Rubric also entailed a significant development effort.

# **Data Collection Activities**

Data collection activities were conducted for first, second and third year teachers that were part of cohort 1. The teachers that made up the second cohort were assessed only as first and second year teachers. The data collected for first and second year teachers was the same for both cohorts. A summary of data collection activities (method and content) by year are shown in Table 2.

Several things are worth noting in regards to data collection efforts. First, some slight modifications were made to the classroom observation protocol from its initial design as used with first year teachers in cohort one. An additional dimension of classroom practice as well as the level of student engagement were included from year one to years two and three. Additional descriptions of the content and complexity of instruction observed were also included. The

	Year Collected		
Instrumentation/Method	1 <sup>st</sup> year	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3 <sup>rd</sup> year
Content Focus	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher
Structured Interview			
Preparation			
Planning/Classroom Management	Χ		
Student Assessment/Accountability			
Reflection			
Focus Group			
Differences/similarities from previous year			
Areas of improvement, CPD goals, influences			
Changes in practice/beliefs & influences		Х	
Coping/support mechanisms			
Standards-based schooling/teaching practices			
Influences and views of Preparation Program			
Summative Open-ended Ouestionnaire			
Differences/similarities from previous year			
Areas of improvement CPD goals influences			X
Changes in practice/beliefs & influences			
Influences and views of Preparation Program			
Self-Assessment: CTL Proficiency Ratings			
Self-ratings of proficiency	x	x	x
Evidence used to make rating			2
Self-Assessment: Open-ended Questionnaire			
Classroom Context: Similarities w/student teaching/previous vr			
Mentoring/support			
Standards-Based Schooling practices	x	v	v
Current and hoped for experience as a teacher		28	28
Areas of improvement/professional development			
Surveys			
Classroom Demographics			
Stress			
Burnout			
Self-Efficacy	x	v	v
Commitment	Λ	1	~
School Climate			
Decision Participation			
Accountability			
Portfolio			
Planning			
Instruction	v	v	
Assessment	Λ	Λ	
Deflection			
Student Learning			
Observation			
Incidence of instructional practices observed		Fall and	Fall and
Quality of instructional practices observed	Spring Onl-	Fail and	Fair and Spring
Content of instruction observed	spring Only	spring	spring
Contribution of instruction observed			
	1	1	1

# Table 2. Summary of TEP-II Data Collection Plan and Focus

summative rating scale was also expanded from a five point scale to an eight point scale to be consistent with the needs of the Title-II Continuing Licensure Core Assessment System.

These changes to the protocol, while greatly improving its usability as well as the usefulness of the data it generated, did result in observation data for first year teachers in cohort one to be slightly different than other observation data. A fuller discussion of this issue was presented in Research Brief 5.

A second issue to note is the absence of standardized student learning data in this table. Oregon does not have an assessment system in place allowing such data to be collected across grades. Instead, Oregon has adopted a benchmarked system, collecting data only at grades three and five at the elementary level. Additional testing was not as universally conducted across Oregon's school districts as thought, nor at all grade levels. As a result, consistent, standardized student learning data was not possible to collect. Instead we relied on the student assessment data generated through the Teacher Effectiveness Portfolios. A fuller discussion of this issue was presented in Research Brief 15.

# **Data Management Activities**

Data management included a broad array of activities, from transcribing interviews and focus groups, translating all open-ended questionnaire comments into electronic format, to coding and entering all data into a multi-year database. Managing the shear volume of both the qualitative and quantitative data generated through the project was a massive effort.

A data management system was developed to manage this volume of data across the three years of the TEPII project. This system included, in addition to a TEPII specific research participant confidential ID system, a data type, project year and cohort identifier system. Original hard copy data sets were packaged according to project year, data set, and individual research participant, and housed in lockup for security and confidentiality reasons.

# **Data Coding, Reduction and Analysis Activities**

The mix of qualitative as well as quantitative data, comments, products as well as surveys and observation protocols required extensive coding, scoring, and reduction or aggregation activities prior to actually analyzing the data. Coding the hundreds upon hundreds of pages of written and recorded comments as well as double scoring 80 individual Teacher Effectiveness Portfolios on a number of dimensions took a significant amount of time and energy.

# Data Analyses - Qualitative.

All qualitative data generated through a single process were typically processed as one document, and an individual document for each participant and data set was processed for analysis through QSR NUD\*IST<sup>®</sup> (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing), versions N5 and N6. A categorical, multi-level tree structure was developed. Participant responses were coded with tree-structure categories using the QSR software. This method enabled the data to be analyzed in a number of ways, including across data sets and across project years, by individual participant and by group. We were able to view the data in content areas, look for patterns and build matrixes for chart making, do cross-tabulations among

qualitative and quantitative data, retrieve participant statements for response examples, and theorize next steps according to results.

# Data Analyses – Quantitative.

Quantitative data analyses were conducted using SPSS<sup>+</sup> (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and took place on several levels. At the most basic level, purely descriptive analyses were conducted to get a sense of the data collected. Means, variances, frequencies and measures of "normality" were calculated on all variables.

Simple two- variable analyses including correlation, t-tests and ANOVAs where appropriate and warranted were also conducted to address a number of questions posed both through the research as well to address questions specific to various publications and presentations. Both cross-sectional as well as longitudinal analyses were conducted as called for to answer the questions we had posed.

More sophisticated multivariate analyses were severely restricted due to both overall sample size as well as uneven Ns within our three group design. Uneven and small group sizes, especially for second and third year teachers, was a major stumbling block in conducting significance tests and estimating effect sizes.

# **Networking and Dissemination Activities**

### **Networking activities**

The majority of our efforts in networking and dissemination have been within the state of Oregon to advertise the project, recruit participants and develop support from teacher preparation programs, the teacher licensing agency, and the teacher and administrator associations.

First, our "in-state" stakeholders advisory group was the Design Team/ Steering Committee for Title II, Project 3.1, made up of representatives of institutions of higher education, TSPC, OEA, the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators and the Oregon Association of School Personnel Administrators.

Instead of bringing National Advisory Panel members to Oregon, we took the opportunity to meet with several NAP members at the AACTE Conference in Dallas, TX during March, 2001.

Additional networking activities have taken place through our participation in the DELTA project, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the New Era institutions funded by the Carnegie Corporation of NY, Education Commission of the States, and AACTE.

Additional networking activities also have taken place with researchers at the University of Florida (principally, Dr. Mary T. Brownell) within the Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education who are conducting research on Beginning Teacher Quality.

Dissemination activities. Dissemination efforts include:

<u>Publications/Products:</u> To date, products have been developed for the Oregon Teacher Preparation and Licensure audience and published internally.

- BRIEF 1: *The TEP-2 research project: Purpose, design, participants.* (December, 2001).
   Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 2: Teaching assignments and conditions of work. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 3: Diversity in the elementary classroom. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 4: *Mentoring and other forms of assistance received.* (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 5: Classroom observation data: Instrumentation, procedures, quality and trustworthiness. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 6: *The range of performance observed in first and second year teachers*. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 7: Preliminary Findings around a hypothesis: Linking dimensions of preparation to classroom performance. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 8: Antecedents of teacher preparation program effects: Institutional traces on classroom performance. (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University,

Monmouth, OR. Author.

- BRIEF 9: A contextual variable influencing classroom performance: Mentoring effects.
  (December, 2001). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 10: The prevalence of specific standards-based teaching practices observed in the classrooms of first and second year teachers. (May, 2002). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 11: Patterns and relationships among teacher beliefs, perceptions of context, and responses to the context. (May, 2002). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 12: Self-assessment of competence on continuing licensure proficiencies and the evidence used in making these ratings. (May, 2002). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 13: Beginning teacher beliefs on accountability for student learning. (May, 2002).
   Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 14: *Patterns of development in 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers.* (May, 2002). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 15: Assessing teacher impact on learning: Multiple sources, multiple indicators. (May, 2002). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 16: Variability found in <u>Portfolio</u> Based measures pertaining to learning. (June, 2003). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.

- BRIEF 17: Variability found in <u>Observation</u> Based measures pertaining to learning. (June, 2003). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.
- BRIEF 18: Preliminary findings around a hypothesis: Linking dimensions of preparation to teacher impact on learning. (June, 2003). Teacher Effectiveness Project, Phase II: The Longitudinal Effects of Teacher Preparation on the Practice and Beliefs of New Teachers and the Learning of Their Students. Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR. Author.

In addition we have six products in various stages of development that we will complete. These include:

- 1. A synoptic document of findings from the research titled, *What We Are Learning From Western Oregon's Longitudinal Study Of Preparation Program Effects On Early Career Elementary Teachers And The Learning Of Their Students.* This document organized the findings into broad areas and provides summary finding statements with supporting results.
- 2. Two documents focusing on the teacher preparation and licensing community, tentatively titled:

Findings from a Three Year Study of Beginning Teachers in Oregon: Implications for Initial Licensure Requirements and Program Design.

and,

Findings from a Three Year Study of Beginning Teachers in Oregon: Implications for Teacher Support, Development and Continuing Licensure Requirements and Program Design.

- 3. A *Catalogue of Measures* that exhibits the various data collection instruments used in the study and a summary of technical information available for each measures.
- 4. An invitation from the Editor of the *Journal of Teacher Education* to publish as quickly as possible two articles from the research. This was a result of our presentations at the national AACTE Conference. One article will address the theory, measures and design employed in the study to explore the hypothesis being investigated. The other article will report the findings around the hypothesis explored.

<u>Presentations:</u> Presentation were made at several national conferences, including: AERA, AACTE, Education Trust, Western States Certification Conference, Western Psychological Association, and the National Evaluation Institute.

- Schalock, M.D., Schalock, H.D. and Ayres, R. (January, 2003). Teacher preparation effects in the classroom: Findings from a 3-year longitudinal study. Presentation at the 55<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Schalock, M.D., Ayres, R. and Schalock, H.D (January, 2003). *Consistency and change in early career teachers: Findings from a 3-year longitudinal study*. Presentation at the 55<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Schalock, M.D., Schalock, H.D, and Brodsky, M. (January, 2003). Does standards-based teacher preparation make a difference? Program design and supporting evidence. Presentation at the 55<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Schalock, H.D. (January, 2003). Assessing teacher contribution to student learning: Multiple methods, multiple sources. Presentation at the 55<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Samek, L. (January, 2003). Performance Assessment and Professional Development for Early Career Teachers: Perils and Promise. Western States Certification Conference, San Antonio, Texas.
- Cooley, E., Ayres, R. and Schalock, M.D. (2002). Burnout, self-efficacy, and commitment in beginning teachers. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association Annual Conference. April, 2002. Irvine, California.
- Hansen, J. B. & Schalock, H. D. *Under the Microscope: The Performance of First-year Teachers in Oregon's Standards-based Schools.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Education Trust, Washington, DC.
- Schalock, H. D. & Hansen, J.B. (November, 2001). *The performance of early career teachers in Oregon's standards-based classrooms: Profiles of accomplished teaching.* Paper presented at the Annual Education Trust conference, Washington, DC.
- Ayres, R., McConney, A., Schalock, M.D., & Cuthbertson, L. (April, 2001). Beginning teachers on accountability for student learning. Paper presented at the symposium <u>The Teacher</u> <u>Effectiveness Project Phase –II: A mixed-method study of early career teachers in a</u> <u>standards-based schooling context</u>, at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Schalock, M.D., Hansen, J.B., and McConney, A. (April, 2001). Incorporating multiple data instruments and methods from a research study for use in evaluating teacher proficiency for continuing licensure. Paper presented at the symposium <u>The Teacher Effectiveness Project</u> <u>Phase –II: A mixed-method study of early career teachers in a standards-based schooling</u> <u>context</u>, at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.

- McConney, A. and Schalock, M.D. (April, 2001). *Developing an instrument for observing standards-based teaching*. Paper presented at the symposium <u>The Teacher Effectiveness</u> <u>Project Phase –II: A mixed-method study of early career teachers in a standards-based</u> <u>schooling context</u>, at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Hansen, J.B., Schalock, M.D., McConney, A. and Rudd, A. (April, 2001). Self evaluation and peer observation of early career teachers in a standards-based context: preliminary results. Paper presented at the symposium <u>The Teacher Effectiveness Project Phase–II: A mixed-method study of early career teachers in a standards-based schooling context</u>, at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Schalock, H. D., Schalock, M.D., French, R., Hall, G., and Howey, K. (March, 2001). *Research on teacher work sample methodology*. Major Forum at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Dallas, TX.
- Schalock, H. D. (July, 2001). Assessing teacher performance in standards-based schools: Illustrative evidence sets and scoring rubrics. Paper presented at the Annual Consortium for Research, Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE) Institute, Wilmington, NC.
- McConney, A., Ayres, R., & Schalock, M. (July, 2000). *Beginning Teachers on Accountability for Student Learning*. Paper presented at the 9th Annual National Evaluation Institute, San Jose, CA.
- McConney, A., & Schalock, M. (July, 2000). *An Instrument for Observing Standards-Based Teaching*. Paper presented at the 9th Annual National Evaluation Institute, San Jose, CA.
- Hansen, J. B. (July, 2000). Using Peer Based Regional Teams to Assist Early Career Teachers Seeking Continuing Licensure. Paper presented at the 9th Annual National Evaluation Institute, San Jose, CA.

# Achievement of Project Outcomes

In assessing the achievement of intended project outcomes we will speak to Outcomes 1 and 2 together as they address the research findings.

# Outcomes 1 and 2

Outcomes One and Two anticipated an **improved understanding** of both the extended effects of teacher preparation on teacher thinking, beliefs, practice and student learning as well as the development, effectiveness and productivity of early career teachers who work within our public schools. Explicit in this research was Oregon's standards-based model of schooling and redesigned teacher preparation program requirements to prepare teachers to work within this context.

The research, as proposed and carried out, was intended to answer questions that would shed additional light on both of these issues through a retrospective causal-comparative mixed-method study with a strong longitudinal component. As originally designed, the research was intended to generalize to Oregon's policy context, but not necessarily beyond, simply because of the variation in policy contexts across the states. The sampling issues described in Part II of this report categorizes this research more as descriptive and relational than causal.

Descriptive relational research, however, can improve our understanding of initial and extended relationships between preparation on the one hand and thinking, beliefs and practices of beginning teachers and the learning of their students as well as their development, on the other, even if causation can not be attributed. In this case, we believe the research has improved our collective understanding of these relationships and the design implications for conducting such research.

Specific findings can be found in the various Research Briefs as well as other products prepared through the project. Some broad findings around the relationships between teacher preparation emphases and beginning teachers are presented here.

# Relationships Between Teacher Preparation Emphases and the Thinking, Beliefs and Practices of Beginning Teachers and the Learning of Their Students

Neither programs, nor these prospective teachers responses to these programs, were uniform. While Oregon's policy initiative dictated both broad and specific characteristics of programs, significant variation existed across programs and, to a lesser extent, within programs at the time of the study. Some of this variation was due to programs being in their first year of implementing their redesign. Additionally, responses to programs were not uniform across prospective teachers. Prospective teachers going through the same program at the same time related very different experiences, as well as reactions to those experiences.

Teacher preparation should not be viewed as a uniform "intervention" that can be fully controlled through policy. Individual faculty make up a program, offering varying strengths,

weakness, perspectives and experiences. Additionally, student teaching experiences, which typically were identified as the most influential aspect of preparation by these beginning teachers, varied significantly, both in terms of contexts as well as philosophy and practices of the supervising master teachers. Finally, prospective teachers are individuals, bringing with them their own sets of experiences and perspectives. As individuals their responses to their preparation varied.

- ✓ Given the findings above, it was not surprising that variation was the norm. There was significant within-group variation on most measures of practice, beliefs, thinking and student learning.
- ✓ Despite the variation described above, however, we did find identifiable and expected relationships between the policy related program emphases investigated and observed classroom performance of these early career elementary teachers as first year teachers. That is, first year teachers prepared in "high dose" programs on average engaged in different specific teaching practices and were rated as more competent on broad domains of practice than teachers prepared in other programs categorized as moderate or low dose programs.
- ✓ These observed relationships, however, were not as powerful as expected, lessened in the second year of teaching, and tended to disappear or reverse themselves in the third year of teaching. That is, any hypothesized differences related to program emphases that were found in first year teachers were minimal in second year teachers and non-existent or reversed in third year teachers.
- ✓ While we did find identifiable relationships between these policy emphases and practice as first year teachers, we could find no parallel relationship with either *classroom indicators* of impact on student learning or *teacher documented* impact on student learning. That is, while differently prepared teachers were observed to practice differently, this did not translate into any differences in the quality or quantity of student learning on the measures we employed.
- ✓ Preliminary analyses have found no consistent relationships between teacher preparation emphases investigated and the thinking, dispositions or emotional responses to work context for these early career elementary teachers (See attachment E for related analyses planned).
- ✓ Preliminary analyses have identified a number intervening factors that have varying degrees of influence on these findings. Chief among these are classroom, school and community contexts in which these beginning teachers work and the formal and informal supports they received (See attachment E for related analyses planned).

<u>Summary</u>: We have come to better understand how long and loosely coupled a chain it is between state level policy around teacher preparation and licensure and observed differences in the learning of K-12 students taught by teachers prepared under these policy initiatives. Despite this loose connection, we did find an identifiable relationship between the emphasis programs place on those characteristics under study and performance as a first year teacher. It also appears, however, that experience, context and support networks can and do overwhelm any initial observed differences by the third years of teaching.

What we were not able to find were any direct or indirect relationships between preparation emphases and the learning of elementary students taught by the teachers, at least on the measures we employed. Direct, in that there were no differences in measures of student learning by groups of differently prepared teachers. Indirect, in that, while we found differences in practice between differently prepared teachers, these differences did not subsequently result in differences in student learning. Deeper and more complex analyses of these relationships, however, are now underway (See attachment E for related analyses planned).

An interesting and critical finding from the analyses conducted thus far is the apparent tenuousness of our initial assumptions about the alignment between Oregon's standards-based model of schooling and re-designed teacher preparation program requirements. There was a clear mismatch for many participants between the types of schools and schooling they were prepared for and those they actually found themselves in. Specifically, teachers were being prepared for a model of schooling that many schools had not yet implemented.

Given the time bound nature of this study it is impossible to know whether results might have been different if there was a better match between the two. We hypothesize that a stronger relationship between preparation, practice and student learning would have been found if there had been a better match.

# **Teacher Development and Change**

Teacher development and change were found to be greatly influenced by context and support. At a policy level, Oregon is a state without organized mentoring or support programs. Certainly individual school districts offer such programs, but for beginning teachers this support is "hit or miss." A large number of beginning teachers in Oregon simply find themselves responsible for their own continued growth and development as a professional and progress from an Initial Teaching License to a Continuing (second stage) Teaching License.

This contextual reality is coupled with a standards-based model of schooling with clearly defined benchmarked content and performance standards and a school-based accountability system. It is in this dual contextual reality that provided the focus of Goal 2; to understand how early career expertise and effectiveness evolve under such conditions. The design of this aspect of the study was longitudinal (3 years) and descriptive. It was carried out as part of the hypothesis exploration study described under Goal 1, but as Goal 2 it stands as an independent line of inquiry. All of the measures collected and reported in relation to teacher preparation effects, however, are the measures used to describe and understand the continued development of expertise and effectiveness in the early career teachers studied.

On the surface, at least the contexts of these teachers seemed stable. For example, none changed school districts and only one teacher changed schools during their first three years of teaching. However, between one quarter and one half saw their classroom teaching context change dramatically over their first three years of teaching.

At the same time, the nature and helpfulness of supports these beginning teachers received was uneven at best. Less than half were assigned a formal mentor their first year, and only slightly more than half of these teachers found their mentor to be helpful. Fully one third of these

teachers indicated that they were pretty much on their own, receiving neither formal or informal supports. While formal supports dropped significantly for second and third year teachers, informal supports increased.

Further, more than half of these teachers felt they were in unsupportive school environments, as defined by both principal leadership and faculty collegiality, or environments that changed significantly over their first 3 years.

In summary, change was the norm for the majority of these teachers. Only 3 teachers found themselves in situations where, over the course of their first three years of teaching: they had significant and helpful support; they were in supportive and collaborative schools; and, their classroom context remain fairly stable.

Given these contextual realities:

- ✓ The teachers participating in this study generally became more competent with experience, though a certain number who were rated weak as first year teachers were also rated weak as third year teachers.
- ✓ Generally, these teachers honed and focused their practice over time, applying some practices more often with experience and discarding others they may have applied as beginning teachers.
- ✓ By and large these teachers worked through participation in professional development activities – to improve their day-to-day practice, especially in the area of classroom management.
- ✓ Generally, these teachers were able to more fully engage students in learning activities as they gained experience.
- ✓ Generally, these teachers maintained high levels of intellectual demand in their instruction.
- ✓ Interestingly, however, while a focus on higher level learning outcomes remained fairly constant, lower level learning related to knowing and/or remembering greatly increased over time. This anomaly appears to be in reaction to both the needs of students as well as the demands of the state testing accountability movement in Oregon. Basic skills instruction and preparation for state tests assumed a more prominent place in these teachers work as they developed.
- ✓ In terms of beliefs and attitudes, it appears that the participating teachers began their teaching careers with strongly held, positive beliefs about teaching and their own abilities. The experiences they had as beginning teaching did not appear to alter their beliefs in any meaningful way. They may have become more realistic, having been in the "real world" for up to 3 years, but they continued to report positive beliefs about what they were doing. There is a strong sense of stability in the beliefs and attitudes of these teachers.

<u>Summary</u>: For the majority of these teachers, their first year was a year of survival. While a few did thrive, even without significant support, the majority struggled in one way or another. What surprised us was not the work load, but emotional load of student circumstances that weighed so heavily for so many. They simply were not prepared for the range of social, emotional and physical needs of their students and the toll it took on them emotionally and physically to meet these needs.

Even though these teachers worked in relatively unsupportive and changing environments they worked to improve their knowledge and practice. Through a combination of formal professional development, sharing with colleagues, as well as trial and error experience most were able to become more efficient (focusing their repertoire of practices) and competent over time. We have no evidence, however, that this improved efficiency and competence has resulted in being more effective in fostering student learning, at least on the measures we employed.

<u>Overall Evaluation – Goals 1 and 2:</u> While the generalizability of the findings may be questionable, the depth of findings and their longitudinal nature have certainly increased our understanding of the ties between statewide policy, the characteristics of teacher preparation, and the resulting relationships to teacher beliefs, thinking and practices and the various variables that confound these relationships.

Similarly, following a group of teachers for three years, delving deeply into their experiences and resulting thinking, attitudes, and practices has also improved our understanding of teacher development in a standards-based schooling system.

Even given the limitations inherent in the study we believe our achievement level on these two outcomes to be very good (a 4 on a 5 point scale).

# Outcome 3

Originally Outcome Three anticipated an expanded and refined methodology for linking teaching and learning that could be used with practicing teachers (a streamlined TWS). We broadened this outcome to include an expanded and refined design and methodology for research on teacher education effects, including effects on K-12 student learning in standards-based schools.

Our design and methodology were anchored conceptually to policy related emphases in teacher preparation, and to the "two-step" problem in teacher education research to trace effects to K-12 learning: 1) linking teacher performance in the classroom to teacher preparation; and 2) linking student progress in learning to a teacher's classroom performance when a multitude of student, classroom, school and family characteristics -- and other teachers in a school -- impact a student's progress in learning as well.

Given this complex arena in which the project rested we had to employ a research design that accommodated the "two-step" problem referred to above, and develop a battery of assessment procedures that addressed the enormously wide range of variables that come with it. We also had to employ a research design and develop assessment procedures that accommodated the demands of a 3-year longitudinal study, and that reflected the demands of standards-based teaching and learning.

Four broad lines of assessment were developed and implemented within the project to accommodate these demands: 1) The assessment of classroom practice from the perspective of standards-based teaching and learning; 2) A framework for viewing teacher impact on learning in a standards-based school environment, and accompanying means for assessing impact that is "instructionally embedded"; 3) Critical dimensions of teacher thinking, dispositions, and emotional reactions to work in a standards-based school environment, with multiple means for their assessment; and 4) Critical dimensions of a classroom and school context affecting teacher performance and student learning in a standards-based school. Each of these lines of assessment have had and should continue to have utility far beyond the present project for research on both teacher and teacher preparation effects on the learning of K-12 students.

To the best of our knowledge, to date:

- ✓ TEP-II is one of the few studies available that traces the effects of large scale policy related changes in teacher preparation to effects on teacher thinking, dispositions, classroom practices and impact on student learning.
- ✓ TEP-II is one of the few studies available that traces the change in teacher thinking, dispositions, practices and impact on learning occurring during the first three years of teaching and relates change to dimensions of the classroom and school contexts in which they work.
- ✓ TEP-II is one of the few studies available on teachers and teaching effects on student learning that "gets inside the black box" of explanatory variables. The range of variables attended to in the study, and the conceptual/theoretical contexts in which they rest, are a contrast to those found in most related research.
- ✓ TEP-II is one of the first studies of teaching and teacher preparation carried out explicitly within the context of standards-based teaching and learning.

<u>Summary</u>: As an approach (both design, method and the measures used) to studying the complex issues of teacher preparation effects on teacher practices, thinking, beliefs and impact on student learning, TEP-II has been cited as a model by Marilyn Cochran-Smith, editor of the Journal of Teacher Education, in an editorial in the May/June 2003 issue JTE.

<u>Overall Evaluation</u>: Based on the review of the research on teacher preparation effects, and responses to the project design, method and measures by various state and national audiences, we rate our achievement on this outcome as excellent (a 5 on a 5 point scale).

# Outcome 4

Outcome Four anticipated the dissemination of information and products pertaining to all aspects of the project in venues selected to further the national policy debate around the assurance of quality in teachers and teaching. The dissemination strategy for the project has varied depending on purpose and audience.

<u>Locally</u> (within the Teaching Research Division and College of Education at Western Oregon University) dissemination has occurred primarily through TEP-II staff working with colleagues on projects adopting some or all of the methodology used in the study, or incorporating findings or measures into teacher preparation program refinements. The TEP-II assessment system also has provided the ongoing structure and focus for the automated data management system being developed at Western to support the operation of the college's standards-based teacher preparation programs.

At the <u>state</u> level (Oregon) dissemination has occurred through a mixed strategy for project and information sharing. Measures and reports on findings were shared personally through two years of monthly meetings with the state-wide Title II Design Team for CONTINUING LICENSURE, with all products shared now posted on the Oregon University System website. Selected findings from the study also have been reported to Oregon's Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, and will be reported in November to representatives of all teacher preparation institutions in Oregon at the Fall meeting of the Oregon Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

At the <u>national</u> level dissemination thus far has occurred through reporting at conferences, twiceannual meetings of the Carnegie Foundation sponsored DELTA group, serving in a consultant role to the Carnegie Corporation sponsored Teachers for a New Era initiative, and serving in an advisory role to the Education Commission of the States new Policy Center for Teacher Quality. In these various contexts the project has been discussed in varying degrees of detail, but on all occasions products pertaining to the project were described and means of access to them noted.

Through these various contexts the project has become reasonably well known, even without formal publications, and viewed by the Editor of the <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u> as a project that,

"...contributes to what has thus far been a missing program of research in teacher education – research that connects teacher preparation to outcomes by examining some of the links among preparation, on the one hand, and teachers' learning, their professional practices, and their K-12 students' learning, on the other."

As a consequence of this view an invitation has come from the Editor to "publish as soon as possible" two articles pertaining to the study: one describing theory and methodology, and one describing findings on teacher preparation program effects. Working titles for the two papers are

*"Facing the demand of theory and methodology in research connecting teacher preparation and K-12 student learning."* 

and

"Looking at teacher education effects through the lens of early career teacher performance: *A longitudinal study that informs policy, practicing and research.*"

Titles of all project related presentations and products describing findings, measures, etc. were listed on pages 11-15 in this report.

Summary: In addition to the 18 internally published Research Briefs we have six additional

products in various stages of development for dissemination. We have also made seventeen presentations at regional and national conferences regarding various aspects of project design, methodology and findings. Where we have failed to meet expectations to date is in the realm of publications in refereed journals. We do have plans for addressing this deficiency, but in the future.

<u>Overall Evaluation</u>: Given the unbalanced dissemination efforts, we rate our achievement of this goal only as good (a 3 on a 5-point scale). Project staff have indicated future plans for professional writing related to the project.

# Outcome 5

Outcome Five anticipated a significant and continuing contribution to theory, method, and knowledge pertaining to standards-based teaching and learning.

The primary contribution of the project to this goal rests within the specific content and foci of the various lines of assessment outlined under Outcome Three on pages 20 and 21 and the various related publications and presentations. The dimensions of teaching and impact on learning addressed in the <u>classroom observation protocol</u> represent a major contribution in this regard. So do the dimensions of teaching and impact on learning addressed through teacher documentation in <u>the extended work sample</u>. These two vehicles for classroom assessment that connect teaching and learning are described, respectively, in Research Briefs 5 and 15.

The other two lines of assessment pursued are less directly focused on the process of teaching and learning, and focus instead on factors important to an understanding of that process. Teacher thinking, dispositions, emotions, etc. clearly influence what a teacher does in a classroom, as do the features of a classroom in which teaching and learning occur (e.g., number and characteristics of students taught and instructional resources available) and the school in which a classroom rests (e.g., the extent to which a principal provides strong instructional leadership and a supportive environment exists for teachers in the school). The content and focus of the various measures used to capture these "intervening" dimensions of a teaching/learning context are being described in the <u>Catalogue of Measures</u> that will be posted on the project's website. [http://www.tr.wou.edu/tep/products.html]

In combination these four broad lines of assessment provide a focus and level of detail that permits researchers to not only describe what occurs between teachers and students, and the impact on learning that follow, but also move toward understanding – and ultimately being able to explain – how and why what has been observed occurs. The aim and promise of a comprehensive assessment system of this kind is to "unlock the black box" that has characterized most teacher and teacher education effects research that currently exists. The research design, the questions posed, and the measures used in the present study represent a start toward the kind of research needed to do so.

These products also have more utilitarian purposes within the contexts of both initial preparation programs and continuing licensure programs in Oregon, and at a broader level, within the NCATE 2000 standards for teacher preparation program approval and the congressional No-

Child-Left-Behind Act.

<u>Summary</u>: This study is one of the first to explicitly explore the effectiveness and development of teachers in a standards-based model of schooling using measures purposefully developed for such a role.

<u>Overall Evaluation</u>: We base our judgment on both the extent to which the project's conceptual underpinnings, methods and findings contribute to our understanding of standards-based teaching and learning, but also the extent to which they have been disseminated. When taking both into account we rate our achievement of this goal as very good (a 4 on a 5-point scale).

# PART 3. PROJECT IMPACT

Through the design of the project, and achieving the outcomes anticipated, we believed that we would have an impact on three levels of policy and practice related to the initial preparation and licensure of teachers, as well as to the development and support of early career teachers.

<u>Locally</u>, the results of the study would feed back on the design and operation of Western's teacher preparation program, with clear indications of where it needs to be strengthened or refined.

Regionally, or at the <u>state level</u>, the study's findings would inform state policymakers and practitioners on issues related to teacher preparation and practice, as well as on issues relevant to the support and continued professional development of early career teachers.

<u>Nationally</u>, the project would, through active and aggressive dissemination of its work, further pursue the conversation with stakeholders in the education and teacher education communities as to the centrality of student learning in efforts to reform K-12 education and teacher preparation, licensing, and professional development.

On the pages that follow we have summarized our perceptions of the project's impact in tabular form. For each of the three levels - local, state and national, we identify both the impact and the source of the impact for various audiences.

# **TEP-II IMPACT: LOCAL**

SOUDCE OF IMPACT	Tanahar Education Community	I Pasaarah Community	Teacher Education
Theory and measures	Extension and refinement of Western Oregon's quality assurance assessment and related data management support systems for the INITIAL and CONTINUING licensure of teachers	Incorporated into a wide range of currently funded Teaching Research and College of Education research, evaluation and training projects	NA
Findings on teacher preparation effects	Informing Western's teacher preparation program refinement for NCATE and STATE accreditation (INITIAL and CONTINUING licensure)	Informing research, evaluation and training proposals from Teaching Research, Western's College of Education, and Oregon State University's College of Education	NA
Findings on teacher development	Same as above	Same as above	NA
Research design and methodology	Informing graduate follow-up and program evaluation designs required for State and National accreditation, especially around the assessment of classroom performance, dispositions, and impact on learning	Same as above	NA

Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Education, Oregon Education, Oregon Education, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, etc.

			Teacher Education
SOURCE OF IMPACT	Teacher Education Community	Research Community	Policy Community <sup>*</sup>
Theory and measures	A foundation for the design of a COMMON CORE assessment system for the CONTINUING (second stage) licensing of teachers in Oregon (the TEP-II/Title II statewide partnership).		A policy advisory committee consisting of representatives from all state agencies and organizations concerned with teacher quality in Oregon reviewed and critiqued the work of the TEP-II/Title II
	A foundation for the design of a state funded multi-agency pilot mentoring program, and evaluation of a federally funded multi- institutional program to recruit and prepare teachers to work in high need schools.	TEP-II impact on research community at the state level has thus far been limited largely to that pursued at Western Oregon University (see the previous page) and that pursued by Oregon State University listed below. One important consequence of the project at the state level, however, is the partnership established between Teaching Research and the Northwest Evaluation Association to	partnership throughout its design and testing of COMMON CORE assessment system for CONTINUING licensure. TEP-II measures available to all teacher preparation institutions in Oregon through the Oregon University Teacher Education website.
Findings on teacher preparation effects	Representatives from all teacher preparation institutions in Oregon approved to offer CONTINUING licensure programs were presented these data and their implications (through the RESEARCH BRIEFS referred to previously) for both the initial and continuing licensure of teachers.	pursue subsequent research and development projects on teacher and teacher preparation effects in school districts that use the NWEA standards-referenced and developmentally calibrated K-12 assessment system as a primary measure of teacher impact on student learning.	<ul> <li>Preliminary TEP-II findings on teacher</li> <li>preparation effects have been</li> <li>presented to the Teacher Standards</li> <li>and Practices Commission and</li> <li>discussed from the perspective of</li> <li>enhancing quality control in the</li> <li>INITIAL licensing of teachers in</li> <li>Oregon</li> </ul>
Findings on teacher development	Same as above		Preliminary TEP-findings on teacher development have been presented to TSPC and discussed from the perspective of their implications for induction, mentoring, and the continued professional development of early career teachers.
Research design and methodology	Oregon State University has incorporated essential features of the design in an NSF proposal around the preparation of Science and Mathematics teachers to work in standards-based schools.		Implications of the TEP-II design for teacher education follow-up and evaluation studies have been recognized and discussed, but no policy actions have as yet been taken.

# **TEP-II IMPACT: STATE**

<sup>\*</sup> Oregon's Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Education, Oregon Education, Oregon Education, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, etc.

# **TEP-II IMPACT: NATIONAL<sup>1</sup>**

		1	Teacher Education
SOURCE OF IMPACT	Teacher Education Community	Research Community	Policy Community
Theory and measures <sup>2</sup>	<ul> <li>Existing Avenues of Impact</li> <li>AACTE annual conferences (2001, 2002, 2003, 2004)</li> <li>Membership in the DELTA project, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which has as its aim the development of a "toolbox" of measures for teacher educators that connect teaching and learning</li> <li>Emerging Avenues of Impact</li> <li>The possibility of a working relationship with Teachers for a New Era institutions funded by the Carnegie Corporation of NY</li> <li>A series of Summer Institutes sponsored by the AACTE/Western partnership for connecting teaching and learning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Existing Avenues of Impact</li> <li>✓ AERA annual meetings (2002, 2003)</li> <li>✓ AACTE annual meetings (2001, 2002, 2003)</li> <li>Emerging Avenue of Impact</li> <li>✓ the Carnegie sponsored Teachers for a New Era initiative as a context for research in teacher education</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Existing Avenues of Impact</li> <li>the AACTE/Western Oregon</li> <li>University partnership for</li> <li>connecting teaching and learning</li> <li>(AACTE annual conference presessions, seminars and forums)</li> <li>Emerging Avenue of Impact</li> <li>preliminary conversations with</li> <li>Charles Coble, Director of the new</li> <li>ECS Policy Center for Teacher</li> <li>Quality, around ECS sponsored</li> <li>conferences, institutes and related</li> <li>writing</li> <li>membership on the Advisory</li> <li>Board to the ECS Policy Center</li> <li>the possible working relationship</li> <li>with the Teachers for a New Era</li> <li>initiative</li> </ul>
Findings on teacher	Existing Avenues of Impact $\sqrt{(\text{same as noted above})}$	Existing Avenues of Impact $\sqrt{(same as noted above)}$	Existing Avenues of Impact $\sqrt{(\text{same as noted above})}$
Findings on tangkar	<ul> <li>Emerging Avenues of Impact</li> <li>✓ (same as noted above) PLUS</li> <li>✓ an invitation from the Editor of the Journal of Teacher Education to publish "as soon as possible" an article reporting our findings on teacher preparation effects plus subsequent articles of a related nature and longer publications that are projected</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Emerging Avenues of Impact</li> <li>(same as noted above) PLUS</li> <li>the Journal of Teacher Education article and other publications referred to in the column to the left</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Emerging Avenues of Impact</li> <li>✓ (same as noted above) PLUS</li> <li>✓ the articles invited by the Journal of Teacher Education and subsequent publications projected</li> </ul>
development	Same as noted above	Same as noted above	Same as noted above

# CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

#### TEP-II NATIONAL IMPACT continued...

|--|

<sup>1</sup> Since the project has just been completed its impact nationally cannot have been extensive. Several avenues for impact, however, were established during the course of the project, and several additional avenues have emerged since its completion. These are discussed here, as well as related projections for long term impact.

<sup>2</sup> Four broad lines of assessment were carried out within the project which already have had a great deal of impact locally and in Oregon generally, and hold promise of broad impact nationally. These are 1) the assessment of classroom practice from the perspective of standards-based teaching and learning; 2) a framework for viewing teacher impact on learning in a standards-based school environment, and multiple means for its assessment; 3) critical dimensions of teacher thinking, dispositions, and emotional reactions to work in a standards-based school environment, with multiple means for their assessment; and 4) critical dimensions of a classroom and school context affecting teacher performance and student learning in a standards-based school environment. The project probably has had its greatest impact thus far through these measures and conceptual frames of reference, and they may well be its greatest source of impact in the future.

# PART 4. AN ELABORATION OF FINDINGS FROM ANALYSES THUS FAR COMPLETED

Teaching and learning in standards-based schools is vastly different, and more demanding on both teachers and students, than teaching and learning in the nom-referenced schools of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In standards-based schools neither the work of teachers nor students is done until specified standards for learning have been met -- or significant progress has been made toward their achievement -- by all students for whom one is responsible as a teacher. In norm-referenced schools students worked as hard as they needed to receive the grade desired -- or thought they could obtain -- and teachers decided upon the grade received. Helping all students reach a designated level of accomplishment on designated goals for learning is a new responsibility for teachers; reaching such goals is a new responsibility for students.

The preparation of teachers to do the work required of them in schools of this nature puts new demands on teacher preparation institutions and programs. Today's teachers must understand the fundamental shift that has occurred in the teaching/learning dynamic that accompanies a standards-orientation to schooling, and be prepared to cope with it. To do so they must understand fully the goals for learning their students are expected to accomplish, the performance standards that accompany them, and the high stakes involved for their students, themselves, and their schools when significant progress toward these goals and standards is wanting. They also must posses the content and procedural knowledge needed to help each student progress toward each goal to be accomplished, the assessment knowledge needed to determine where each student stands with respect to these goals, and the classroom management knowledge needed to create environments for learning that support and permit each student to engage productivity in the teaching/learning process. These are far different requirements for teachers and the teacher education community than have existed in the past even though much of the language describing them appears to be the same.

A major purpose of the TEP-II project was to explore the hypothesis that teachers prepared in programs that emphasize the nature of standards-based teaching and learning, and that reflect similar characteristics in their own design and operation, would perform differently in a standards-based school environment than teachers prepared in programs without such emphases. It also was hypothesized that the learning of their students would differ. Stated in another way we wanted to see whether we could trace the effects of a large scale policy related change in teacher preparation, that was related to policy driven emphases in public schools to effects on teacher thinking, dispositions, classroom practices, and impact on K-12 learning.

The means by which we pursued this question, and the limitations accompanying them, have already been discussed (see pages 4 to 15). In this section of the report we will highlight findings around the hypothesis explored and provide references to where related findings are reported in greater detail.

# **Teacher Preparation Effects**

1. The policy related emphases investigated in the present study have identifiable influence on the classroom performance of early career elementary teachers, but their influence is not as clear cut as expected, lessens after the 1<sup>st</sup> year of teaching, and tend not to persist after the 2<sup>nd</sup> year. Related details are provided in Research Briefs 5 through 10 and overheads for AACTE 2003 SESSION I, Presentation #3, and AACTE 2003 SESSION III, Presentations 1 through 4, on the project website.

2. These emphases, however, have no consistently identifiable influence on either *observed* indicators of impact on student learning or *teacher documented* impact (see pages 34 through 36 for related details). Mixed to reverse levels of impact from that expected by the hypothesis being explored were the rule rather than the exception. Related details are provided in Research Briefs 15 through 20 and Overheads for AACTE 2003 SESSION I, Presentation #4, and AACTE 2003 SESSION III, Presentations 1 through 4, on the project website.

3. From analyses thus far completed the teacher preparation emphases investigated also appear to have had no consistently identifiable influence on selected aspects of the thinking, dispositions and emotional consequences of work in the early career elementary teachers studied. These analyses are in a beginning stage, however, so firm conclusions are premature. Related details are spelled out in Research Brief 11 and Overheads for AACTE 2003 SESSION II, Presentation #7.

4. While state policies pertaining to program emphases within teacher preparation influence the classroom performance of early career elementary teachers, they do not do so uniformly across preparing institutions. Mean classroom performance scores for first year teachers prepared in Oregon institutions having at least 4 graduates in the sample studied, for example, ranged from 4.46 to 3.50, with still larger differences observed on individual proficiencies assessed. Related details are provided in Research Brief 8 and Overheads 8, 9 and 10 for AACTE 2003 SESSION III, Presentation #11. Implications for these observed differences for INITIAL and CONTINUING licensure are discussed in Brief 8.

5. Even though there is considerable variability in the classroom performance of teachers prepared by different institutions within Oregon, the mean of performance scores for the graduates of each of these institutions were higher than the mean of performance scores for 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers in the sample prepared in out-of-state institutions. A totally unexpected finding, however, was the rapid increase in the quality of performance in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers prepared out-of-state, and by teachers prepared in-state by institutions whose preparation programs were judged to reflect only MODERATELY the preparation emphases being investigated. Related details are provided in the resources referenced in items (1) and (4) above.

6. Another unanticipated finding was the *magnitude of within-group variability* found in all measures examined (classroom performance, impact on learning, dispositions, emotional reactions) in all sub-group comparisons explored. The size of this variability often exceeded the between-group variability of interest, and undoubtedly masks many of the differences we

expected to find. Related details and implications for the INITIAL and CONTINUING licensure of teachers are provided in resources referenced in items (1), (2) and (3) above.

7. Still another unanticipated finding was the lack of relationship between mentoring support received as an early career teacher and either classroom performance or impact on learning. Related details are provided in Research Briefs 9, 11, and 12.

8. Several other sources of influence assumed by many to be significant in the preparation of teachers were not identified as being so in the present study. These included

- $\checkmark$  a 5-year, or 5<sup>th</sup> year graduate program vs a 4-year undergraduate program;
- ✓ preparation offered in private vs public institutions; and
- ✓ preparation offered in regional vs research universities.

Related details are provided in Research Briefs 8 and 11.

# <u>The Development of Expertise</u> (classroom performance)

# A. WHEN THEY STARTED

- 1. Enormous variability existed among teachers taking part in the study in the kind and quality of classroom performance observed. With the 5-point rating scale used in 1<sup>st</sup> year observations (adjusted to accommodate the 8-point scale used in years 2 and 3), 6 of 66 Cohort 1 teachers observed in two separate instructional periods in late Spring had a mean score across ratings of 6.0, while 8 had a mean score across ratings of only 1.66.
- 2. The 5-point rating scale used in Year 1 observations led to a decidedly skewed distribution toward the upper end of the scale (a mean score of 3.78). Adjusting scores to fit the 8-point scale corrected the skewness to some extent, but performance ratings for this set of 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers continued to be high (a mean score of 4.63). Related details are provided in Research Brief 6 and overheads for Presentation 3 in AACTE 2003 SESSION I and Presentation 8 in SESSION II.

# B. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF WORK

- 1. Of the 77 first year teachers participating in the study (68 from Cohort 1 and 9 from Cohort 2) all worked in K-5 or K-6 configured schools. Teaching assignments ranged from Kindergarten to Grade 6, but nearly half taught at a "benchmark" grade (grades 3 or 5) in which state tests are administered annually.
- 2. The schools in which our sample of 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers worked mirrored fairly well the diversity of schools and districts in Oregon in terms of geographic location, size, student performance and socio-economic status.

- 3. Nearly one-quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers participating in the study were hired into the same school or district in which they did their student teaching. An additional quarter (23.3%) felt their 1<sup>st</sup> year teaching context was very similar to that in which they did their student teaching, but 34% felt it was vastly different.
- 4. Eighty percent of these teachers taught classes made up of students in a single grade level; the remaining 20% had multi-grade classes.
- 5. Seventy percent of these teachers viewed their schools as being "standards-based" in their focus and operation; 22% felt their schools operated "somewhat" in this manner, but 8% felt their schools did not reflect such an orientation.
- 6. Nearly 80% of these teachers viewed their principal as being interested in and supportive of innovation, but only 2/3 felt their principal let them know what was expected of them as a 1<sup>st</sup> year teacher.
- 7. While only 63% of these teachers indicated there was a good deal of collaborative effort among staff, about 8 in 10 (78.9%) said they could count on other teachers to help them out when asked or needed.
- 8. The type and amount of mentoring received by these teachers varied widely:
  - $\checkmark$  20 of the 76 received a "great deal" of mentoring formally organized by their school;
  - ✓ 11 of the 76 had a formally designated mentor but received little mentoring assistance;
  - $\checkmark$  1 teacher assigned a mentor received no mentoring assistance;
  - ✓ 21 of the 76 had no formally appointed mentor but received a great deal of "informal" mentoring assistance;
  - ✓ 22 of the 76 indicated they received limited assistance through an informal mentoring arrangement;
  - $\checkmark$  1 teacher reported receiving no formal or informal mentoring assistance.

For related information see Research Briefs 2 and 4, and Overheads from Presentations 5, 6 and 7 in AACTE 2003 SESSION II.

# C. HOW THEY PROGRESSED

- 1. The variability observed in the classroom performance of 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers continued among 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers. The performance distributions in both years, however, were less skewed toward the high end of the scale than in Year 1, and the proportions of extremely high or low performing teachers were smaller<sup>1</sup>. For related information see Research Briefs 6 and 10, and Overheads 1 through 7 for Presentation 8 in AACTE 2003 SESSION II.
- 2. Though variability in performance among teachers was pervasive throughout the study, performance tended to improve from the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 3<sup>rd</sup> years of teaching.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These distribution shifts were due to the refined and behaviorally anchored 8-point metric used in Year 2 and 3 observations compared to the 5-point metric used in Year 1.

- 3. Within this general pattern of improvement a majority of 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers whose performance was viewed as WEAK (a rating of 1 or 2 on the 5-point scale) were viewed as having advanced skills in Year 3, but 50% were still viewed as weak or marginally competent as 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers (ratings of 3 or 4 on the 8-point scale) and 30% were still viewed as marginally competent as 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers. For related information see Overhead 5 in Presentation 8 in AACTE 2003 SESSION II.
- 4. A similar perpetuation of weaker than expected performance was found for teachers viewed as MARGINALLY COMPETENT (a rating of 3 on the 5-point scale) as 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers: Approximately 40% continued to function at this level as 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers. (See Overhead 6 in the Presentation referred to above.)
- 5. Even a fairly large proportion (35%) of teachers viewed as having ADVANCED skills (a rating of 4 or 5 on the 5-point scale) as a 1<sup>st</sup> year teacher performed in a weak or marginally competent manner as 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers. (See Overhead 7 in the Presentation referred to above.)
- 6. Within these general patterns of observed performance, however,
  - ✓ some specific teaching proficiencies did not change in pattern of use, for example, "Clarifies learning outcomes to be accomplished";
  - ✓ some increased in frequency of use, for example, "Aligning and varying instructional activities and materials"; and
  - ✓ some decreased, for example, "Reinforcing the importance of learning outcomes to be achieved." (See Research Brief 10 for related information.)
- 7. Contrary to expectations patterns of observed performance did not vary consistently for teachers working at different grade levels (K-2, 3-4, 5-6), nor in different subject areas (Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics). Many practices did vary systematically, however, from the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of teaching (some increased, some decreased).

8. Most portfolio documented proficiencies did not improve from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of teaching. These include

- $\checkmark$  General and specific planning;
- ✓ Implementing instructional plans;
- ✓ Assessing student progress toward targets for learning;
- ✓ Reflecting on practice and student progress toward learning; and
- ✓ Attention given to standards for learning in all the above. (For related information see Research Brief 16.)

# A. WHEN THEY STARTED

- 1. The one measure of impact on learning obtained for 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers through classroom observation, *Student Engagement in Learning*, reflected the same range of variability across teachers studied that was found in the observation of classroom performance. Engagement in learning received
  - ✓ a rating of 1 or 2 on a 5-point scale in 17% of the 102 instructional periods observed near the end of the school year;
  - $\checkmark$  a rating of 3 in 18% of the instructional periods observed;
  - $\checkmark$  a rating of 4 in 33%; and
  - ✓ a rating of 5 in 32%.

As in the case of classroom performance these ratings were clearly skewed toward the upper end of scale (For related information see Research Briefs 15 and 17).

- 2. The two measures of impact on learning obtained through extended work samples prepared by 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers also reflected a great deal of variability in effectiveness, but considerably less skewness toward the upper end of the scales used.
  - ✓ *Teacher Documentation and Analysis of Student Progress in Learning* reflected an essentially "normal" distribution of scores.
  - ✓ Summative ratings for the *Occurrence of Non-Trivial Learning* in the units of study reported were more restricted in range, but still had some semblance of a normal distribution. (For related information see Research Briefs 15 and 16, and Overheads 1 through 9 in Presentation 4 in AACTE 2003 SESSION I).

# B. HOW THEY PROGRESSED: OBSERVED IMPACT ON LEARNING

- 1. *Student engagement in learning* during the course of instructional periods observed (2 per site visit, 5 site visits across three years) tended to increase with experience. In observations made near the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> year of teaching students were reasonably to fully engaged in planned learning activities in only 65% of the 102 instructional periods observed. By the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of teaching this increased to 83% of the 105 instructional periods observed, and by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of teaching decreased slightly to 79% of the 78 instructional periods observed.
- 2. *Student interest in content to be learned*, and *Student understanding and exploration of meaning within and across subject areas*, followed similar patterns of change in the two years they were attended to in the project (Years 2 and 3).
- 3. Some Levels of intellectual work students were asked to pursue also varied with experience, but others did not.

- ✓ KNOWING/REMEMBERING was a prominent focus in fewer than 40% of the instructional periods observed that were managed by 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers, but increased to nearly 80% of the classrooms managed by 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers;
- ✓ ANALYZING/EVALUATING moved steadily in the opposite direction, with these intellectual activities having a prominent focus in 67% of the instructional periods managed by 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers in the Fall and 60% in the Spring, to 43% of the instructional periods managed by 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers in the Fall and 39% in the Spring.
- ✓ UNDERSTANDING/EXPLAINING and PERFORMING/APPLYING remained reasonable stable as prominent foci for instruction in both the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years of teaching, with both levels of intellectual work appearing in 80% to 90% of all instructional periods observed during Fall and Spring site visits both years.
- ✓ SOLVING NOVEL PROBLEMS and INTEGRATING/CREATING also remained reasonably stable as prominent foci of intellectual work in 30% to 40% of all instructional periods observed during Fall and Spring site visits both years.

For related information see Research brief 17 and Overhead 5 in AACTE 2003 SESSION I, Presentation 4.

# C. HOW THEY PROGRESSED: TEACHER DOCUMENTED IMPACT ON LEARNING

- 1. Summative ratings for documented learning gains made by students toward standardsreferenced goals for learning in one or more units of instruction (assembled and reported through teacher work samples adopted for use with employed teachers) during both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years of teaching yielded results that were both disappointing and surprising:
  - ✓ Disappointing in the relatively small number of participating teachers willing or able to document the learning gains made by their students as called for in the extended teacher work sample (47 of 77 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers, and 33 of 60 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers);
  - Surprising in the large proportion of teachers completing a work sample that failed to meet the performance standards expected (a rating of 3 on a 4-point descriptively anchored scale) for *the occurrence of non-trivial learning* (22 of 47 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers, and 18 of 33 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers failed to do so); and
  - ✓ Surprising in the lack of improvement in documented learning from the  $1^{st}$  year of teaching to the second.<sup>2</sup>
- 2. Five sub-scale scores of 0 to 4 summed around the quality of information presented in documenting and analyzing the learning progress made by students in the unit(s) of instruction described in the extended work samples were surprising to the point of being alarming:
  - ✓ A great deal of variability was found in the quality of information provided by both  $1^{st}$  and  $2^{nd}$  year teachers;

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Teachers were offered a stipend of \$500.00 each year to prepare an extended work sample. Since these were licensed teachers the decision was made to provide them with only a broad outline of the information to be included in the documentation, rather than the detailed guidelines and scoring rubrics provided pre-service teachers. It is doubtful this decision contributed to the low completion rate, but it probably did contribute to the low quality of documentation provided.

- ✓ While a few teachers provided outstanding documentation, a majority of the teachers completing a work sample failed to meet even a modest performance standard in this regard (only 20 of the 47 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers completing the documentation received a summed scale score of 10 or more of 20 points possible, and only 10 of the 32 second year teachers completing documentation reached this performance standard); and
- ✓ The decrease in quality of documentation and analysis of learning gains by students taught between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years of teaching was totally unexpected.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> It is not possible to determine the cause of either the low completion rate or the low performance level of participating teachers on this important aspect of teaching in today's standards-based, accountability-driven schools. It could have been lack of proficiency, lack of motivation, lack of time, or a combination of all three. All teachers participating in the research found the task burdensome, as their lives as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers were full to overflowing. Also, neither work sample completion nor the quality of its preparation led to a "high stakes" decision. When signing on to the project all participants said they would be willing to undertake the task, but nothing of consequence would happen if they didn't other than losing the \$500 that accompanied task completion. Whatever the reason for the disappointing results obtained, some tentative implications of these findings from the research for the initial and continuing licensure of teachers are discussed in Research Brief 16.

# PART 5. OTHER ANALYSES COMPLETED, AND REMAINING ANALYSES PLANNED

As a frame of reference for this discussion Table 5.1 provides an overview of data collected in the study in terms of a qualitative/quantitative distinction. Related details, including collection schedule, are provided in Table 2 on page 8 of this report. An overview of data coding, reduction and approaches taken to data analysis are provided on pages 9 and 10.

Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data
Individual interview protocols: Teacher preparation, teaching practices, student learning, and teacher reflection (year 1)	Classroom observation protocol: Instructional practices and impact on learning (years 1, 2, 3)
Extended teacher work samples: Teacher documentation of instruction related practices and impact on learning (years 1 and 2)	Surveys for demographic/contextual information: Classroom, school, district (years 1, 2, 3)
<ul> <li>Self assessment: Open-ended questionnaire (years 1, 2, 3)</li> <li>✓ Classroom context; similarities with student teaching</li> <li>✓ Mentoring/support</li> <li>✓ Standards-based schooling practices</li> <li>✓ Current and hoped for experience as a teacher</li> <li>✓ Areas of improvement/professional development</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Surveys for teacher thinking, dispositions and response to stress (years 1, 2, 3)</li> <li>✓ Locus of accountability for student learning</li> <li>✓ Commitment to teaching as a profession</li> <li>✓ Level of stress incurred as a 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teacher</li> <li>✓ Emotional response to stress</li> <li>Self assessment: Proficiency ratings and evidence used in making the ratings (years 1, 2, 3)</li> </ul>
Focus group protocol: Changes in practice and beliefs, support, continued influence of teacher education (year 2)	
Third year summative reflection questionnaire (year 3)	

### Table 5.1. Range and Nature of Data Collected in the Study

### **Analysis Strategy**

Given the mass and diversity of information collected in the study, and its longitudinal as well as comparative nature, it became clear that we needed to conduct its analysis in stages. After considering a variety of alternatives we decided to follow a 4-level (stage) plan.

LEVEL I. Purely descriptive analyses on a variable-by-variable basis. We needed to know what confidence we could place in each of the data sets we had, and we wanted to know what each data set looked like in its most basic sense. Put in another way, we wanted to be sure we had sufficient variability within each data set to warrant looking for factors relating to or contributing to that variability. For this purpose means, variances, frequencies, and measures of "normality" were calculated for all variables. This level of analysis also let us "clean" and refine the data pertaining to each variable for subsequent analyses.

LEVEL II. Simple two-variable analyses including correlations, t-tests, and ANOVAs where appropriate and warranted to address questions posed through the research, or were of general interest conceptually or theoretically and able to be explored through the research. Both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses were conducted at this level of inquiry. This level of analysis also let us further refine data pertaining to each variable in preparation for more complex analyses.

LEVEL III. Multi-variate analyses to explore the more complex interactions among variables involved in the study. These will address both teacher preparation effects and longitudinal/developmental hypotheses, and pursue the model building/theory anchored interests underlying the study. It is at this level that order and sense has to be made of the status of a particular variable within a particular analysis (Independent? Intervening? Moderator? Control? Level I or Level II Dependent?), and deciding which cluster of variables should be included within an analysis. The overarching schematic we used in thinking about these issues is shown in Figure 5.1. The working taxonomy of variables we currently are using is shown in Figure 5.2. Specific path diagrams depicting expected relationships among variables selected for a particular analysis are still being developed.<sup>4,2</sup>

LEVEL IV. Extreme case analyses that go beyond the capabilities of statistical manipulation in bringing understanding to the interaction and influence of factors playing upon a particular teacher with a particular group of students in a particular classroom, school, and community context at a particular point in time. Such analyses can help explain outliers that appear in statistical analyses of data, and can provide insight into the power of context and circumstance that shape a teacher or classroom dynamic.

# **Analyses Completed**

All Level I, but only selected Level II analyses have been completed. Also, analyses reported in most of the Research Briefs prepared for continuing licensure design team partners involved only 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year data, though these analyses have now been extended to include all three years of longitudinal data. A few exploratory multivariate analyses and extreme case studies have been undertaken, but, as of this writing, many Level II and essentially all Level III and IV analyses remain to be carried out.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> As noted on page 10 of the report it is in analyses at this level that the uneven and small group sizes of our sample, especially for  $2^{nd}$  and  $3^{rd}$  year teachers, becomes a stumbling block in conducting tests of significance and estimating effect sizes. This is particularly the case for the teacher preparation effects aspect of the study, where analyses are sub-group based and comparative. The problem of sample size lessens considerably, however, in the longitudinal/developmental aspect of the study where analyses are free to involve the total sample.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We believe a related point should be made. In largely exploratory studies, which this study is, in contrast to confirmatory studies, small sample sizes can often work to a researcher's advantage. Small samples require LARGE differences for a statistically significant difference to be demonstrated, and such differences are likely to signal practical as well as theoretical significance. Differences required for statistical significance in large sample studies may carry little practical or theoretical significance.

# Figure 5.1. A Framework for Thinking About Teaching and Teacher Development That Acknowledges the Complexity of both In Standards-Based Schools



<sup>1</sup> Program emphases investigated in the TEP-II study were

- 1. Alignment with Oregon's design for standards-based schools;
- 2. Focus on the connection of teaching and learning, for example through teacher work sampling;
- 3. Provision of on-going developmental assessment of candidates against clear and public performance standards resembling those encountered in Oregon's K-12 schools.

Differentiation by the developmental level of students a candidate is preparing to teach (Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle School, Secondary) was added as supporting information but not used in categorizing programs for inclusion in the research.

#### Figure 5.2. A Conceptual Map of the Variables Involved in the Research



<sup>1</sup> School improvement and continued professional development activities.

# **Analyses Planned**

Given the 170 variables for which data have been collected the number of two-variable analyses possible are staggering. Obviously, not all possible interactions warrant analysis, but many not yet undertaken do. Examples of analyses yet to be undertaken include relationships between

- ✓ Quality of instructional planning and quality of instructional practice;
- Self perceptions of strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and observed strengths and weaknesses;
- ✓ Quality of instructional practice and student engagement in learning;
- ✓ The level of intellectual work pursued by students under the guidance of a teacher and other indicators of teacher impact on learning;
- ✓ Features of the classroom (or school) context in all of the above.

All such analyses will need to specify 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers, and be reviewed for variations in findings that occur with experience. An analysis of change in this regard is an important aspect of the longitudinal focus of the study.

More complex issues of choice exist in determining which sets of variables to include in the range of multi-variate analyses possible and reasonable to undertake. Current plans call for these to incorporate at least three of the five broad categories of variables outlined in Figure 5.2, and possibly four. Some examples involving three sets of variables are

- ✓ The impact of teacher preparation emphases (independent variable) on first or second level dependent variables, with selected intervening variables controlled statistically (again, sub-group sample size will severely limit the number of variables that can be included in any analysis pertaining to preparation effects);
- ✓ The effects of selected instructional, or instruction related practices such as planning and classroom management (first level dependent variables) on measures of teacher impact on learning (second level dependent variables), with selected first or second level intervening variables controlled statistically (sub-group constraints will not apply to these analyses);
- ✓ The effects of selected classroom, school or district context variables (second level intervening variables) on classroom performance (first level dependent variables), with selected first level intervening variables controlled statistically.

All such analyses also will need to specify 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers, and be reviewed for variations in findings that occur with experience.

A separate line of multi-variate dimensional analyses will be pursued to advance conceptual and methodological interests. Factorial, step-wise regression and partial correlation analyses will be carried out on conceptually related sets of measures to determine overlap, interdependencies and stand-alone contributions to dependent variables of interest. Refinements are expected from these analyses in constructs, measures and related theory.

Choice as to focus of extreme case studies also is essentially endless, but currently we are planning to limit these to two broad categories:

- Outliers in any data set whose performance in light of context or circumstance is dramatic or puzzling;
- ✓ Teachers having differing patterns of performance from one year of teaching to the next, for example, outstandingly strong or weak performance across their first three years of teaching, continuous improvement or decline across the three years, or uneven performance across the three years.

#### ATTACHMENTS

### FOUNDATIONS ON WHICH THE PROJECT RESTED

### FOUNDATION A <u>The Emergence of Teacher Work Sampling as a Means of Connecting</u> <u>Teaching and Learning (1965-1986)</u>

By receiving a US Office of Education award in the late 1960's to develop one of eight Elementary Teacher Education Models (the competency-based and field centered, or ComField, model) Western became a major contributor to the development of what came to be known as performance-based teacher preparation. After nearly a decade of developing and implementing the ComField model it became clear that focusing only on teacher knowledge and skills provided no assurance that beginning teachers would be able to help all K-12 students progress in their learning. It was at this point that we began the search for a means to clearly and defensibly connect teaching and learning, with the emergence of teacher work sampling as a vehicle for doing so.

### **Related policy initiatives addressed**

- $\checkmark$  The assurance of quality in teacher preparation and licensure
- Linking teacher preparation and licensing to emerging research on teaching and learning
- ✓ Preparing teachers to meet the demands of Public Law 94-142 (a "free and appropriate" public education for students with disabilities)
- ✓ Responding to the implications for teacher preparation of the 1983 publication <u>A</u> <u>Nation At Risk</u>
- ✓ Responding to Oregon's design for "goal-based" schooling (a pre-cursor to the state's current design for standards-based schools)
- ✓ Responding to a shift in teacher licensing in Oregon from an "input" to an "outcomebased" model that paralleled the state's approach to goal-based schooling

### Illustrative products and publications

Schalock, H. D. (1970). The focus of performance-based certification: Knowledge, teaching behavior, or the products that derive from a teacher's behavior? <u>Procedures of the</u> <u>Conference on Performance-Based Certification</u>, Florida State Department of Education, May, Miami Beach.

Schalock, H. D. (1974). The impact of competency definition on teacher preparation institutions. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, January, pp 318-321.

- Schalock, H. D. and Girod, G. R. (1975). The Oregon College of Education -Teaching Research Division paradigm for research on teacher preparation. In G. E. Dickson (Ed.), <u>Research and Evaluation in Operational Competency-Based Teacher Education Programs</u>, College of Education, Educational Comment, University of Toledo, No. 1, pp 21-38.
- Schalock, H. D., Hersh, B., and Garrison, J. (1976). <u>From Commitment to Practice: The OCE</u> <u>Elementary Teacher Preparation Program</u>. Washington, DC: The American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Schalock, H. D. (1979a). Research in Teacher Selection. In D.C. Berliner (Ed.) Annual Review of Research in Education Vol. VII, pp 364-417.
- Schalock, H. D. (1979b). The Assessment of Competence: Problems and Issues. In R. Nickse and L. McClure (Eds.) *Competency Based Education: Beyond Minimum Competency Testing*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, pp 248-295.
- Schalock, H. D. (1980), Eating Humble Pie: Notes on Methodology in Teacher Education Research. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), *Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research*. Report of an NIE sponsored conference on research and development in teacher education at the R and D Center for Teacher Education, Austin Texas.
- Schalock, H. D. (1981a). A Foundation for Excellence: Oregon's Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools. In G. Fielding, D. Schalock and R. Talbert (Eds.) *Perspectives on Schooling: Implications of Oregon's Approach to School Improvement*. Proceedings of a Conference, March 18-20, 1981.
- Schalock, H. D. (1981b). Assuring Proficiency in the Basic Skills of Oregon's College and University Graduates in Teacher Education: Recommendations and Procedures. A report submitted to and adopted by the Oregon Board of Higher Education, June27, 1981 (with V. Remple and members of an inter-institutional committee).
- Schalock, H. D. (1982). Bridging the Gap: Next Steps in the Evolution of Teacher Education. *California Journal of Teacher Education* (invited paper). Summer, pp 48-62.
- Schalock, H. D. (1983). Methodological considerations in future research and development in teacher education. In Kenneth Howey and William Gardner (Eds.), *The Education of Teachers: A Look Ahead*. New York: Longman, pp 38-73.
- Schalock, H. D. and Fielding, G. (1985). The development of a teacher's handbook and a related staff development program for integrating teaching and testing in high school (Final report to the National Institute of Education). Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, (ERIC Document N. ED 258 935).
- Schalock, H. D. (1985). Assuring quality in the graduates of teacher preparation programs: Three institutions that have adopted the concept of a "Warranty." A paper presented at the annual

meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Denver, February 27-March 2, 1985.

- Schalock, H. D. (1987). The central issue in the concept of teacher warranties: Quality assurance for what? *Journal of Teacher Education 38(5)*, 51-58.
- Schalock, H. D. (1988). Teacher selection: A problem of admission criteria, certification criteria or prediction of job performance? In W. J. Gephart and J. B. Ayers (Eds), *Teacher Education Evaluation*. Boston: Kliewer Academic Publishers, pp 1-22.
- Schalock, H. D. (1989a). Student learning: The professional touchstone for teachers and teacher educators. *Proceedings of the 1988 Far West Meeting of the Holmes Group*, Boulder, CO, pp 165-178.
- Schalock,, H. D.(1989b). A new paradigm for teacher licensure: Oregon's demand for evidence of success in fostering learning. *Journal of Teacher Education* 29(6), 8-16.

# FOUNDATION B <u>The Emergence of Oregon's Design for Standards-BasedSschools (1975-94).</u>

During the late 1970's Oregon began moving toward a standards-orientation to schooling. In the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of this development (1976-1982) the design was referred to as "goal-based" schooling. In the next stage in its evolution (1983-1990) it was referred to as "outcome-based" schooling. In 1991 the Oregon Legislative Assembly formally adopted one of the nation's first designs for "standards-based" schooling under the title *Oregon's Design for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools*. As a consequence of these various designs for schooling in Oregon policies governing teacher preparation were in a constant state of adaptation and redesign to keep pace. Teacher work sampling evolved within this context, and paralleled in its design the model of schooling being implemented.

# **Related policy initiatives addressed**

- ✓ The use of strategies from business to manage public schools, e.g., Management by Objectives and Total Quality Management
- ✓ Responding to the issues raised by the 1983 <u>Nation at Risk</u> report around the effectiveness of the nation's schools
- ✓ Responding to the proposals contained in the 1986 Carnegie Forum for Education and the Economy report <u>A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</u>
- ✓ The short-lived bandwagon of "outcome-based" education in response to the Nation-At-Risk report
- ✓ The recommendations of the Presidentially appointed National Goals Panel, and the impetus it gave to a standards-orientation to schooling
- ✓ The enhancement of teaching as a profession through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the emergence of national guidelines for the continued professional development of school personnel

# **Illustrative products and publications**

- Schalock, H. D. and Egge, D. (1979). The Oregon Plan for Staff Development in Education: A Profession-wide Support System. Oregon's final report for the USOE sponsored 4-state project on the continued professional development of school personnel, August, 1979 (with D. Egge, Oregon Department of Education).
- Fielding, G., Schalock, D., and Talbert, R. (Eds). (1981). Perspectives On Schooling: Implications of Oregon's Approach to School Improvement. Proceedings of a conference, March 18-20, 1981.
- Schalock,, H. D. (Ed.) (1982). Program Guide and Teacher Handbooks for the Valley Education Consortium's High Performance Instructional Program in Mathematics, Grades 1-8 (An instructional program that integrates curriculum, teaching, testing and program evaluation).

- Fielding, G. and Schalock, H. D. (1983). School improvement through an educational consortium: A model and a process. *R & D Perspectives*, Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and management, University of Oregon, Spring/Summer 1983.
- Schalock, H. D. (1983). A Consortium At Task For A Nation at Risk: Response of the Valley Education Consortium to the Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Division, OSSHE. Pp 29.
- Schalock, H. D., Fielding, G., and Egge, D. (1983). Implementation and initial impact of Oregon's 1980 Standards for student and program assessment in the basic skills. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Schalock, H. D. (1984a). A descriptive study of the continued professional development of school personnel in Oregon. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1984.
- Schalock, H. D. (1984b). Implications of high performance instructional programs for preservice and inservice teacher education. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for colleges of Teacher Education, San Antonio, February, 1984.
- Fielding, G., Gall, M. and Schalock, H. D. (1984). Involving the principal in teacher's staff development: Effects on the quality of mathematics instruction in elementary schools. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Schalock, H. D., Duncan, V., and Harris, W. (1985). Linking the initial and continued professional development of school personnel to instructional programs in the schools: An essential feature of Oregon's approach to school improvement. In Gene Hall (Ed.) Beyond the Looking Glass: Proceedings of a National Conference on Research and Development in Teacher Education, Austin, Texas.
- Schalock, H. D. (1985a). Pooling resources for the continued professional development of school personnel: Oregon's profession-wide approach to staff development. A paper presented at the annual meting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Denver, February 27-March 2.
- Schalock, H. D. (1985b). Promoting the professional development of teachers and administrators. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Supported with funds from the National Institute of Education.
- Fielding, G., Schalock, M. Schalock, D., Erickson, J., and Bratt, M. (1985). Integrating teaching and testing with program management. *Educational Leadership* 23(2), 55-58.

- Fielding, G. and Schalock, H. D. (1985a). Integrating Teaching and Testing: A Handbook for High School Teachers. Monmouth, Oregon. Oregon State System of Higher Education. Pp 165. Produced through a contract with the National Institute of Education.
- Schalock, H. D. and Fielding, G. (1985b) Integrating teaching and testing: A school-based staff development program for improving the quality of instruction in high schools. Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, (ERIC Document No. 258 934). Produced through a contract with the National Institute of Education.
- Fielding, G., Shaughnessy, J, Schalock, M., and Schalock, D. (1986). Curriculum, assessment, and the use of assessment information in Oregon schools: Results from a state-wide survey (Final report to the Oregon Department of Education). Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education.
- Schalock, H. D. (1986). Implementing outcome-based instructional programs: The Valley Education Consortium's approach. *Outcomes: A Quarterly Journal of the Network of Outcome-Based Schools*, 1(14), 1-14.
- Schalock, M. D., (1987). Teacher productivity: What is it? How might it be measured? Can it be warranted? *Journal of Teacher Education*, <u>38</u>(5), pp. 59-62.
- Schalock, H. D., and Schalock, M. D., (Eds.) (1988). Managing goal-based, outcome directed instructional programs: A handbook for principals, McMinnville, OR. Valley Education Consortium.
- Schalock, H. D. (Ed.) (1990a). Learning goals for students in mathematics: A CORE OF COMMON LEARNING for Grades K through 10. An instructional resource of the Valley Education Consortium. Yamhill Education Service District, McMinnville, OR.
- Schalock, H. D. (Ed.) (1990b). Learning goals for students in Science and Technology: A CORE OF COMMON LEARNING for Grades K through 10. An instructional resource of the Valley Education Consortium. Yamhill Education Service District, McMinnville, OR.
- Schalock, H. D. (Ed.) (1990c). Learning goals for students in Health and Physical Education: A CORE OF COMMON LEARNING for Grades K through 10. An instructional resource of the Valley Education Consortium. Yamhill Education Service District, McMinnville, OR.

### FOUNDATION C <u>An Invitational Conference Leading to the TEP-I Project</u> Supported by Atlantic Philanthropies (USA) Inc.(October, 1994)

By the early 1990's Oregon had formalized its design for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools and Western Oregon University, through its work with the Valley Education Consortium (a three county coalition of local school districts and county-based Education Service Districts) and the State Department of Education, had helped school faculties and teacher educators across the state understand the nature and implications of this new design for its schools. Particular attention was given to its implications for teaching and learning, and related preparation of school personnel. Also by the early 1990's Western had gained sufficient experience with teacher work sampling as a vehicle for instruction and assessment within its teacher preparation programs, and had accumulated sufficient research and evaluation-evidence as to its effectiveness on both counts, that the Provost of the University encouraged the faculty to "go public" with the methodology. The faculty accepted the challenge and designed a three day conference to bring to the campus invited experts with related measurement, evaluation and research expertise to critically review and evaluate the methodology from the perspective of its various utilities. The conference was held in October, 1994, and carried out within the context of Oregon's design for standards-based schools as an applied frame of reference. Dr. Angela Covert attended the conference as a Program Officer from Atlantic Philanthropies.

# **Related policy initiatives addressed**

- ✓ Preparing teachers to understand and work within a standards-based classroom and school environment
- ✓ Assuring the quality and effectiveness of teachers licensed to work in a standardsbased school
- ✓ Preparing teachers to deal with the growing emphasis on accountability for schools by helping ALL students reach high standards for learning
- Preparing teachers to become adept in assessing student progress in a standards-based school, and using assessment information to enhance teaching, learning, and the effectiveness of school programs

# **Related products and publications**

- Schalock, H. D. and Cowart, B. H. (1993). *DOCUMENT I. Oregon's design for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools and its implications for teachers: A paradigm shift*. Division of Continuing Education, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, OR 97361.
- Schalock, H. D. (1993). DOCUMENT III. Oregon's design for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools: A transformation in the meaning of teaching. Division of Continuing Education, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, OR 97361.
- Schalock, H. D., Cowart, B., Myton, D., and Reinke, J. (1993). DOCUMENT IV. Oregon's design for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools: Recommendations for licensure redesign. Division of Continuing Education, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, OR 97361.

- Schalock, H. D., Schalock, M. D. (1993). Student learning in teacher evaluation and school improvement: An introduction. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(2), 105-134.
- Schalock, H. D., Schalock, M. D., Cowart, B., & Myton, D. (1993). Extending teacher assessment beyond knowledge and skills: An emerging focus on teacher accomplishments. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(2), 105-134.
- Schalock, H. D., Schalock, M. D., Myton, D., & Girod, G. R. (1993). Focusing on learning gains by pupils taught: A central feature of Oregon's outcome-based approach to the initial preparation and licensure of teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(2), 135-158.
- Schalock, M.D., Cowart, B. and Staebler, B. (1993). Teacher productivity revisited: Definition, theory, measurement and application. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, <u>7(2)</u>, 179-196.
- Schalock, H. D. (1994). DOCUMENT II. Oregon's design for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools and its implications for teachers: Related concepts, practices, and research. Division of Continuing Education, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, OR 97361.
- Schalock, H. D. and Schalock, M. D. (1994). Working Documents Prepared for Conference Participants
  - I. History, design and definitions
  - II. Theory elaboration and predictions
  - III. Construct elaboration and measurements
  - IV. Data collection, coding and files

Schalock, M. D. (1994). Data Summaries Prepared for Conference Participants

- I. Theory testing and refinement
- II. Applications to teacher preparation and licensure

### FOUNDATION D The TEP-I Project (1995-98)

The October 1994 invitational conference convened as an external review and critique of the concept of teacher work sampling and its applications led to a recommendation by the reviewing panel that the methodology be submitted to a rigorous, externally refereed study of its merit and worth. Following this recommendation Dr. Angela Covert, the Atlantic Philanthropies program officer attending the conference, invited a formal proposal for such a study. The proposal, built around a National Advisory Panel of twelve leading measurement, evaluation and research experts in teaching and learning, was funded early in 1995.

The project focused on extending the research and development activities at Western that had been reviewed in the October conference, and making this work known nationally to the teacher education and research community. The issues of primary concern in this regard were 1) the utility of the methodology as a vehicle for preparing teachers to work in standards-based schools, and 2) the defensibility of the methodology as a core assessment in recommending prospective teachers for initial licensure. A related concern was determining the utility of the methodology as a vehicle for preparation.

To meet these various goals the National Advisory Panel met on five separate occasions for two-day work sessions. In addition, three national invitational conferences were held in Oregon around the methodology and its utility in preparing teachers to work in standards-based schools, and working partnerships were established with the Education Trust and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. In addition to numerous conference presentations, book chapters and journal articles coming from this work (see below), a Handbook was prepared for teacher educators on using the methodology to help prospective teachers functionally connect teaching and learning. Also, during the course of the project, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education built on the work that had been pursued in Oregon toward connecting teaching and learning in shaping its 2000 Standards to include a strong emphasis on teacher impact on learning.

### **Related policy initiatives addressed**

A continued focus on the initiatives which led initially to developing work sample methodology as a means of assessing quality in teachers and teaching (see page 43) PLUS

- ✓ The place of measures connecting teacher work to student learning in "high stakes" decisions such as teacher licensure and job continuation;
- ✓ The properties such measures need to be treated as "defensible evidence" in reaching such decisions; and
- ✓ The properties such measures need to be treated as defensible evidence in research and evaluation studies pertaining to teacher effectiveness.

#### **Illustrative products and publications**

#### Products

- Schalock, H.D., and Schalock, M.D. (1995). Advances in theory and research on teacher effectiveness: Proceedings of a Conference. Division of Continuing Education, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, OR 97361.
- Teacher Effectiveness Project & School of Education Faculties. (1996). Progressive Summary: Connecting Teacher Work and Student Learning (H.D. Schalock & M.D. Schalock, Eds.). Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Ayres, R., Girod, G., McConney, A., Schalock, M.D., Schalock, H.D., & Wright, D. (1996). A Guide to Teacher Work Sample Methodology (A. McConney, Ed.). Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division.
- McConney, A., Ayres, R., Schalock, M.D., & Schalock, H.D. (1997). The Reliability and Validity of Teacher Work Sample Methodology: A Report to the National Advisory Panel for Western Oregon University's Teacher Effectiveness Project. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectives Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D. (1996). A Six Year Analysis of Teacher Work Sample Content, Assessments, and Level of Schooling: Fall, 1991 - Spring, 1997. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, H.D., Tell, C., & Smith, D. (1997, for conference critique). Foundation Monograph I: Teaching and Learning in Standards-Based Schools. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, H.D., Schalock, M.D., Tell, C., & Brodsky, M. (1997, for conference critique). Foundation Monograph II: Preparing Teachers to Work in Standards-Based Schools. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D., Brott, M., Dickson, K., M., & Schalock, H.D. (1997, for conference critique). Foundation Monograph III: Implications of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning for the Organization and Operation of Schools. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, H.D., & Smith, D. (1997). Oregon's Design for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools and Its Implications for Teaching and Learning. Monmouth, OR: Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D. (1997). 1995-1996 Follow Up Summary: Western Oregon University School of Education Elementary Division. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D. (1997). 1995-1996 Follow Up Summary: Western Oregon University School of Education Secondary Division. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.

- Ayres, R., McConney, A., Schalock, M.D., Cuthbertson, L, & Bartelheim, F. (1997). Preliminary Findings from Three Focus Group Sessions with Recent Western Oregon University Teacher Education Graduates. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D., McConney, A., McConney, A.W., Schalock, H.D. (1997). Matching Study Between the Oregon Benchmarks and ETS PRAXIS Content Examinations. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, H.D., & Schalock, M.D. (1998). Verifying the Worth of Teacher Work Sampling as an Applied Assessment System. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, H.D., & Schalock, M.D. (1998). Teacher Work Sampling Endorsement Packet I: Preservice Preparation and Initial Licensure of Teachers. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- McConney, A., Schalock, M.D., & Schalock, H.D. (1998). Teacher Work Sampling Endorsement Packet II: Verifying the Worth of Teacher Work Sampling as an Applied Assessment System. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D., & Schalock, H.D. (1998). Teacher Work Sampling Endorsement Packet III: Teacher Work Sampling as a Methodology for Studying Teacher and Context Effects on Learning. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Schalock, M.D. (1998). A Brief Summary of Findings from the Teacher Effectiveness Project. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.
- Smith, D., McConney, A.W., and Perry, C. (1998). Assessment Framework for a Proficiency-Based Teacher Education Program. Monmouth, OR: Teacher Effectiveness Project, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon University.

#### Publications

- McConney, A. & Schalock, M.D. (1996). Teacher Work Sample Methodology...Promise for Program and Personnel Appraisal? *American Association of School Personnel Administrators Report*, Vol. III(8).
- Schalock, H.D., Schalock, M.D., & Girod, G.R. (1997). Oregon's teacher effectiveness work sample methodology as used at Western Oregon University. In Jason Millman (Ed.), <u>Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?</u> Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

- McConney, A., Schalock, M..D., & Schalock, H.D. (1997). Indicators of student learning in teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge, (Ed.), <u>Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- McConney, A., & Ayres, R. (1997, Spring). Assessment: Importance, standards, and practice. *Bridge*, 7(3), 5-8. (Oregon Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.)
- McConney A. (1998). Introduction: The issue in perspective. In, A. McConney (Guest Ed.), Special Issue on Teacher Accountability and Student Learning. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3).
- Schalock, H.D. (1998). Student progress in learning: Teacher responsibility, accountability, and realty. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12, 237-246.
- Schalock, M.D. (1998). Accountability, student learning, and the preparation and licensure of teachers: Oregon's teacher work sample methodology. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), pp.269-286.
- McConney, A., Schalock, M.D., & Schalock, H.D. (1998). Focusing improvement and quality assurance: Work samples as authentic performance measures of prospective teachers' effectiveness. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 343-363.
- McConney, A., & Ayres, R. (1998). Assessing student teachers' assessments. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(2), 140-150.
- Schalock, H.D., & Reinke, J. (1998). The Oregon initiative: Pursuing America's choice for high skill schooling. In M.D. Garay & S.A. Bernhardt (Eds.) *Expanding literacies: English teaching and the new workplace* (p 315-340). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schalock, H.D., Schalock, M.D., & Myton, D. (1998). Effectiveness along with quality should be the focus. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(6), 468-70.
- Schalock, H.D. (1999). Bringing coherence and meaning to the accountability discussion. *Negotiators Notebook*. Salem, OR: Oregon School Board's Association.
- Girod, G.R. (Ed.) (2002). Connecting Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teacher Educators on Teacher Work Sample Methodology. Washington DC American Association of Colleges of Teacher Preparation.