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If there is anything that is constant about education, it is that it will change. In 1916, John Dewey, contemplating the impact of industrialism on American society, wrote, "Democracy has to be born anew each generation, and education is its midwife."

The demands on public education have continued to expand as the needs of today's citizens are reflected in our rapidly evolving American society. Initially established to educate the masses in the three Rs, American schools have now been redefined at the national and state levels, taking into consideration both the ills and the concerns of today's rapidly changing and complex society.

In 1993, President George Bush and the National Governors' Association's Blue Ribbon Committee on the Nation's Educational Goals proposed a blueprint for the year 2000:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history,
and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so that they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

4. U. S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. (Goals 2000: Achieving the Nation’s Educational Goals. A Phi Delta Kappa Working Paper.)

7. All New Jersey parents will be involved in their children’s education. (New Jersey State Department of Education’s Goals for New Jersey Schools.)

The New Jersey Department of Education has adopted these goals for all of its schools and has added a seventh goal, dealing with parent/community involvement. Only two of the seven goals are academic in nature, while the remaining five goals deal with social issues and serve a much broader spectrum than traditional schooling. America’s schools, for the next decade and beyond, will address learning from the cradle to the grave, and from a much broader multicultural perspective.

In the future, schools must accept a greater responsibility for meeting our country’s goals. The schools alone can no longer be expected to educate students at current levels of funding and within the old one-hundred-eighty-day school year. Schools of the 1990s must actively recruit and attract the participation of a much broader community, including parents and guardians, social service departments, small and large businesses, legal and law enforcement sectors, adult and high school volunteers, and anyone else in the community who can contribute to the growth and development of students of all ages.
The definition of education in the next century will have to expand to include the meaning of an old African adage: "It takes a whole village to raise a child."

*Carl L. Calliari*
Professor, School of Education
and Related Professional Studies
Introduction

In Write to Learn’s fourth volume of Occasional Papers, faculty from Rowan’s School of Education and Related Professional Studies and their co-authors explore one of education’s most influential movements—collaboration. Gone is the old image of the solitary, self-absorbed scholar; in its place is the new and more hopeful image of a community of scholars, sharing concerns and experiences and cooperating to search for answers to education’s most pressing problems.

The recent literature on learning contains high praise for teaching students to collaborate on papers and projects to prepare them for cooperative tasks in the work world. Likewise, our Occasional Papers’ authors laud the collaborative efforts of educators who have formed new coalitions to improve learning for all students. Our authors speak to issues such as the need for more fully developed partnerships between K–12 faculty and college faculty, and between all members of the teams involved in teacher training.

Some articles report very successful collaborations, such as the Cooper’s Poynt Professional Development School and the Summer of Literacy; some herald new and exciting ventures such as Jerseyside Health Institute. One article challenges faculty to recognize diverse learning styles and to
accommodate all learners; another urges us to continue to seek solutions to the enormous problems faced by urban schools.

But perhaps the most compelling theme, common to several of the essays, is an exhortation to move away from a narrow and traditional idea of education, which confines learning to our schools. Our authors would have us enlarge the concept of education and see the entire community as potential educators. The prospect of this larger and deeper collaboration, embracing and involving all of us, holds real promise for educational renewal.

Our hopes for education must also be bolstered by the profound sense of caring about students and about learning evident in all the essays. These professionals, so committed to improving our educational system and so adept at alerting us to our shared responsibilities in the educational process, give us reason to hope in the educational achievements of tomorrow.
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Dr. Jane Sullivan, professor in the Department of Reading, has taught at Rowan for twenty years. Although she has taught all of the undergraduate course offerings in reading, her specialization is emergent literacy and the literacy development of the special needs child.

In addition to journal articles, she has authored Communicating, one of a series of Cub Scout academic handbooks developed in conjunction with the International Reading Association. Past president of the New Jersey Reading Association, she is presently co-editor of The Newsletter, an NJRA quarterly publication. Jane is an active participator in the Reading Department's Teachers as Readers group and is an avid reader of the latest in children's literature.

Dr. Sullivan also maintains a strong interest in projects that encourage college students' persistence to graduation. She is the coordinator of retention programs at Rowan and has authored several grants to support students' academic progress.
In a recent article, Gordon Donaldson, Jr. (1993) points out that "simply working longer and harder will not significantly change our performance; we must learn to work smarter." One proven way for teacher educators to "work smarter"—to work more productively, that is—is to participate in collaborative projects with school administrators and teachers. Such an arrangement can be beneficial to all parties when it has been undertaken as a community of educators, a partnership in which all the players contribute to the groundwork—goal setting, timelines, strategies—and act collectively to carry out these goals.

The Summer of Literacy (SoL) Project that took place in Salem Schools in summer 1993 was such a collaboration, funded jointly by the Salem Schools and a NJDHE separately budgeted research grant awarded to the investigator. While the primary goal was to provide literacy instruction for entering first graders flagged as "at-risk," it had, as a secondary objective, a collaborative effort that would lead to enhancement of teachers' skills in literacy instruction and, for the college professor, opportunities to observe at close hand and
over a six-week period, teacher/student interaction in an “early intervention” environment.

The Concept of Early Intervention

For decades, the conventional procedure for selecting at-risk students for additional literacy instruction was to wait and see. Most programs were remedial, identifying students who had fallen behind their peers in learning to read and write. These programs began late in the educational experience of the child, often after three years of failure. More recently, school districts have adopted programs to prevent failure rather than to remediate it. The leader in this movement is Marie Clay, a New Zealand educator, whose Reading Recovery program has demonstrated remarkable success both in New Zealand and in the United States. The program identifies students whose lack of “concepts about print” marks them as prime candidates for failure in learning to read and write. These children are selected for special instruction early in first grade, before such failure has a chance to occur—thus the term early intervention. Clay, and others like her (Clay, 1985; Deford, Lyons, Pinnell, 1991; Pinnell, Lyons, Deford, Bryk, Seltzer, 1994), recommend specific techniques to assist children to develop concepts they will need to form strategies for literacy. Clay speaks of “the knots and tangles” beginning readers and writers encounter. Her philosophy is to provide a structure for these children so they develop strategies that will help them untangle the knots. The SoL project was designed to apply such techniques to entering first- graders in a summer program.

The Structure of SoL

All the participants—college professors, school administrators, teachers, parents and children—were subjects for SoL. The child subjects were fifteen kindergarten children who had been identified as candidates for “transitional first grade.” The criterion for such a recommendation is that the children are, academically, in the lowest percentile of their kindergarten class. The teacher subjects filled one of two roles. Five were
assigned to be “early intervention” teachers and two—Fine Arts teachers—scheduled activities to integrate literacy with the arts. The children’s parents or other care-providers were included in the family literacy workshop portion of the project. These workshops, conducted by the school’s vice principal, were held once a week.

The college professor began the program with a two-day workshop for the project’s faculty and staff. In addition, these teacher subjects met in a one-hour seminar following each day’s session during the six-week instructional segment of the project.

For six weeks after the workshop, the fifteen child subjects attended a two-hour, four-day-a-week summer literacy program. During that time, they engaged in half-hour individual instructional sessions in an integrated reading and writing program. The rest of the time, the children engaged in art and music projects, singing songs and painting pictures about the stories they were reading, and participated in creative drama activities, acting out these stories. Thus, all the activities were linked to literacy development in individual sessions.

During this six-week period, the vice principal conducted weekly workshops for the care providers. The workshops stressed ways to promote family literacy. Thus the project developed as a three-tier program: a staff development program in early intervention techniques; a summer emergent literacy program for pre-first graders; and a program to teach care providers strategies for family literacy.

During the introductory workshop, the college professor discussed topics related to developing literacy, such as (1) the young child as learner; (2) positive signs of emergent literacy skills; (3) recording emerging reading/writing skills; (4) spelling development; (5) strategies used in successful early intervention programs; and (6) developing literacy through the arts. In addition to these training sessions, the professor and the teachers discussed the results of the base line testing of child subjects and planned teaching strategies based on these results. Finally, a framework was developed during the workshop for
the early intervention teachers to follow regularly with three children with whom they would work during the six weeks. In addition, the professor and teachers together planned art, music, and drama activities to enhance literacy learning.

During these six weeks, hour-long seminars followed each day's session. During these seminars, teachers discussed the child subjects' needs and progress with the professor. The group critiqued videotapes of both children in the early intervention session and children engaged in related arts activities. Based on these discussions, the professor and teachers made recommendations for modifications in approaches.

At the end of the six weeks, early intervention teachers were asked to provide a general evaluation of the three children for whom they were responsible. The Arts teachers assisted in these evaluations, contributing their observation of the children during the literacy and Arts sessions.

The fifteen child subjects met four days a week for six weeks. Each two-hour school day was divided into three half-hour segments; the additional thirty minutes served as transitional times between segments. The children were divided into groups of four and rotated between early intervention instruction, group art and music activities, and group drama. The thirty-minute early intervention sessions employed techniques recommended by Marie Clay, such as reading familiar books, letter identification, writing a story, cutting apart and rearranging the story, and reading new books along with the teacher (a technique referred to as shared reading). During art and music time, children worked cooperatively on art and/or music projects related to the reading and writing they were doing. They painted pictures that illustrated the stories they were reading and sang the text of stories like The Wheels of the Bus and Teddy Bear, Teddy Bear. In the drama period, children acted out some of the stories they shared in their literacy sessions, like Very Hungry Caterpillar and The Three Little Pigs.

The weekly workshops for care providers focused on subjects related to promoting family literacy. Reading to children, encouraging children to write, discussing stories and relating
them to real life, and encouraging "knowledge of print" skills were some topics covered in these workshops. In addition, parents and other providers were the audience for the dramatic presentation the children gave at the end of the project.

After the second week of the program, a modification was made that addressed a concern of the teachers. During a seminar discussion, teachers agreed that they were having difficulty motivating the children to write independently. The majority of the children preferred to copy text rather than produce it creatively. To stimulate creative writing and to encourage the children to use their own "invented spelling," the college professor suggested starting a pen pal club between adults and children. Once a week, the children would write letters to their pen pals, who would respond. This project proved to be successful and continued even after the end of the project.

What Took Place in SoL?

The progress of each child was carefully recorded. The investigator collected baseline data in an interview with each child prior to the start of the program. During that twenty-minute interview, children performed tasks that assessed such concepts about print as recognition of title, author, the role of printed text, left-to-right directionality, and recognition of a word and a letter. They also identified upper- and lowercase letters and executed a simple spelling task.

During the project, each child was observed as he or she took part in each of the three instructional settings. Two of these sessions were small group settings; the third was the individual meeting with the early intervention teacher. Teachers in the dramatic play, and in the art and music sessions worked collaboratively with the early intervention teachers to reinforce the learning that took place in individual literacy instruction. For example, early intervention teachers spent five minutes each day on letter names and sounds. The children made alphabet books in the art sessions. On each page, they colored and pasted the target letter and familiar words and pictures that
begin with that letter. Similarly, early intervention teachers read stories aloud to the children each day and talked about meaning. The dramatic play teacher had the children reenact those stories. Through this type of teamwork, constant reinforcement enabled the children to build strong concepts of literacy tasks.

Why Summer?
SoL was designed as a summer program for a number of reasons. Cost, while perhaps not the most important reason, was a critical factor in deciding on a summer session. The training process for teachers in an early intervention program is long and expensive and must be borne by the district. Once trained, the teacher works individually with a maximum of four students. SoL was designed as a summer project, using district teachers and aides who received a stipend. The cost for the seven teachers participating was a fraction of the annual salaries for the same number of teachers. The on-site training, although not as lengthy as training for Reading Recovery, was comprehensive, delivered by a trained and experienced instructor in the area of literacy education, and uniquely tailored to the needs of the children in the program. Time was another variable that dictated the design. The investigator, freed from the teaching responsibilities of a regular semester, had the time needed to spend observing the instructional sessions. The teachers from the school district, also freed from the demanding curriculum of a school year, concentrated on the early intervention procedures and literacy development. In addition, time was a positive factor for the children participating, since the program created a bridge between kindergarten and first grade for them, preventing the regression that frequently occurs in children's learning over the summer.

How Did the College Professor and the Teachers Collaborate?
Collaboration between college and school personnel was a built-in characteristic of the SoL project. At the beginning of the project, certain principles were agreed upon by all adult
participants. First, the responsibility for carrying out the project was to be shared by all. The college professor developed the project framework, based on studies of other early intervention projects. Necessary tailoring for the unique population in SoL was a collaborative effort. Each participant contributed. A second underlying principle of the project was trust. Every individual—child, teacher, principal, parent, college professor—was a learner as well as a resource for learning. The third principle was dedication. Each participant was a volunteer. The financial compensation alone did not repay participants for the time and effort they invested. They were there primarily as members of a learning community.

As the project progressed, it became apparent that participants were indeed functioning according to these principles. The initial two-day workshop defined the project and set the tone. In the beginning, the relationship between the investigator and the teachers was the traditional one of professor to student. The college professor explained the structure of the sessions, set goals, and provided expertise to insure that necessary concepts were understood. The teachers, on the other hand, were about to venture on uncharted waters. They needed support and reassurance before they would willingly accept the responsibility for a new approach to literacy instruction. However, as participants exchanged ideas, asked questions, and speculated, a shift occurred and the partnership was born. The discussion introduced in the workshop continued over the six weeks during the one-hour seminars at the end of each day's session. In these meetings, and in the informal encounters during spare moments, the spirit of camaraderie grew.

From the start, the college instructor encouraged collaboration. The participants used first names. Whenever possible, a discussion replaced the more formal lecture. The college professor was there to observe, to learn, to support, to step in when needed, and to listen with a sympathetic ear. She respected the knowledge of the teachers—experienced educators whose familiarity with the background experience and
behavior of children would be invaluable in the execution of the program.

As their confidence grew, teachers' ownership of the project became increasingly evident. Was a child absent? Teachers called the child's home. Did someone find a book or technique particularly effective? It was time to share. Did a child make a breakthrough? It was time to acknowledge the teacher's talent. Videotapes of sessions, viewed regularly during daily seminar sessions, served as matter for discussion. The group could learn what took place in other sessions, observe their peers' teaching strategies, watch the children's reactions, pick up ideas for their own sessions, integrate goals more uniformly within the three components, and reinforce one another's efforts.

One illustration of the ownership teachers exhibited was the pen pal project. Once the idea was introduced, teachers took charge. They drafted the adults they needed—secretaries, the principal, and aides. They planned a bulletin board that became the mailbox, created the form the children used for their stationery, and set aside time once a week (during the dramatic play segment) when the children would write their letters. Wednesday, mail day, became the highlight of the week for the children. The letters became precious to them, and they grew eager to respond so they might receive "more mail." Writing had taken on a meaning for them that previously had been absent. True, the suggestion for the project came from the college professor, but it was the teachers who followed through.

And what of the college professor—was there anything new for her? To say that learning took place for her is understatement. She saw the theoretical insights she had developed through reading and listening confirmed over and over. She sought and found answers to questions she had raised about the practicality of early intervention techniques. She gathered hundreds of examples to serve as illustrations in the courses she taught. From observation of the behavior of six-year-olds who exhibited symptoms of such syndromes as "crack baby," "abused child," and "attention-deficit," she restructured and modified
her profile of the “typical at-risk” first grader. But above all, her belief that, given a chance, “at-risk” children could learn—despite obstacles—was confirmed over and over.

*What Were the Results of SoL?*

Of fifteen children originally selected for the program, twelve reached the criterion for acceptable attendance (no more than five absences, representing an attendance rate of 80% or better). For these subjects, progress was noted in three categories. Did their knowledge of letter names increase? Did they develop a greater understanding of concepts about print? Did they make progress in reading and writing skills? In the pre-assessment, four of the twelve subjects scored low in their understanding of concepts about print, while eight exhibited the beginning of understanding. At the end of the program, five of the children were at the beginning stage, and seven were competent in the concepts. At the end of the program, the children had made advances in literacy skills. Two children had learned all of the alphabet letters, upper- and lowercase. Four knew more than 80% of them; five knew at least 50%; and only one of the children knew fewer than 50% of the letter names. Two had learned to read one to three books independently; eight had read four to six books; and two had read seven to nine books. The children experienced shared reading of a number of books with their instructor. One read three books together with his instructor, four read four to six books, four read seven to nine books, and three read ten or more. Similarly, signs of emerging phonological awareness were present. Nine of the children, at the end of the program, could identify word syllables; eight could match letters with sounds. Five were in the advanced phonetic stage; that is, in spelling words, they understood that each sound in a word should be represented by a letter or combination of letters. Three of the children had a sight vocabulary of more than ten words. Six of the children entered first grade; the remainder were placed in T-1, a transitional first grade. The T-1 children will be re-evaluated.
during the year to determine whether their progress indicates placement in regular first grade.

It is more difficult to capture the qualitative results of such a project as SoL. Examining the assessment records of one child in the program, Charmaine, might provide some insight into the progress made by the child subjects. In the original June assessment, Charmaine could write her first name in uppercase and lowercase letters. She was generally familiar with concepts about print, but she could not point to individual words as text was read, indicating that she had not yet formed a clear concept of “word.” Additionally, Charmaine knew ten uppercase letters and only a few lowercase letters.

At the end of the six weeks, Charmaine’s teachers reported that she was beginning to use phoneme-letter matching in her spelling. They also reported that Charmaine was interested in books, was involved in all the activities of dramatic play, and art and music, and had a good attention span. While Charmaine had a limited understanding of the situations and language encountered in books, her imagination was emerging, and she used it to make meaning of stories.

During the six-week session, Charmaine gained the competency to handle books. She held each book upright and turned the pages, and, although she was still unsure about identifying the illustrator of a story, she could locate the title and title page, and point to the name of the author.

According to her early intervention teacher, Charmaine’s understanding of concepts about print was now sound. She understood that print evokes meaning and that pictures enhance the meaning. She had no difficulty with directionality. She had grasped the concept of a letter, a period, a question mark, a sentence, and a word.

At the end of the program, Charmaine had a high interest in books and reading. She demonstrated an interest in listening to stories and reading along when the sentences repeated a pattern, that is, when they were written in predictable text. She saw herself as a reader, selecting her own books, reading independently, and talking about books and stories.
Charmaine was now competent in discussing the meaning of stories, in predicting and confirming her predictions, in recalling the sequence of events in a story, and in understanding the main idea of a book. She could recall details with ease and, with encouragement, supply words in “cloze-type” activities, in which a word has been deliberately omitted from a sentence.

During the course of the summer, Charmaine had many experiences with reading books. She listened to and discussed Flossie and the Fox; Where the Wild Things Are; Clifford, the Big Red Dog; and The Napping House. With her teacher, she also did “shared reading” of books with predictable text, such as I Know an Old Lady, What Can You Do?, Wheels on the Bus, Baby Writer, and Can’t You See We’re Reading. Finally, Charmaine learned to read some books independently. So Can I; Brown Bear, Brown Bear; Looking for Halloween; Snowflakes; and Marching Band were all books she read on her own.

Charmaine’s knowledge of letter names was now 77%. She was in the “early phonetic stage” of invented spelling. That is, she knew that there is a connection between the physical aspects of producing a word and the spelling of the word and tried to use letters of the alphabet to do this. She knew that words have parts or syllables and could segment words into their component sounds. She also matched some letter sounds with letter names and could identify beginning sounds in words. Charmaine had built a small but meaningful sight vocabulary of some thirty words during her reading exercises. Charmaine was one of the subjects who entered first grade. In the words of her early intervention teacher, she “is motivated to learn and has emerged as a reader and writer with skills that will put her in a good position to start in first grade.”

Although not all subjects in the program made the same progress, Charmaine’s gains can be considered typical for many of them. Follow-up visits to the children’s classrooms confirmed that they are, at this point, holding their own. All have maintained enthusiasm for literacy. Whether the momentum continues will depend largely on whether the interest
cultivated during the summer program is fostered at home and at school.

A workshop with the teachers involved in the program is scheduled for early November. It will be an opportunity for the investigator to strengthen the bonds formed in summer 1993 and to rekindle the excitement that permeated the program. Repeating the experience is possible; the request was put to the local board, which is considering it. Should the project be refunded, it will be expanded to include more training, more teachers, and more children. Even if the program is not repeated, the effects of the summer 1993 collaborative experience will linger—for the children, for the teachers, and for the college professor. Good memories do not die easily.
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Specialization and Collaboration: Today’s Paradox in Education

Carl L. Calliari

A recent Wall Street business report indicates that, for most manufacturers, the expected life span of a product, without updating, redesign, or modernization, is about two years. In today’s world of rapidly developing technology, consumers demand the continued refinement and specialization of both products and services. They also expect these products and services to be integrated with other products and services.

Moreover, the past three decades have witnessed the gradual shift from generalist to specialist in a variety of areas, most noticeably in medicine, law, architecture, accounting, pharmacy, and engineering (Johnson and others, 1993). Not surprisingly, the profession of education has also shown signs of specialization in its approaches to educating a rapidly changing clientele.

During the last thirty years, schools have seen the evolution of special education, with separate classifications in as many as thirteen specialized areas. Other educational innovations include the development of nurseries and pre-schools, kindergarten learning centers, primary schools (grades K–3), middle schools (grades 4–6), alternative schools, and magnet/commu-
nity-based schools with a specific focus on the arts, sciences, mathematics, and computers.

One assumption underlying a specialized approach is that by limiting the scope or the focus of a school, a better job can be done of addressing the specialized talents of its students. One outcome of this emphasis on specialization has been the narrowed focus among those sharing the specialization, (such as subject specialists), and the further isolation of these specialists from others in the profession. It may not be as obvious when these specialists are housed in a shared building, (e.g., alternative schools, special education schools, day care centers, etc.), but such is not always the case.

An alternative to specialized schools is the “school campus” concept: limited local resources, the cost of real estate, and the availability of underdeveloped land force school districts to house children from ages three to eighteen at a common site with separate wings but with shared, non-instructional resources, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums, playgrounds, swimming pools, and vocational shops.

Another example is the national trend towards decentralization of all special needs students (Inclusion) by enrolling them in regular education classrooms and pairing special education and regular education teachers in a shared collaborative setting. Both are equally responsible for the instruction of all pupils assigned to the class. Hence, there is a need to focus on much closer collaboration within the educational process.

Longitudinal research studies have indicated that the needs of all teachers, regardless of area of specialization, are more similar than dissimilar. A meta-analysis by Vreenman (1984) indicates that few differences exist between teachers within the United States and those in other countries; among elementary, secondary, and special education teachers; between studies done in the ’60s and the ’80s; and between problems perceived by principals and by teachers (Neil, 1993). Vreenman (1984) cautions against viewing the problems of beginning teachers as unique and documents that experienced teachers also share many of the same problems.
It seems ironic that at the height of professional specialization in education, the hot buzzword is "collaboration." Initially, the terms "specialization" and "collaboration" seem to be mutually exclusive, but in reality they are mutually inclusive and absolutely critical to a successful education for all children.

If the schools are to treat the whole child in education as medical practitioners treat the whole body in medicine, then it is not only logical that we share all pertinent information about the client—it is paramount. The medical profession, in fact, has been somewhat successful in designing a "whole patient model," providing health services with the development of HMOs (health maintenance organizations) and community medical centers.

Many educational communities have already adopted similar models, including the Pupil Assistance Committee (PAC) and School Resource Committee (SRC), which review children's backgrounds before recommending children for specialized services or even Child Study Team evaluations. But the need for educational collaboration goes far beyond the interactions of teachers within special education areas. In fact, it requires collaboration beyond the realms of professional educators.

There is an old African saying, "It takes a whole village to raise a child." In America, that village includes all those with whom a child interacts, both in and out of the classroom. In our haste to embrace the 21st century, some educators contend that parents and the community have abrogated some responsibilities which are best handled in the home, the neighborhood, the extended family, and the community at large. Who better, in their opinion, than parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles, guardians, clergy, store owners, and other members of the community to teach and model basic values, such as politeness, courtesy, honesty, equity, respect for the law, for property, and for oneself?

Psychologists tell us that children believe and retain only what they themselves perceive as having value. Too often in today's schools and homes, children hear about right and wrong, and good and bad. Then they leave their classrooms
and homes to see their teachers and parents sometimes practicing a different value system. The children may observe adult role models bragging about conning their way out of speeding tickets, cheating on their income taxes, and abusing alcohol, tobacco, and designer drugs; and the children wonder what it means to be honest.

The growing diversity of today's schools and communities makes it even more difficult to reach out to parents and guardians without being suspected of belonging to the establishment. If teachers hug children who are starving for affection, teachers may be suspected of child abuse. If teachers teach middle-class or other values, they may be accused of forcing their values on their students. If teachers model American values only, they may be accused of ignoring or denigrating other cultural mores. For schooling to remain a valued segment of tomorrow's society, schools will have to change radically in their operation.

The goals and aims that drive the schooling process must reflect new and more meaningful curricula and redefine outcome products. If real change is to occur, it must reflect meaningful input from all segments of the community. The whole village must take an active role in the most important task assigned to parents and guardians—educating children.
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Rethinking Teacher Education through Collaborative Consultation

Sharon Davis-Bianco and Donna Hathaway

- Mrs. Ryan and Mr. Turner are team-teaching Earth Science for three of their five instructional periods. In addition to elementary/secondary education students, each ninth grade class has four or five learners classified educationally handicapped.
- Mr. Ramos, a resource center teacher, goes into a third grade classroom to provide in-class support in reading for three children classified educationally handicapped.
- In addition to twenty-six elementary/secondary education students in her sixth grade classroom, Mrs. Washington has a student with multiple disabilities. The child has a full-time aide.

Classrooms in the nineties are very different from classrooms in the eighties. No longer are there clear boundaries or divisions between elementary/secondary education and special education. Teachers from different disciplines are working, teaching, and planning together—many in the same classroom. Traditional roles for elementary/secondary education and special education teachers are being challenged or rethought. This revolution in our classrooms has serious,
direct implications for preservice teacher education. Programs must be redesigned to meet the challenges of the nineties. All preservice teachers must be prepared to work with a variety of learners in many different settings. Educating children with special needs in the regular classroom—the inclusion movement—is supported by both federal and state law and has considerable impact on teacher training in our colleges and universities.

In the past, departments in schools of education have been as separatist as elementary/secondary education and special education programs in the public schools. Territoriality, and the concept that each department holds the key to a unique body of knowledge that can only be taught by faculty in that department, interfere with direct, honest communication.

It is not our intention to discuss the efficacy of team-teaching, in-class support, or the inclusion of students with disabilities in a regular classroom setting. It is not our intention to discuss what teacher education programs should or should not look like. It is not our intention to suggest whether the changes in programs are minor or if complete restructuring seems feasible.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss how collaboration during consultation can be adopted in higher education and to present a viable paradigm which should encourage either curricular or programmatic change in schools of education. The uniqueness of this model is that it incorporates the work on collaborative consultation by Idol and West (1987) and Friend and Cook (1992). In addition, the collaboration model is enhanced by the work of Steven Covey, as found in his book, *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. Covey (1990) presents a holistic, principled approach for solving both personal and professional problems. Covey’s work focuses on what individuals bring to collaborative consultation and how they can rethink their role and actions in the process.

Much has been written in the literature about consultation. In collaborative consultation, team consensus is reached in each stage before progressing to the subsequent stage. The
consultant as defined in this paper is one or more faculty members who initiate the process. The consultee as defined in this paper is one or more faculty members who agree to meet and discuss some aspect of the teacher training program. It is understood by both parties that the consultation might lead to recommendations for curricular change. Both parties are assumed to have a discipline-specific knowledge base.

Idol and West (1987) examined the literature on collaborative consultation and identified ten models. Of the ten, only six advanced a clearly identifiable theory or theories. The theoretical base of the collaborative consultation model, according to West and Idol, is “a set of generic principles of consultation and collaboration which is hypothesized as being essential to the building of collaborative relationships between consultants and consultees” (1987, p. 9).

Friend and Cook present one of the most widely used definitions of collaboration: “Interpersonal collaboration is a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal” (1992, p. 5). They further define collaboration by listing characteristics: “Collaboration is voluntary; collaboration requires parity among participants; collaboration is based on mutual goals; collaboration depends on shared responsibility for participation and decision making; individuals who collaborate share their resources; individuals who collaborate share accountability for outcomes; individuals who collaborate value this interpersonal style; professionals who collaborate trust one another; a sense of community evolves from collaboration” (1992, pp. 6, 8).

Just as teachers are training themselves to work collaboratively, faculty in schools of education must do the same. We have much to gain from working together. We then can model the process we teach students to use. Individual program quality is enhanced through collaborative consultation, which leads to collaborative problem solving. As faculty members from two or more departments begin to focus on outcomes for preservice teachers, regardless of the departments’ certifica-
tion programs, graduates will be better prepared to enter the profession with the necessary consultation skills. An additional advantage is that the district administrator will be able to hire teachers prepared to work with teachers from other disciplines, in special or regular classrooms, with children functioning on diverse intellectual levels. The most significant advantage is that children will directly benefit from teachers who have knowledge and understanding of the children’s special needs. Johnson and Pugach (1992) state, “How faculty members conceptualize their own working relationships, and what is modeled for prospective teachers in terms of interdisciplinary teaching and teaming, is critical to the eventual development of collaboration in the schools themselves” (p. 219).

There are, however, barriers to the consultation process. Collaboration takes time. It requires collaborators to sit down and discuss issues, solve problems, develop a plan of action, implement it, and evaluate its success. The collaborators must also be committed to the process. If the plan involves territory or resource issues, it may be difficult to focus on the plan and not get sidetracked by political issues. Johnson, Pugach, and Hammitte (1988) state that there are two major barriers to the consultation process: programmatic and conceptual. Programmatic barriers include items such as lack of time or lack of administrative support. Conceptual barriers refer to a mismatch in thinking and problem solving ability between consultant and consultee, the attitude of the consultee, or knowledge base differences between the consultant and the consultee.

Restructuring or even minimally changing programs to train teachers requires a significant investment of time and energy. In most colleges it requires faculty members from one or more departments to identify a problem or see a need for change in the present program structure. After identification, there are often endless discussions, meetings, and position papers. Many times there is no resolution. If and when groups within the school agree on even a minor change in the curriculum, it can take months to go through the faculty governance process.
This can be an incredibly difficult, frustrating, and unrewarding task—especially when the stakes are high, and the stakeholders are unsure of the outcomes. When a curriculum change is viewed as difficult conceptually or emotionally, the change is often not initiated, or if initiated, never completed.

The following stages in the collaborative consultation model should provide a guideline or structure for programmatic change.

**Stage 1: Goal Setting**

During the first stage, the consultant and consultee meet to set goals and to establish roles, responsibilities, and expectations. Formal or informal contracts can be written so that both parties clearly understand the issues. At this stage, goal setting focuses on team goals for the consultative process. Specifically, faculty members from two or more departments agree to meet and discuss some aspect of curricular or programmatic change. The group decides on one or more broad goals that will help to structure the entire process.

*Example:*

Faculty members from the Curriculum Committee in the Elementary Education Department initiate contact with members from the Curriculum Committee in the Special Education Department. They meet to discuss the feasibility of developing and co-teaching a curriculum course. The goal that they both agree on is to improve the training of regular and special education undergraduates in the area of curriculum options. At this first meeting, they decide that the chairs of both committees will alternate as meeting convener and recorder.

**Stage 2: Objectives**

The second stage requires that the consultant clearly and accurately listen to and understand the consultee's idea, suggestion, or recommendation for curricular change. It requires the consultee to succinctly and clearly present an idea, sugges-
tion, or recommendation. After listening to the consultee, the consultant paraphrases what has been said to check if both parties' perceptions are in agreement. Each idea, suggestion or recommendation is recorded as an objective. The objectives focus the team on the intended outcomes. Faculty must agree on each of the objectives at this stage.

Example:
Dr. Harris, responsible for placing students in field experiences for the special education department, approaches Dr. Stack, who has the same role in the elementary education department, and asks whether Stack would consider—as a pilot project—placing a special education student teacher with an elementary education student teacher. Harris proposes that the classroom be an elementary/secondary education classroom with at least one child with multiple handicaps. After establishing a goal to work together to better prepare student teachers during their senior field experience, Harris and Stack develop several objectives. The objectives include 1) placing a special education student teacher and an elementary education student teacher in the same classroom with children of diverse abilities; 2) planning training sessions for the elementary/secondary education teacher, special education teacher, and college supervisors; and 3) developing written requirements for this initial experience.

Stage 3: Recommendations
Based on the specific objectives in Stage 2, the participants generate recommendations and predict the effects of each. Then they prioritize the recommendations in the order to be implemented. At this stage, it is important to brainstorm and to record as many recommendations as possible. As team members suggest possible recommendations, each should be recorded without debate or comment. Later, recommendations will be prioritized based on group consensus. The team members should also identify resource needs at this stage and, after prioritizing recommendations, discuss the possible ef-
ffects of each. The Consultation Plan provides a format for carrying out stages 1–3 in this model. (See Fig. 1 below)

**Figure 1**
Consultation Plan

Participants: ___________________ ___________________

Date: _______________________
Goal Statement: _______________________
Objective(s):
1. _______________________
2. _______________________
3. _______________________

Recommendations/ Strategies Possible Effects Priorities
1. _______________________
2. _______________________
3. _______________________
4. _______________________
5. _______________________

**Example:**
As Drs. Harris and Stack meet to discuss putting student teacher teams in regular classroom settings, they begin to list possible ways to implement their plan. They write down each suggestion immediately. Dr. Harris recommends Topnotch School and suggests a specific classroom and teachers. Dr. Stack suggests a particular training model for working within inclusive classrooms. They each list a number of on-site requirements. Then they discuss resource issues. Both professors agree to list Topnotch School as their first priority. They discuss the possible effects of selecting that school over one closer to campus.
Stage 4: Implementation

Once the recommendations to meet the goals of the two departments have been determined, prioritized, and written in a way that allows the strategies to be measured, the implementation stage begins. In this stage, the "How," "Who," and "When" are established. "How" means the intervention recommendations are broken down into specific steps, so each can be implemented. "Who" refers to the assignment of specific tasks to specific people. And "When" establishes timelines for each recommendation.

Specifically, what occurs in this stage to faculty in elementary/secondary education and special education? These faculty build consensus about the best way to implement each intervention recommendation. For example, there may be global restructuring of two departments into one department, or one new course may be developed or redesigned. To assist in the development of this stage, the faculty fill out an Implementation Plan. (See Fig. 2 below)

Figure 2
Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Recommendation/Strategies</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:

A collaborative faculty team proposes a generic course in classroom management to achieve a team goal. Dr. Jensen from elementary education and Dr. Thomas from special education will develop such a course within four weeks (the "How," "Who," and "When").
Stage 5: Evaluation
During this stage team members evaluate the success of the joint effort. The "How did we do?" is determined:
- Was each objective met? To what degree?
- What went well? What did not go well? Why?
- What is left to do?

Evaluation for the joint model includes measurement of proposed curriculum changes, academic program change, and systems changes to determine if objectives were met and how. Additional tasks that may need to be accomplished are also identified.

Example:
After reviewing the four strategies used to accomplish curricular change, the team finds that some faculty feel disenfranchised. The team also perceives the need to enhance their efforts to communicate proposed changes with students. The team asks less involved faculty to work in pairs and meet in focus groups with students and elicit student feedback about the proposed program.

Stage 6: Redesign
Based upon the evaluation of the outcomes, the team continues, redesigns, or discontinues intervention strategies. If a strategy is not working, the team can reconfigure or discontinue it. Of course, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." In that case, the team continues the intervention.

With any programmatic changes, there need to be some fine-tuning and alterations. Anticipating this stage of redesign will reduce levels of frustration among faculty from all departments. Student feedback, outcomes assessment, program goals, and course syllabi all provide opportunities for redesign.

In this section we have outlined the six stages of the collaborative consultation process, from goal setting to redesign. Although this process has enjoyed success in both educational and business environments (Schein, 1990), experience indi-
cates that some people are more effective in implementing this process than others. To further improve the collaborative consultation process, we will now consider Covey’s *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.*

**Covey’s Seven Habits**

Both the content and methodology of Covey’s principles form a solid foundation for effective communication. Some see his principles as a methodology for succeeding in business. But the principles are more than that. Covey’s work also provides an ethical basis for human relationships and assists all human interaction, especially those involving collaborative consultation. Covey’s book has sold over three million copies since 1989. The Habits are taught at dozens of cutting-edge companies, such as Saturn, Federal Express, Hewlett-Packard, and Blue Cross & Blue Shield (Hillkirk, 1993).

The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People are described here as they apply to the collaborative consultation process. The application of the Habits to our personal lives or to the world of business may be worth exploring in a different venue.

**Personality versus Character Ethics**

Before describing the seven habits, Covey presents a principle-centered paradigm as a base for the habits. He differentiates personality ethics from character ethics. Many of us who grew up in the fifties and sixties remember the buzzwords Covey refers to as personality ethics: the “me generation,” “positive mental attitude,” and education in the “field of influence strategies.” Following a personality ethics paradigm is tantamount to taking an aspirin to deal with a brain tumor. We do not deal with the problem, just apply an easy, quick “social band-aid” (Covey, 1990, p. 18). The character ethic, however, espouses integrity, humility, fidelity, temperance, courage, justice, patience, industry, modesty, and the Golden Rule. The character ethic provides us with these basic principles of effective living, according to Covey. We experience true success and enduring happiness as we learn and integrate
these principles and habits in our nature. In combination with the collaborative consultation process, these principles significantly improve our ability to become more effective change agents as we improve our academic programs.

Habit 1—Be Proactive (Personal vision)

What does it mean to be proactive? Is this psychobabble? Recognition of our ability to be proactive, not reactive in the Covey sense, challenges us to take responsibility to improve our day-to-day and semester-to-semester training and interactions with students and staff.

Part of being proactive deals with the concept of “circle of concern” versus “circle of influence.” Covey’s work focuses our efforts by differentiating our circle of influence from our circle of concern. The ratio of these concentric circles is under our control. Electing to expend our energy considering whether or not U.S. troops assist the Somalians or the degree to which this nation will reduce the national debt is not our personal decision. We could elect rather to be proactive in our circle of influence and become a change agent within our academic department or school. We can do something about the way students are systematically introduced to the challenges of teaching children with special needs. Our degree of proactivity is greatly determined by our focus on these two circles: influence and concern.

Proactive people focus their efforts on the circle of influence. Their energy is positive, enlarging and magnifying, causing their circle of influence to increase. On the other hand, according to Covey, reactive people miss this opportunity. They focus on the weakness of other people, the problems in the environment, and circumstances over which they have no control. Their focus results in blaming and accusing attitudes, reactive language, and increased feelings of victimization. The combination of the negative energy this focus generates, and the neglect of areas in which we could effect change, causes our circle of influence to shrink (Covey, 1990, p. 83).
Considering our circle of influence versus our circle of concern would be particularly helpful in Stages One and Two of the collaborative consultation model, in which we establish goals and realistic strategies. One of the questions that could be asked to establish a goal or after the brainstorming session is, Is this in our circle of influence or our circle of concern? Faculty in regular and special education may fantasize that a limitless number of new faculty will teach existing courses while they establish a new program with an expansive budget to provide state-of-the-art technology and space more conducive to a joint program. However, that is outside of the circle of influence. So they consider reconfiguring existing faculty assignments, starting with a small pilot program and other options.

_Habit 2—“Begin with the End in Mind” (Personal leadership)_

Most consultation models present the idea of beginning with the end in mind. In collaborative consultation this step occurs in Stage One, the goal-setting stage, and is jointly or collaboratively determined. When Stage One is completed thoroughly, the habit of beginning with the end in mind is inherent in the collaboration model.

However, as a caution, and to assure that the goal is clear, we should ask ourselves the question Covey poses: “Is your ladder against the right wall?” If, for example, our goal is to improve our training of undergraduate students in the departments of Elementary/Secondary and Special Education and not to protect turf or assure autonomy, we need to state that goal clearly in writing and to remind ourselves of that goal periodically throughout the change process.

This habit may keep us aspiring toward the ideal, thinking about how we can best prepare our graduates, rather than considering everyday matters, such as how we will assign supervision time for faculty. The real strength of the collaborative consultation process is its generic applicability. The down-in-the-weeds details can be tackled again later, using
this same process. The details then become the new goal, problem, or wall upon which our ladder is leaning.

**Habit 3—“Put First Things First” (Personal management)**

Habit three says to devote more time to what is important but not necessarily urgent. The single phrase that captures the essence of habit three is “organize and execute around priorities” (Covey, 1990). We find this easy to articulate, not so easy to execute.

This habit, putting first things first, is essential to Stage Three of the collaborative consultative process. As noted above, team members prioritize potential recommendations in the order in which they will be implemented. In addition, they establish timelines for completion and identify the personnel responsible in Stage Four. This should focus efforts on what is important, not urgent, and establish accountability for each member of the planning team.

**Habit 4—“Think Win/Win” (Interpersonal leadership)**

Win/Win, according to Covey, is a mindset that makes us seek mutual benefit in all human interactions. It means that agreements or solutions are mutually beneficial and mutually satisfying. With a Win/Win solution, all parties feel good about the decision and feel committed to the action plan. Win/Win sees life as a cooperative, not as a competitive, arena. It is not your way or my way; it is a better way.

Of course, the Win/Lose paradigm also exists. It says, If I win, you lose. It has an authoritarian flavor to it. Win/Lose people are prone to use power, position, credentials, possessions, or personality to get their way. Obviously, though, there are times when the Win/Lose paradigm of human interaction is the reality, and may be preferred. It exists in our daily lives (e.g., sporting events, sales competitions, lotteries). But, as Covey cautions us, cooperation (Win/Win) is as important in the workplace as competition (Win/Lose) is in the marketplace.
Ideally, in collaborative consultation, “Think Win/Win” is a part of each stage in the process. If faculty from regular and special education are to implement the recommendations determined in Stage 3, both groups must agree with the recommendations and feel they are achievable. Otherwise, a Win/Lose situation could develop. And as Covey points out, no one really wins if there is a loser. The relationships are in conflict, and the “winner” eventually loses. The time constraints of establishing a Win/Win relationship can not be ignored. It will probably require time to find a solution that everyone finds acceptable. However, as Covey points out, it is time well spent if the entire team is striving toward the same end.

**Habit 5—“Seek First to Understand, Then to Be Understood” (Empathic communication)**

Covey makes the point that communication is the most important skill in life. Despite our years of instruction in learning how to read, write and speak, few of us have had any training in listening. He adds that the single most important principle he has learned in the field of interpersonal relations is, “seek first to understand, then to be understood” (Covey, 1990, p. 237). We typically seek first to be understood. We listen with the intent to reply. We filter things through our own paradigms, reading our autobiography into other people’s lives.

A significant dimension or level of listening is added to the more traditional approach of “active” or “reflective” listening in the Covey model. It is called “empathic listening.” He perceives that active or reflective listening basically involves mimicking what another person says, and that kind of listening is skill-based, truncated from character and relationships. Active listening also insults those listened to and is essentially autobiographical. You listen, intending to reply, to control, or to manipulate.

Empathic listening is listening with the intent to really understand. It is an entirely different paradigm. Empathic
listening gets inside another person's frame of reference. You try to see the world the way he or she sees it, and you try to understand how he or she feels. In empathic listening, you listen with your ears, but you also, and more importantly, listen with your eyes and with your heart. You listen for feeling and meaning, and observe behavior. Covey reports that communications experts estimate only 10 percent of our communication is represented by the words we say. Another 30 percent is represented by our sounds, and 60 percent by our body language. Hence, his emphasis is on listening with our eyes as well as our hearts.

In the collaborative consultative process, we open ourselves to be influenced as we apply Covey's fifth habit or principle, "seek first to understand, then to be understood." We could become vulnerable. It's a paradox, because in order to have influence, we have to be influenced. The fifth habit could provide a powerful adjunct to the process of establishing a cooperative program to train teachers of regular and special education. Both groups could feel they have a great deal to lose in this joint process. However, as we sincerely listen as our colleagues share their concerns and ideas about a collaborative effort of teacher training, we may enhance the collaborative consultative process and thus enhance a joint program. To improve interpersonal communication is not a matter of technique alone. It is empathic listening that inspires openness and trust. We listen first and are influenced by what others say. Then we share our perceptions and ideas.

**Habit 6—"Synergize"** (Creative cooperation)

Simply defined, this habit means that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. It is a catalytic relationship, a creative one, a synergistic one. But the creative process can be terrifying because we do not know what is going to happen or where it is going to lead. Often we are trained or scripted into defensive and protective communications or into believing that life or other people cannot be trusted. As a result, according to Covey, we are never really open to habit number six,
synergy. In addition to trust and cooperation, we need to value our differences for synergy to occur. The key to valuing those differences is to realize that all people see the world, not as I do or you do, but as they do. When we are left to our own experiences, we constantly suffer from a shortage of data.

This may seem simplistic and obvious. However, the principle is more difficult to put into practice than to preach. As we work in a collaborative process, it is so easy to begin to think that I see the world as it is. Why do I want to value the differences? Why do I want to bother with someone who’s off track? My paradigm is that I am objective. I see the world as it is. Everyone else is buried in the details. I see the bigger picture. But if I am to be effectively interdependent, I need the humility and reverence to recognize my perceptual limitations and to appreciate the rich resources available through interaction with the hearts and minds of the others in this collaborative consultation process.

Habit 7—“Sharpen the Saw” (Balanced self-renewal)

The principles of balanced self-renewal are composed of renewing the four dimensions of our nature: physical, spiritual, mental, and social/emotional. We need to sharpen our saw periodically if we expect to stay alive. It is preserving the greatest asset you have—you. It is renewing or improving our four dimensions, according to Covey. He also describes an upward spiral: learn, commit, do. This spiral is then applied to each dimension to enhance our personal development.

Although this habit is not as readily applicable to the consultative process as the first six, it would seem that as we continue to grow as individuals according to this principle, so too would our contribution to the group process grow.

Each of Covey’s habits has been described as they might apply to the collaborative consultation process. Having all members of a change-agent group or a committee of college faculty practice these seven habits should enhance the collaborative consultative process. In a more generic sense, these habits should enhance any committee’s process and product.
It is hoped, if not in whole, then in part, that the paradigm for collaborative consultation presented in this paper will enhance problem-solving techniques within an academic discipline. This may lead to interdepartmental curricular or programmatic change. It is also hoped that Covey's principles of human interaction will enhance the collaborative consultation process and perhaps our personal lives as well.
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Coaching Cooperative Teachers to Be Effective Supervisors of Student Teachers

Jody M. Blohm

Many of us are very familiar with the goals of America 2000. In the rural community of Glassboro, however, we have already reached many of those national goals. You might call our program Rowan 1993. Through collaborative efforts between the faculty of the School of Education and Related Professional Studies (SERPS) and the public school districts where Rowan students are placed for field assignments, the goals of the teacher education program are being achieved through training sessions for cooperating teachers who supervise student teachers. This author has designed a model which incorporates the three major skills necessary for effective supervision, in conjunction with the philosophy and goals of the teacher education program: conferencing, classroom observation, and evaluation.

Since the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983, teachers have endeavored to revise or even reinvent education. The major focus of the Study of the Education of Educators (SEE) was the curriculum in teacher education: the experiences that higher education institutions deliberately provide for prospective teachers.
According to Edmundson (1990):

In only three of the 29 institutions in the SEE were teacher preparation programs based on a coherent, articulated, and commonly shared vision of what it means to be a teacher. At the other 26 institutions, ... statements [acknowledged] that the programs are not based on a common definition of the purposes of schooling and the role of the teachers. (p. 718.)

Higher education institutions must prepare prospective teachers to be active participants in their own training. To make this goal realistic, cooperating teachers must interact with each prospective teacher and college supervisor. A coherent student teaching experience requires coordinated preservice and inservice preparation, which includes acquisition and application of the philosophy and goals of the teacher education program. To make the transition between theory and practice, student teachers should be paired with cooperating teachers who can demonstrate effective teaching strategies in their respective disciplines. However, cooperating teachers often feel they lack the pedagogical skills necessary to guide student teachers through this essential field-based experience. Student teachers often become confused because of the difference between their understanding of pedagogy learned in the teacher education program and what they are actually encountering in the field. Sometimes, student teachers, who are usually a minority for change, are confronted with cooperating teachers who are reluctant to change. The result can be a disappointing experience for both student teachers and cooperating teachers. In the long run, the learners will suffer. How can this conflict be avoided?

Cooperating teachers should be empowered to use their best professional judgment when mentoring student teachers. However, if the cooperating teachers are not fully aware of their empowerment or how to use their power, then they must be informed and trained to do so. An earlier study provides an alternative.
In 1986, as the result of a study conducted on preservice education, Bush, Moss, and Seiler proposed an alternative to traditional student teaching. The authors' main criticism was that in the traditional mode of student teaching there is the assumption that all the answers can be found in one semester in the classroom. In essence, they proposed a collaborative movement achieved through professional development teams with two goals: to supervise prospective teachers from the college or university, and to design a professional development plan for participating teachers. A college educator would lead the resulting collaborative professional development teams. A number of circumstances made the study successful, particularly the stipends provided by school districts for supervision and continuing education. A chief measure of the program's success is that it is still underway (1991).

National educational goals will never materialize unless attention is given to preservice education of prospective teachers and inservice education of supervising teachers. A number of higher education institutions is moving in the direction of revising teacher education programs, while some institutions are discontinuing or reducing course offerings in teacher education. The fact is that expectations for student achievement have not been reached. If students are not learning, the problem may well rest with the teacher. A possible solution is to provide better teacher preparation programs. The pilot for the Cooperating Teacher Training Model was developed over a period of four years through informal discussions with cooperating teachers. As part of this author's supervision framework, she centered the discussions on informing the cooperating teachers and the public schools' administrators about the revised teacher education program and expectations for student teaching requirements. At this time, a number of cooperating teachers voiced their concerns, including the following:

- their lack of knowledge about the new Rowan teacher education program
their desire to better guide the student teacher
- their lack of continuing education in teaching strategies
- their need for training in the supervision of student teachers

Responding to this information, the author developed and distributed a survey to cooperating teachers assigned a student teacher in spring semester 1993.

This author then designed a generic training model for SERPS, addressing the skills necessary for effective supervision of student teachers and incorporating the goals and philosophy of the teacher education program at Rowan. Awarded a Separately Budgeted Research (SBR) grant, the author developed and implemented a pilot program in spring semester 1993 for the Department of Secondary Education. The basic composition of the model was generic and would only become content specific in the small group phase of training. The schema included a developmental framework for establishing a team network among the three participants in the field experience: the college supervisor, the student teacher, and the cooperating teacher. Upon completion of training, cooperating teachers were expected:

- to be aware of the philosophy and goals of the Rowan teacher education program
- to improve their mentoring skills (that is, observation, evaluation and conferencing)
- to provide more meaningful understanding of team collaboration in discussing student teachers’ teaching
- to increase their awareness of current pedagogical trends and strategies in their content areas
- to improve professional working relationships between public schools and Rowan College
- to provide more productive preservice preparation for student teachers
Ultimately, cooperating teachers would understand the scope of supervising and training student teachers in collaboration with college supervisors. Cooperating teachers, communicating with student teachers, would use the same concepts and terminology the students acquired in pedagogy courses at Rowan. This mutual understanding would facilitate a smooth transition from theory to practice for the student teacher.

**Program Design**

The program was designed specifically to improve communication concerning the teacher education program and to establish open and frequent collaboration among the college supervisor, student teacher, and the cooperating teacher. In developing the program, it was essential to include the college supervisor, as well as the cooperating teacher, to obtain a collaborative network. In the program’s design, three sessions are held three weeks apart during the first half of the semester, the timing of the meetings paralleling the developmental stages of the student teacher and the learning phases of cooperating teachers in applying these skills. Each training session occurred three weeks apart to provide adequate time for the cooperating teacher to incorporate and practice newly acquired skills in conjunction with the development stage of the student teacher. To facilitate a comprehensive framework for the second half of the semester, it was important to schedule the training sessions during the first half of the semester and to consider the results of the midterm evaluation. At the beginning of each training session, cooperating teachers completed a ten-question survey, expressing their perceptions of how effective they were in adapting the skills learned in the program. The survey used a Likert rating scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questions developed for each session survey were aligned with the expected objectives for each session.

One of the most important aspects of the model is the involvement of the Rowan College supervisor, whether full-time or adjunct faculty. In previous discussions, cooperating
teachers expressed concern about whether or not the college supervisors communicated with them. The college supervisor's participation was addressed as a key component of the training model for cooperating teachers.

Research Basis of the Program

Originally, the pilot program was conducted as an experimental research study with a pre-test, post-test, and control group design. This author used a time-series design to analyze the results of the study, and, after the first eight weeks, determined how the cooperating teachers responded to the program. Statistical tests included a correlation analysis and a Chi-Square contingency table.

A pre- and post-survey determined how cooperating teachers needed to improve their supervision. The survey asked questions in five areas, each directly related to a specific function of supervision. These areas were evaluated:

- pre- and post-conferences with the student teacher
- observation of student teaching
- evaluation of student teaching
- cooperating teachers' knowledge of current pedagogy
- cooperating teachers' additional comments

The same survey and format were used before and after the training sessions for purposes of comparison.

Evaluation of the Program

The program's evaluation was consistent. In addition to the pre- and post-survey to determine perceptions before and after training, two additional surveys provided immediate feedback. They measured the participants' effectiveness in applying skills and served as a means of self-evaluation. Both of the additional surveys indicated high success in the cooperating teachers' perceptions of improving their skills. Cooperating teachers felt they more effectively communicated with the student teacher and college supervisor.
Results of the Surveys

The results confirmed the idea that cooperating teachers favored training to improve their supervision skills and pedagogical knowledge in their content areas. Many of the cooperating teachers indicated some knowledge of observational skills but did not feel confident in the application of those skills.

Regarding conferencing, ninety percent of cooperating teachers indicated the need to become better communicators with student teachers but were uncertain how to achieve this. Cooperating teachers and college supervisors also desired better communication skills because they often misunderstood each other's roles and responsibilities.

The third major area of concern was the method of evaluating the student teacher at midterm and at the end of the semester. The process was not always made clear to the cooperating teacher, which often resulted in an inadequate analysis of the student teacher's teaching capabilities.

The cooperating teachers were positive about being able to express their desires to become better supervisors, and they were grateful for the opportunity to fulfill those desires through training sessions. Self-evaluation questionnaires, administered at the beginning of each training session, were significant in showing how the cooperating teachers effectively implemented their newly acquired skills. Ninety-four percent believed they were more effective at supervising student teachers.

These results support the recommendations of various national educational organizations, as well as the National Commission on Teacher Education.

Conclusion

As a result of the training sessions, cooperating teachers now feel like an integral part of the student teaching experience. The team collaboration—among student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers—has been accomplished, according to most cooperating teachers in the spring and fall 1993 training sessions. Through the training sessions, the cooperating teachers were also introduced to Rowan's teacher
education program and philosophy. This has had a positive impact on the cooperating teachers, who have exhibited more confidence as supervisors.

In fall 1993, the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences became responsible for maintaining the training program for cooperating teachers in the School of Education and Related Professional Studies. Training sessions were offered on two consecutive evenings to accommodate the departments of secondary education, elementary education, special education, music, art, and physical education. Participants included department chairpersons, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Training sessions are slated to continue for each succeeding semester. Cooperating teachers who complete a training session are awarded a certificate of accomplishment.

Student teachers noted that lines of communication were "more open," and discussions were more focused on specific teaching strategies, rather than on classroom management.

Informing school district superintendents and principals involved in supervising Rowan students has provided administrators with a better understanding of the student teaching process. It has also provided cooperating teachers and the college supervisor with a common goal—equal educational opportunities for Rowan and public school students.
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Death by Classroom: Perpetrators and Victims

Christine A. Johnston and Gary R. Dainton

Abstract

“Death by Classroom” refers to the daily struggle of public school students whose chief difficulty is being caught in a formalized system of education that does not address their conative needs—that is, the students’ natural approach to completing assigned tasks. This article details the plight of these at-risk learners and their school experiences, focusing on the negative effects which occur when students are forced to use their conation to learn in spite of the limitations of the typical classroom/desk setting. The authors reflect on their personal and research experiences within this formalized system and conclude that conation has a profound effect on students’ academic achievement in today’s formalized classroom environment.

Introduction

Each day American students are losing their will to learn, their desire to strive and succeed in the classroom. These students experience “Death by Classroom.” This article does not attribute blame. Instead, its authors tell their individual and diverse experiences from the perspectives of perpetrators
and victims of this phenomenon. We begin with the classroom teacher.

**The Unintentional Perpetrator**

As a classroom teacher, I was always afraid I would hinder the intellectual development of the brightest and best learners who were certain to enter my classroom. Consequently, each fall I would scan my classes, looking for that bright face, listening for those words indicative of mental acuity, and searching for eyes denoting depth and insight.

As I completed my perusal, I would silently pray, “Oh Lord, don’t let me hold a student back because of my own intellectual limitations.” Interestingly, I could never figure out who the brightest was because while one student was brilliant in writing, another brought perspicuity to class discussions, and yet another provided a novel approach to completing the most tedious of learning tasks. Who, then, I asked was the brightest and best?

Years later I learned what I had recognized as unique modes of performance were actually different learning styles. With this awareness came other insights, including the realization that by focusing my concerns on averting harm to the academically achieving learner, I was ignoring the plight of those students who did the “work-of-the-classroom,” but completed only what was required, and then, to a limited degree. These students, who met with a modicum of success, were obvious in their dislike of the subject matter and of school in general. Unmotivated and underachieving, they plodded their way through twelve years of schooling, rarely, if ever, experiencing a spark of excitement about learning. These students chose not to participate actively in the “corral ’em, teach ’em, and test ’em” educational process. Many dropped out mentally, if not physically, long before reaching the twelfth grade.

This was brought vividly to mind this past summer when I read the obituary of an eighteen-year-old, who was tragically killed in a Memorial Day weekend accident (Webber, 1993). The story of the young man’s death was all too familiar—the
celebration of his friends’ high school graduation, a celebration that ended in death.

The obituary read like that of anyone whose life has been cut short, whose experiences are too few to require long columns of print citing achievements, community affiliations, and awards. In place of a recitation of life-long attainments were remarks of family and friends. It was among these remembrances that I learned the victim had dropped out of school the previous year. The young man’s employer, the owner of a landscaping and pool business, said he had grown to know and respect the ability of the young man who had left high school in the fall to work as a yard manager at the garden center.

Even more striking was the grandfather’s account of his grandson’s struggles in school. The grandfather said his grandson was “happiest when he was out-of-doors, fishing, or hunting with his golden retriever. My grandson was intelligent but restless in a classroom” (Webber, 1993). He added that after working for a year, the grandson realized he needed more education to be successful and had been considering going back to vocational school.

After reading the newspaper account, I was left with this question: Was this young man’s death by auto the only death he had experienced in his brief life, or was this a culminating tragedy, preceded by another type of death, the death of a student by public education (Kozol, 1968)?

Let us now look at the experience of a victim of “Death by Classroom,” a student whose experience is vital to understanding this educational tragedy.

The Victim: The Voice of a Student
From my earliest memories of education in nursery school, I had anxiety about sitting in the classroom with unfamiliar people and being forced to learn. I always felt that the educational setting was more like a punishment or jail sentence than a safe harbor of learning. Students were sentenced during the first week of September and paroled during the
third week of June. The same question arose throughout my formal schooling: Why am I here?

I hated school. But I didn’t know why. I have come to realize that there are others who had similar fears and anxieties about public school, unable to articulate their overwhelming despair even now. Today, there are students in public schools who have the same fears and depression I once experienced. These students are labeled lazy, dysfunctional, delinquent, obstructive, or just plain stupid. These students are victims, not of a premeditated crime, but of a theory of expendability. It is time to address the problems of these disenfranchised students and realize that they have untapped potential. They are victims of an unresponsive educational system, suffering from an overwhelming ignorance of their plight within the educational setting.

**Forces, Influences, and Factors**

While it is not possible to know all the forces, influences, and factors which contribute to students’ lack of achievement in public education, we believe it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of the components in students’ learning profiles that explain why they give up on school.

Gordon Allport suggests, “To be truly acquainted with a person means to be able to take his point of view, to think within his frame of reference, to reason from his premises” (1961, p. 249). Making an acquaintance with this type of student begins with examining three key aspects of his learning profile: the student’s cognition, affection, and conation.

“Intelligent but restless in the classroom,” is the way the system might describe the unfortunate eighteen-year-old high school drop-out who died in the car crash. He would be considered cognitively capable of learning, but affectively disengaged. We know that he “didn’t enjoy school” and conatively was happiest when active in the out-of-doors.

Is this not the “unmotivated and underachieving” student who “drops out” of the educational process without either the system’s recognition of his style of learning or validation of his
knowledge base? The facts as presented bring us to the conclusion that there is nothing new in this profile. It is the same frustrating description of potential and failure teachers and administrators see day in and day out. What, then, can be learned by revisiting this territory, especially when the fate of such a student appears sealed?

An answer to this very important question is found in the third area of an individual's learning profile—the student's conation or will to learn. In the study of conation and its effects upon the learning process, public schools can gain insight into the implications and potential of addressing the cognitively capable student. This student's conation places him or her into a conative mode of learning which does not fit the traditional classroom.

Conation is one's self-direction, volition, focus, intentionality, and striving (Assagioli, 1973). It is the natural approach each individual takes to completing a given task. Kolbe (1987) has done pioneering work in the field of conation, resulting in the development of an instrument which identifies how an individual's conation/volition manifests itself through behaviors. She classified the "act of doing" into four categories, which she termed Action Modes and defined as "the focused use of energy which each of us exerts in order to begin and accomplish any task." The Action Modes, or the "natural ways of doing tasks," are categorized and quantified on the Kolbe Conative Index as varying levels of Fact Finder, Follow Thru, Quick Start, and Implementor (Kolbe, 1987; 1993).

The Implementor

It is the Implementor/Learner who forms the basis of this discussion of the "intelligent-but-restless-and-underachieving-in-the-classroom" student. Conative research on student learners clarifies why it is so important for educators to understand the conation of this type of student-learner (Altman, 1992; Corno, 1993; Snow, 1993). They are physically charged individuals who possess an uncanny sense of their
immediate environment. They enjoy taking physical risks from which they experience a natural high.

These same individuals seek to be responsible for handling important tasks on their own, especially in stressful situations. As one high school student explained, “When the game gets down to crunch time and our team needs a big play, I tell the guys, ‘Just give me the ball... I want the ball... I will take care of this.’” This sense of being able to get the job done by going the extra mile is a primary characteristic of the Implementor/Learner. While others might view this behavior as arrogance, it is in fact the Implementor’s strong sense of self-direction and self-determination which motivates him or her to take charge.

To that end, when an Implementor is confronted by a physical challenge, he or she will accept the challenge “quickly, effectively, productively, and efficiently.” When an Implementor/Learner comes across something that is not working or a plan that is not progressing correctly, that person will typically say, “Enough of this! Get out of my way. I’m going to do it.” As one Implementor said, “It’s instinctual with me. I just say, ‘Get out of the way. I’ll do it!’” (Johnston, 1993a).

Implementors also hold tenaciously to their independence and freedom as they seek to confront and dominate any physical challenge which presents itself. As persons of few words, they seek to know what is asked of them, and then, given the opportunity to problem-solve on their own, “do what needs to be done” without being required to explain their concerns or affective considerations toward the task.

**Practical Research**

Two studies of the effects of conation upon an Implementor/Learner’s productivity and self-esteem provide additional insights into the challenges facing an Implementor in an educational setting. The first study is based on a specific student population extrapolated from a larger study (Johnston & Dainton, 1993). The second involves a case-study-in-retrospect, retracing the schooling experiences of a cognitively capable but conatively disaffected learner.
In the first instance, a total of 132 subjects, including 6th grade math, 7th grade English, and 9th grade world history students, participated in a 12-week study to examine student responses to assignments which either matched the student’s conative Insistent Action Mode or required a response which went against the conative grain of the student.

Observers noted that those students whose conative profile identified them as Fact Finders initiated their assignments by first “asking questions, looking in their notes, and finding the answers.” Follow Thrus immediately looked for the steps they needed to follow and then sorted out the assignment into parts to complete. Quick Starts “just jumped in” and began “discussing the assignment immediately.” Implementors, on the other hand, preferred to remain aloof and “figure things out” by themselves. An examination of the learning profiles of the 12 students who were identified as Insistent Implementors reveals that each scored significantly above the 50th percentile, based on the national percentile rank for the areas of English, social studies, and math. Their self-declared interest in learning the subject matter also demonstrated a mean of three on a five-point Lickert scale. However, it is the students’ own descriptions of their “doing” of the various assignments which provide the clearest insight into the Implementor/Learner.

The students repeatedly described their motivation to do the typical paper-and-pencil Fact Finder seat work as, “boring,” “too easy,” and “nothing to this.” On the other hand, they described those learning tasks which required them to use their area of conative Implementor insistence as “the best assignment so far this year,” “cool,” “really got into it,” “I liked the challenge; it wasn’t as hard as I thought,” and “I liked this type of assignment, but I need more time and things to work with.”

When these students were asked, “What is the first thing that goes through your mind when you get an assignment?” each responded, without exception, “Just getting it done!” “Getting things done,” and “Getting them done my way.” After all, these are the physically charged doers who rebel against the

When asked how they would like to be able to "do" their school work, each of the twelve Implementor/Learners used similar words and phrases, such as, "I like doing my own work," "I like working alone," "I like working alone better," "I figure things out by myself," "I sit down with paper and draw it," and "I like to figure out a problem by myself and then solve it."

Students were also asked, "How do you come to understand how to do an assignment?" Again the responses were similar: "I like being the person who puts it all together," and "I like to build things. I like projects if they let me do it my way." When these students work in a group, they "like them [other students] to listen...." Implementor/Learners say, "I like to have them do it the way I want it done." They also say, "I'd like to pick my group. I think they would listen to me better."

**A Case Study**

The conative behaviors of this type of learner are elaborated upon in the second study. Here, an individual, years older than the students who participated in the classroom studies, reflects upon his experiences in a public school environment and confirms the need of the Implementor/Learner to be able to learn in the least restrictive environment:

I can remember that I had difficulty learning in many school and classroom situations. For one thing, I didn't enjoy sitting at my desk doing rows and rows of math problems. I've always enjoyed having a debate or problem solving. I think some of my frustration as an Implementor in the classroom was created by the insecurity I felt when I just didn't want to be sitting in the classroom participating in activities that I had little interest in and felt little importance in completing.

My favorite "class" was recess because that was unrestricted time where I could do what interested me with nobody telling me if my performance was adequate. Recess
was a catharsis; it allowed me to release my classroom anxiety while recharging my energies to make it through the rest of the day. It seemed as though I couldn’t create any bonds with people in the classroom, but during recess it seemed as though Implementors had an internal magnet which drew them together.

In terms of my learning, I am very analytical. Everything has to make sense. The majority of what I have learned, I have assessed and analyzed myself. In past classes, I would prefer to be in the corner by myself, trying to figure out something without someone directing me or looking over me. Trial and error was—and continues to be—the most important component of my learning processes. Practical and analytical problem solving is the key for the Implementor. It took me a long time to understand how to be a successful student. I’ve had people preach to me about how to be a successful student. I’ve taken courses on how to be a good student, but it is something I have come across myself. I have figured out that the key to becoming a good student is to develop your own strategy or process for learning and to use that process every day.

I can remember as a seventh grader being called down to the guidance counselor’s office during class to discuss my “laziness” in the classroom. After overcoming the embarrassment of being called out of class, I entered the guidance counselor’s office and sat there until he was ready to address me. This “guidance” counselor then tried some child psychology babble on me to create some sort of bond. Then the counselor began to tell me that I was not trying in or out of class and that I had to overcome my laziness.

I saw right through the whole “scared straight” lecture, and most of all, I resented this stranger telling me how to be a good student when I didn’t care about school and was miserable going to school. I resented... what this professional educator had to say to me, and, if anything, it alienated me further from the mainstream educational process. If I had not been motivated by the fear of repercussions from my
parents, I am sure I would have never made it through my formal schooling.

I hated going to school while I was growing up, and I hate sitting in lectures today. It is almost a weekly process of my debating as to whether I want to continue with my graduate education. My interests lie in places other than the educational setting, but now I have the ability to see the larger picture of what it takes to be successful in this culture.

The Consequences of Irrelevance

The Implementor/Learner frequently sees what goes on in the classroom as irrelevant and withdraws from the learning community, seeking anonymity rather than interaction with it. If we take seriously the urging of Ernest Boyer, who for years has called for relevance in the public classroom, we will act to keep the Implementor/Learner engaged in relevant learning activities. After all, as Boyer stated recently, "It is our duty as educators to protect a child's potential, not destroy it" (1993).

To engage the student before he or she withdraws requires that we first identify the Implementors/Students among us; secondly, that we provide relevant subject matter; and finally, that we offer opportunities for independence, freedom, self-direction, and active doing.

If we fail to provide these learning opportunities, we will perpetuate a system in which the Implementor is "demeaned by those who give more prestige to acquired skills or educated disciplines" (Kolbe, 1987, p. 194). And we will continue year after year to victimize those students whose conative grain goes against a classroom environment which only values the learning of formal operations in an abstract context.

The message is clear. We can no longer afford to ignore the impact of the conative factor upon student learning. When we do, we are allowing, in Mark Twain's words, "the educational system to get in the way of our education." If we refuse to identify and address the conative factor in the learning process, then we are, at the very least, condemning all students to less effective learning environments. More tragically, we are pass-
ing a death sentence upon the Implementor/Learner in our classrooms. "I know you can't set up a program for everybody dying in the classroom. But something has to be done for the Implementors. They're being killed."

**Alternatives for the Future**

Before we examine alternatives, it is important to understand that no single factor causes an Implementor's "death." Consequently, when we talk of addressing the "death" of a learner, we need to consider much more than one of the contributing factors.

At this point, it is apparent that "Death by Classroom" is a metaphorical reference which suggests that the classroom consists of much more than the physical trappings of the chalkboards, desks, and bulletin boards. In this article, "classroom" refers to the totality of the physical, emotional, and human interaction which occurs during a given period of time within a specific schedule and setting. The physical context, the time organization, the nature of the work to be done, and the interaction or lack of interaction with fellow learners comprise what these authors mean by "classroom."

Beginning with classroom instruction, teachers can develop a much needed awareness of their students' conative learning mode. In the case of Implementor/Learners, teachers need to be prepared to set them free. Show them a picture, a design, or a strategy for doing something in the briefest terms possible and set them free to try and figure it out by themselves. "You've go to set them free. That's how you teach Implementors. Give them a puzzle. Let them try to figure something out. The analytical part is just as important as the physical part. The Implementor needs to build something. Not just Lincoln Logs. It needs to be on a grander scale. Use more problem solving in which people can design and build something. I think that would be primary for Implementors. You've got to let these people go" (Johnston, 1993c).

Two things are certain: an Implementor/Learner cannot change his or her learning style, even when confronted with
the frequently used Fact Finder/Follow Thru teaching methods used in most of America's classrooms. Another approach, such as providing more personal attention, won't solve the dilemma faced by the Implementor/Learner either. In fact, more personal attention may aggravate the already negative learning experience. This occurs because of the Implementor's strong sense of individuality and conscious desire to have less community affiliation within the classroom. Consequently, the standard approaches to addressing students' style through teaching and affective strategies aren't enough.

If the challenge of teaching an Implementor/Learner goes beyond reconstituting the teaching behaviors which occur within the physical confines, then where does the public school system turn next to address the conative learning style of the Implementor and bring him or her into the "learning fold"? The public schools can begin by examining how the school curriculum is structured. As schools are currently designed, both academically and physically, "the words classroom and Implementor just aren't compatible, in the sense that you have to sit down all day long and take notes while the teacher lectures" (Johnston, 1993b). In a recent Kappan article, Hartman raises this same issue: "Why are these creative, highly social people shut up in a room with me all day long studying algebra, English, physical science, and world history? Is this really the most constructive use of their time?" Earlier in the same article, she states that students need to "get into an active role, puzzling out complex problems that have applications in the 'real world.' " She concludes, "If we're serious about increasing learning, we'll create a new design for today's schools." Until such time as we address the stultifying environment of public education, schools—as they currently operate—will continue to endanger learners, not the least among them the Implementor/Learners. Recently, Secretary of Education Richard Riley declared that a "quiet crisis" exists in public education. He is correct. The Implementor/Learner is at the heart of the quiet crisis. Yet Secretary Riley did not cite these students as the victims. Instead, he identified students
who traditionally score in the top 3 to 5 percent of IQ and achievement tests as those who are not sufficiently challenged during their school day (Jordan, 1993).

How sad that this major force in public education has failed to mourn the loss of the twenty to thirty percent of public school students (Boyer, 1985) who are dying daily in classrooms across this nation because their talents for learning are not recognized or nurtured.

The number of these victims will continue to increase until the perpetrators of this “Death by Classroom” recognize that the “brightest and best” are not defined solely by standardized academic achievement but consist of an array of students who deserve the opportunity to use their unique combinations of cognitive, affective, and conative strengths to develop their individual learning systems.
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Achieving Educational Reform: A New Coalition

Carl L. Calliari and Charles M. Ivory

Our nation's dissatisfaction with education is evident. Little that is wrong in our society is not at some point perceived to be related to the quality of education. National Assessment of Educational Progress reports show America's youth deficient in mathematics and science. The ability of our youth to think and solve problems within the context of a global economy is questioned.

Education, like politics and industry, is facing new problems in the 1990s, and strategies effective in the 1960s, 1970s, and the 1980s are no longer effective. Old solutions to new problems just aren't working anymore. The finger-in-the-dike approach is no longer sufficient to hold back the waters of the 21st century. The new century requires new solutions to the problems of a new generation.

The 1986 Holmes Group report refers to the paradox of the educational reform movement: teachers are seen as a root cause of our educational problems, yet at the same time are seen as our hope for reform. Few would argue against the idea that teaching needs to be improved, but we must also focus on strategies for improving teaching. There must be a new coalition of pre-service, inservice, and post-service agencies and
institutions to effectively and efficiently address the reform issues before us. The issues are far too wide-ranging for any one part of the educational community to attempt to resolve our dilemma. We must simultaneously address academics, planning, and governance issues. The scope of such reform necessitates a comprehensive and carefully orchestrated strategy. Leadership at the state, college, and local school district levels must be willing to rise above turf issues if we expect to make a significant difference.

There is not enough time during a four-year undergraduate program to ingest the volumes of academia as well as to develop a repertoire of teaching skills necessary to succeed in any classroom, pre-school through twelfth grade. Education is a lifelong process. The need to learn continues beyond graduation from an undergraduate teacher education program. The Holmes report recommends that “university officials and professors must join with schools and with the teacher organizations and state and local school governments that shape the schools, to change the teaching profession” (1986, p. 322). Only then will we create an environment in which we can integrate research and practice.

To address this problem, the Thomas E. Robinson Beginning Teacher Induction Center (BTIC) in the School of Education and Related Professional Studies at Rowan College, and the Regional Curriculum Services Unit–South (RCSU–South), a field office of the New Jersey State Department of Education, joined in a unique collaborative venture to provide support services to address the needs of beginning teachers.

Developing simultaneously was a New Jersey State Department of Education proposal to mandate induction support teams at the local school level for all beginning teachers hired after August 31, 1991.

The BTIC/RCSU–South seminar series began in August 1989 and focused on Classroom Management/Discipline, one of the most difficult problems identified by beginning teachers during the first year of teaching (Veenman, 1984).
The seminars were offered as two full days of training. The first day was held in August or September with a follow-up day in October or November.

Separate seminars were conducted for elementary (K–6) and secondary (6–12) teachers. The sixth-grade overlap accommodated self-contained or departmentalized arrangements in the middle grades. The first day of the seminar, new teachers received training on the importance of pre-planned and organized routines implemented from the outset of the school year. Many examples of effective classroom management strategies were discussed with the novices. In addition, experienced teachers were on hand to share their knowledge and expertise with new teachers. The second day of the seminar focused on feedback from new teachers related to their classroom management and organization experiences. The extended period between the first and second day allowed for the novice teacher to institute, experiment with, modify, and re-apply strategies presented during the training. New teachers were then able to share what was effective, what was not, and generally, to discuss how their year had begun.

In this non-threatening environment, experienced professionals were able to support beginning teacher efforts, present new ideas and materials, and send the novices back to schools more competent and more confident of success. In all, 10 classroom management seminars were conducted between August and November 1989, serving 421 beginning teachers from pre-school through grade 12 in all subject or specialization areas.

At the time of this joint venture, the Thomas E. Robinson Beginning Teacher Induction Center had been offering services since 1988. The Regional Curriculum Services Unit-South was opened in 1983. Both agencies have successful histories of offering extensive training opportunities in the South Jersey area. The new effort combined the resources and expertise of two educational agencies, each providing support for new teachers entering the profession, thus reducing the
attrition rate of new teachers while improving their effectiveness.

Representatives of both agencies spent the early part of summer 1989 designing a program to integrate the recently developed “Knowledge Base of Beginning Teachers” (Reynolds, 1989), as well as objectives of the New Jersey Department of Education in teacher induction. Free seminars were offered to teachers throughout the seven-county South Jersey area served by RCSU–South. These teachers, along with non-participating new teachers employed in either a public or private school in the southern part of the state, were eligible to enroll in the six additional seminars offered through the Thomas E. Robinson Beginning Teacher Induction Center during the rest of their first year of teaching. The remaining seminars were held after school hours so as not to interfere with teacher/student contact time. New teachers were also encouraged to participate in training opportunities at RCSU–South, especially during summer months.

Data collected during the ensuing school year indicate that the attrition rate of teachers involved in the seminar series was 3.48%, even less than the low 4% attrition rate reported by the New Jersey Alternate Route Certification Program (Kearns, 1990). Additional data collected during the past two years reflect a high degree of satisfaction of participant novice teachers with the support induction program (Calliari, 1990). Additionally, this interagency initiative was developed using existing staff, materials, and financial resources.

It is clear that graduation from college or an approved pre-service teacher preparation program in the 1990s is only the first step in a long career voyage involving continued professional growth and development. Teaching has become more complex than it was even a single generation ago. Teachers must continually update their content knowledge and repertoire of teaching skills to address the needs of current and future generations of children. Continued joint ventures such as the one described here are essential in the ’90s if we expect to meet teachers’ pre-service and post-service needs. As for the
BTIC and RCSU–South, the 1993–94 schedule to continue their collaborative support for new teachers is already set.
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Technology-Enhanced Classrooms for K–12 and Teacher Education: A Grassroots Collaboration

Christy Faison and Peggy Beck

Today there are many successful relationships between higher education and the K–12 community. Most have the benefits of financial and human resource support, as well as adequate time for planning the collaboration. Equally successful are those cooperative relationships that grow out of common interests and needs. Here is the story of a collaboration between two media specialists, one from Rowan and one from a public school district.

The Beginning: The K–12 View, by Peggy Beck

"A Grassroots Collaboration" is a doubly fitting title for the cooperative effort which emerged between Rowan and Cherry Hill. First, it began with everyday experiences. Second, in true "grassroots" fashion, the collaboration started with a seed, grew roots, and sent forth shoots.

My partnership with Dr. Christy Faison demonstrates the true concept of education: sharing and absorbing and nurturing. When I became a School and Public Librarianship student in Dr. Faison's Instructional Television and Modern Media class, I had already taught English at Cherry Hill High School for eighteen years and had been advisor to the Cable TV Club.
since its inception. What better way for Christy’s other media students to learn about television production than to discuss the process with me? I had actually experienced weekly programming, production, and working with students. So Christy asked me to give the library science students a tour of the Cherry Hill studio, and my public school colleagues were responsive. They made me realize we had yet another asset the district could share with other educators. Christy established connections with Allen Hauss, our District Coordinator of Educational Technology, and Gordon Hamson, our cameraman and editor. The following year, Christy was introduced to Denise Wiltsee, the Media Department Chairperson at Cherry Hill High School West.

Our collaboration continued over the years with tours of the Media Center and Television Studio at Cherry Hill High School West, thus strengthening our bond. By this time, I was Head Educational Specialist at Cherry Hill High School East, in a position to further enhance our collaboration.

The Beginning: The Rowan View, by Christy Faison

Every instructor strives to make a class more meaningful to her students. Thus, when I was faced with teaching Instructional Television and Modern Media, and assigned a lecture classroom, I was challenged to find a way to teach my students about the use and production of instructional videos without the benefit of a television studio or the technology that they would be expected to use in their K–12 settings.

In 1988, I was fortunate enough to have a student who was a seasoned instructor—she had eighteen years of experience compared to my seven—and she also had access to a television studio in a K–12 setting. We were a perfect match! Through Peggy’s effort, I was able to arrange a tour of the facilities at Cherry Hill High School West. Peggy and I maintained contact, and each year the tour continued, expanding to include all of the school’s media services. I became more familiar with my K–12 media colleagues in Cherry Hill and established a cooperative relationship.
We also developed another aspect of our partnership. The Rowan Library Science Program was in need of adjunct faculty. Soon both Peggy Beck and Denise Wiltsee of Cherry Hill were teaching key courses in our Library Science Program, incorporating their current knowledge of the field and combining it with textbook theory.

*The Next Step: Enhancing Technology in Classrooms*

The Rowan Library Science program has an advisory board of working librarians. Through this advisory board, we obtain information about the state of the art in the field. Based upon Peggy Beck's and Denise Wiltsee's information, we are investigating ways to revise the program to include greater emphasis on technology. Some areas for consideration are in-depth study of automation, increased use of multimedia for students, and technology-enhanced classrooms to increase use of media by faculty. Now that the College has hired a full-time library program director, we expect greater activity on the part of the board.

At the same time Rowan is investigating ways to enhance the use of technology in its Library Science Program, the Cherry Hill School District has been researching ways to enhance its use in the public schools. Because of her connection with the Cherry Hill media staff, Dr. Faison was asked to serve on the district advisory board. As a part of this service, she visits other K-12 schools and assists in planning the expansion of technology in the public school district.

The Cherry Hill District Media Evaluation and Development Committee began in 1991-92 to develop a five-year plan for the district's media centers. In the first year, Denise Wiltsee, chair of the MEDC and Networking Committees, worked with Leadership Committee chairs: Peggy Beck (Curriculum Committee); Roz Shoemaker (Long-Range Goals Committee); Nina Kemps (Facility Committee); and Sally Ann Nestor (Staff Development Committee). They selected community members committed to excellence in the field of media and technology. Allen Hauss, District Coordinator of
Educational Technology, agreed to chair the Technology Committee.

At the first general meeting of the MEDC in spring 1992, community members were introduced to the initial research of the Leadership Committee and asked to serve on one subcommittee. The research dealt with the current status of the use of technology and facilities in the Cherry Hill School District. It was determined that improvement in the use of technology was essential for the education of Cherry Hill's youth. The invitees included teachers and librarians from elementary and secondary schools and colleges, from public and parochial schools, and from the regional cooperative, township, and county libraries. Members also included students, businessmen, and administrators. Dr. Faison began her work with the technology subcommittee. The charge of each subcommittee was to assess the media needs of the Cherry Hill schools in terms of hardware, software, and human and financial resources, conduct a literature search, determine a timeline for incorporation of new technology formats into K-12 schools, and create and implement an action plan.

These were the recommendations for improved media services in the Cherry Hill School District:

- Automate all school libraries, K-12 (high schools and junior highs have been automated to date)
- Introduce multimedia personal computers into all classrooms
- Revise the curriculum to meet changing technological needs

The following recommendations were made to improve media services for the Library Science Program at Rowan College:

- Incorporate a lab into Library Science courses
- Provide additional electives
• Provide continuing education courses for librarians in the field
• Update the cataloguing course

In spring 1993, the MEDC presented its first-year research and activity plans. Already, some of the recommended technology, networking, curriculum, facilities, staff development, and long-range improvements are realities. Other suggestions for improvement continue to be explored as the committee works this year.

Plans for the Future

The Rowan–Cherry Hill partnership continues to be informal, expanding at need to meet mutual interests. The beneficiaries of the relationship are clearly the students of Rowan College and the Cherry Hill Schools. Future plans include implementation of five-year activity plans for the Cherry Hill District Media Centers; continued input into the training of Rowan School and Public Librarianship students; and a projected consortium to share regional technology.

Little did we know how much a cooperative relationship between two South Jersey teachers would enhance the technological literacy of students K–College.
About the Author

Dr. David E. Kapel is Dean of Rowan’s School of Education and Related Professional Studies and holds the rank of Professor in Secondary Education/Foundations. He has a B.S., an M.Ed., and an Ed.D. from Temple University and was a U.S. Office of Education Research Post-Doctoral Fellow at the American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences in 1966 and 1967.

Dean Kapel taught junior and senior high school mathematics and social studies for ten years in the Philadelphia Public Schools. He has held administrative and professional positions at Rowan, at Temple University, and at the Universities of Nebraska–Omaha, Louisville, and New Orleans.

He has published extensively in the areas of education, teacher education, and educational research and is the co-author of two books. The American Educators’ Encyclopedia is in its second edition.
Education in Urban Communities

David E. Kapel

I believe there is no such thing as urban education; rather, there is education in urban communities. Urban communities are unique environments, different from those found in rural or suburban America; however, dividing education into urban, suburban, and rural implies variant educational goals for students taught in these communities. Different styles of learning must be addressed (some may be culturally imbedded), and teachers must face significantly different challenges in the urban environment. Yet I reject the concept that children in urban schools, at least in terms of ultimate educational goals, must be treated differently. Parenthetically, it's interesting to note that many of the issues facing urban America are also found in rural and suburban areas—drugs, social problems, violence, diversity, non-English-speaking students. Our country is changing rapidly and drastically.

In his first speech as President of the Council of Great City Schools, former New York City School Chief Joe Fernandez described the state of urban education: "Nowhere does the national resolve to strengthen our children's education face a tougher test than in our inner cities." He went on to say,
“Every problem is more pronounced there.” To support these statements, Dr. Fernandez cited the following:

- Of the nation’s 15,000 school districts, the largest 50 educate about 38 percent of the country’s limited-English-proficient students, a quarter of the nation’s poor children, and about 14 percent of its disabled children.
- About 40 percent of the nation’s black, Hispanic and Asian children attend urban schools.
- Nearly 60 percent of urban school districts assess children’s school readiness with a combination of measures of cognitive development, immunization and social development, as well as weight and age. And about half of urban first-graders had full-day kindergarten in the same school where they are in first grade. Yet, about 20 percent of urban districts still use only a birth certificate to assess readiness.
- Dropout rates in urban schools are about twice as high as the national average. And dropout rates, particularly of Hispanic students, are not budging. If the urban graduation rate equalled the national average,... urban schools would have graduated 295,500 students in the 1990–91 school year instead of 214,000.
- Only a third of urban students have finished first-year algebra by the end of the tenth grade. And only 10 percent of black students score in the top quartile in mathematics by tenth grade, even though a quarter had in second grade.
- Urban schools have not been able to pay teachers much more than the national average, cutting their ability to attract professionals willing to work under difficult conditions.
- While violence has hit urban schools hardest, inner city students are safer in school than almost anywhere else, including home. (Report on Education Research, September 29, 1993, p. 4).

The last statement is a major indictment of the urban community as a whole.
In spite of all the problems facing urban schools, some of the best and most exciting teaching occurs in the urban community. One needs only to enter the schools to observe excellent teachers working under extremely difficult conditions. Some of these conditions could be altered through a better redistribution of resources and additional resources (even though some critics claim that money will not do the job). I will talk more about funding later.

In this country, we must commit ourselves to the intention of the African proverb, "It takes a whole village to raise a child." I would make a minor revision by stating that "It takes all of the community to raise and educate a child and create a positive learning community." All refers to parents, extended family, the neighborhood, and all the social, medical, and business institutions that create the environment of the community, such as health, business and industry, state and city governments, recreation, and social service agencies. Anyone can list most of the organizations, but it takes all of us working together in collaboration to create a positive environment. We must extend the learning community to include all of the community—not just the classroom or the school building.

Society must recognize that, whether we like it or not, the large and small cities in the United States are the real pillars of our country. Once these cities are weakened or destroyed, the rest of the country will go down with them.

The 1985 avant-garde film Brazil had tremendous impact because it prophesied the dim future of urban America. The city in Brazil is surrounded by a wall. Soldiers keep the inhabitants inside, and outsiders have limited access. The film emphasizes the city's decay, poverty, and violence, and viewers sense the despair.

The question to be asked is: Do we have walls around our cities? The answer is yes. They may not be physical walls like the Berlin Wall. Rather, ribbons of highways and interstates keep communities separated. We don't go through a city anymore; we use the interstates to go around them so that we don't have to see or enter the city. Thus we have "contained"
those living in the cities; since many who live in cities are poor and/or members of minorities, we have de facto social/racial separation.

As the 1968 Kerner Commission stated, "We will be a nation of Black and White." I would like to extend that to say that we are a nation not only of Black and White or a nation of Brown, Black and White, but are now a nation of have-nots and have-nots. The have-nots tend to be in the cities; the have in the suburbs. Is this the kind of community that we really want our children to live in and become adults in?

If one agrees that our cities are as I have described them, then one must admit that it is very difficult to educate children who live in an economically depressed environment, who are taught in a contrived environment called the school, and who live in a violent community. National goals for the next century have very little meaning for children who are victims of violence, who are on drugs, or whose parents are on drugs, who may be children with their own children, who live in poor housing, or, in some cases, are homeless, whose parents are unemployed, and who are sick, cold, and hungry. National goals have little meaning to children who do not have the nurturing and support they need, and who are able to see on television the "haves," and know that they are the "have-nots." Regardless, we must recognize that the national goals for the twenty-first century have to be appropriate for urban children too. We must create a learning community that makes Goals 2000—Educate America obtainable for all children, including those living in our cities.

In August 1993, at the National Governors' Conference in Tulsa, Oklahoma, Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley stated, "It is time for America to get serious about our children." He went on to say, "Education is and must also be a national priority. That is why the National Education Goals are so important. America's future is dependent on a well-educated citizenry. It is both an economic necessity and a moral imperative to provide a high quality and effective education for all children in America. We don't have a single
person to waste" (Community Update, No. 6, September, 1993, U.S. Department of Education). Riley is correct: we don't have a single person to waste—whether he or she lives in Camden, Newark, Morristown, or Moorestown.

Reorganizing School Districts

If the State Legislature does not find a broad-based state tax to support education—most particularly to support the 30 urban special needs districts—then we must move quickly to reduce the number of school districts to recover needed funds for education. Even if funds become available, I still recommend reducing the number of school districts. It is unconscionable for a state the size of New Jersey to have 613 school districts. The amount of money expended for the administrative structure of these school districts is astronomical.

I advocate reorganizing the 613 districts into county school districts, as Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, and Louisiana have done. We should reduce the 613 districts to 21 districts: the number of counties in New Jersey. If one assumes the average school superintendent makes $80,000 a year, the 613 school districts cost $49 million in wages for superintendents alone. Can you imagine how much more is spent for assistant and associate superintendents, maintaining school boards, and various other directors? Maintaining a school board (not counting secretarial support) runs about $36,000 per year. The estimated cost of the 613 districts is $22 million. The same number of business managers (or board secretaries) at $40,000 per district costs $24,520,000. The cost of the two positions and of maintaining school boards for the 613 is $115,628,000. Twenty-one school districts, at even $100,000 per superintendent, would cost only $2.1 million. School board support at $36,000 would cost $756,000, and business managers would cost $840,000. The cost of the two positions and of school board support for the 21 school districts would be $3,696,000—a savings of $111,932,000. Moreover, the number of administrative units or departments in the current 613 districts is considerable. Most have offices for personnel, transportation,
and special services, as well as a staff of curriculum coordinators and directors and various business departments. These add up in costs and complexities—well above the $450 million needed by the urban districts, as projected by State Superior Court Judge Levy in his August 31, 1993, decision concerning New Jersey funding for the 30 urban school districts.

Another advantage to 21 county districts would be a breakdown of the isolation between school districts, most particularly, the urban school districts and the suburban school districts. This is crucial in terms of integration. In addition, county districts would tend to equalize the tax base, thus partially meeting the Supreme Court mandate.

One might argue that the bureaucracy developed by these larger districts would be cumbersome. I suggest that the number of bureaucracies that exist within the 613 makes that argument ludicrous. If we can't reduce the number to 21 county districts, then we should at least consolidate the number of districts to 150. Such a reduction would go far in equalizing the tax base, if we consolidate urban and suburban school districts.

**Infrastructure of Urban Schools**

Even if we create county districts or reduce the number of districts by consolidation, we need to look at the structure of the urban school districts. It's not enough to bring in new funds or a new superintendent and expect major changes to occur in large urban school districts. The infrastructure of urban school districts is such that, even with a major infusion of funds or the hiring of the most dynamic and farsighted urban school superintendent, it is the people in the infrastructure who actually run the district on a day-to-day basis, the ones who implement the policies, the "old boy" and "old girl" network, the ones who distribute the books, the paper, the equipment, the monies that make or break change. One only needs to look at Chicago or New York to see the influence of infrastructure. In order to make changes in the urban school districts, we have to make changes in that structure.
If you think that's not a problem, take a look at what's happening in Russia and the trouble that Yeltsin is having with the infrastructure left by the Communist regime. We have the same problem in the large urban school districts. We need to restructure or redesign urban school districts so that site-based management and other reforms become institutionalized. We need to place decision-making in the hands of school building principals and teachers. We need to enable parents to be heavily involved in the education provided their children. We must recognize that the schools belong to the community, not to the school administrators or the school boards.

In 1978, an article written by Kapel and Pink described a proposal to democratize urban school districts ("The School Board: Participatory Democracy Revisited," The Urban Review, Volume 10, No. 1, 1978, pp. 20–34). This article was written as a result of massive busing across town and the need to empower parents to have a say in their children's schools. To some degree, the model is used in Chicago, with individual school buildings having much more independence. But Kapel and Pink argued that parents must be heavily involved in the decision-making process at the school level. They suggested that each building have its own "school board" populated by parents of the children attending the school. Two parents were to be randomly selected by grade level to serve on the school's board. This enabled parents to be part of the decision-making process without going through all of the politics involved in school board elections. Of course, this would require fewer restrictions from the state, the mayor's office, and the city-wide school board.

Accountability and Professional Development Schools

One of the major arguments against increased funding for urban education has been accountability. I've heard from school superintendents, state legislators, local politicians, and average citizens that money spent on urban schools goes down a rat hole. There is no accountability.
Since there is no accountability, how do we establish it in urban schools? This is a problem that's been facing urban schools for many years. We read in the newspapers that urban children are not functioning properly; they can't read or write. The fact that this occurs in some suburban and rural schools as well is irrelevant. The fact is, in many urban communities, children live in an environment that is depressed and violent. Many urban children are not English-speaking and are in a school system that is predominantly verbal and uses English as the means of instruction. Such an environment makes traditional accountability procedures (or models) inappropriate for urban schools.

One accountability approach is to designate a school or schools to demonstrate how funding can positively alter student learning and outcomes. Such a school could be designed as a “collaborative.” Much has been written about collaboratives (collaboration between public schools and institutions of higher education, social institutions, and businesses and industry). These collaboratives have different names. They may be titled “family schools” or “community schools”; whatever you call them, the design maximizes cooperation between and among the various individuals and social, business, or higher education institutions involved. The basic function of such collaboratives is to improve education for the children attending a particular school or schools. Why not use collaboratives as a demonstration of accountability?

One collaborative that contributes to the improvement of K–12 education and the preparation of future teachers is known as a professional development school. Professional Development Schools (PDSs) are analogous to the lab schools of the '30s and '40s. The major difference between PDSs and lab schools is that PDSs in urban districts use a naturalistic urban setting with the children from that urban community in attendance. In some urban PDSs, the teachers are selected; in others, they are not. It may be a school that is not restructured from the start to emulate ideal conditions, but rather a school that evolves into an ideal learning community.
Cooper's Poynt Professional Development School

We at Rowan College of New Jersey have developed several Professional Development School relationships. I would like to address briefly our Cooper's Poynt Professional Development School in North Camden, where we are now in our third year of working with Ms. Annie Rubin and her staff at Cooper's Poynt Elementary School, a K–8 Family School.

The first year was a planning year. We held a retreat funded by the Department of Higher Education. We brought experts from around the country to talk about varied PDS models. We ultimately adopted a Michigan State model to meet the particular conditions of the Cooper's Poynt Elementary School. The first year we implemented the PDS was 1992–93, and it was an interesting and fascinating year of growth.

We established Professional Development School principles modeled after the Holmes Group: 1) Creating a Learning Community; 2) Teaching and Learning for Understanding for All Children; 3) Continued Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators; 4) Thoughtful, Long-Term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning; and 5) Inventing a New Institution. The Cooper's Poynt PDS incorporates action research, alternative assessment models, and collaboration across the curriculum in grade levels into the instructional program. There are two major components: a preservice component and an inservice component.

The preservice component includes college student visitations to the PDS, Professional Development staff visitations to the College, practicum courses delivered at the PDS, students participating in classroom observations and tutoring, and student teacher placements at the School. The inservice component includes graduate courses for school district staff in the school, “success clinics” for school district staff, professional seminars for school district and College staff, and workshops and inservices. These workshops cover such topics as peer coaching, effective instructional practices, cooperative learning, computer-assisted instruction, integration of technology, and mentoring techniques.
For example, Teaching for Understanding includes the following topics: effective instruction, building on prior learning, focusing on concepts and their relationships, teacher reflection on delivery of instruction, and student development of critical thinking skills. All learners are valued for their contributions to the classroom experience, and all learners are encouraged to make learning a lifelong pursuit.

Inventing a New Instructional School Structure includes shaping new teacher roles and assignments, designing different ways of organizing resources, developing strong parent and community organizations, exploring new ways of evaluating student growth, and creating a network for communicating standards and expectations and shared responsibility and leadership roles.

Similar types of activities were set for the other goals as well, such as promoting cooperative planning and learning, acknowledging multiple intelligence and learning styles, respecting and incorporating cultural diversity in all instruction, building on the strengths of all learners, and developing new and innovative curricula. We are concerned about teaching parents and teachers as well as children. Inservice is part of teaching adults. This list is not exhaustive.

Our collaboration has other significant goals and objectives. For instance, one of our faculty is working with Cooper's Poynt students on an oral history of the community and developing a "dig" for artifacts surrounding the Cooper's Poynt building. Another member of the Rowan faculty worked with students and faculty in developing computer skills. One of our instructors has created a tutoring project titled MERIT. In that project, high school students from Woodrow Wilson High School tutor children at Cooper's Poynt. These high school students work closely with Rowan preservice teacher candidates to develop procedures and approaches to use in the tutoring.

"Success Clinics," held for both Cooper's Poynt faculty and instructional aides, were designed so that teachers of the early grades work together in one clinic and those in the upper
elementary work together in another. Each teacher integrates what is learned into his or her teaching. The topics in the clinic come directly from classroom needs. Thus, the clinics provide a highly integrated program.

Our faculty have been involved with Cooper’s Poynt on Saturdays and in the evenings. From 8:30 to 1:00 on Saturday, October 2, 1993, parents of children attending Cooper’s Poynt, as well as the entire staff of the school and all of the Rowan faculty assigned to the school, met for Parents’ Day.

Rowan involvement includes faculty from the Elementary, Secondary and Special Education Departments. The strides we’ve made and the accomplishments achieved are a function of the commitment of our faculty to improve education and provide an exciting and dynamic experience for our preservice teachers. Cooper’s Poynt would not exist without the commitment of our faculty and the faculty and administration in Camden.

The first full year of operation was facilitated by a $25,000 grant from the Camden Public Schools. This enabled us to provide faculty for the Cooper’s Poynt PDS on a released time basis. This year, the College is contributing released time (24 semester hours of load time, about $48,000) to the Cooper’s Poynt Project. Money is still a major problem; PDSs require a considerable amount of up-front funding. Again, if it had not been for the commitment on the part of the teachers at Cooper’s Poynt, the faculty at Rowan College, the preservice students who went to Cooper’s Poynt last year and who are attending this year, and the initial generous grant of $25,000 from Camden, we would not have a PDS in Camden. The PDS has been firmly established, and there are many exciting activities we’re planning to initiate in the future. We are looking forward to expanding the PDS to include Woodrow Wilson High School. Where we will get the funds is another issue. We hope the State will recognize the value of PDSs, particularly as tools of fiscal accountability.

One might ask, Well, what do we know about our effectiveness? Obviously, one year does not allow for proper and in-
depth assessment. However, we do know that there were fewer discipline referrals to the principal this past year, there were improved teacher attitudes, and there was much better student attendance. These effects were all in the affective area. The proof in the pudding will be academic school improvement, that is, improvement as evaluated by standardized tests and other means.

I suggest the State allocate a million dollars to each of the thirty urban school districts to develop Professional Development Schools as well as other district collaboratives. The million dollars must be allocated with the understanding that there will be improvements in instruction, learning, attitudes towards education, and academic/cognitive outcomes. The State can and should use the PDS as an example of how urban education can be improved. It should use the PDS as an accountability measure. With collaborative PDSs, we will be able to demonstrate that urban schools can and should be equal to any schools in the State of New Jersey.

We are cognizant of the problems, issues, and concerns facing children attending schools in urban environments. Because of these problems, it takes the entire community to raise and educate a child—not just the parents. I have great hopes for urban America. I believe we can begin to solve urban problems once we, as a State and as citizens, make a commitment to equal education for all children.

—From a presentation at the Urban Education Consortium at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, October 26, 1993.
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The Cooper's Poynt Project: A Collaboration between Rowan College & Camden Public Schools

Carol Sharp and Janet Moss

The School of Education and Related Professional Studies is working in partnership with Camden City Public Schools on a Professional Development School (PDS) Project. The site of this joint venture is the Cooper's Poynt School (pre-K–8) located at 3rd and State Streets in the northern section of Camden, New Jersey.

The PDS concept evolved out of the educational reform efforts of the Holmes Group, a consortium of nearly 100 research universities, which first met in the mid 1980s. The Holmes Group has continued its commitment to the goals of rigorous teacher preparation programs and the enhancement of the quality of schooling through research and development. According to the Holmes Group (1990), a Professional Development School is defined as a regular elementary, middle, or high school that works in partnership with a college or university to develop and demonstrate:

- fine learning programs for diverse students;
- new understandings and professional responsibilities for experienced educators; and
research projects that add to all educators' knowledge about how to make schools more productive.

Rowan College of New Jersey (formerly Glassboro State College) and the Camden School District have worked together for over thirty years on projects of mutual interest. This long history of collaboration and consultation underlies the current new PDS partnership. When calls for educational reform and trends in teacher education suggested the Professional Development School as a new, comprehensive model for attaining national, state, and local educational goals, leaders at all levels in Camden and at Rowan initiated discussions. Ultimately, the Rowan Dean of the School of Education and Related Professional Studies (SERPS) and key Education faculty, the Camden School District Superintendent, key administrators, the Camden Educational Association leadership, and parents began to design the Rowan–Camden PDS Model. Throughout the 1991–92 school year, they studied existing and emerging models in the country, determined planning and organizational policies and procedures, and held the first annual planning retreat in Atlantic City. These activities were fully and enthusiastically supported by the New Jersey State Departments of Education, Higher Education, and Urban Education.

The School of Education and Related Professional Studies (SERPS) and the Camden City Public Schools have agreed to adopt the PDS principles of the Holmes Group as their goals for this collaborative endeavor. The principles are as follows:

- teaching for understanding so that students learn for a lifetime;
- organizing the school and its classrooms as a community of learning;
- setting ambitious learning goals for everybody's children;
- teaching adults as well as children;
- making reflection and inquiry a central feature of the school; and
• inventing a new organizational structure for the school.

PDS Components
Three major components guide the direction of the PDS towards the successful achievement of its goals. They are the Preservice Component, the Inservice Component, and the Parent/Community Component.

The Preservice Component
The purposes of the Preservice Component are to prepare future teachers to work in an urban environment and to provide a site so that well-planned, consistent supervision takes place. This component enables teachers, administrators, and professors to collaborate in giving future teachers experiences to connect theory to practice. For future teachers, the expected outcomes of the Preservice Component are:
• to grow in their ability to teach for understanding so that all students learn;
• to develop an understanding of the needs of a diverse student population and the factors in an urban environment that affect student performance;
• to learn how to interact with parent and community groups to help meet their students' needs; and
• to contribute to the establishment of the learning community mission of the PDS.

The Elementary/Early Childhood Education Department has been actively involved in the Preservice Component of the PDS. Currently, all elementary education majors—approximately one hundred new majors each semester—visit Cooper's Poynt for a half day as part of their initial professional course in the Program. First, they are given an informative overview of the school through presentations by the principal, assistant principal, and the PDS project manager. Next, in small groups, they are given tours of Cooper's Poynt by student teachers who share personal experiences and insights about working at the PDS, answer questions, and then take the visitors to meet
their cooperating teachers and the children in their classrooms. Finally, the elementary education visitors reconvene with the administrators and their Rowan professor for a follow-up question and answer session.

Rowan preservice elementary teacher candidates have two semester-long opportunities for fieldwork at Cooper's Poynt: Junior Field Experience (Practicum), for one and a half days each week, and Senior Student Teaching, daily for the entire semester. To date, forty-eight future teachers majoring in elementary education have chosen Cooper's Poynt for their Practicum experience, and twenty teacher candidates have completed their student teaching at Cooper's Poynt.

To achieve agreed-upon preservice outcomes, supervision of future teachers is much more intense than regular supervision of student teachers. At the PDS, a team supervision approach has been developed. This means that two college faculty members share equally the supervision responsibilities for the future teachers. Each future teacher is visited by a college professor at least once a week, and weekly seminars are held on site by the two faculty members to address concerns or critical issues. Regular meetings between the cooperating teachers and supervisors also take place so that communication is established to enhance the support that the future teachers need.

Also, as a part of the Preservice Component, PDS teachers are invited to participate in the seminars and offer suggestions for strengthening the teacher education program of the future teachers. This affords the PDS teachers the opportunity to engage in the role of teacher educator. They sharpen their own pedagogical practices as they demonstrate and model for future teachers, which leads to the enhancement of their own professional repertoire and status.

The Inservice Component

The Inservice Component provides teachers the opportunity to engage in reflective inquiry in order to make their practice more diverse, subtle, substantive, broad-gauged, and
ongoing. This approach is quite different from the usual staff development programs offered in public schools. The PDS allows teachers to engage in serious work to strengthen teaching practices that ultimately improve learning for all students.

For the Inservice Component to be effective, the following professional development opportunities have been offered to the teachers at Cooper’s Poynt PDS:

- **Graduate Study:** Two graduate courses—Analyzing Teacher Behavior and Learning Community Classrooms have been conducted on site. Thirty-eight teachers participated.
- **Success Clinic I:** Twenty-four teachers met over a three-month period (March–May 1993) to increase their skill in teaching for understanding so that all children learn.
- **Summer Institute I:** In a four-week program (July 1993), twenty-three teachers analyzed their curriculum to develop integrated unit themes and a plan for starting the school year, entitled, “The First Eight Days in September: A Time for Initial Success.”

In addition to strengthening the pedagogical practices of the PDS teachers, the Inservice Component also provides for other Camden City teachers to visit PDS teachers for professional development. This part of the Inservice Component is the Camden City Visiting Teacher Program. The nature of this program is that PDS teachers will share insights from their involvement in PDS professional activities with teachers from other Camden City schools.

In order for PDS teachers to prepare for their role as host teachers to visiting teachers, they are currently participating in Success Clinic II. The purpose of this clinic is to have host teachers develop work plans for the Visiting Teacher Program.

One other professional development opportunity offered under the auspices of the Inservice Component involves the PDS instructional assistants. These instructional assistants participate in the Saturday Success Clinic I (two Saturdays per
month) to strengthen their skills in helping Cooper's Poynt students experience increased success in school. Children's success in school will be enhanced when both classroom teachers and instructional assistants study the current knowledge base related to effective and supportive classrooms and increase their understanding of how children learn.

All of these professional development initiatives demonstrate the commitment of PDS educators to the improved learning of all children in the Cooper's Poynt PDS.

The Parent/Community Component

The School of Education and Related Professional Studies and Camden City Public Schools agree that parent/community involvement is necessary for a successful PDS to achieve its goals. To become a community of learning, to teach adults as well as children, and to invent a new organizational school structure, the program needs parental as well as community support. To facilitate this involvement, the Cooper's Poynt PDS is currently developing a program in which parents and the community can engage in schooling at the classroom, school, and district levels.

To initiate activities for the Parent/Community Component, plans have been developed to inform parents about the curriculum through a monthly curriculum overview at each grade level, which includes suggestions for assisting children at home. Next, surveys and questionnaires asked parents about their knowledge and interest in topics they would be willing to teach children in collaboration with the Cooper's Poynt PDS faculty. Also, to provide opportunities for parents and community members to enhance their own learning, another survey ascertained interests in adult learning opportunities that could be furnished by the Cooper's Poynt PDS. The survey listed classes on topics such as parenting skills, home and car repair skills, exercise programs, and job acquisition skills, among others. In addition, plans are underway to develop a videotape library for parents that provides information and suggestions about how to help children at home with schoolwork. The
Parent/Community Component highlights the commitment of the Cooper’s Poynt PDS to include parents and community in the educational enterprise.

Feedback Received Concerning the Cooper’s Poynt PDS
Future Teachers

Both preservice teachers who completed a semester-long field experience at Cooper’s Poynt and teacher candidates who visited the PDS on only one occasion have provided positive feedback about the program. The half-day field visit has a major positive impact on future elementary teachers. The reflections of these students indicate that many stereotypes and misconceptions were dispelled as a result of the morning spent at this urban school. Many of these teacher candidates expressed an interest in returning to the PDS for their semester-long practicum or student teaching field experience. The following excerpts from their written reflections are representative of the overall feedback, capture their impressions, and indicate that the PDS goals can, in fact, be perceived by visitors to the school:

“I thoroughly enjoyed our visit to Cooper’s Poynt School in Camden! I really had no idea of what to expect before I got to the school, and I started to have some doubts as we drove closer into the surrounding community. But I can honestly say, the moment I walked through the front doors, I felt a warmth and enthusiasm that is really hard to describe. Everyone was so excited about this wonderful, innovative learning program, and their strong belief in their philosophy of education was just overwhelming. The most obvious focus was their absolute love of children and the belief that each individual can succeed with proper nurturing. One aspect of this environment that really impressed me was that this school is much more than just a school—it’s like an entire family or community caring about each other and working together all under one roof! The administrators, teachers, parents, and students are all interlinked and are there to help
their children learn and develop into responsible citizens—it’s a joint cooperative arrangement. I could see the love of children all over the faces of staff and could sense their caring devotion in their thoughts and actions."

“To see the environment outside of the school and then go in and witness the possibilities these children have, gave me such hope that there is a way to improve lives for our youth.”

“One thing that most impressed me about Cooper’s Poynt was the attitude of the staff.... Student teachers also reflected this pride. They were very excited to be studying in a school that is always in stride with the latest teaching techniques and strategies.”

“I love how they want and call for change. They’re not afraid to try something educationally new and challenging.”

“The classrooms were so visually stimulating that everywhere I looked there was something new. I would very much like to be a participant in that environment and help to contribute to the growth of the students and also myself.”

“The interaction between Cooper’s Poynt and Rowan was equally impressive. The desire to produce quality teachers was very encouraging.”

“I was impressed with how much time went into the presentation we saw.”

“Cooper’s Poynt should certainly be proud of what they have accomplished and should arrange daily tours to business, government, and community leaders to show them what can happen when educators have a goal and they strive everyday to achieve it.”
Soon after the PDS field visit, a group of students wrote a letter expressing their desire to be placed at Cooper's Poynt for practicum and student teaching. The following excerpt is the conclusion of their letter:

If given the opportunity to teach at Cooper’s Poynt, we feel we will become better teachers. We will be exposed to many things that aren’t incorporated into a typical suburban school. Also, we feel we have a lot of new and interesting ideas to bring to the school to help contribute to its success.

Many of us never considered teaching in an inner city school, until visiting Cooper's Poynt. Now we feel we would be missing a great opportunity if we were unable to experience teaching there.

Feedback also addressed reasons for choosing to student teach at Cooper's Poynt. Many student teachers referred to the community feeling at Cooper's Poynt. They described the sense of community, family, and support as being created by Rowan college supervisors, administrators and staff at Cooper's Poynt, and their peers. They indicated feeling fully supported as well as truly valued. Many student teachers acknowledged the quality of teacher preparation they were receiving and the unique experience of working at a PDS. Many individuals identified the challenge of an urban setting and the opportunity for first-hand experience at this urban school as benefits of the student-teaching experience. The following excerpts were taken from written student teacher feedback:

“My experience during practicum was a small step into the exciting restructuring and innovative changes at Cooper's Poynt. I wanted to take that giant step as a student teacher at Cooper's Poynt to become a part of the learning community at Cooper's Poynt.”
“Everyone takes his or her work so seriously and sincerely at the same time.... Everyone cooperates with everyone else and does not hesitate to help you no matter who you are.”

“I have never experienced going to an urban school prior to student teaching here at Cooper’s Poynt. I had many misconceptions, as many people do, about inner city schools. I wanted to student teach here to see for myself what city schools were like and to broaden my horizons.”

“This school environment incorporates all that we have been taught in the education classes, such as learning community, cooperative learning, and whole language. Everyone is looked upon and treated as an equal, and respect is the only acceptable behavior for both students and adults.”

The feedback provided by Elementary Education majors at Rowan College may serve to explain why there are currently more students who wish to be placed at Cooper’s Poynt for their field experience than can be accommodated.

**PDS Teachers**

The feedback received from PDS teachers has been positive. Most PDS teachers have indicated that they have modified their teaching behaviors to incorporate strategies and suggestions studied in the graduate courses and Success Clinic I. For example, the following quotes are from participant feedback forms for Success Clinic I:

“I use more divergent questioning techniques in my class now.”

“I allow my students more wait-time, and their answers are better.”

“I’ve changed my responsive behavior. I’m more positive now.”
"I am more aware of what or how I do things in the classroom. I feel more comfortable trying new things."

"I started to use more hands-on activities rather than dittos or paperwork."

"I'm more aware of my modeling strategies. Instead of telling students what is expected, I show them what I expect."

The PDS teachers also indicated that meeting with their colleagues to study and discuss educational issues was beneficial and that they hoped these opportunities would continue. One item of concern that the PDS teachers reported was that they did not want to be taken out of their classrooms for professional development activities. They suggested a reallocation of school time.

Although the professional development activities of the PDS teachers started less than a year ago, their responses to participating in these experiences have indicated that positive results are apparent in their classrooms.

**Changes Needed to Refine the PDS Project**

Time needs to be devoted to more communication opportunities for PDS representatives from the School of Education and Related Professional Studies and from Camden. They must clarify and plan the specific strategies for working towards the PDS principles. They must be able to explain the vision of their respective roles in this project to develop better understanding of expectations. Two huge bureaucracies need to understand each other before they can work collaboratively towards a new organizational structure for the Cooper's Poynt PDS.

**Conclusion**

Collaboration for the development of a PDS is a long-term endeavor. The College, the school district, and the individuals involved are committed to educational excellence. The words
used here to describe Cooper's Poynt present merely a superficial picture; a visit to the school will convey the essence of this PDS.
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Seaside, Lakeside, Jerseyside: Schoolsite Health Promotion Coast to Coast

Edith S. Thompson

Recently, the term "Comprehensive School Health" has been used to look at school health from a broader and more interrelated perspective, a change from using the more traditional triangular components of instruction, services, and environment. This new eight-component model of school health has gained acceptance and has been expanded since its introduction by Allensworth and Kolbe in 1987 (Nader, 1990). New Jersey has expanded the Comprehensive School Health Program beyond the three traditional components of health instruction, health services, and positive school environment to include five other components: physical education, student assistance and counseling, nutrition and food services, staff wellness, and parent and community involvement.

In summer 1995, with the inception of the First Annual New Jersey Comprehensive School Health Institute (Jerseyside I), New Jersey will bring the number of states with three-to-five-day summer health promotion programs to nearly thirty. Institutes like Jerseyside I have been one strategy for encouraging schools to adopt and implement comprehensive school health programs. "Since the origination of these conferences [more recently called institutes] in 1977 at Seaside, Oregon,
twenty-six other states have conducted similar conferences" (Smith and others, 1991, p. 69).

The first Seaside Health Education Conference (SHEC) was launched by Dr. Len Tritsch, who was then the Oregon Department of Education’s Health Promotion Specialist. Seaside grew out of a long-term goal for grassroots planning through the establishment of a health education coordinator in all school districts. Dr. Tritsch, working through the superintendent, encouraged school personnel to attend regional meetings. After a three-year period of meetings, Seaside was established as a better way to bring about changes in attitudes and to provide school personnel with updates about health education. By 1990, 90% of more than 300 Oregon school districts had been involved in SHEC. “Several school districts [did] cost effectiveness studies to find that health promotion works” (Tritsch, 1991, p. 71). Some of these studies will be cited later in this paper. Since Oregon’s Seaside met most components measured, can Jersey side not realize its mission statement and goals?

In December 1991, the New Jersey State Board of Education approved a State Plan for Comprehensive School Health, Safety, and Physical Education Programs (K–12). Among responses to various issues raised in the State Plan is the following charge: “The department (New Jersey Department of Education—NJDOE) should join state education organizations, private health organizations, and corporate sponsors to develop a New Jersey Seaside Conference Model.”

The New Jersey Department of Education’s Coalition for Comprehensive School Health, Safety, and Physical Education, comprised of nearly thirty New Jersey health-related organizations, has been meeting since early 1992 to address various issues in the State Plan. In June 1993, the Coalition sent a New Jersey team of seven delegates to the New York State Education Department’s annual Health Promotion Institute (Lakeside VI). The mission of the New Jersey team was to plan a similar New Jersey institute, which became the New
Jersey Comprehensive School Health Institute (NJCSHI), or Jerseyside I.

The New Jersey Lakeside team reported to the Coalition at monthly meetings during summer 1993, and the First Annual NJCSHI went through the approval process. Many organizations, both inside and outside the Coalition, are cooperating to provide leadership and support for this collaborative effort. After a personal visit from the New Jersey team to Lakeside, Jerseyside I gained the support of then New Jersey Education Commissioner, Dr. Mary Lee Fitzgerald.

Jerseyside I will be housed at Rowan College of New Jersey. The Rowan School of Education and Related Professional Studies will co-sponsor this event with the New Jersey Department of Education and the New Jersey Affiliate of the American Cancer Society. The American Cancer Society serves as the fiscal agent to the NJCSHI.

Jerseyside I's mission statement describes the empowerment of local school district personnel to design and implement comprehensive school health promotion strategies. These strategies incorporate the programs, services, and environment necessary to develop healthy children and maximize learning potential. Local advocacy and action are key. Will such an undertaking work?

Drolet and Davis reported information on three evaluations of the Seaside conferences. "A study conducted by Passwater, Tritsch, and Slater in 1981 described knowledge, attitude, and behavior changes resulting from Seaside conference participation" (1984, p. 26). In the Drolet and Davis study, the Seaside group was compared to a control group. Except for teacher absenteeism, for all components measured, "the percentage of change for each program component is at least two-to-three times greater in the 'Seaside' group than in the comparison group" (1984, p. 32).

Following are some of the components of change reported in the Seaside group that had implications for improving the health of students and maximizing learning potential: (1) five years after Seaside, participants indicated curricula were sig-
significantly more wellness-oriented; (2) more than three-quarters of former Seaside participants perceived their administrators and teachers as supportive of a wide variety of health-related activities; (3) significantly more Seaside participants than nonparticipants indicated the importance of being positive health role models. Subjective comments by the Seaside participants included the observations that there is loss of credibility when role modeling is absent and that teaching improves with role modeling (Drolet and Davis, 1984).

JerseySide I is being designed to bring together school building or school district teams. Each team includes a central office administrator, with two or more of the following: teachers, a nurse, a Substance Awareness Coordinator, a guidance counselor or a school psychologist, a food service manager or dietician, a custodian, a parent, a school board member, a secretary, and members of the community who have health-related connections with the school. All these personnel play a crucial role in the lives of students. School district teams develop models for local efforts to promote a holistic approach to wellness. The desired outcome is for the majority of students and school personnel to be unified in the pursuit and promotion of well-being.

School district teams in NJCSHI will assess situations and plan for the implementation and evaluation of an effective Comprehensive School Health Program (CSHP) that includes eight components in ten content areas.

The eight components of a CSHP are:

- Health Instruction
- Health Services
- Positive School Environment (social and physical)
- Physical Education
- Student Support Services
- Nutrition and Food Services
- Staff Wellness
- Parent and Community Involvement
Health Instruction includes the following ten content areas:

- Family Life Education and Relationship Skills
- Chemical Health (substance use and abuse)
- Diseases and Disorders, including HIV-AIDS
- Growth and Development
- Personal Fitness, including Physical Fitness
- Nutrition Education
- Safe Behaviors and Appropriate Emergency Response (safety and first aid)
- Consumer Decisions Related to Health and Fitness
- Enhancing Emotional and Mental Health
- Conservation of the Environment

The mission and goal of NJCSHI will be achieved by the team approach. Team meetings will be scheduled before, during, and after Jerseyside I. The team will be encouraged to make a commitment for the future. This will be facilitated by the provision of a common framework for team members to develop an action plan. During the institute, the team will be involved in a variety of learning experiences, which will increase team members' knowledge base. Team members will develop skill in the use of interdisciplinary strategies. They will link with established resources and will create networks to facilitate their action plan. Teams will be encouraged to establish an effective year-round, school-based team.

Jerseyside I will provide research opportunities for higher education personnel, as well as for those in leadership positions in the NJDOE and in other organizations in the Coalition. The outcome of the New Jersey Comprehensive School Health Institute will be measured in a variety of ways. Initially, a database of school team action plans will be established. Eventually, teams planning to attend future Jerseysides will be able to review the action plans of groups who participated in previous Jerseysides and will also be able to study the program outcomes in the schools. Teams will be provided with technical assistance and follow-up reports. Increased motivation and
involvement are short-term expectations. Healthier schools and communities are long-range goals.

Other long-range possibilities resulting from Jerseystate I and future NJCSHIs include more involvement between the State Department of Education and the participating school. Following code, the State recently completed the Core Course Proficiencies for Health, Physical Education, and Safety, based on the draft Curriculum Content Standards document developed in early 1993. If these documents are approved, the NJSCHIs can help implement the Standards and Proficiencies. Higher education personnel and other Jerseyide leaders might involve themselves in the school-based assessment of the Health and Physical Education Proficiencies.

Involvement with Jerseyide is likely to develop leaders who will take a proactive role regarding child, adolescent, and community health issues. Involvement will occur on many levels. In addition to participating team members and leaders who plan Jerseyide, many others in attending school districts will be positively influenced. Higher education faculty and personnel from many state health organizations and departments other than the NJDOE will be involved at different levels. Students majoring in health-related fields, who will serve as staff assistants, can develop into leaders of this school-site health promotion effort.

The health promotion movement is thriving. Schools are the biggest business in most communities. The national movement by businesses to increase health promotion programs and to reduce employee health care costs continues (Tritsch, 1991). The time is right for a joint wellness effort in New Jersey to reach our common goal. Together we can meet the challenge to improve health and ultimately reduce health care costs.
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Collaboration: The Key to the Success of a Pre-Service Program

Brenda Benson-Burrell

The need for quality articulation and collaboration among colleagues at all levels of education is essential if significant changes are to occur. At the college level, there is opportunity to create change in field-based experiences for pre-service teachers in public schools. To improve their experiences, I initiated communication with Rowan's Professional Laboratory Experience Office, regarding the preparation of aspiring teachers.

As an assistant professor teaching Secondary Methods of Social Studies (now called Pedagogy III), I began to seek a more effective field-based experience for students. I did some groundwork before a formal presentation: I met with representatives from Rowan, found a secondary Social Studies Department interested in my proposal, and discussed ideas with my department as well as with the administrators of high school and pre-service teachers.

Establishing the Network

In fall 1988, I planned an informal arrangement for field-based experiences for pre-service teachers in Washington Township Public Schools, in Gloucester County, New Jersey.
These experiences included 20 hours in grades 7–9 and 20 hours in grades 9–12. Coordinating the school grade-level experiences for these students and yet providing a variety of experiences was part of the design. Washington Township provided field experiences in which pre-service teachers might observe and practice in a culturally diverse environment, as encouraged by Rowan’s guidelines for clinical and field-based experiences.

After the informal program, I debriefed the coordinating and pre-service teachers and added my own observations. I reached the following conclusions:

- College professors need to establish a professional rapport with coordinating teachers and collaborate with them to develop programs for pre-service teachers.
- College professors, by providing depth of content knowledge and research, can serve as valuable resources to school systems in which pre-service teachers gain their experience. For instance, professors can provide departmental forums.
- When the pre-service teacher is in the classroom, the college professors can coordinate lectures on theories, practices, and applications with experiences provided by the coordinating teacher.
- Pre-service teachers need experiences which more closely mirror actual teaching responsibilities. For example, the school could offer them an opportunity to teach a variety of courses.

In fall 1989, supported by a New Jersey State Challenge Grant awarded to Rowan College, I established a comprehensive faculty development program for teacher education. The course was called Teaching Secondary Social Studies. Using the conclusions from my earlier study, I collaborated with the Social Studies Department at Paulsboro High School, Gloucester County, New Jersey, to design a more comprehensive study. From September to December 1989, I met with mem-
bers of the Social Studies Department about courses, professional growth services, joint on-site activities, and the development of site-based expectations for pre-service teachers. We developed a field-based pre- and post-survey to learn the pre-service teachers' perceptions of their experiences. We distributed the survey in February and May 1990 to 40 collaborating teachers (also called cooperating teachers). Collaborating teachers in this project returned 6 surveys; of the remaining 34 teachers, 16 returned surveys (See Table 1). Cooperating teachers who were not in the project returned 12 post-field-based surveys; all 6 cooperating teachers who participated in the project returned surveys (See Table 2).

Discussion of Data
On both pre- and post-surveys, respondents were asked for comments. Although these data are only descriptive, some conclusions support the collaboration research:

1. Cooperating teachers benefit from full information about the goals and objectives of the field-based experiences.
2. Cooperating teachers favor developing working relationships with college supervisors before and during school-based experiences. Initially, 44% of non-participating teachers anticipated working with college professors. However, only 16% shared information. Cooperating teachers in the project expected 100% participation, yet only 83% experienced direct contact with a college professor.
3. Cooperating teachers desire more input in planning with college supervisors for the school-based experiences of pre-service teachers.
4. Cooperating teachers in the project knew what was expected of them before and after the school-based experiences because of joint planning with the college professor. Planning took place every two weeks. Non-participants said they knew what to expect because of past experiences and exposure to written materials from their college
supervisors, not because of coordination with the college professor.

5. Cooperating teachers believe that their college supervisors should be aware of the instructional program and courses taught in the teachers' classes.

6. Cooperating teachers believe that school-based experiences are enhanced when the college supervisor is knowledgeable about the school's students, cultural profile, and program of studies.

Pre-Service Student Teacher Teams

Pre-service student teachers were grouped into teams of three or four. There were six high school social studies teachers and six student teams. Pre-service students met with the high school principal and their teachers before they began their field-based experience. Student teachers taught in six different instructional settings in grades 7-12. The teams visited the school on different days of the week. The pre-service student teachers had one-hour sessions with a variety of high school personnel: the department chairperson, the principal, the guidance director, the curriculum director, and the student activities advisor.

In each cycle (six full days per teacher for six Fridays), teams had the opportunity to observe teachers in the Social Studies Department, as well as in Business Education, Foreign Language, Physical Education, Math, Science, and Art. During the cycle, student-teachers gathered the following information: (1) timing of class periods; (2) observations of teachers; (3) significant events; (4) personal reactions, impressions, and evaluations; and (5) data collection, based on the topics of study in class. During the final cycle, the team spent the whole day with one social studies teacher—four hours for observation and four hours to conduct a mini-lesson. (Each team member taught a lesson while the other team members observed.)

The following comments summarize entries from student teacher logs:
• Students enjoyed working in teams.
• Students appreciated the opportunity to observe the teaching styles of twelve teachers and a variety of student groupings.
• Students enjoyed the comprehensive variety of observations represented by a 7–12 pre-service experience.
• Students felt it a great advantage to observe teachers and students in other content areas.
• Students enjoyed learning about career opportunities in education.
• Students linked their class studies with their field-based experiences.
• Students realized that both their cooperating teacher and their college professors knew what was expected of them in every school-based activity.
• Students transferred concepts learned in Secondary School Environment (now called Pedagogy I) to their field-based experience and gained a better understanding of what is expected in their student teaching experiences.

The conclusion—based on students’ logs, data from coordinating teachers, and my own experiences with this course—is that school-based activities like these were beneficial to the pre-service teaching program.

Replicating the Program
This program will be replicated if the following conditions are met:

1. All social science teachers at the school site agree to participate in the project.
2. The college professor and cooperating teachers meet informally to plan the pre-service experiences.
3. The college professor establishes and maintains good rapport on the district level with principal, department chair, and teachers, and also sustains relationships with staff members who support the program.
4. A variety of districts can be targeted for this project so that the same district is not asked to participate annually.
5. The college professor sponsors in-service activities for the department, school, and district.
6. The college professor is kept abreast of curriculum and instructional changes at the target schools.

*Future Pre-Service Programs*

Since the initial collaboration study, three 7-12 social studies partnerships have developed between school districts and Rowan College. The positive experiences with the initial group of pre-service student teachers and cooperating teachers is being replicated in these partnerships.

Collaboration has been the essential ingredient in the success of the pre-service teacher program—Teaching Secondary Social Studies. These future teachers view highly competent educators in the midst of their daily routines, teaching a variety of classes. The student teachers also note the involvement of classroom teachers in extracurricular activities. Teaching today demands so much. In the pre-service program, prospective teachers see examples of the multiple demands of day-to-day teaching.
### TABLE 1

Survey of Perceptions of Secondary Methods & Techniques School-Based Experiences

#### Pre-field Based Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th>B**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you know and understand the goals and objectives of this course?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the college supervisor shared the contents of the course?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the college supervisor planned the school-based experiences with you?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you know what is expected of you as a coordinating teacher?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the college supervisor aware of your present instructional program and courses of study?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the college supervisor aware of the types of students in your classes?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the college supervisor understand the cultural profile of the school and its community?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the supervisor aware of the scope and sequence of your secondary content area(s)?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A*—Non-Participants (N = 16). B**—Participants (N = 6).
### TABLE 2

Survey of Perceptions of Secondary Methods & Techniques School-Based Experiences

**Post-field Based Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th></th>
<th>B**</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a better understanding of the goals and objectives of this course</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. During the semester, the college supervisor has continued to share the aspects of this program with me.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. During the semester, the college supervisor and I planned school-based experiences together.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I now have a better understanding of my role as a coordinating teacher.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The college supervisor has a deeper understanding of the instructional programs and courses of study in my content area(s).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The college supervisor knows the types of students who enroll in my classes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The college supervisor knows the cultural profile of our school and its community.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The college supervisor is aware of our program of studies with regard to the secondary instructional scope and sequence presented in my content area(s).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A*—Non-Participants (N = 12). B**—Participants (N = 6).
### TABLE 3

Pre/Post Data Presented in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre: Percent of “Yes”</th>
<th>Post: Percent of “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>B**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A*—Non-participants. B**—Participants.
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