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The purpose of this study was to learn what teacher educators think is important in forming our future teaching force. This study showed that most teacher educators feel they have quality programs. Teacher educators believed their programs prepare graduates well for their first year of teaching. They felt most programs are of quality in the state of Ohio. They were pleased with the current emphasis on pedagogy, subject area, and general education requirements. Teacher educators were concerned about the importance of quality in field and clinical experiences. The overall quality of teacher education programs in Ohio is better than in the past.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This dissertation is a report of a study of the opinions of teacher educators as to what makes a quality teacher preparation program. This first chapter of the dissertation describes the background of the study, identifies the problem statement and explains the professional significance and the methodology of this study.

Background of the Study

At a time when accountability is paramount in education, it is important to understand how educators can increase student learning. In order to increase student learning, teachers must be taught how to increase student learning. Teachers need to be taught how to teach. In order to make sure teachers are learning how to best educate the future leaders of the nation, it is imperative that the courses a candidate takes to become a teacher are worthwhile (Spring, 2007). This research study examined what a quality teacher education program looks like.

Formal teacher preparation has a history that goes back more than 100 years. Some of the individuals who helped shape teacher education as it is today include: Horace Mann, known as the father of American education (Spring, 2007), John Dewey,
known as the father of progressivism (PBS, 2007), and William Bagley known as the father of essentialism (Imig & Imig, 2006). Their influence can be seen in such teacher preparation practices as pedagogical knowledge requirements, field experiences, and subject area knowledge, respectively.

In recent years there have been many groups that studied, reported, suggested and even sometimes mandated best practices and standards for teachers and teacher educators. These groups include the federal government, the state governments, and departments of education. Some well known groups are: National Commission on Teaching in America's Future (NCTAF) Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and also the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Educator’s Standards Board (ESB), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). With so many groups with different standards it can be unwieldy to sift through all of the differing studies that promote one approach to teaching over the other. The sheer volume of research on the topic of teacher education is huge as more and more standards, rules, and accountability measures are placed upon departments of education, school districts, and teacher candidates.

In Chapter two, the previous published research has been grouped into the key areas of teacher preparation: clinical practice, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and teacher dispositions. These areas have been chosen to be researched because best practices of quality teachers are described as having some combination of the areas listed above (Cobb, Darling-Hammond, & Murangi, 1995), and because they are the components of many college or university teacher preparation programs.
Problem Statement

The literature points to many different types of best practices for teachers, teacher educators and teacher education institutions (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; NBPTS, 1998; NCTAF, 1996, U.S. Dept of Education, 1998; Wang, Coleman, Coley, & Phelps, 2003). However, almost all of the viewpoints come from stakeholders other than the people responsible for teacher education. For this study, I wanted to understand teacher education from the college/university faculty point of view. It is important to find out how teacher educators describe quality teacher education, because the responsibility falls on them to implement and deliver the instruction to future teachers. There is a need for a study that investigates how teacher educators describe quality teacher education.

Professional Significance of the Study

Better teachers mean better schools. The purpose of this study is to learn what teacher educators think is important in forming our future teaching force. Their opinions represent the place where theory meets practice in teacher education. Their understandings can inform policies which will improve our schools.

Spring (2007) refers to an educational summit held by Achieve Inc, in which key players were asked to voice their opinions about education. The key players that were identified as being part of this meeting were CEOs of huge companies. The goals of schooling are varied; however, in this meeting the goal of developing human capital was at the forefront. I logically wondered why more teacher educators were not asked what
they believe about their own teacher education programs and the development of teachers as it relates to the goals of schools?

In a paper read at the regular meeting of the Worchester society of antiquity on June 5th, 1877, Staples (1877) read from a volume entitled “Lectures on School-keeping,” by Hall that was published in 1829.

There is a very general belief that one of the most common defects in our common schools is the improper character and superficial qualifications of teachers. It is well known that many who are employed to teach our primary schools are deficient in almost every necessary qualification. While this defect is so prominent all the efforts to increase the usefulness of schools can be attended with only partial success.

Staples (1877) point was the importance of quality teacher education. Hall (as cited in Staples, 1877) discussed this in 1829. The importance of teacher education is still be discussed today. How to train good teachers is still being explored and improved upon in present day. This study will further investigate the importance and training teacher candidates should receive.

Overview of Methodology

The primary methodology of this study was descriptive, using qualitative and quantitative data. Data were collected from an on-line survey that teacher education faculty were asked to complete. The sample consisted of 2,452 teacher educators working in colleges and universities in Ohio.
A positivist paradigm was used as the approach for this study. Merriam (1998) stated, “In positivist forms of research, education or schooling is considered the object, phenomenon, or delivery system to be studied” (p.4). This philosophical paradigm of positivism emphasizes the ability of participants to know reality and therefore to explain their own reality. As a result, their reality is considered objective and quantifiable.
Introduction

Teacher education has been the subject of much study and debate for more than 150 years. Teacher education has been thought to create significant impact in terms of training future leaders, professionals, and workers. Teacher education has become increasingly rigorous, with government leaders, schools of education, and policy makers continually challenging and debating what comprises effective teacher education (Coble, Edelfelt, & Kettlewell, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Imig & Imig, 2006; NCTAF, 1996, 2003; Spring, 2006; Staples, 1877).

History of Bureaucracy in Teacher Education

Historically, schools have been asked to meet many agendas, including historical, social, political and economic ones (Spring, 2007). These varied (and sometimes conflicting) goals have led to an increase in regulations and bureaucracy within the educational systems. Spring (2007) stated, “Most of the original goals of schooling still guide the work of educators. The multiplicity of things schools are now asked to do is a result of an accumulating historical agenda” (p. 11).

Examples of historical goals include educating future citizens, reducing crimes, and providing equal access and opportunity. An example of a significant political goal is meritocracy as suggested by Thomas Jefferson. “A meritocracy is an educational system
that gives an equal chance to all to develop their abilities and to advance in the social hierarchy. Advancement within the educational system and society is based on the merit or achievements of the individual” (as cited in Spring, 2007, p. 13) Economic goals closely align with political ones, and a stated economic goal of education is defined by the human capital theory, which states that investments made in education today will have important consequences for the work force of tomorrow (Spring, 2007).

Aside from these historical, political and economic goals, schools have also been expected to accomplish social goals, such as teaching respect, caring, responsibility, and trustworthiness. Social goals often line up directly with stated historical and economic goals. With so many goals intertwined in education, it is understandable that the educational system would be marked by increasing levels of bureaucracy, especially in the realm of teacher education (Spring, 2006; Wise, 1979).

There are many groups that play into the bureaucracy of teacher education. Spring (2002, 2006) described the major political groups in education. Spring (2002) also described the roles of policy actors inside and outside of the government, as well as special interest groups. Major political groups included: politicians, administrative politicians that include the federal secretary of education, the state superintendent of education, and locally the school boards and superintendent. Groups outside the government that had the greatest influence were: (a) educational associations, (b) non-educational groups (business leaders, taxpayers’ groups), (c) lay groups (PTAs, school advisory groups), (d) educational research organizations, and (e) producers of educational materials. Other special interest groups that played a role by influencing the groups listed above were: teachers unions (National Education Association and American Federation
of Teachers), corporate sector foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford
Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. There were other special interest groups as
well that promoted and represented particular religious, racial, or ethnic populations.
With all of these players driving new policies, the bureaucracy increases (Spring 2002,
2006).

Historically, teacher education has been managed at the individual state level, as
provided for in the tenth amendment of the United States Constitution. The tenth
amendment allows, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution,
nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”
(Lilienthal, 2005, ¶ 7). Therefore, it is the states’ responsibility to administer public
education. As a federally funded mandate, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has
brought up questions of its constitutionality (Lilienthal, 2005). With respect to teachers,
NCLB mandated that all students have highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals.
NCLB, PL 107-110, required that parents are notified preferably in writing when their
child has a teacher that is not highly qualified for more than 20 consecutive days. NCLB,
section 1119, also required instructional paraprofessionals to be highly qualified (U.S.
Department of Education, 2001). Teachers were required to meet the federal definition
of a highly qualified teacher (HQT) in core academic subject areas (Ohio Department of

This is an example of how states have been losing control of teacher education to
the federal government. Johnson, Johnson, Farenga, and Ness (2005) suggested the
increased federal educational policy reforms have decreased state and local control,
promoting a more nationalized bureaucracy.
Examples of a more national bureaucracy include the 1965 passing of ESEA (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), which allowed the federal government to give funding to states to combat the War on Poverty (Spring, 2006). This act was transformed to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which also allowed monies to go to school districts funded by the states from the federal government. The U.S. Department of Education and the National Center for Educational Statistics (as cited in Spring, 2006) stated these monies made up only about six percent of the total funding in Ohio.

NCLB required high stakes testing in the form of achievement tests; it also created measures to increase accountability among districts, schools, and teachers. NCLB has put considerable regulations on schools and teachers (Spring, 2006). NCLB required schools to make sure that all students can learn. Schools were responsible for the learning of all children at grade level. This has put considerable accountability on schools.

According to Ravitch (2003, p. 4), “Education will not achieve the status that it deserves until there is carefully constructed, validated knowledge about how to improve student learning, as well as how to measure student learning.” Accountability is important in the areas of pedagogical knowledge, subject area knowledge, the skills of on the job training as well as dispositions of the teacher candidates. All of these aspects must be addressed to ensure the quality of future teachers and the lives they influence by ensuring the future of the workforce through human capital (Ravitch, 2003).

To increase human capital, educators must know how to increase teacher effectiveness. Imig and Imig (2006, p. 171) stated “For at least the past 80 years, researchers and others have sought to identify measures of teacher effectiveness….What
must an effective teacher carry to the classroom in terms of requisite skills and knowledge, background and experience?” To answer this question, value added measures have been added to improve accountability among schools, principals, and teachers (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2007).

Teacher Education in Ohio

With the mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), accountability became more important than ever. Ohio has recently instituted value added measures to its school report cards. Value added measures can be traced to classroom data which means they can be traced back to the teacher (Battelle for Kids, 2007). Value added measures were a significant means to show how the teacher has added value to each student’s learning. The value added measure is a score from each individual student that assessed the growth for the specified school year (Seidel, Bordenkircher, Hambright, Hanby, Herrington, & Shelly, 2007).

Ohio was important to teacher education because it has multiple regulating bodies, each with their own agenda and interests as far as teacher education. The main bodies are the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Educator’s Standards Board, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (ODE, 2007a; NCATE, 2007a).

As a result, Ohio was an excellent locale in which to study what factors are most important in teacher education. Historically, teacher education has focused on teacher preparedness, apprenticeship and content knowledge (The New York Times, 1890, 1895). These factors will now be discussed in greater detail.
The Beginning of Teacher Education

During the beginning of the 19th century, earning a teaching job did not have many requirements. Applicants were awarded teaching jobs if they could convince the local school board they were in good health and possessed good moral character; sometimes the requirements included a basic comprehension test (Ravitch, 2003; New York Times, 1895). Indiana was the first state to require a high school diploma and minimum standards for teachers (Crumrin, n.d.; Coble, Edelfel, & Kettlewell, 2004). During the beginning of the 19th century most states continued to train teachers through apprenticeships.

Pennsylvania was the first state to require teachers to pass tests to become a teacher. Tests over reading, writing, and arithmetic were first required in 1834. More states followed after this and by 1867, nearly all states not only required a basic knowledge test, but also included history, geography, spelling, and grammar facts (Ravitch, 2003; New York Times, 1895).

Normal Schools

Normal schools were teacher training schools (PBS, 2007; Bullough, 2001). The first normal schools were fashioned after schools in France called ecole normale. From the French meaning ecole normale comes normal school; “normal” meant to set the norm or standard. These schools were to set the standard for others and to be the best at training teachers. Horace Mann started normal schools to train teachers in Massachusetts in 1838 (PBS, 2007; Spring, 2007).
Mann became the first secretary of education of Massachusetts in 1837 (PBS, 2007). He thought it was important for all children to receive a universal education. In order to best serve the students, the teachers needed training. His ideas caught on and spread throughout the rest of America. Mann was key in the start of professionalizing teaching. He believed in recruiting women to teach as he spoke that female teachers would be “moral leaders in the schoolroom” (PBS, 2007, Spring, 2007).

Women were recruited into normal schools to be trained to be teachers. This had a lot to do with the history of low pay and status for teachers. The female teaching force was often demeaned and oppressed. Spring (2006) called this the feminization of teaching. Teachers’ salaries were kept low and female teachers were required to resign their position when they became married. However, teaching was to become a serious profession and many people had opinions on the correct way to teach teachers.

Daniel Webster spoke at the first normal school Convention held September 3, 1838 in Hanover, Massachusetts (New York Times, 1890):

Normal schools are to teach teachers and thus enlist this interest on the right side; they make parents and all who in any way influence childhood competent for their high office. If this school succeeds they will go up in every part of the State and the United States. It has raised in many minds a conviction of the importance of competent teachers. In any expanded mind there can be no objection to this new school (¶ 5).

Normal schools offered courses in psychology, elocution (public speaking is a requirement still today), penmanship, and the history and science of education (New York Times, 1895). These courses were paired with subject area knowledge requirements
that included zoology, botany, algebra, physics, chemistry, and geometry. These teacher candidates were also assigned to a “critic teacher” with whom they practiced lessons and observed from the teacher’s point of view as well as served as an assistant (New York Times, 1895). Many of these concepts still hold true today, with teacher education institutions looking at a teacher candidate’s knowledge, skills and dispositions (NCATE, 2007a).

Normal schools continued to evolve as the teaching profession was further professionalized. Colleges and universities took over training teachers as increasing levels of course work became needed to further the common schools. Common schools were public schools funded by tax dollars to train students to be good citizens, democratic thinkers, and laborers to add to the much needed workforce (PBS, 2007). These schools were to be common to every student and available to all students for the opportunity for a common education for all children, hence, the name common schools. Common schools lasted from 1830-1880 (PBS, 2007).

As the normal school and common school movement progressed, speakers at the National Education Association conference in 1907 spoke to the difference and importance of subject area knowledge, pedagogical learning and skill, and the ability to manage the classroom effectively (Bullough, 2001). Some speakers focused on the importance of pedagogical knowledge. They stated without pedagogical knowledge teachers could not effectively teach from the student’s point of view and would fail to control the classroom through proper management. These meetings continued as the need for subject area knowledge was debated. Brooks (as cited in Bullough, 2001),
Superintendent of schools for Boston, Massachusetts, stated that the teachers must be able to explain things from their students’ point of view.

States used many different approaches to training teachers in the nineteenth century. Some training academies required courses in “educational methods”, scholarly courses and specialized courses to prepare potential teachers. Teacher certification among the states was not regulated. There was no body of professional knowledge to pull from to educate these future teachers (Ravitch, 2003).

Normal schools lost candidates when colleges of teacher education began to professionalize the field further. Normal schools were criticized for teaching “methods and not scholarship” (Harper as cited in Bullough, 2001). At this point, colleges and departments of teacher education were formed to increase scholastic learning to further legitimize teacher education.

Then in the early parts of the 20th century, Boards of education moved to industrialize education. As America became more industrialized itself, school boards that were compromised of businessmen, moved to institutionalize teaching and schools. The goals of these schools boards were admirable; they wanted to curb crime, raise up the standards of teaching, and increase student achievement. This led to the move away from normal schools to university and college schools of education where the theory was taken from a business model (PBS, 2007).

During the beginning of the twentieth century, colleges of teacher education started to emerge. This was because a professional body of knowledge was started from the work of the normal schools and the teacher training institutes that the states had established. This surge of knowledge, helped professionalize the job of teaching. The
new professional knowledge changed the normal schools into departments of education within colleges and universities. These schools started departments in pedagogy. They also started fields of interest which consisted of school administration, educational psychology, and curriculum development (Ravitch, 2003). Future teachers could also majored in subjects other than pedagogy. They were encouraged to specialize in subjects such as history, math and science. Some programs were set up to make the pedagogical courses a minor.

The intuitionalism of teacher education became a problem for the teachers who were actually in the classroom; they felt demeaned and not listened to. The top down administration of boards of education and the business model of factory production applied to schools, students, and teachers, and therefore led to the creation of teachers unions (PBS, 2007). As a result, research was done by many now prominent and influential twentieth century pioneers as the philosophy of teacher education began to emerge.

Early Twentieth Century Pioneers

John Dewey was the father of progressivism. He was beloved by teachers who felt like they were being marginalized due to increased bureaucratic control (PBS, 2007). From the 1910s to the 1930s, Dewey’s progressivism challenged the inflexibility of the current teaching and learning models in schools. Dewey fought to allow teachers to evaluate each student individually and to have a more democratic classroom and school. This was a vastly different idea from the bureaucratic former model of schools.
William C. Bagley was the father of essentialism. He believed that subject matter and student learning should be the main focus of school (Imig & Imig, 2006). The essentialist point of view was renewed during the 1950’s when the Russians launched Sputnik (Spring, 2007). Schools started a back to basics curriculum with increased focus on math and science.

Progression of Teacher Education

The 1930s to the 1960s led to increased wages for women in the workforce and therefore in teaching (PBS, 2007). The disparity between the wages of African American teachers and white teachers was then recognized as well as the importance of desegregation in schools. Teachers were influential in the social issues of the day.

The 1960s to the 1980s led to the need for increased standards in schools. Teachers in America also became involved in social justice as the Civil Rights Act was enacted in 1964 to combat discrimination. In 1972, Title IX of the Higher Education Act outlawed gender discrimination in educational programs. In 1975, Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was passed. The accountability movement in the 1970s required schools to publish test scores on achievement tests. In 1983 A Nation At Risk was published. This stated that America’s educational system was the problem for the lack of ability to compete in the world market place (Spring, 2007).

The 1990s to the new millennium marked increased teacher involvement in schools. They worked to increase respect of the teaching profession. Teachers continued to be “graded” with the use of high stakes testing (PBS, 2007).
Teacher Standards

Many studies were done that discussed the importance of quality teacher preparation. One such study was done by the National Commission on Teaching in America's Future (NCTAF, 2003). The study stated that teacher preparation must begin with what we know about quality teaching. The NCLB act required that teachers be highly qualified. Part of this requirement was that teachers meet high standards. The teacher preparation programs were supported by research developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and also the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). All had standards and criteria and had done research on what makes teachers highly qualified and what teachers knew and were able to do (NCTAF, 2003).

The Educator’s Standards Board (ESB) had defined Ohio’s Standards for the teaching profession (Ohio Department of Education, 2007b). It was difficult to understand which standards were the most important with so many to uphold. Standards changed frequently as more research was done to further the profession and lessen the marginalization of teachers and teacher education.

National Board

The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) had established guidelines entitled What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do. NBPTS’s position was that most reform movements that affect teacher education left out a critical part of the learning: the classroom teacher (NBPTS, 2002). Quality teachers needed rewarded, and recognized as model teachers. National Board Certification was a high standard for
teachers. This certification allowed teachers to showcase their abilities in recognition of standards set by others already in the field. National Board Certification showed the complexities of teaching through testing and portfolio work. Beginning teachers were required to have certain knowledge, skills and dispositions to earn initial licensure, but NBPTS focused additionally on how the knowledge, skills and dispositions were practiced with professional judgments for individual students, classrooms, schools, and communities (NBPTS, 2002).

NBPTS had outlined what teachers should know and be able to do. The five core propositions were (a) teachers were committed to students and their learning, (b) teachers knew the subjects they taught and how to teach those subjects to students, (c) teachers were responsible for managing and monitoring student learning, (d) teachers thought systematically about their practice and learned from experience, and (e) teachers were members of learning communities (NBPTS, 2002). There were many aspects involved in being a “good teacher.” Some teachers excelled in an urban environment, while other teachers did well in a rural setting. Some teachers made huge strides with gifted students, while other teachers worked best with students on Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). NBPTS created the five core principles to show excellence in any teaching area and in any community and setting. These principles were chosen by NBTPS (2002) to show what teachers knew and could do. All of them were key elements in teaching. It was how the teachers were able to document and to prove they were proficient in these areas that made them a master teacher or not by NBPTS standards.

All of these standards made teachers professionals in their field. Teachers had to have content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Teachers needed to know when to
push forward and when to review material. Teachers needed to be familiar with the students and their home lives. Teachers were ultimately judged on how much a student learns and also the way the teacher made the student feel when in the classroom. Did the teacher foster a good learning environment? Was the room neat and tidy, with materials easily accessible? Did the classroom look pleasing and inviting? These things made a difference in learning and overall student development (NBPTS, 2002).

Best Practices

The best practices of teacher education have been an ongoing area of research, as evidenced by studies appearing in the literature as early as 1839 (Ravitch, 2003; New York Times, 1895). The literature defined four main areas for best practices in teacher education. These four areas were consistent across all the literature and within the regulations of each governing body. They included clinical practice, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and teacher dispositions (Allen, 2003; Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003; Lasley, Bainbridge, Berry, 2002).

Clinical practice referred to the amount and type of direct and applied teaching experience the new teacher has access to. Pedagogical knowledge referred to the knowledge about the practice and process of effective teaching. Content knowledge refers to the level of expertise and experience with the subject matter at hand; while dispositions refer to certain intrinsic and personality qualities possessed by the very best teachers. Each of these four main areas will be discussed further.
Quality teachers were described as having some combination of the following attributes: pedagogical knowledge, subject area content knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for effective teaching, strong understanding of human growth and child development, effective communication skills, strong sense of ethics, and capacity for renewal and ongoing learning (Cobb, Darling-Hammond, & Murangi, 1995).

Clinical Practice

Clinical practice referred to the amount and type of direct and applied teaching experience to which the new teacher had access. It was an important part of teaching (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), as it brought theory and teacher preparation programs to a direct application. The value of direct application of teaching skills has been identified by much research. Clinical practice has been identified as a core skill for student teachers by several regulatory bodies, including NCATE, INTASC, and now the Ohio ESB (NCATE, 2007a; ODE, 2007c).

Clinical practice was most often obtained through the process of field experience. Field experience hours varied by state and university. During a field experience, the candidate spent time in a classroom either observing a cooperating teacher or assisting the cooperating teacher, writing lesson plans, or actually teaching lessons (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; MVNU, 2005; Wang et al., 2003). The requirement in Ohio for clinical practice was 12 weeks (M. Lehmon, personal communication, April 3, 2007).

According to Darling-Hammond and Bransford, (2005) time spent in the classroom as an apprentice teacher helped prospective teachers to transform their
educational courses into actual practice. This allowed prospective teachers to analyze, interpret and better hone their ability to take the theory that they learned in an education classroom. This practice included classroom management dealing with different personalities and behaviors dealing with different learning styles and the overall day-to-day tasks that it took to manage a classroom in today's society. This may have included anything from dealing with students of poverty to dealing with students with learning disabilities, to dealing with students of low socioeconomic status, and the overall challenge of dealing with a diverse student body. Anyone could have studied information and theory and have learned about how students learn out of a textbook and pass a test over it, but candidates have shown the ability to apply this knowledge (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

*No Dream Denied, A Pledge to America's Children* (NCTAF, 2003) also stated that strong clinical practice to develop effective teaching skills was a key to improving student performance. This helped teachers create a positive learning environment, integrate technology, collaborate with others and be able to prove that they have a firm understanding of how students learn. The Carnegie Foundation of New York talked about the importance of the integration of knowledge and skills in a well designed and carefully supervised clinical practice setting (NCTAF, 2003).

As a result of this research and information, colleges and schools of education were moving towards using professional development schools (PDSs). PDSs were a collaborative effort between universities and school systems. This allowed for greater ability for teacher candidates to practice and hone their skills with a mentor professional teacher. The state of Maryland was known for their PDSs. PDSs as proposed by
NCATE were used to improve the quality of teacher education. The problem with PDSs was that it takes a lot of money to implement, facilitate, and prolong the PDS partnership. However the research showed PDSs, which allowed field experiences, were valuable to teacher candidates at many stages in their training (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

Denton’s research (as cited in Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) found that teacher candidates with field experiences early in their programs performed significantly better in their methods courses than those without early field experiences. Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) agreed that when teacher candidates had the opportunity to practice under the supervision of a mentor teacher, they were better able to apply their learning to the practice of teaching.

Teacher candidates needed to be able to practice the knowledge they have learned. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) wrote “Learning from teaching ought to be regarded as the primary task of teacher education across the professional lifespan… classrooms and schools ought to be treated as research sites” (p.63). Teacher candidates cannot only learn by teaching. They should have learned by becoming a reflective practitioner. Being a reflective practitioner was also tied in with having the dispositions needed to be an effective teacher.

Teachers needed to practice their trade. This was why clinical practice was so important to have throughout all learning stages of teacher development. It was also very important for teachers to reflect on their practice. Having good teachers to emulate can be a good piece of the training once the complexity of teaching was understood. Larabee (2004), in the following quote talked about teaching as both an art and science:
There are simply too many people and too many factors involved in shaping the learning process for us to be able to point to a particular pedagogical technique and claim that it produces successful learning independent of other factors. (p. 54)

Larabee (2004) argued that teaching is dependent upon a huge array of variables. Teachers were required to make thousands of decisions in every class, every day. Teaching is an extremely complex dance of interactions between the student, the classroom, the school, and the atmosphere of the students’ surroundings. Other variables included the students’ home life and if they ate breakfast that morning, whether there was a fire drill right before the lesson, whether the student is concerned about their sick grandmother, and so on.

Many questions are asked about how teachers feel about being prepared to teach. Preparedness made a huge difference when a candidate is thrust in front of a classroom. It was not only about preparation, but also about perceived preparation. A teacher who felt he or she was ready to take over a classroom will do a better job at working with students (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) explained that field, clinical, and especially experience in PDSs helped candidates to feel prepared, as well as increased candidates’ overall classroom management skills and encouraged them to be reflective practitioners.

**Dispositions**

NCATE required schools and colleges of education to have candidates reflect on quality knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Dispositions were the attitudes that all
children can learn (NCATE, 2007c). NCATE defined Professional Dispositions as: “Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development.” (¶5) Dispositions were an important part of assessing a candidate for teacher education.

Elements of dispositions included: social justice, fairness, and believing all children can learn.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) had very similar language to that of NCATE. TEAC’s goal was to provide public assurance that educators were competent, caring and qualified (TEAC, 2006). Understanding multicultural perspectives and caring for students were a part of TEAC’s quality principles.

Dispositions were an important part of ensuring every teacher candidate was prepared to teach and care for children regardless of socio-economic status, level of functioning, ethnicity, race, or language (NCATE 2007c; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; TEAC, 2006). It was important for teacher candidates to understand their own biases and their own experiences that they brought to the classroom. This helped when dealing with different students and differing backgrounds of students (Talbert-Johnson, 2006).

Institutions charged with preparing teachers needed to further embrace the importance of measuring and reporting dispositions (NCATE, 2007c). According to published studies (Teacher Quality Partnership, 2006) the majority of teachers in Ohio were White and female. According to other published studies, students of differing socio-economic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds and non-English speakers continued to
increase (Spring, 2007). There was a need to prepare teachers for the present and the future. Teachers needed to be prepared to continue to learn themselves and to have an open mind to learn and being reflective practitioners (Talbert-Johnson, 2006). The teaching force was very different than their students in terms of gender, race and background. Therefore, teachers needed do their best to understand a student’s cultural frame of reference (Spring, 2007). All NCATE accredited institution included dispositions as related to their conceptual framework (NCATE, 2007c).

*Pedagogical Knowledge*

Pedagogical knowledge referred to an understanding of the best methodology and practice in teaching. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1998) defined pedagogy as follows:

Content pedagogy refers to the pedagogical (teaching) skills teachers use to impart the specialized knowledge/content of their subject area(s). Effective teachers display a wide range of skills and abilities that lead to creating a learning environment where all students feel comfortable and are sure that they can succeed both academically and personally. This complex combination of skills and abilities is integrated in the professional teaching standards that also include essential knowledge, dispositions, and commitments that allow educators to practice at a high level (p.1).

Pedagogical training included many course names including but not limited to (a) history and philosophy of education, (b) educational psychology, (c) technology for educators, (d) curriculum development, (e) instructional design, (f) classroom
management, (g) effective teaching methods, (h) current educational trends and ethical issues, (i) inclusion and differentiated instruction (Bullough, 2001; Wang et al., 2003). Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) explained that teachers needed a professional learning base.

Allen (2003) found the research states that even if teacher candidates have the content knowledge needed, many do not have the ability to disseminate that knowledge in a way for learners to grasp important concepts. Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) stated that the research supported pedagogical training to ensure teaching quality. Principals reported the majority of teachers do not have a problem with subject area knowledge, but with classroom management, lesson planning and execution, and rapport. These teachers “know their stuff, but can’t teach it” (Torff & Fusco, 2007, p.1).

The NCTAF (2003) stated strong academic preparation for teaching is one of the keys to prepare candidates. This research stated that having a major in the subject area in which you are teaching increases student academic performance. However, teacher candidates not only needed to know what to teach, but also how to teach. It was very important for teachers to be able to know how to teach by using differentiated instruction, and different teaching strategies and by understanding how students learn. It was also very important for teachers to be able to have quality classroom management skills (NCTAF, 2003).

Subject Area Knowledge

The No Child Left Behind Act required all teachers in core academic subjects to be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year (Wang et al., 2003). Core
academic subjects for grades seven through twelve included English, language arts, reading, science, math, arts (including music, visual arts, dance, and drama), foreign Language, government and civics, history, economics, and geography. This required teachers to have a major in the subject area taught (Wang et al., 2003).

According to the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) (2003), one of the requirements to being a good teacher was having a deep knowledge base of the subjects they teach in order to effectively work with students. Therefore an attribute to a quality teacher education program was strong academic preparation in the subject area. Teachers could not teach what they do not know (National Council for Teacher Quality, 2007).

The National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ, 2007) recommended that Ohio require teachers to have a major in the subject area they teach. Ohio did not have requirements as to the number of hours necessary. NCTQ stated a major should consist of at least 30 credit hours and a minor should consist of at least 15 credit hours. The Ohio Department of Education replied to NCTQ that Ohio requires a 60 hour minimum major for their secondary teachers. Best practice for course load requirements according to NCTQ were as follows: 50% general education courses, 30% subject area (major) courses, and 20% pedagogy. NCTQ stated that subject area should not be taught by education faculty, but by arts and science faculty. A teacher’s own academic ability was a factor in effecting student performance. NCTQ stated that teacher education programs often required too many courses in pedagogy. They were of the opinion that too many hours are spent on pedagogy and not enough hours spent on electives and not enough coursework in the subject area.
In the state of Ohio, subject area knowledge was monitored by specialized professional associations (SPAs). An example of this was the National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) which was the SPA for Early Childhood Education. This SPA was for grades pre-kindergarten through third grade (National Council for Teacher Quality, 2007).

There is no clear amount of college credit hours necessary to prove competence in a major or even in a minor. This was a hotly debated topic with the studies discussed above differing in recommendations. One clear way to prove a candidate understands material of a particular subject was to take a high stakes test that will examine the candidate’s knowledge on a particular subject (ETS, 2007).

Testing

In many states, teacher candidates must have taken several standardized tests to become licensed. In Ohio, and many other states, teachers were tested on their content knowledge, their pedagogical knowledge, and their actual practice in the classroom. Many states had their own tests, but the majority of states (44 states total) used Educational Testing Service tests (ETS, 2007).

Many institutions required teacher candidates to take the Praxis I test during the freshman year in college. This was a test of reading, writing, and mathematics. It was formerly known as the PPST or pre-professional skills test (ETS, 2007, Wang et al., 2003). The series of Praxis II exams tested content knowledge in the form of tests over specific areas of study. The PLT, which stood for Principles of Learning and Teaching, tested pedagogical knowledge which was largely based on educational psychology.
studies (ETS, 2007, Wang et al., 2003). In Ohio, passing Praxis I and II was part of the requirements for earning a provisional teaching license. Praxis III was a test in the classroom during the teacher’s term on a provisional license. This test was used to assess the teacher’s ability in the classroom and passage was a requirement to move from a two year provisional license to a five year professional license (ODE, 2007c).

According to ETS, testing was an important part of teacher education as it is necessary to assess candidates and thus have minimum standards of knowledge. But teacher testing was only the beginning of identifying what it takes to be an effective teacher (ETS, 2007). Institutions of higher learning needed to train effective teachers.

Sanders (1993) recommended that teacher education preparation programs should be totally redone to allow universities and colleges the ability to teach what was most important. Greater flexibility was needed, while at the same time teachers should be held accountable for their skills as well as their subject matter knowledge. According to Sanders, too much emphasis was placed on passing the prescribed tests to earn a license to teach.

Conclusion

Teaching was a very challenging profession that needed to attract the very best and brightest teachers possible. Teacher quality could sometimes be a mystery to figure out what indeed happens in that black box that was the classroom and school building. Teacher quality could be a mystery when experts say you know a good teacher when you see it. There were so many factors and variables that go into teaching. Teacher
education colleges and universities focused on both subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge with emphasis on field experiences (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

It was important for teacher preparation programs to require professional growth in both content and pedagogy. Being able to reflect and become a reflective practitioner helped improve quality teacher preparation (NCTAF, 2003).

Better teacher preparation was important to our society as a whole. Teacher education was needed to improve our nation. The problem was finding out what makes a good teacher and how to teach a teacher to better work with students. It was a complex practice that has been examined by many researchers. Schools of education, principals and government leaders needed to work to find out how to improve teacher education (Spring, 2007).

As a former institutional representative for the Ohio Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) and a former administrator for teacher education, the researcher was interested in teacher quality (Smith, 2005). In the researcher’s eight years as a classroom teacher, and four years working in higher education, the researcher had realized the disconnect between the training of teachers and the real working lives of teachers.

The literature pointed to many best practices for teachers, teacher educators and teacher education institutions (Allen, 2003; Battelle for Kids, 2007; Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Imig & Imig, 2006; Lasley, Bainbridge, & Berry, 2002; NBPTS, 1998; NCTAF, 1996, 2003; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; U.S. Dept of Education, 1998; Wang et al, 2003). However, almost all of the viewpoints for what was best practice come from stakeholders other than the people responsible for teacher education. The researcher thought it was important to find out how teacher
educators describe quality teacher education. There was a need for a study that investigates how teacher educators describe quality teacher education.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This descriptive study using quantitative and qualitative data is being done to find out what teacher educators in the state of Ohio think about the quality of teacher education. The following research questions will be analyzed:

1. To what extent do teacher educators in Ohio believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching?

2. What are the opinions of teacher educators in Ohio regarding the relative importance of pedagogy, subject areas, and clinical or field experience in teacher preparation programs?

3. Do teacher educators in Ohio believe that accreditation, standardized testing, and NBPTS are helping to improve the quality of teachers and teacher education?

This chapter discusses the participants, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis that will be implemented to help answer these questions.

Nature and Context of the Study

There are 50 teacher education institutions in the state of Ohio, thirteen of which are public universities (Ohio Board of Regents, 2007, ODE, 2007c). Approximately, two-thirds of the target population is working in public universities, and approximately one-third are working in private colleges or universities.
Participants in this study are faculty members from accredited departments, schools or colleges of teacher education and/or graduate education in the state of Ohio. All participants work at an institution that trained their students to teach at the elementary, middle, and/or secondary levels.

Participants are recruited through list serves, committee email addresses, and conference email address lists. Ohio Associate of Private Colleges of Teacher Education (OAPCTE), the Ohio Confederation of Teacher Education Organizations (OCTEO), Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP), as well as Ohio Department of Education (ODE) email lists will be used to solicit survey responses. College and university websites will be used to complete the list of email addresses. The researcher will send an email requesting participation with an explanation of the survey and benefits of participation (See Appendix A).

Design of the Study

This will be a descriptive study that uses both quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2003). A total of 13 quantitative questions and one qualitative question will be asked. Two of the questions permitted open-ended responses. The survey will be sent to the entire population of teacher educators in Ohio colleges and universities. Four questions will be used from the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (MetLife, 2006).

A web-based survey is chosen for many reasons. The first reason is feasibility since the researcher was aware that all participants had an email address and internet access to be able to take the survey. The second reason is the low cost of a web based
survey. The online survey design is also chosen because it had a faster delivery method than a mailed survey and had a quick response time. Other factors of the online survey method that are considered: spam and privacy issues and multiple submissions. The researcher will account for these issues by using Survey Monkey to create a link for the email recipient to opt out of further emails, and by choosing a Survey Monkey option that will allow the participant to answer the survey questions only once through a link that will be provided (Survey Monkey, 2008). Several steps will be taken to increase response rates. There is a concern that the length of the survey may decrease response rates (Dillman, 2007).

Shaefer and Dillman asserted that the most significant factor found to influence response rate is multiple contacts (as cited in Dillman, 2007). Therefore, a reminder will be emailed to recipients two weeks after the initial contact. One of the elements needed for achieving high response rates is a respondent-friendly questionnaire (Dillman, 2007). The questions will be field tested by teacher education experts to assure that the questions were clear and easy to comprehend.

Sampling Procedures

In an effort to get the most responses possible, the entire population will be used as the sample. This should give the researcher a representative sample of all teacher educators in Ohio. The sample size will be approximately 2,500 teacher educators in the state.
Instrumentation

The survey will take between 10 and 15 minutes to complete. It is 28 questions long and uses a Likert scale. A copy of the survey is in Appendix C. The survey uses elements from Dillman (2007) to increase response rates; these elements include respondent-friendly questions with repeated contacts.

Three demographic questions will be asked to determine gender, age range, and ethnicity. Questions are asked about professor rank, size of teacher education program and geographic location. Questions on the survey are designed by the researcher, based on the literature review in Chapter Two. Participants will be surveyed about the overall quality of teachers, preparation of first year teachers, preparation for testing, subject area knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, field and clinical experience, and dispositions. Special attention has been paid to make sure the questions created by the researcher were objective by not asking leading questions, loaded questions, or questions with built in assumptions.

Four of the 26 questions will be taken from a (2006) survey conducted by Metropolitan Life (MetLife, 2006). MetLife granted permission for the use of the questions (See Appendix B). The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, Expectations and Experiences, 2006 researched through a survey what teachers, principals and deans of schools of education and education department chairpersons consider most important to prepare teachers. The researcher only used questions that were asked to the deans of schools of education and education department chairpersons. In the MetLife survey 200 deans of schools of education and education department chairpersons were interviewed. This provided the researcher the opportunity to expand
the MetLife survey to more scholars in schools and departments of education across Ohio.

A web survey will be used to collect data (Dillman, 2007). Participants will be informed of the nature of this study in writing through an email giving information on the study and the general goals of the study and the researcher. IRB approvals will be obtained through both Mount Vernon Nazarene University and Ashland University (See Appendix D).

Participants will be sent an email with a link to an online survey. Participants will give permission to use their answers by clicking on the link to participate. They will be told that they could withdraw from the survey at any time.

The participants will be assured that their email addresses will not to be used for any other purpose if they respond. The participants will also be assured that the link they were clicking on was in no way harmful to their computer.

Survey Monkey will be used to create the web survey. It allows the researcher to develop a professional looking survey, to collect responses and then analyze the data by downloading the data into an Excel spreadsheet.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability will be tested using the Cronbach’s alpha test. With coefficients ranging from .00 to 1.00, the larger indices indicate a higher degree of reliability. Coefficients of .70 and higher are indicative of more reliable indices.
Validity will be tested by using content and face validity. A panel of experts will review the survey to determine content validity. Face validity will also be established by comparing the survey to the literature review in Chapter Two.

Analysis of the Quantitative Data

Data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics. Nominal and ordinal level responses will be analyzed using the Chi-Square goodness of fit test. SPSS will be used to analyze the quantitative data. The ordinal data will be analyzed using frequencies on SPSS. The nominal data will be analyzed using non-parametric Chi-Squared testing.

Analysis of the Qualitative Data

To analyze the qualitative data, the researcher will download the answers onto a spreadsheet. The answers will then color be coded by category until all answers were coded. The number of times each category is mentioned will then be tallied and ranked to show the most common themes (Creswell, 2003).

Synthesis of the Data

The two types of data will be synthesized by reviewing the quantitative and qualitative data. An in depth comparison will be conducted by reviewing the survey items and emergent themes.
Summary

Participants will be asked to fill out a survey via an email link answering both demographic and informational questions. This chapter described the participants, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis that will be implemented to help answer the presented research questions.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the survey. Responses to the research questions and results are presented. The analysis of the data includes characteristics of the sample, demographics of participants, and answers to the research questions. This is an exploratory study in which descriptive statistics were used and Chi-Squared was employed to examine the goodness-of-fit of the data.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample consisted of 2,452 people who worked in 50 teacher education institutions in Ohio. Email addresses were obtained by visiting each college, school, or department of education website and from list serves, conference lists, and committee lists. The number of people that responded to the survey was 491 for a response rate of 20%. Although approximately 2,500 surveys were sent by email, there were about 15% of surveys emailed that were determined undeliverable due to an invalid address or an individual no longer working at the college or university.

After excluding incomplete responses, the number of responders was 404 for an overall response rate of 16%. A total of 87 participants began the survey but did not complete it. Due to the very low total number of questions (usually only one or two) that these participants answered, these survey answers were excluded from the data analysis (Creswell, 2003; Dillman, 2007). Additionally, if the respondent answered “no” to the
first question, they were not permitted to take the survey and were sent directly to the last page of the survey which stated “thank you.” Emails were sent from several responders that answered “no” explaining the reason the survey was not completed. These responses ranged from statements about only being a statistician for the education department or they were part of educational administration/leadership only and did not feel qualified to answer the questions.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability was tested using the Cronbach’s Alpha test. The internal consistency of the non-demographic portion (questions 3 – 11) of the survey was examined using Cronbach’s alpha and the results are presented in Table 1. With coefficients ranging from .00 to 1.00, the larger indices indicate a higher degree of reliability for the items. Coefficients of .70 and higher are indicative of more reliable indices. Cronbach’s alpha was used over other reliability tests due to the large number of participants and the ordinal nature of the responses (Chatterji, 2004; Hopkins, 1998).

Although the alphas for survey items 3-5 (α = .816) and 6-8 (α = .687) were sufficient for the descriptive nature of this study, the coefficient for questions 9-11 (α = .156) was low. This was possibly due to the subjective nature of the items or how they were constructed; there were only three possible responses. The researcher constructed these questions and they were not part of the MetLife survey instrument. Alphas were also computed for the different clusters of items are presented in Table 1 with the exception of 12-14 due to the unique nature of the questions. The overall alpha for the instrument (α = .722) met the minimum standard noted above (.70).
Table 1

*Cronbach’s Test of Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity was established using content validity. The researcher asked an expert panel in the field of teacher education to review the instrument. Content validity is established by a professional judgment. The review of literature and use of questions from the MetLife survey shows this survey was valid. Face validity was established by looking at the survey. This survey was determined to be valid.
Demographics of Participants

As seen in Table 2, the majority of the responders were White females. Only 30% of the responders identified themselves as male. Less than 14% of the responders were non-White. Almost 86% of the responders were over the age of 36 and nearly 41% were over the age of 55. Table 2 further identifies the demographics of the participants which include: gender, race/ethnicity, and age range.
### Table 2

**Demographics of participants: Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Age Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (n=404)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity (n=404)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Racial Background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range (n=404)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and older</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
In Table 3 the academic rank or staff position held at the time of the survey, as well as years in current position are illustrated. Table 3 also depicts the number of respondents with PK-12 classroom experience and their respective undergraduate academic major. The greatest number were associate professors (21.3%), and 11.1% (45) identified themselves as staff members. Thirty-three responders (8.2%) listed other and 20 (5.0%) responders did not answer this question.

The second panel of Table 3 lists the number of years the responders had been in their current position; almost 40% had been in their current position for six to 20 years and more than 11% had been in their position for more than 21 years. Participants were also asked to respond to their previous experience as a teacher and related undergraduate degree. The majority of responders had experience as a classroom teacher and held an undergraduate degree in education (See Table 4).
Table 3

Demographics of Participants: Position and Years in Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position (n=404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Position (n=404)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Table 4

Demographics of Participants: Ever a Teacher and Undergraduate Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever a teacher (n=404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Major (n=404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Tables 5 and 6 present the information about the participants’ institutions of higher education which included affiliation, accreditation of the school, college or department of education, enrollment range, and location. Fifty-three percent identified themselves as being from a public institution, and 41.6% indicated they worked at a private institution. The majority of respondents said that their education departments were NCATE accredited. Eighteen respondents reported that their programs were accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).

Participants were also asked about the enrollment or number of students in their respective teacher education program; 29.9% of the respondents were in programs with 1-249 students enrolled, and 13.9% were in programs with more than 1000 students
enrolled. As noted in Table 6, the respondents were located in different areas across Ohio and identified themselves as: 37.1% urban, 28.5% small town, 12.4% suburban, 9.7% inner city, and 6.4% rural.

Table 5

Demographics of Participants’ Institutions: Affiliation and Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$%$ of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation (n=404)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation (n=404)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Table 6

Demographics of Participants Institutions’ Enrollment and Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>( % ) of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment (n=404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-249</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (n=404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

Research Question One

To what extent do teacher educators in Ohio believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching?

Survey questions two through five dealt with answering this research question. Participants were asked about the overall quality of teachers today compared to those in the past: 203 (50.3%) answered better and 19 (4.7%) answered worse. The Chi-Square goodness of fit statistic test was used $X^2(4, N = 403) = 275.896, p = .000$ indicating that the data does not follow any specified distribution. The data obtained relative to the overall quality of teachers is highly significantly different from the distribution of responses that would be anticipated from random responses.

When asked about the overall preparedness of graduates of participants’ own school’s teaching program to teach the subject matter in their first year of teaching, nearly three quarters said their graduates were either extremely prepared or very prepared to teach the subject matter as shown in Table 7. In the Chi-Square goodness of fit test, $X^2(4, N = 402) = 320.463, p = .000$, the data again did not follow any anticipated distribution and thus was indicative of real differences in the responses. Table 7 further identifies the results of survey question two by showing the frequency and percent of each response.
Table 7

*Overall Quality of Teachers Today as Compared to the Quality of Teachers in the Past*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
<th>f and % Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>203 (50.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>83 (20.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>76 (18.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>22 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>19 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage may not equal 100% due to rounding.

When asked about the overall preparedness of graduates of participants’ own school’s teaching program to maintain order and discipline in the first year of teaching, the goodness of fit results, $X^2 (4, N = 398) = 225.442, p = .000$ followed a similar pattern. This was also the case regarding the overall preparedness of graduates of the participants’ schools to work with children of varying abilities during their first year of teaching was, $X^2 (4, N = 398) = 250.568, p = .000$. The majority of participants responded prepared to some degree to both of these questions, as seen in Table 8. Table 8 also shows the number of responses to each question as well as frequencies and percentages of the responses.
Table 8

Overall preparedness of graduates from participants’ schools in the first year of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely prepared (%)</th>
<th>Very prepared (%)</th>
<th>Prepared (%)</th>
<th>Not too prepared (%)</th>
<th>Not at all prepared (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach subject matter</td>
<td>90 (22.3)</td>
<td>209 (51.9)</td>
<td>75 (18.6)</td>
<td>26 (6.4)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=402)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Order</td>
<td>20 (5.0)</td>
<td>143 (35.9)</td>
<td>150 (37.6)</td>
<td>79 (19.8)</td>
<td>6 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=398)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Children of</td>
<td>42 (10.5)</td>
<td>171 (42.9)</td>
<td>136 (34.1)</td>
<td>46 (11.5)</td>
<td>3 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varying abilities</td>
<td>(n=398)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Research Question Two

What are the opinions of teacher educators in Ohio regarding the relative importance of pedagogy, subject areas, and clinical or field experience in teacher preparation programs?

Survey questions 9-11, 13 and 14 dealt with this question. The participants were asked for their opinions about the importance of these areas and the majority responded that the hours currently required for subject area knowledge and pedagogical knowledge were about right. Nearly 47% of participants responded the hours required for field and clinical experience were about right, but 23.2% indicated the hours were too low. The descriptive results are presented in Table 9 and the Goodness of Fit statistics were similar to the earlier results and are presented in Table 10. Further, Table 9 shows the total results for survey questions 9-11 while Table 10 shows the Chi-Squared results, degrees of freedom and level of significance for these same questions.
Table 9

*Table of frequency and percentages for Items 9-11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours required for</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too High</td>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>Too Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>19 (5.0)</td>
<td>303 (79.7)</td>
<td>58 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>20 (5.2)</td>
<td>302 (79.2)</td>
<td>59 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=381)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field and Clinical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>18 (4.7)</td>
<td>276 (72.1)</td>
<td>89 (23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=383)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 10

*Chi Square Goodness-of-Fit for Items 9-11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours required in</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>374.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>367.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field and Clinical</td>
<td>278.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
Participants were asked to rank the training that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers to be more effective teachers. Table 11 shows the results as percentages and also lists the number of answers for each item. More practical training was ranked as the most important. This was followed by the need for more classroom management training. Third in importance was more subject area training. Fourth in importance was more reading area training for the majority of participants, and fifth was more math area training. And finally, the 6th most important ranking in preparing first-time teachers was the “other” category for 35.7%. Similar to the previous results, the Goodness-of-Fit statistics for the rankings of types of training are presented in Table 12.
Table 11

*Rank the type of training that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers to be more effective teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Second in Importance</th>
<th>Third in Importance</th>
<th>Fourth in Importance</th>
<th>Fifth in Importance</th>
<th>Sixth in Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n=376)</td>
<td>% (n=375)</td>
<td>% (n=366)</td>
<td>% (n=366)</td>
<td>% (n=356)</td>
<td>% (n=151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More practical training</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subject area training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reading area training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More math area training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More classroom management skills</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

*Goodness-of-Fit statistic for rankings of types of training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Effective</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>310.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in importance</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third in importance</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth in importance</td>
<td>159.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth in importance</td>
<td>260.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth in importance</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001

Listed as 6th in importance was the “Other” category. Participants were asked to comment on what they thought was important in training effective teachers and several themes were identified. The majority of the 120 comments fit under one of four themes (with frequencies): diversity (32), pedagogical training (24), special education/differentiated instruction/children of varying abilities (18), and dispositions(11). Other (35) comments did not fit into any specific category and did not have more than two occurrences. Tables 13 and 14 contain responses that were representative of those themes as well as examples from the “other” category.
Table 13

Types of training that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers:

Responses to open-ended questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Experience in working with urban students and ESL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and Context Based Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of race and structural and colorblind racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More training to work with a diverse student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with speakers of languages/cultures other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More experience working with children of diverse races, languages, etc. in transformational ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in cultural diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More multicultural education and teaching for social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical training</td>
<td>More research based teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More pedagogy skills/knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big-picture nature of T &amp; L. [teaching and learning]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More pedagogy/methodology training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching learning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a clear rationale for why they teach the way they do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching basic PROCESSES e.g. problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Types of training that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers:*

*Responses to open-ended questions, table continued*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Special education integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with children and youth who have special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration of special education and general education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More differentiation skills, for low and high ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with children of differing abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
<td>Allowed to develop their passionate interests as teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions(ethics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More people of passion and principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical &amp; moral emphasis in the overall Teacher Ed. program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somehow determine candidates’ passion for teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Physical activity training should be in this list as well as reading and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments not</td>
<td>math.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorized</td>
<td>Mental health issues should be a part of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers need to be better writers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers should have MA in field to teach content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>common sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked to rank student teaching experience, expertise in a specific content or subject (such as math, science, history, foreign language, etc.), specific instruction on working with students of varying abilities, and dispositions in level of importance. Participants responded by ranking the training by degree of importance (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th). Table 15 presents how most ranked their answers in terms of the importance: student teaching experience (1st), children of varying abilities (2nd), expertise in a subject area (3rd), and dispositions (4th). The number of answers and percentages for these results are also listed in Table 15.
Table 15

*Importance ranking of clinical, content, pedagogy, and dispositions elements of training for new teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Important ((n=383))</th>
<th>Second in Importance ((n=379))</th>
<th>Third in Importance ((n=378))</th>
<th>Fourth in Importance ((n=378))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student teaching experience</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in a specific content or subject area</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Instruction or coursework on working with children of varying abilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage may not equal 100 due to rounding.
The only difference with the goodness-of-fit statistic for Item 14 was noted in the ranking of 2nd most importance (p < .05). This ranking had a slightly lower degree of confidence than the other rankings in Table 16. This may be due to the similarities in outcomes for the second and third in importance ratings in the expertise in specific content or subject area and the specific instruction in coursework on working with children of varying abilities categories. Table 16 shows the Chi-squared results as well as degrees of freedom and significance of each item.

Table 16

Goodness-of-Fit statistic for rankings of clinical, content, pedagogy and dispositions elements of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in importance</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third in importance</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth in importance</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
***p < .001
Research Question Three

Do teacher educators in Ohio believe that accreditation, standardized testing, and NBPTS are helping to improve the quality of teachers and teacher education?

Survey questions 6, 7, 8, and 12 examined this question and the descriptive data (frequencies and percentages) are presented in Table 17. When asked to what extent did the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards help improve teacher quality, more than three fourth of the participants indicated NBPTS was helpful to some degree. When asked to what extent does the emphasis on dispositions (professional attitudes, values, and beliefs) help to improve teacher quality, more than 86% responded helpful to some degree. When asked to what extent does accreditation help achieve quality teachers, almost 84% responded in the helpful to some degree.

Table 17
Helpfulness of NBPTS, Dispositions, and Accreditation Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>NBPTS f (%)</th>
<th>Dispositions f (%)</th>
<th>Accreditation f (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=377)</td>
<td>(n=400)</td>
<td>(n=399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely helpful</td>
<td>19 (5.0)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
<td>74 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>66 (17.5)</td>
<td>150 (37.5)</td>
<td>142 (35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>201 (53.3)</td>
<td>95 (23.7)</td>
<td>119 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful</td>
<td>72 (19.0)</td>
<td>44 (11)</td>
<td>50 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all helpful</td>
<td>19 (5.0)</td>
<td>11 (2.7)</td>
<td>14 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.
Table 18 indicates how the respondents felt when they were asked if there was too much emphasis placed on passing the prescribed tests to earn a license. More than 45% answered no. Table 12 shows the results from the amount of testing item in terms of frequencies and percentages.

Table 18

*Amount of emphasis on testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there too much?</th>
<th>f/(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>60(15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>173 (45.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382(99.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding

Consistent with the majority of Goodness-of-Fit, Table 19 shows that answers to questions regarding NBPTS, dispositions, accreditation and testing did not follow any prescribed distribution and indicates there were real differences in the survey responses. Chi-squared results as well as degrees of freedom and level of significance are presented in Table 19.
Table 19

*Goodness-of-fit for questions about NBPTS, dispositions, accreditation, and testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS</td>
<td>294.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on testing</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$***

Cross tabulations were run on every survey question. No differences were found comparing every survey question to every demographic question. A cross tabulation was run comparing question two to every demographic question, then question three to every demographic question and so on. Every possible variable was run only to find very weak associations between the variables.

**Qualitative Data**

Qualitative Data were also collected as part of this survey. The final question asked: What else would you like to tell me about your view of the quality of teacher preparation programs? There were two major themes that emerged from the 214 responses. The first theme identified was factors that could be directly controlled inside a department, school, or college of education and the second theme was factors that could be indirectly controlled inside a department, school, or college of education.

The factors identified under the direct control themes were (in order of frequency of responses): field and clinical experiences, selectivity and high standards, dispositions,
differentiated instruction and special education training, pedagogy, diversity, technology, classroom management, and reading instruction.

The factors identified under the indirect control theme were (in order of frequency of responses): NCATE or accreditation issues, faculty, collaboration, mentorship, dealing with bureaucracy, general education core and liberal arts, and use of data. In Table 20 the numbers of responses indicating those factors under direct control appear under the column headed “Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education.” The numbers of responses indicating those factors under indirect control appear in the columns headed “University” and “Public School.”
**Table 20**

*Themes in order of response categorized by locus of control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Public School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field and clinical experiences</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity and High Standards</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction and Special Education Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE or Accreditation Issues</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Bureaucracy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Core</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct Control Theme

Professors of education have direct control over the course work in their department. One aspect that many participants found important was the number of hours teacher candidates spend in the field. One participant wrote: “I think teacher preparation programs are doing a better job in providing earlier experiences for students to be in school settings. Students have many hours of field experiences prior to their student teaching.”

Professors of education also have direct control over the policies approved in their education departments. One participant wrote:

I believe that it is important that we encourage the BEST and BRIGHTEST to pursue a degree in teaching. We need to maintain very HIGH STANDARDS in our programs so the people we send into the classroom are true professionals and are aware of the seriousness of their responsibilities.

Professors of education have control over how lessons are conducted in their own classrooms. Some participants commented that professors and cooperating teachers do not practice what they are teaching in terms of best practices. One participant commented: “Modeling by professors and cooperating teachers may be more important than the content. Placing student teachers in classrooms where best practice is not modeled is counterproductive, but common.”

Participants also commented on dispositions. There were fourteen comments on dispositions of teacher candidates. One comment was:

Good preparation calls for more than mechanical and superficial busy work!
I remain concerned about the emphasis placed on subject matter knowledge, which is often to the exclusion of other forms of knowledge, other skills, dispositions, and understandings of society, social patterns, and democracy. While no one would dispute that a teacher cannot teach what he/she does not know, it is equally clear that no amount of subject matter knowledge can make up for a lack of pedagogical knowledge, dispositions that demonstrate a clear value of the profession, the acts of teaching and learning, and an appreciation for the achievements made by every student in a classroom.

*Indirect Control Theme*

Professors of education have indirect control over many themes written about in question 15. Indirect control in this instance means that through education, training, and lobbying, others outside the world of teacher education can come to understand the importance of teacher education and the need for educating quality teachers.

Professors of education have indirect control over further professionalizing the occupation of teaching. Through continued use of quality control and research based interventions, participants can continue to professionalize the field of teaching. One participant wrote: “We need teacher candidates that have the ability to see the complexity of today’s teacher education. The low pay scale and the lack of professional respect for the field does not send us the top quality candidates.”

Several participants also wrote about the increasing amount of effort that goes into being accredited. One participant commented: “I am overwhelmed as a professor of
education at the sheer volume of standards and assessments; this obfuscates a great deal of thinking and learning in favor of training and preparation.”

This can indirectly be controlled by lobbying others to understand the experiences in departments of education.

Along the same lines, is this comment from a participant:

NCATE Program Reports are extremely important The IHE [Institution of Higher Education] IR [Institutional Report] for the BOE [Board of Examiners] is vital.

I believe in standards, but I think the proliferation of multiple sets of detailed and politically correct standards - including but not limited to the NCATE standards, the subsequent need to align everything with everything, the collection of a plethora of data to provide evidence that "candidates" are actually learning something, and the rush to look and the data and change something -anything - has actually reduced the effectiveness of the courses I teach.

Indirect control over time management issues and the accreditation movement is an important part of improving teacher education.

Summary

This chapter discussed the analysis of data from the administered survey.

Responses to the three research questions were answered. The data analyzed included characteristics of the sample, demographics of participants, and the responses to survey questions analyzed by using Chi-Squared statistics. Qualitative data were analyzed into themes that represented the responses from participants.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

Chapter five of this dissertation includes a summary and discussion of the dissertation. The research problem, review of the methodology, and summary of results are included in this chapter. The discussion of the results include interpretation of the findings, relationship of the current study to previous research, recommendations for educators, and suggestions for additional research.

Statement of the Problem

This dissertation was a study of the opinions of teacher educators as to what makes a quality teacher preparation program. The literature points to many different types of best practices for teachers, teacher educators and teacher education institutions (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; NBPTS, 1998; NCTAF, 1996, U.S. Dept of Education, 1998; Wang et al, 2003). However, almost all of the viewpoints come from stakeholders other than the people responsible for teacher education. For this study, the researcher wanted to understand teacher education from the college/university faculty point of view. It is important to find out how teacher educators describe quality teacher education, because the responsibility falls on them to implement and deliver the instruction to future teachers. There is a need for a study that investigates how teacher educators describe quality teacher education.
Better teachers mean better schools. The purpose of this study is to learn what teacher educators think is important in forming our future teaching force. Their opinions represent the place where theory meets practice in teacher education. Their understandings can inform policies which will improve our schools.

Review of the Methodology

This descriptive study using both qualitative and quantitative data was done to find out what teacher educators in the state of Ohio think about the quality of teacher education.

The following research questions were analyzed:

1. To what extent do teacher educators in Ohio believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching?

2. What are the opinions of teacher educators in Ohio regarding the relative importance of pedagogy, subject areas, and clinical or field experience in teacher preparation programs?

3. Do teacher educators in Ohio believe that accreditation, standardized testing, and NBPTS are helping to improve the quality of teachers and teacher education?

There were 50 teacher education institutions in the state of Ohio, thirteen of which were public universities (Ohio Board of Regents, 2007, ODE, 2007c). Approximately, 2,000 of the target population of teacher educators were working in public universities, and approximately 1,000 were working in private colleges or universities.

A web survey was used to collect data (Dillman, 2007). A copy of the survey is in Appendix C. Participants were informed of the nature of this study in writing through an
email giving information on the study and the general goals of the study and the researcher. IRB approvals were obtained through both Mount Vernon Nazarene University and Ashland University.

Survey Monkey was used to create the web survey. It allowed the researcher to develop a professional looking survey, to collect responses and then analyze the data by downloading the data into an excel spreadsheet.

Participants were asked to fill out a survey via an email link answering both demographic and informational questions. The data analyzed used descriptive statistics and Chi-Squared nominal and ordinal hierarchies.

The number of people that attempted to complete the survey was 491 for an overall response rate of 20%. After taking out the incomplete responses, the number of responders was 404 for a 16% completed survey response rate.

Summary of the Results

Demographics

The majority of the participants were female and white and over 56 years of age. There was a fairly even distribution of level of positions from full professor to associate professor to assistant professor to instructor. Most participants had been in their positions for 0-20 years. A large majority of the participants had been teachers and had an undergraduate education major.

There was a fairly even distribution of participants whose institutions were public and private. The majority of the institutions of the participants were NCATE accredited.
The majority of participants were from institutions that had up to 500 teacher candidates and were in urban or small town areas.

*Research Question One*

To what extent do teacher educators in Ohio believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching?

The majority of participants thought the overall quality of teachers today was better as compared to the quality of teachers in the past. Figure 1 shows this result as well as the percentages of responses to overall quality. The teacher educators surveyed believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching. Figure 2 shows this result as well as levels of preparedness for the three items surveyed.

*Figure 1.* Overall quality of new teachers entering the profession.
Most participants of the study thought that graduates of their own school’s teaching program were prepared to teach the subject matter in their first year of teaching. The majority of the participants thought their school’s graduates were very prepared to maintain order and discipline in the first year of teaching. Most participants thought their graduates were very prepared to work with children of varying abilities during their first year of teaching. These responses were very similar to those of the Deans/Chairpersons in the 2006 MetLife® Teacher survey (MetLife, 2006). Figures 3, 4, and 5 show the
representation of the Ohio responses to the MetLife Teacher survey for the exact same questions asked to all participants.

*Figure 3.* Overall quality of teachers as compared to the MetLife® survey.
**Figure 4.** Preparedness to teach the subject matter as compared to the MetLife® survey.

**Figure 5.** Preparedness to maintain order and discipline as compared to the MetLife® survey.
Figure 6. Preparedness to work with children of varying abilities as compared to the MetLife® survey.

Research Question Two

What are the opinions of teacher educators in Ohio regarding the relative importance of pedagogy, subject areas, and clinical or field experience in teacher preparation programs?

As seen in Figure 7, most participants thought the number of hours required for subject area knowledge related to licensure was about right. The majority of the participants also responded that the hours required in pedagogical knowledge related to licensure were about right. Most participants also responded that the hours required for field and clinical experience related to licensure were about right. Figure 7 further shows the responses to the number of hours for each area identified.
When participants were asked to rank items that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers to be more effective, the majority responded that more practical training was most important, more classroom management training was second in importance, more subject area training was third in importance, more reading area training was fourth in importance, more math area training was fifth in importance, and “other” was sixth in importance. The majority of participants thought the “other” item that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers to be more effective was diversity training. This is not surprising with the current move toward all education departments in the state of Ohio becoming nationally accredited. NCATE standard four, diversity, is one that is under continual work for departments of education (NCATE, 2007a).
When participants were asked to rank items in importance of training new teachers, the majority of participants thought a student teaching experience was most important, second in importance was specific instruction or coursework on working with children of varying abilities, third in importance was expertise in a specific content or subject area (such as math, science, history, foreign language, etc.), and fourth in importance was dispositions (professional attitudes, values and beliefs).

*Research Question Three*

Do teacher educators in Ohio believe that accreditation, standardized testing, and NBPTS are helping to improve the quality of teachers and teacher education?

The majority of participants thought the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has been helpful in improving teacher quality. Most participants responded the emphasis on dispositions has been very helpful to improve teacher quality. Most participants also responded that accreditation that been very helpful to achieve quality teachers. The majority of participants also responded that they did not think too much emphasis was placed on passing the prescribed test to earn a license. Figure 8 further shows the comparisons of items identified as being helpful in improving teacher quality.
Qualitative data results

Several themes became apparent when participants responded to survey question fifteen which asked participants if there was anything else they would like to tell the researchers about their view of the quality of teacher preparation programs. The theme that was mentioned the most was the value of field and clinical experiences, followed by the importance of selectivity and high standards. Other themes that emerged within both direct and indirect control of the teacher education departments (in order of responses) were the importance of dispositions, differentiated instruction and special education training, NCATE or accreditation issues, pedagogy, and faculty,
Discussion of the Results

Teacher educators in Ohio believe that their graduates are well prepared for their first year of teaching. Teacher educators in Ohio believe that field and clinical experience is most important, followed by pedagogy and then subject area in relative importance in teacher preparation programs. Teacher educators in Ohio believe that accreditation, testing, and NBPTS have helped improved the quality of teachers and teacher education programs.

This study shows that most teacher educators feel they have quality programs. Teacher educators believe their programs prepare graduates well for their first year of teaching. They feel most programs are of quality in the state of Ohio. They are pleased with the current emphasis on pedagogy, subject area, and general education requirements. Teacher educators are concerned about the importance of quality in field and clinical experiences. The overall quality of teacher education programs in Ohio is better than in the past.

The importance of field and clinical experience is evident from this research and past research. Teacher educators need to make sure candidates are placed with mentor teachers that will enhance the candidate’s program. One common complaint from this research was the inability of some veteran cooperating teachers to demonstrate effective teaching methods. Along the same lines was the complaint that teacher educators at the college/university level were not demonstrating effective methods of teaching. In order to properly train candidates, teacher educators, cooperating teachers, and mentors need to model effective teaching methods.
NCATE (2007c) continues to refine the meaning of dispositions. The wording has been changed to professional dispositions. Professional dispositions include fairness and the belief that all children can learn. The term social justice has been taken out of the standards. With all of the controversy over the terminology of social justice, it was not surprising that many participants wrote to the importance of dispositions (NCATE, 2007c). Participants also commented on the need to try to further develop dispositions by modeling them as well as the difficulty in measuring dispositions effectively.

Dispositions need to be further developed in teacher candidates. Although dispositions are very important as stated by teacher educators, the measuring and reporting of dispositions seemed to be frustrating for the teacher educators that responded to this study. Continued research and types of measurements are needed in teacher education for dispositions. Figure 9 is a visual representation of these items as they relate to teacher education.
Relationship of the Current Study to Previous Research

The teacher educators, who were the participants in this study, were important to survey because their opinions represent the place where theory meets practice. Formal teacher preparation has been around for more than 100 years; and debating the curriculum of teacher education has been a topic for more than 150 years. Teacher education has been challenged and debated due to increasing bureaucracy. Government
leaders, schools of education and policy makers have made an impact on the goals of public schooling (Spring, 2007). Teacher educators play a key role in training teachers and the point of view of teacher educators in Ohio is especially important to study since their ideas can be transmitted into the K-12 classroom through the teaching of teachers.

Many, if not all, of the best practices discussed in chapters one and two were represented in the qualitative data from the participants. The literature describes four main areas of best practices that include: clinical practice, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge and dispositions (Allen, 2003; Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003; Lasley, Bainbridge, & Berry, 2002). All of these best practices were thoroughly discussed in the data.

Teachers cannot teach what they do not know (National Council for Teacher Quality, 2007). According to the NCTAF (2003) a requirement of being a good teacher is having a deep knowledge base of the subjects area in which they teach. Strong academic preparation is a quality attribute in teacher education programs. NCTQ (2007) stated that teacher education programs often require too many courses in pedagogy without enough hours spent on electives and subject area courses. This was not the case at all in the responses from teacher educators in Ohio. The data from this study rebukes the NCTQ study. Ohio requires a major of at least 60 semester hours for secondary teachers.

Chapters one and two previously discussed the bureaucracy that seems to be prevalent in teacher education (Spring, 2006; Wise, 1979). The relationship of this study to previous research is much the same in that teacher educators need to continue to work towards a professional body of knowledge. However, in an effort to create a professional
body of knowledge, we seem to create more bureaucracy. Thus we experience the
continued dissatisfaction of teacher education. A call to be a lifelong learner and to
continue to improve on teacher education seems to be very important to teacher
educators.

Recommendations for Educators

It is important to continue research in teacher education by involving teacher
educators. The data in this study support the recommendations in the literature for more
effective teacher mentors (Larabee, 2004). Seeking out qualified faculty to serve as
cooperating teachers and university supervisors for each field experience in a candidate’s
program is important. A high quality student teaching experience with an experienced
mentor teacher is key to providing the best teacher education program possible, as
supported in the literature by NCTAF (2003). These components were at the top of the
list of qualitative data that was reported. In response to the importance of having
effective cooperating teacher and university supervisors, the state of Ohio should
embrace Professional Development Schools (PDSs). Ohio should become a PDS state
which would allow increased funding for PDSs and therefore improve the quality of not
only pre-service teachers but also in-service teachers through the use of sustained
professional development. This concept is supported by the data in this study about
PDSs (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

Another component about which teacher educators expressed frustrations
according to the qualitative data presented in Chapter Four was dispositions. Educators
should also continue to explore how to evaluate and foster dispositions in prospective
teachers as addressed in the literature (Talbert-Johnson, 2006). Evaluation of
dispositions worried teacher educators due to the sometimes ambiguous nature of trying
to quantitatively rate a candidate’s attitude (NCATE, 2007c). Evaluation of dispositions
can include components of rapport and interaction with students, respect and sensitivity
to students, social justice and service to others, showing professionalism, self-knowledge
and tolerance of situational ambiguity, as well as demonstrating initiative, and having
high standards for all students. The education community has found the importance of
dispositions and realizes the necessity of continued research in the area of professional
attitudes, values and beliefs that all children can learn.

Teacher educators see the importance of subject matter knowledge as much less a
problem than discipline and classroom management (Price & Nelson, 2007). Subject
matter preparedness in some form (ranging from the choices of extremely prepared, very
prepared, and prepared) were 92%. Classroom management and use of effective
discipline is the classroom was 78% preparedness to some degree in the Ohio survey.
New teachers feel the same way about wanting more training and practice with classroom
management skills and discipline. Teachers and principals feel new teachers know their
content area(s) (MetLife, 2006).

Suggestions for Additional Research

The expectation that teacher education programs in Ohio were homogeneous was
not met. This is because of the number of standards to which programs must conform in
order to earn accreditation. Standards from both the Ohio Department of Education and
NCATE are infused into each unit’s conceptual framework. A conceptual framework is
the underlying mission that drives the goals and operation of the education unit (NCATE, 2007a). However, the qualitative data where many different respondents discussed their particular programs—showed that each program in the state of Ohio has a unique conceptual framework. An area for further research is to explore the conceptual frameworks of each of the 50 teacher education programs in the state to allow further understandings of the similarities and differences among the programs that educated the more than 5,000 Ohio teachers that graduate each year (Teacher Quality Partnership, 2006).

Asking the total number of hours each department required in their field and clinical experiences would further help in order to further examine the differences in programs. Since field and clinical experiences were the most emergent theme from the qualitative data, this would allow further investigation into the practice of teacher education. Also asking the participants their area of expertise would allow the researcher to further understand the responses due to some differences among early childhood, middle childhood and adolescent/young adult programs. Asking these same questions to principals, as was done in the MetLife survey may also prove beneficial to further compare the results.

Limitations of the Study

Since this study is limited to Ohio, it cannot be generalized to other states. This study also had nearly equal public and private representation from teacher educators in Ohio’s universities and colleges which may make the results different from other states.
However, the responses in this study were very similar to responses in the survey conducted by MetLife (2006) that was a national survey.

Due to the under representation of males and participants under of the age of 56, the researcher suggests seeking out participants that are male and less than 56 years of age. Including more qualitative data would give participants the opportunity to explain and discuss why they feel teachers are better now than in the past. It would also give them the opportunity to discuss the history and the evolution of teacher education programs at their institutions.

Conclusion

A summary and discussion of the dissertation were in this chapter. Also included in this chapter were the research problem, review of the methodology, and summary of results. The results were discussed in terms of interpretation of the findings, relationship of the current study to previous research, recommendations for educators, and suggestions for additional research.
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APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM AND EMAIL LETTER
CONSENT FORM

“Teaching Teachers: The Curriculum of Teacher Education”

A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

Amy Biggs is conducting a research study to help understand what a quality teacher education program looks like. You are being asked to participate because your experience in teacher education is invaluable to this study.

B. PROCEDURES

If you agree to be in the study, the following will occur:
You will be asked to click on a link to fill out an online survey. The total amount of time will be approximately 10 minutes.

C. RISKS/DISCOMFORTS

1. No risk or discomfort is expected as a result of participating in this survey.

2. If you feel uncomfortable you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

3. Confidentiality: Participation in research will be confidential.

D. BENEFITS

There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information that you provide may help educators to better understand how to make a difference in teacher education.

E. COSTS

There will be no costs to you as a result of taking part in this study.

F. PAYMENT

You will not receive a payment for your participation.

G. QUESTIONS

If you have further questions, you may contact the researcher at 740-392-6868 x 3419.

If you have any comments or concerns about participation in this study, you should first talk with the researchers. If for some reason you do not wish to do this, you may contact
the Human Subjects Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the board office between 8:00 and 5:00, Monday through Friday, by calling or writing Ashland University, Randy Gearhart, Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, Phone: (419) 207-6198, Fax: (419) 289-5460, E-mail: rgearhar@ashland.edu

H. CONSENT

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. Your decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on your present or future status as a student, teacher, or professor.
Dear Colleague:

My name is Amy Biggs. I am a doctoral student at Ashland University and an Assistant Professor at Mount Vernon Nazarene University. I am conducting a dissertation study about the quality of teacher education in Ohio.

You are being asked to participate because your experience in teacher education is invaluable to this study.

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address; please do not forward this message.

Thanks for your participation!

Please see my MVNU faculty page for more information:
http://www.mvnu.edu/facstaff/professors/Education/abiggs.asp

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from the mailing list.
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

Respectfully,
Amy M. Biggs
Assistant Professor of Education
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
800 Martinsburg Road
Mt. Vernon, OH 43050
abiggs@mvnu.edu
(740) 392-6868 x3419
APPENDIX B

PERMISSION LETTER FROM METLIFE
Subject: Re: permission to use survey

Created By: rlove1@metlife.com

Scheduled Date:

Creation Date: 5/12/2008 11:22 AM

From: "Rick Love" <rlove1@metlife.com>

Dear Amy,

Thank you for your request. We are pleased to give you permission to use questions from the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher: Expectations and Experiences 2006 as part of your doctoral research. Please cite the Survey appropriately.

With best wishes for your research,

Sincerely,

Rick Love

A. Richardson Love, Jr.
Program Manager, Education
MetLife Foundation
27-01 Queens Plaza North, Area 5C-302C
Long Island City, NY 11101
tel. 212-578-2419
fax: 212-578-0617
e-mail: rlove1@metlife.com

“Amy Biggs”<Amy.Biggs@mvnu.edu>

05/12/2008 11:13 AM

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
May 12, 2008

Dear Mr. Rick Love:

As a doctoral student in educational leadership at Ashland University in Ashland, Ohio
and a graduate education professor at Mount Vernon Nazarene University, I am very interested in The MetLife Survey of *The American Teacher: Expectations and Experiences 2006, A Survey of Teachers, Principals, and Leaders of College Education Programs*. This is a wonderful study that your company had done. I applaud your efforts to learn more about teachers and how to improve teacher education and therefore improve the future of our students.

I am interested in using several of your questions you used to interview deans and ask these same questions to private university teacher educators in Ohio. I am writing to ask permission to use several of your questions and scale to perform my own study. I am in the process of writing my dissertation on the topic of what teacher educators think need done to improve teacher education.

Thank you,
Amy M. Biggs

Doctoral Candidate, Ashland University

Amy M. Biggs
Assistant Professor of Graduate Education
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
800 Martinsburg Road
Mt. Vernon, OH 43050
abiggs@mvnu.edu
(740) 392-6868 x3419
1-800-839-2355 option 2 then x3419
Fax (740) 397-2918
APPENDIX C

SURVEY
Informed Consent

CONSENT FORM

"Teaching Teachers:
The Curriculum of Teacher Education"

A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

Amy Biggs is conducting a research study to help understand what a quality teacher education program looks like. You are being asked to participate because your experience in teacher education is invaluable to this study.

B. PROCEDURES

If you agree to be in the study, the following will occur:
You will be asked to click on a link to fill out an online survey. The total amount of time will be approximately 10 minutes.

C. RISKS/DISCOMFORTS

1. No risk or discomfort is expected as a result of participating in this survey.

2. If you feel uncomfortable you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

3. Confidentiality: Participation in research will be confidential.

D. BENEFITS

There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information that you provide may help educators to better understand how to make a difference in teacher education.

E. COSTS

There will be no costs to you as a result of taking part in this study.

F. PAYMENT

You will not receive a payment for your participation.

G. QUESTIONS

If you have further questions, you may contact the researcher at 740-392-6868 x 3419.

If you have any comments or concerns about participation in this study, you should first talk with the researchers. If for some reason you do not wish to do this, you may contact the Human Subjects Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the board office between 8:00 and 5:00, Monday through Friday, by calling or writing Ashland University, Randy Gearhart, Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, Phone: (419) 287-6198, Fax: (419) 289-9466, E-mail: rgearhart@ashland.edu

H. CONSENT

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. Your decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on your present or future status as a student, teacher, or professor.

* 1. Do you agree to the above consent form?

☐ Yes, I agree to the above consent form.

☐ No, I don't agree to the above consent form.
Questions 2-5 are reprinted with permission from MetLife. Questions are from The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2006: Expectations and Experiences, A survey of teachers, principals, and leaders of college education programs.

2. Is the overall quality of new teachers entering the profession today better, worse or about the same as the quality of new teachers in the past?
   - Better (5)
   - About the same (4)
   - Depends (3)
   - Not sure (2)
   - Worse (1)

3. Overall, how prepared are graduates of your school’s teaching program to teach the subject matter in their first teaching position?
   - Extremely prepared (5)
   - Very prepared (4)
   - Prepared (3)
   - Somewhat prepared (2)
   - Not at all prepared (1)

4. Overall, how prepared are graduates of your school’s teaching program to maintain order and discipline in their first year of teaching?
   - Extremely prepared (5)
   - Very prepared (4)
   - Prepared (3)
   - Somewhat prepared (2)
   - Not at all prepared (1)

5. Overall, how prepared are graduates of your school’s teaching program to work with children of varying abilities during their first year of teaching?
   - Extremely prepared (5)
   - Very prepared (4)
   - Prepared (3)
   - Not too prepared (2)
   - Not at all prepared (1)
6. To what extent has National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) helped improve teacher quality?
   - Extremely helpful (5)
   - Very helpful (4)
   - Helpful (3)
   - Not helpful (2)
   - Not at all helpful (1)

7. To what extent does the emphasis on dispositions (professional attitudes, values, and beliefs) help improve teacher quality?
   - Extremely helpful (5)
   - Very helpful (4)
   - Helpful (3)
   - Not very helpful (2)
   - Not at all helpful (1)

8. To what extent does your accreditation help achieve quality teachers?
   - Extremely helpful (5)
   - Very helpful (4)
   - Helpful (3)
   - Not too helpful (2)
   - Not at all helpful (1)
9. Are the hours required for subject area knowledge (for example, English, Chemistry, Social Studies) related to licensure...
   - Too high
   - About right
   - Too low

10. Are the hours required in pedagogical knowledge related to licensure...
    - Too high
    - About right
    - Too low

11. Are the hours required for field and clinical experience related to licensure...
    - Too high
    - About right
    - Too low

12. Do you think too much emphasis is placed on passing the prescribed tests to earn a license to teach?
    - Yes
    - Not sure
    - No

13. Rank the following that would be most helpful in preparing first-time teachers to be more effective teachers? Would it be...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More practical training</th>
<th>More subject area training</th>
<th>More reading area training</th>
<th>More math area training</th>
<th>More classroom management skills</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill in OTHER, if you choose this option.
14. Rank the following in importance of training of new teachers. Please rank the following items in level of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A student teaching experience</th>
<th>Expertise in a specific content or subject area (such as math, science, history, foreign language, children of varying abilities, etc.)</th>
<th>Specific instruction or coursework on working with dispositions (professional attitudes, values, and beliefs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth in importance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. (OPTIONAL)
What else would you like to tell me about your view of the quality of teacher preparation programs?
16. What is your position? Are you a ...?
- Professor of Education
- Associate Professor of Education
- Assistant Professor of Education
- Instructor of Education
- Staff member
- Other

17. What is your school affiliation?
- Public
- Private

18. What accreditation does your unit have?
- NCATE
- TEAC
- Other

19. Is the area where your school is located considered inner city, urban, suburban, small town, or rural?
- Inner city
- Urban
- Suburban
- Small town
- Rural

20. In total, how many students are enrolled in your teacher preparation program?
- 1 to 249
- 250 to 499
- 500 to 999
- 1000+

21. How many years have you served in your current position?
- 0 to 5
- 6 to 20
- 21+
22. At any point in your career have you ever taught full time in an elementary or secondary school classroom?
   - Yes
   - No

23. What was your undergraduate major?
   - Education
   - Other

24. Gender
   - Female
   - Male

25. Age range
   - Less than 25
   - 26 to 35
   - 36 to 45
   - 46 to 55
   - 56+

26. Race/ Ethnicity
   - White
   - African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Asian or Pacific Islander
   - Mixed racial background
   - Other
Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX D

IRB APPROVALS
TO: Amy Biggs  
FROM: Randy Gearhart, Chair
DATE: May 5, 2008
RE: Human Subjects Review Board Approval

The Human Subjects Review Board has approved the research proposal you submitted. You may proceed with this project.

The primary function of the HSRB is to ensure protection of human research subjects. As a result of this mandate, we ask that you pay close attention to the fundamental ethical principles of autonomy, justice, and beneficence when establishing your research proposal. These ethical principles pertain specifically to the issues of informed consent, fair selection of subjects, and risk/benefit considerations.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Randy Gearhart  
Phone: 419-207-6198  
Fax: 419-289-5460  
E-mail: rgearhart@ashland.edu
Amy Biggs
Education

Dear Amy,

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has received your application entitled, What Should We Teach Teachers?, and has deemed it to fall under the Expedited review category. On June 6, 2008, the IRB reviewed, accepted, and endorsed your application with no additional conditions. Should any aspect of your research project be changed, the IRB should be notified to verify if any additional review needs to be conducted. That notification should be directed to Kenny McQuitty, IRB Staff Administrator. Additionally, if the research study extends longer than one year from the beginning date of June 6, 2008, a renewal application should be completed and submitted to the IRB prior to two weeks before the expiration date.

This letter is your official notification of the IRB approval and should be kept as part of your research records. The IRB extends its best wishes to your research project.

Should you have any further questions, please direct those to Kenny McQuitty. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joyce C. Miller, Ph.D., M.T. (ASCP)
IRB Chair
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
740.397.9000 ext. 3212
joyce.miller@mvnu.edu