1-1-2013

A Case Study Seeking Indicators of Coherence in a PETE Program

Robert John Doan
University of South Carolina

A Case Study Seeking Indicators of Coherence in a PETE Program

by

Robert John Doan

Bachelor of Science
Grand Valley State University, 2005

Master of Science
Winthrop University, 2010

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Physical Education

College of Education

University of South Carolina

2013

Accepted by:

Murray Mitchell, Major Professor

Karen French, Committee Member

Panayiotis Doutis, Committee Member

Robert Johnson, Committee Member

Lacy Ford, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

DEDICATION

To my beautiful wife: Sara. I am so thankful that God has given me a soul mate that loves and supports me through the good times and bad. Thank you Sara for being the glue that holds our family together.

To my wonderful kids who I love so much: Lauryn, Ty, Ashlynn, and Trey. I know daddy has not been around and I have been working long hours. I look forward to spending more quality time with you and watching you grow up to be successful children. I love you all very much.

To my parents who have supported me through the years: Ronald and Peggy Doan. Thank you for your love and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Mitchell, Dr. French, Dr. Doutis, and Dr. Johnson for displaying such patience during all of the time they spent with me on this dissertation. I have really enjoyed and felt honored to work with them at University of South Carolina. Their professionalism and dedication to the lives of each student makes them great role models in the profession.

I would also like to thank the faculty, instructor, and students who participated in the study. Without them, I would not have been able to complete this project.

Last I would like to thank the graduate students who have been riding the roller coaster with me. I thank you for supporting me through all the twist and turns of graduate school.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest was the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. Teacher educators have been challenged to respond to a variety of forces and to design more effective programs of teacher preparation. There are at least two challenges for teacher educators to respond to these challenges to their effectiveness. One challenge is that there is little empirical research focused on teacher educators themselves (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Korthagen, 2001; Maguire, 1994). A second challenge is that many teacher educators have allowed periodic accreditation reviews to serve as proxy measures of program effectiveness (Metzler & Tjeerdsma (2000). The present study is responsive to both of these challenges. A case study of a single facet of one program can potentially provide PETE faculty with a model of introspection, such models being rare in the literature. Understanding how the faculty in one program perceive and can articulate the goals of one aspect of the program provides insight into the actual rather than theoretical existence of program coherence. Furthermore, the intentions, delivery, and received messages surrounding one significant course provide even deeper insights into the notion of coherence. Six faculty members and students from the course were recruited for this study. Through interviews, observations, and artifact analysis, the shared visions of how educational gymnastics fits into the overall goals of the PETE program were explored. Results indicated faculty members had a shared understanding of the components of a

total program, and where this course “fits” into the PETE program. There was less consensuses on the specific components of the course or how it “fits” into the overall teacher preparation program. There was even less consensus when comparing visions of students to the vision of faculty. These findings are not an end but a beginning. With the information generated in this type of study, faculty members can explore where their agreements and disagreements exist and decide what steps must be taken to reinforce or change program attributes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

ABSTRACT v

LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

PROGRAM COHERENCE 2

LIMITED WORK ON PETE, TEACHER EDUCATION, AND TEACHER EDUCATORS 3

WE CAN BETTER PREPARE TEACHERS 6

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 6

RESEARCH QUESTIONS 7

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 7

ASSUMPTIONS 8

LIMITATIONS 9

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE 11

TEACHER EDUCATORS 11

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS 16

A CLOSER LOOK IN PETE 22

COHERENCE/SHARED BELIEFS 27

DEFINING COHERENCE 28

Aspects of coherence 29
vision of a coherent teacher preparation program 30
curriculum 34
coherence missing in today's teacher education programs 37
research design 38
case study 39
Interview 41
observations 42
Review of literature summary 42
Chapter 3: methods 44
Research design and rationale 44
research questions 45
instrument development 45
Site and Participants 49
Collection of data 52
measuring of coherence 54
Treatment of data 55
Chapter 4: Results and discussions 62
research question one 62
Research question two 69
research question three 85
research question four 95
Research question five 113

Summary of chapter four 123

Chapter 5: conclusions, implications, suggestions for future research 124

conclusions 124

implications 128

New directions 128

References 131

Appendix A faculty interview guide 142

Appendix B student interview guide 145

appendix c First instructor interview guide 148

appendix d Second instructor interview guide 150

appendix E teaching evaluation tool 153

Appendix F Ground rules for teacher evaluation tool 156

appendix G content development tool 161

Appendix h Course syllabus 163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Conceptual Orientation to Teacher Education 24

Table 2.2 Indicators of Program Coherence 36

Table 4.1 Categories Identified by Faculty 64

Table 4.2 Emphasis of the Course – Faculty Percentages 71

Table 4.3 Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program - Faculty 73

Table 4.4 Expected Student Knowledge/Skills - Faculty 74

Table 4.5 Expected Student Values/Attitudes – Faculty 76

Table 4.6 Thoughts on Assessment/SCPEAP – Faculty 79

Table 4.7 Behaviors of Effective Teaching – Faculty 82

Table 4.8 Emphasis of the Course – Faculty/Instructor 86

Table 4.9 Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program – Faculty/Instructor 88

Table 4.10 Expected Student Knowledge/Skills – Faculty/Instructor 89

Table 4.11 Expected Student Values/Attitudes – Faculty/Instructor 91

Table 4.12 Thoughts on Assessment/SCPEAP – Faculty/Instructor 93

Table 4.13 Behaviors of Effective Teaching – Faculty/Instructor 94

Table 4.14 Objectives for Course 96

Table 4.15 Objective One 97

Table 4.16 Objective Two 99

Table 4.17 Objective Three 100

Table 4.18 Objective Four 101

Table 4.19 Objective Five.....102

Table 4.20 Objective Six.....103

Table 4.21 Objective Seven.....104

Table 4.22 Emphasis of the Course – Faculty/Instructor/Instructor Perceived.....105

Table 4.23 Handouts from Course.....108

Table 4.24 Criteria for Sequence Two.....109

Table 4.25 Teacher Evaluation Scores.....110

Table 4.26 Content Development Scores.....112

Table 4.27 Emphasis on the Course – Faculty/Instructors/Student.....114

Table 4.28 Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program – Faculty/Instructor/ Student..116

Table 4.29 Expected Student Knowledge/Skills – Faculty/Instructor/Student.....117

Table 4.30 Expected Student Values/Attitudes – Faculty/Instructor/Student.....118

Table 4.31 Thoughts on Assessment/SCPEAP – Faculty/Instructor/Student.....120

Table 4.32 Behaviors of Effective Teaching – Faculty/Instructor/Student.....121

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Physical education teacher education (PETE) programs and the faculty who staff them are responsible for preparing teachers who, for generations, will influence the lives of children. In times of limited resources and cutbacks, doing more with less has become standard operating procedure. In the context of ensuring that PETE programs are effectively using available resources, there is evidence to suggest that coherent programs can have a substantive impact on the preparation of future teachers (Graber 1993; Lawson, 1983, 1986; Rovegno, 1992, 1993). Seeking indicators of coherence in a PETE program has the potential to inform how to best prepare physical education teachers, with at least one caveat. Identifying coherence may simply indicate that a unified message is being delivered, without attending to the validity of the message. Therefore, two separate lines of inquiry are indicated as important: Coherence and message validity. Focal in this study is seeking evidence of coherence. Lest the obvious be missed, coherence may not look exactly the same in every program, especially since PETE programs exist within the context of their institution.

Not all colleges and universities are the same. Teacher education programs within different types of institutions also differ because of school administrators, institutional constraints such as quota systems, and above all, the vested interests of faculty (Lawson 1981). In these different colleges and universities, there have been concerns that focus on the currency and adequacy of the curriculum, problems with

program coherence, and appropriate teacher skill development in teacher preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Ingvarson, Elliott, Kleinhenz, & McKenzie, 2006; Kelly, 2006; Zeichner, 2010). While not all of these problems can be examined in one study, the concern of particular interest in this investigation surrounds the vision of coherence. When faculty members disagree, it can result in students receiving contradictory expectations, information, and sanctions, which may limit program effectiveness (Lawson, 1981). There are at least two levels on which the notion of coherence can be examined; As an overall program attribute, or, as the behavior of individual faculty members.

Program Coherence

Program coherence has rarely been systematically explored or methodologically defined in the literature. Only a few authors have offered definitions of coherence (Buchmann & Floden, 1993; Hammerness, 2006; Tatto, 1996). Tatto (1996) defined coherence ‘‘in terms of shared understandings among faculty and in the manner in which opportunities to learn have been arranged (organizationally, logistically) to achieve a common goal—that of educating professional teachers with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to more effectively teach diverse students’’ (p. 176).

Bateman, Taylor, Janik, and Logan (2007) stated a fundamental principle of educational practice is the need for alignment among curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The authors added that in a coherent or aligned curriculum, all components in the teaching system (e.g., the curriculum and its intended outcomes, the teaching methods, the learning activities, the assessment tasks, and the resources to support learning) are aligned. Biggs and Tang (2011) stated when these conditions have not been

met the learner may find it challenging to learn. There is a connection between instructional goals and student assessment in coherent programs (Crooks, 1988; Wiggins, 1993).

Darling-Hammond (2006) provided an image of what a coherent teacher preparation program could look like. Her vision included both conceptual and structural coherence, and included coursework that is:

> carefully sequenced based upon a strong theory of learning to teach; courses are designed to intersect with each another, are aggregated into a well-understood landscape of learning, and are tightly interwoven with the advisement process and students' work in schools. Subject matter learning is brought together with content pedagogy through courses that treat them together; program sequences also create cross-course links. Faculty plan together and syllabi are shared across university divisions as well as within departments. Virtually all of the closely interrelated courses involve applications in classrooms where observations or student teaching occur. These classrooms, in turn, are selected because the rooms model the kind of practice that is discussed in courses and advisement. In such intensely coherent programs, core ideas are reiterated across courses and theoretical frameworks animating courses and assignments are consistent across the program. (p. 306)

In summary, program coherence is characterized by the presence of a shared vision and common purpose across courses and faculty. Students enrolled in such programs receive the same fundamental messages about mission, regardless of the specific courses they are taking. There is another level of coherence that warrants attention—that of individual instructors within programs. Do teacher educators deliver a message within their courses that is consistent with the overall program message?

Limited Work on Physical Education Teacher Education and Teacher Educators

Lawson (1991) stated that research on PETE professors is important because these professors play pivotal roles in the reproduction and transformation of work practices in physical education. An example of the importance of research on PETE

professors is that it can offer immediate and long-term data regarding the impact of doctoral programs. During a time when universities are playing a major role in school reform, research on PETE professors who participate in the improvement and reform of school programs is imperative. Research on PETE professors may yield important knowledge about personal, behavioral, and organizational facilitators and constraints for this kind of work.

Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000) argued quality K-12 physical education programs are dependent upon quality PETE programs. The goal of physical education programs, according to Hill and Brodin (2004), is to produce highly competent and effective teachers. Bahneman (1996) argued "The nature and quality of future physical education programs will depend largely on the insights and commitments of professionals responsible for future curricular decision making" (p.198). To run an effective program, PETE faculty members should systematically review their curricula in reference to the ultimate programmatic goal of producing effective physical educators.

After the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), there was heightened awareness in the United States of teacher education programs. More attention was given to teacher education programs because of the substandard conditions of the public school systems. The reasoning in the report centered on seeking a better understanding of how teachers were being prepared if they were unable to cope successfully with the demands of public schools.

Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998) asserted that if schools were failing, teachers could be contributing to that failure. Kramer (2000) extended this thought with the suggestion that one could take a step further and place the responsibility for the failure of public

schools on the inadequacy of the country's teacher preparation programs. In effect, *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was a major factor for drawing attention to teacher education programs. Not only was there intent to make the programs *different*, but also there was a push to make them more *effective* by achieving specific program goals and objectives (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 1998; 2000).

Teacher education programs have been called to change from a variety of sources. Foremost in calls for reform has been The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and foundations such at The Carnegie Commission and The Holmes Group. Within physical education, concern has been voiced by the main professional group, The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Dance (AAHPERD), most specifically through the subgroup of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). More subtle forces driving change in teacher preparation can be found in the rise of alternative teacher education programs, changing accreditation requirements and the demographic shift of public school student populations (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1996).

The call for more effective teacher education programs is also coming from sources internal to institutions preparing teachers, including administrators, individual departments and individual faculty members (Howey, 1996). And, these individual institutional efforts may be the most effective starting place due to what is presently known about teacher preparation programs.

Teacher education has been described as a set of disconnected individual courses rather than a carefully constructed and integrated learning experience informed by a

cohesive vision of teaching and learning (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Lanier & Little, 1986; Tom, 1997). Ducharme and Ducharme (1996) found that most of what is known about effective teacher education programs comes from limited studies of isolated program components. Hence, it may be more important for internal sources to be the agents for assessment and change, locally.

We Can Better Prepare Teachers

Bateman et al. (2007) stated teachers have enjoyed a certain level of autonomy where they are seldom held accountable to the students or to each other for following institutional and departmental curriculum decisions and policies. In order to attain a more coherent curriculum, all teachers to examine the curriculum they teach and assess individually, as well as collectively with fellow faculty, to make adjustments deemed necessary.

So, if coherence offers some promise for yielding more effective teacher preparation, the concept warrants further investigation. To study coherence broadly is more than can be adequately addressed in one study, and teacher preparation programs appear to be characterized more by differences and disarray than by similarity and coherence. It seems logical, therefore, to propose a study of a single program within one discipline at a single institution.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest was the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. Perceptions of the pedagogy faculty toward the role to be played by this

course represent one aspect of coherence of the overall program. Likewise, the perceptions of the faculty member teaching the class, as compared to the actual delivery of the course, speaks to the coherence of how this course fits into the curriculum. Last, the perspective of students toward the purposes and delivery of this course provide yet another insight into the potential for coherence of this piece of an overall teacher preparation curriculum.

Research Questions

1. To what extent can PETE faculty articulate the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?
2. To what extent is there a consistent or shared vision of the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?
3. Does the view of the role of the unique content course as held by the instructor match the views of other faculty in the program?
4. Does the view of the role of the unique content course espoused by the instructor match the delivery of the course?
5. Do student views of the purposes of the unique content course match instructor and/or faculty views of the purpose of the course?

Significance of the Study

Teacher educators have been challenged to respond to a variety of forces and to design more effective programs of teacher preparation. There are at least two challenges for teacher educators to respond to these challenges to their effectiveness. One challenge is that there is little empirical research focused on teacher educators themselves (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Korthagen, 2001; Maguire, 1994). A second challenge is

that many teacher educators have allowed periodic accreditation reviews to serve as proxy measures of program effectiveness (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000). The present study is responsive to both of these challenges.

A case study of a single facet of one program can potentially produce a model of introspection of PETE faculty that is rare in the literature. Understanding how the faculty in one program perceive and can articulate the goals of one aspect of the program provides insight into the actual rather than theoretical existence of program coherence. Furthermore, the intentions, delivery, and received messages surrounding one significant course provide even deeper insights into the notion of coherence. Put differently, if effective programs are characterized by coherent delivery, what does that look like? Once coherence can be more explicitly identified and quantified in the field, then comparisons across programs can be explored and accompanying indicators of effectiveness can be pursued. A critical first step is to identify and quantify what coherence looks like in a PETE program.

Assumptions

Four key assumptions were made in this study. The first assumption was that PETE faculty would honestly respond to inquiries about the goals of their teacher preparation program. Second, the instructor who taught the course under investigation taught it in the same way she has done in prior semesters when no research was being done. Third, students were able to honestly respond to inquiries about their experiences in the course. Four, thick descriptions observed in this program and the role of this course within the program will provide useful insights to others who wish to study their own PETE program.

Limitations

There are at least seven substantive limitations to this study.

1. This was a case study. Hence, the findings are limited to the population studied. Any generalization beyond the populations studied must be drawn by readers who must estimate the similarities of the program described to their own circumstances.
2. One major data collection strategy included individual interviews with faculty. The accuracy of what faculty chose to share with a doctoral student in their own program is limited by the extent to which each faculty member was willing to be truthful. It is possible that some may have been unwilling to appear critical of colleagues or may have struggled to recall completely all details asked of them. Member checks were used to provide faculty members with an opportunity to reflect upon their responses to questions and to offer clarifications.
3. Another major data collection strategy included interviews with students. Students were actively pursuing their degree within the department and were interviewed by an instructor in the program—the author. It is possible that students may have felt some pressure to provide answers in ways that they believed were supportive of the program and thereby increasing their chances for favorable grades or future considerations. The investigator had no authority to contribute to the grades of students in this course and all were volunteers. None of the students in the present study were concurrently being taught by the investigator during the semester under study and all responses were triangulated with observations and faculty interviews.

4. Lessons were videotaped across the semester. It is possible that simply being videotaped changed the behavior of the instructor and/or the students. Prolonged engagement across the entire semester was one strategy used to address this potential limitation. The instructor and students in this particular program are very accustomed to being videotaped and the cameras used were placed unobtrusively out of the line of sight of students and the instructor.
5. Cognitive based lessons were excluded in verifying the instructor taught effectively using the evaluation tools identified in chapter three. Even though the instructor taught toward objectives during the cognitive lessons, this study focused primarily on the use of the psychomotor domain.
6. The framing of questions may have been confusing to participants. The participants were asked to give their beliefs as to what should be happening in the course. Participants may have construed the question and responded with their perceptions as to what is actually taking place in the course. This is subject interpretation by the researcher.
7. The last limitation identified in this study was the timing of the interviews. A majority of the interviews were conducted 1.5 years after the course was conducted. The time lapse might have been problematic in the reflection and ability of the instructor and the students to remember aspects of the course.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest was the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. This study was designed to address specific holes in the professional literature and there are four major topics that must be considered in the design and interpretation of results of this investigation.

First, little is known about teacher educators (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Maguire, 1994). Teacher educators have been focal in some studies and PETE faculty members are one type of teacher educator that must be situated in this larger context of all faculty members. What is known about these important contributors to preparing future teachers must be reviewed. Second, teacher educators operate within the context of a specific type of teacher education program. There is more than one type of PETE program and a better understanding of these kinds of preparation programs must be addressed. Third, with an understanding of the individuals involved and the types of programs where these individuals work, the concept of coherence must be explored. The fourth area of literature warranting attention involves the methods appropriate for examining a content course within a PETE program.

Teacher Educators

It is well documented that there is limited research on teacher education (Grundy& Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Korthagen, 2001; Maguire, 1994; Murray & Male;

2005). There are even fewer studies when teacher education is broken down into sub-disciplines (i.e. PETE). Lawson (1991) identified research on PETE faculty as limited and any research on PETE faculty has merit. PETE faculty members play pivotal roles in the reproduction and transformation of work practices in physical education. Lawson suggested if we truly want to produce better physical education teachers, we need to study the professors who are preparing them.

The limited research on teacher educators seems to be a huge flaw in teacher education. Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005) proclaimed individual teacher educators as being the most important factor regarding pupil learning and achievement. If one believes this claim, then the literature should be flooded with studies on teacher educators. With regards to teacher educators being the main factor in student learning, more information should be obtained identifying key traits of teacher educators.

Information on teacher education professors (Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989) and PETE professors is growing. Research on PETE professors has included data of scholarly behaviors (Mitchell, 1990), PETE professors' perceptions of the effectiveness of graduates from their programs (Placek & Dodds, 1990), an ethnographic account of life as a teacher educator (Schempp & Graber, 1990), insights into relationships between teacher-education reform and teacher educators (Scott, 1990), PETE professors' perceptions of teaching behaviors of effective general physical educators (Waugh, 2010), and descriptions of various work roles (Williamson, 1990). These are just a few areas of research on PETE professors, but there are many more areas needed. Additionally, more studies are needed to understand the new generation of PETE professors and how some of the above research areas have changed.

Lawson (1991) identified justifications for examining PETE professors: (a) to enhance the understanding of opportunities and constraints surrounding the work of PETE professors; (b) to provide insights into how PETE professors are similar to and different from other kinds of teacher education professors and other kinds of professors; (c) to provide career counseling and faculty-development systems for professors; (d) to provide immediate and long-term indications of the impact of doctoral programs; (e) to understand and assess preservice teacher-certification programs; (f) to help PETE professors perform better as teachers, researchers, and/or change agents through interventionist work; and (g) to understand PETE professors as participants in efforts aimed at the improvement and reform of schools. With these justifications, it is easy to see the need to examine PETE professors. The professors come from different doctoral institutions and work in different PETE programs. Hence, a better understanding of PETE professors is justified.

O'Sullivan (2003) suggested there is little empirical work to support decisions of teacher educators in PETE programs. However, teacher educators have been identified as a potentially important component of teacher education programs (Cruickshank, 1977; Lawson, 1981; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). But, there are several problems affecting the study of teacher educators today.

There seems to be a concern that few people agree on the criteria for identifying teacher educators. Conceptual models have been created to help identify the different types of teacher educators in general education (Carter, 1981; Massanari, Drummond, Houston, & Edelfelt, 1978; Ryan, 1974) and physical education (PETE faculty) in particular (Mitchell, 1990). With these models, none have captured the uniqueness of

physical education, and no single model has been accepted as adequately representative of all who have an interest in and make contributions to teacher education. If we cannot identify the criteria for PETE faculty, then how are we to study them?

Another concern limiting research on teacher educators stems from a definitional standpoint. After years of research, there still seems to be a missing shared understanding as to who teacher educators are or what they do. Lanier and Little (1986) suggested that "while it is known that a teacher educator is one who teaches teachers, the composite of those who teach teachers is loosely defined and constantly changing" (p. 528). These authors go on to observe that "teacher education is practically everyone's, and yet no one's obvious responsibility or priority" (p. 529).

Teacher educators can be classified as a diverse group of individuals who may be difficult to categorize due to many differing values and views of their own professional behavior. Research has shown the most consistently shared trait of these faculty members appears to be the inverse relationship noted between prestige and degree of involvement with the formal education of teachers (Borrowman, 1965; Judge, 1982; Lanier & Little, 1986). Metzler and Freedman (1985) studied physical education teacher educators and authors concluded that "there is no professional pursuit, responsibility, academic content, or mission that bids the group; it is a group by default, not by design" (p. 133).

There is not only a concern with identifying PETE professors, but also in the ways they model effective teaching. A concern for teacher educators should be the images they are portraying of their teaching to their students. Based on the idea that ‘‘teachers teach as they are taught’’ (Blume, 1971), there is a clear need to study

modeling with teacher educators. Gallimore and Tharp (1992) offered a definition of modeling for teacher educators as the practice of intentionally displaying certain teaching behaviors with the aim of promoting student teachers' professionalism.

Egan (1978) was the first to point out the 'be like me' phenomenon of teacher educators regarding themselves as role models. Slogans like 'Teach as you preach' and 'Walk your talk' are commonly heard among teacher educators. The congruence principle (see for example, Day, 1999; Korthagen, Kessels, Koster, Lagerwerf, & Wubbels, 2001) states teacher educators do not only teach subjects (teaching), but they are also role models for future teachers. It is important that teacher educators 'teach as they preach', as well as explain their choices. Most would agree that teacher educators should be good models of the kind of teaching they are trying to promote, in order to support their student teachers' learning.

Despite the popularity of the slogans, student teachers often do not learn a great deal from the model behavior demonstrated by their teacher educators, because they do not recognize the model behaviors (Wubbels, Korthagen, & Broekman, 1997). For this reason, teacher educators should not confine themselves to modeling but should also explain the choices they make while teaching (meta-commentary), and link those choices to relevant theory.

Summary on Teacher Educators

Research on teacher educators is clearly limited and needed. More research needs to be conducted identifying PETE professors and their role in teacher preparation programs. Research on PETE professors may yield important knowledge about personal, behavioral, and organizational facilitators and constraints for the field. Better

understanding of teacher educators is needed if they are the most important factor regarding pupil learning and achievement. Research identifying teacher educator behaviors and those modeled to students is clearly needed.

Teacher Preparation Programs

Teacher educators operate within the context of specific types of teacher education programs. There is more than one type of PETE program and a better understanding of the differences of preparation programs must be addressed. There are many characteristics of PETE programs and understanding the role of faculty within the teacher preparation program is important.

When focusing on teacher educators, it is important to understand the components of teacher education programs. Zeichner (1986) acknowledged despite the growing knowledge base in learning to teach, there remains a considerable lack of research describing effective teacher education program characteristics. To gain an understanding of what teacher education programs consist of, Goodlad (1994) listed seven areas in a teacher education program: (1) recruitment, including admission and retention; (2) general studies; (3) socialization, including co-curricular experiences, formal and informal interactions between students and faculty, and among students; (4) subject-matter specialization; (5) professional sequence; (6) internship; and finally, (7) feedback and follow-up. The list above demonstrates the large amount of work that is included in a teacher preparation program.

There have been consistent efforts to improve teacher preparation programs. Despite all attention and efforts, there is still little evidence that these changes are making preservice teacher education more effective in achieving program goals and outcomes.

These improvements, even though articulated as clearly as NASPE (1995) National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers standards, fail to determine whether preservice teachers actually acquire a program's stated knowledge base, dispositions, and preferred pedagogical practices (Galluzzo & Craig, 1990; Goodlad, 1994; Howey & Zimpher, 1989).

Students enrolled in teacher preparation programs should receive the same fundamental messages about mission, regardless of the specific courses they are taking. When faculty members disagree, it can result in students receiving contradictory expectations, information, and sanctions, which may limit program effectiveness (Lawson, 1981). Even though curriculum is planned by faculty, there is no guarantee that the material will be implemented in a way that students actually gain the intended knowledge. The designed curriculum, which includes specific goals for each course, may vary from what students actually learn. The hidden curriculum, lessons learned but that are not openly intended, should be of interest with regards to the actual education students are receiving. Giroux and Penna (1983) stated studying the hidden curriculum is a way to study the transmission of norms, values, and beliefs conveyed to students in the classrooms. The voices of students enrolled in teacher preparation courses are essential to include in studies on teacher education due to their participatory insights.

The major goal of teacher education programs is to produce highly effective teachers. To achieve this goal, it is important to understand the different ways in which students learn and what teaching methods are most effective. After reviewing the literature on teacher learning, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) suggested three conceptions of teacher preparation. These conceptions reflect different teacher education

programs and policies all over the nation. With each conception of teacher preparation, assumptions are made regarding quality teaching, resulting in different ideas of how to improve teacher education, teacher learning, and professional development.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) labeled the first conception of teacher learning as "knowledge for practice." This type of learning suggested that knowing more about subject matter, pedagogy, and educational theory would lead more directly to improved practice instead of other formal knowledge bases. The authors argued that reality, according to this belief, is skilled teachers possessing a deep and thorough grounding in content knowledge and providing appropriate strategies of delivering this content to students. The teacher preparation programs would teach these knowledge bases through planned experiences. Cochran-Smith and Lytle also suggested that most major initiatives for teacher learning are grounded in the assumptions of this view. O'Sullivan (2003) labeled this conception as the most accurate description of PETE programs.

The second conception of teacher learning that Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) described was an extension of the first. The basic assumption the authors described was "teaching is, to a great extent, an uncertain and spontaneous craft situated and constructed in response to particularities of everyday life in schools and classrooms" (p. 262). With this impression of teacher learning, the physical educator is used as the problem solver. This approach assumes the notion that the teachers construct problems out of the different contextual difficulties in schools. The goal of PETE programs under this conception would be to provide social and intellectual contexts. Through these contexts preservice teachers are encouraged to improve their own knowledge and how to apply this knowledge to other areas in the teaching community.

The third and final conception that Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) described was "knowledge of practice." The authors described the basic assumption of this conception as "the knowledge teachers need to teach well emanates from systematic inquires about teaching, learning, leaners and learning, subject matter and curriculum, and schools and schooling" (p. 174). O'Sullivan (2003) suggested that this view of teacher learning may work better as a theoretical framework to ground professional development initiatives with experienced teachers rather than using this conception as a framework for a teacher preparation program.

Other researchers have focused on the dimensions of teacher preparation programs. Graham (1991) identified "four dimensions of teacher preparation that appeared to positively influence the development of preservice students' perspectives toward teaching" (p. 6). These included the following:

1. A shared vision of teacher education held jointly by university and school personnel who worked hard to establish and maintain a relationship with practicing teachers.
2. The presence of an inquiry approach to teaching in which students, in a non-threatening and safe environment, were provided various types of experiences at different times during their program to reflect on teaching and critically examining the nature of their values and beliefs about teaching and learning.
3. The structure and content of such experiences "were wed inextricably to the theoretical perspective under-girding the program" (p.8).

4. The promotion of a critical approach to curriculum and instruction in which the school was viewed as a place for questioning and transforming existing societal injustices and inequalities.

Graham's work seems to validate the primary goal of PETE programs as developing critical and inquiring teachers. Billett (2009) recognized that even though individuals may interpret knowledge in teacher preparation programs differently, a key question for teacher educators should be how to improve the quality of learning experiences and how to engage learners in deeper experiences. There should be many experiences in the teacher preparation program that gives students practice developing critical and inquiring skills that teachers need. Teacher educators should retain contact with practicing teachers to address current issues preservice teachers may face upon leaving the teacher preparation program in order to gain experience in an educational setting. To plan for these experiences, one should understand which knowledge base is needed.

In teacher education programs, one of the most important questions to ask is 'what is the knowledge base upon which programs should be designed.' Shulman (1987) had the following questions on knowledge bases in teaching; what knowledge base is appropriate? Is enough known about teaching to support a knowledge base?

Shulman (1987) identified that advocates of professional reforms base their arguments on the belief there exists a "knowledge base for teaching" – a codified combination of knowledge, skill, understanding of ethics, disposition, and of collective responsibility – as well as a means for representing and communicating it. The Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Task Force (1986) argue that these professional

knowledge concepts should frame teacher education and directly inform teaching practice. Hashweh (1985) identified another method to study the knowledge base by examining expert and novice teachers. The study revealed that the knowledge, understanding, and skills that novice teachers displayed with great amount of effort, experts demonstrated with success naturally. To understand the needs of novice teachers, a teacher preparation program must identify the major sources of the teaching knowledge base.

Darling-Hammond (2006) summed up the type of knowledge that should be taught in teacher preparation as:

> If teachers must ensure successful learning for students who learn in different ways and may encounter a variety of difficulties, then teachers need to be diagnosticians and planners who know a great deal about the learning process and have a repertoire of tools at their disposal. In this view, teaching requires a professional knowledge base that informs decisions about teaching in response to learners. (p. 80)

There are several categories of the knowledge bases that Shulman (1987) lists. With regards to teacher knowledge, the following are important: (1) Content knowledge; (2) General pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter; (3) Curriculum knowledge, with particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as "tools of the trade" for teachers; (4) Pedagogical content knowledge, that special blend of content and pedagogy that is uniquely that province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding; (5) Knowledge of learners and their characteristics; (6) Knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of

communities and cultures; and (7) Knowledge of educational lends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.

The idea of transformation of content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) can be traced to Dewey and the psychologizing of subject matter (Dewey, 1902). Shulman (1987) explains:

> But the key to distinguishing the knowledge base of teaching lies at the intersection of content and pedagogy, in the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students. (p. 15)

According to Shulman (1987), transformation of content requires the following processes: (1) preparation of curriculum/instructional materials; (2) representation of the material in the form of demonstrations, analogies, etc.; (3) instructional selections from a variety of teaching methods and models; (4) adaptations of representations to children and; (5) tailoring the adaptations to a diverse group of students with individual needs.

A Closer Look into PETE

Siedentop and Locke (1997) suggested initial preparation programs should focus on the effective development, delivery, and dissemination of a particular kind of physical education. The authors also believed for a program to be effective, it must be more than a collection of courses. Teacher education, in many places, consists of classrooms with disconnected experiences. These disconnected experiences in teacher preparation programs may negatively influence physical education at the P-12 level.

Howey (1996) stated effective teacher education programs should be defined by a conceptual framework, part of which in the case of a PETE program, is the vision of physical education in which they are preparing students to deliver as teachers. The

conceptual framework should present the program's assumptions, philosophy, and research base, and should outline the implications of that knowledge for teaching. It should also describe how the program is organized in order to achieve the desired outcomes.

Conceptions of teaching are important factors when creating curriculums in teacher education. Siedentop and Locke (1997) stated there is no single model for PETE programs, but argued that a program should stand for something. Rink (1993) identified there were few models of teacher education curriculum in which most that do exist can be called patchwork models of course work. These limited models seem to have been created by the need to meet requirements for accrediting agencies instead of grounded in theory. Lawson (1990) has argued that teacher education curriculum should be grounded in practice as well as should be framed in the development of problem-solving skills for the variability, complexity, and uncertainty of the real world. Griffey and Podemski (1990) proposed several themes that may characterize the work of physical education teachers. The themes were described as the teacher as technician, theoretician, reflective practitioner, academician, therapist, researcher, and decision makers. Griffey and Podeski argued that teacher understandings may represent a different way of looking at teaching. This different view may result in a different program orientation with different evaluative criteria.

Feiman-Nemser (1990) reviewed conceptual models for teacher education, which in turn, resulted in identifying and exploring five different conceptual orientations to teacher education. Rink (1993) presented these conceptual orientations (see Table 2.1) which included description of the emphasis in physical education.

Table 2.1

Conceptual Orientations to Teacher Education

Conceptual Orientation	Emphasis
Academic	Subject Matter Knowledge PE: Games, sports, dance, fitness
Practical	Experience/conventional wisdom PE: Heavy reliance on field experience, practice, what works
Technological	Systematic/science based training PE: Emphasis on teacher effectiveness skills and research-based teaching skill development
Personal	Teacher as a person and a learner PE: Individualized, nurturing, personal-meaning based orientation to growth as a teacher
Critical/social	Context of schooling/obligation to pupils and society PE: Moral obligation of teachers/equity issues, inclusion

Note. PE = Physical Education

Feiman-Nemser (1990) defined a conceptual orientation for teacher education is "a cluster of ideas about the goals of teacher preparation and the means for achieving them" (p. 17). Within curricular orientations, faculty members may hold different emphases or values. One faculty member may weigh one orientation more important than other faculty members. There is no right or wrong orientation as a field. Rink (1993) suggested that these orientations were not meant as competing orientations. The orientations can, and will, coexist in different aspects of the same program and should be considered in program design. Rink also discussed that one should not focus on which conceptualization is better, but one should consider questions relevant to the appropriateness of a particular component of the curriculum and, more importantly, to the effective development and integration of its components.

The need to study the conceptualization process in teacher education is important because of the continuous shift from an emphasis on one of these components to another (Rink, 1993). She argues the conceptualizing process with regards to the integration of components may be a start to decrease the intensity of the shifts. Rink argued curriculum

development in teacher education should involve establishing a framework in which one of the conceptual orientations would represent a basic score and sequence.

Teacher education programs are unique in which there are many characteristics that make up PETE programs. Rink (1993) stated that one should not study or evaluate programs and/or teacher educators without a clear understanding of the goals of the teacher or the program. Once one has identified the goals, one can make a judgment about whether a teacher educator or teacher education program is fulfilling a particular function, but should refrain from prescribing universal recommendations.

Siedentop and Locke (1997) described variables that should be used for judging the development, sustainment, and dissemination of good PETE programs. These variables are the following: (1) NCATE accreditation -a fully accredited program, (2) collaboration with disciplinary faculty-respectful relationships that allow joint design of program content and training experiences, (3) rewards-appropriate institutional structures to reward the full variety of roles program faculty must perform, (4) Resources-enough for faculty, staff, and students to be able to get the work done, (5) authority-enough to allow selective admission and retention of students who offer which match programs values, (6) control over clinical assignments, (7) school sites-enough to provide every student with a place to observe and practice in a good program, (8) time-enough credits to prepare graduates who can safely be employed as novice with good prospects for survival and success, (9) faculty consensus -enough to ensure program focus and cohesiveness which minimally require everyone to accept the same line on program content, processes, and priorities, and (10) focus-enough to ensure that the programs are persistently and

explicitly about something; graduating students who have a distinctive set of values, beliefs, and professional skills.

Summary of Teacher Preparation Programs

Teacher educators operate within the context of a specific type of teacher education program. There are many frameworks, as well as knowledge bases, that may comprise a teacher preparation program. PETE programs are similar to teacher education programs in regards to there are many characteristics of PETE programs, as well as, ways to go about achieving the major goals of the program. A problem for teacher educators is to determine what framework will: (a) produce teachers who acquire the skills and beliefs promoted by the teacher educators, and (b) lead the teachers to persistently utilize their knowledge and skills upon employment in the schools. Rink (1993) offers orientations to help frame a PETE program. She argues the conceptualizing process between faculty members may decrease the intensity of the shifts within emphasis on which components are needed.

Ross (1987) stated the more focused the teacher preparation program, the more authentic the experiences would be. These authentic experiences would help students retain information, which in turn, make students into better teachers. In order to have a successful practice, students must be able to retain information, as well as link experiences. Therefore, it is important to identify the shared beliefs of faculty members of the role of a unique content course within a PETE program in order to enable a better understanding of how to prepare future physical education teachers.

Coherence/Shared Belief

Seeking indicators of coherence in a PETE program has the potential to inform teacher educators how to better prepare future physical education teachers. One type of program coherence is characterized by the presence of a shared vision among faculty and a common purpose across courses (Buchmann & Floden; 1992). Howey and Zimpher (1989) identified a key attribute in an effective teacher education program are the faculty commitment to a set of shared beliefs. McLaughlin (1994) acknowledged every statement and action teachers make or omit is value-laden. These shared value-laden messages are essential for a clear focus in a program.

Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998) proposed several questions to guide program assessment. The first and possibly most important question involves establishing the main programmatic goals and philosophies of a teacher preparation program. A key question that must be answered is "What are we trying to accomplish in this program?" The authors listed several common goals for a PETE program (i.e. expert subject matter, reflective teacher, professional, etc.). It was added that most programs lack a common goal that reflect the beliefs of the entire faculty. The lack of a common goal can cause confusion among both faculty members and students as to what should be taught and assessed. Howey and Zimpher (1989) stated no matter the number of goals or the order in which one places those goals, it is important that the faculty have a shared program philosophy on which to base the pursuit of those goals.

With the call for more research on both teacher education and PETE, coherence is an important concept to research. Teacher education scholars have noted that historically, teacher preparation has consisted of a set of disconnected individual courses

rather than a carefully constructed and integrated learning experience informed by a cohesive vision of teaching and learning (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Lanier & Little, 1986; Tom, 1997). Not only is there limited research on PETE and teacher education, there is also limited research on the ways faculty members operationalize program coherence (Lamb & Jacobs, 2009).

Defining Coherence

Coherence has rarely been systematically explored or methodologically defined in the literature. Few authors have offered definitions of coherence (Buchmann & Floden, 1993; Hammerness, 2006; Tatto, 1996). Tatto (1996) defined coherence ‘‘in terms of shared understandings among faculty and in the manner in which opportunities to learn have been arranged (organizationally, logistically) to achieve a common goal—that of educating professional teachers with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to more effectively teach diverse students’’ (p. 176). Tatto suggested a program that has coherence does not necessarily suggest that all faculty members must think alike; instead the coherence of a program should be assessed by how faculty members could reach a common ground around professional norms and expectations, as well as, in the way that learning experiences are organized.

Another definition was offered by Youngs and King (2002). The authors defined program coherence as the extent to which courses are coordinated and directed at clear learning goals, and the extent to which central ideas within a program are developed and built upon each other over time. Without limiting coherence to mere “consistency”

(Buchmann & Floden, 1993), these definitions emphasize coherence as the alignment of ideas and learning opportunities.

Paris (1993) examined the match between teachers' planned curriculum and the content actually delivered. The teachers expected the formal curriculum to be coherent, which to teachers, meant a close connection between rationale and objectives. The teaching methods should mirror this connection in order to help create coherence within the teacher's own curriculum. The teachers identified their curriculum as a dynamic process rather than a final product, in which the study also found their curriculum to be uniformly whole, including logical links to content, pedagogical principles, and teaching objectives. These links are an important piece of coherence literature because they represent that teachers taught to stated objectives and were able to rationalize the goals of the course.

Aspects of Coherence

McLaughlin (1994) stated that there are two aspects of coherence. The first aspect of coherence is the concept of consistency. The author described consistency as the values of a school, which should in some sense, be consistent in order to clearly define school effectiveness. An argument has been made which claims that consistency alone may not capture all that is involved in the notion of coherence. The piece that may be missing is the idea that the values of a school could be consistent, but not fully coherent. It was stated that coherence involves making sense in a way that goes beyond consistency.

Vision of a Coherent Teacher Preparation Program

Studies on learning experiences have suggested learning may be enhanced when students encounter consistent ideas across learning experiences (Bransford, Borwn, & Cocking, 2000; Bruner, 1977, 1990). Repeatedly in the expertise literature is the findings that repetitive experiences with a set of conceptual ideas, along with continual opportunities to practice skills and modes of thinking and analysis, support deeper learning (Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Romer, 1993). In an environment where learning is expected, having clear ideas that are connected should deepen the understanding of the material.

Darling-Hammond (2006) provided an example of a coherent teacher preparation program. In her example, she included both conceptual and structural coherence, as well as the mechanisms, that may be needed to develop shared visions of teaching and learning for both faculty and students. Her perspective of a coherent program offered coursework that is carefully sequenced based upon a strong theory of learning to teach. Courses are designed to intersect with one another, are aggregated into a well-understood landscape of learning, and are tightly interwoven with the advisement process and students' work in schools. Faculty plan curriculum and syllabi are shared across university divisions as well as within departments. Through course design, subject matter learning is brought together with content pedagogy; program sequences also create cross-course links. Virtually all of the closely interrelated courses involve applications in classrooms where observations or student teaching occur. These classrooms, in turn, are selected because they model the method of practice discussed in courses and advisement. In such intensely coherent programs, core ideas are reiterated across courses and

theoretical frameworks animating courses and assignments are consistent across the program.

Assaf, Garza, and Battle (2010) recognized the challenge of developing a coherent program, but argued teacher educators must work towards a shared vision of teaching and learning. To be successful, teacher educators must be committed to exploring their individual and shared beliefs and practices. The authors continued with the idea that teacher educators must make the time and create the space to reconsider their beliefs, practices, and goals as educators. These goals should not only be yearly program goals, but coupled with individual and collective program self-assessments. The authors also pointed out since teacher preparation programs work collaboratively with school districts and community groups, a cohesive teacher education program should consider the goals and needs of the local community.

Copeland, Finley, Ferguson, and Alderete (2000) studied coherence as a teaching task. According to the authors there are several tools to advance coherent teaching. The two major sources are: (1) information on the students – what should be learned, and (2) external information – 'what should be learned'. The authors argued to advance coherent teaching; teachers are required to use five tools: understanding the rationale, placing the learner at the center, managing dialogue with the learner, reflecting, and initiating improvement of the learning process.

Coherence is not only a phenomenon in teacher education; it has been studied in athletic training programs as well. The purpose of athletic training education programs (ATEPs) is to prepare students to be competent athletic trainers. Dodge, Walker, and Laursen (2009) stated in order for ATEP programs to prepare students effectively, the

preparation programs need to possess a curriculum that is coherent and well structured. Mitchell (2001) referred to coherence as "a consistency between what is published or espoused as program mission and goals and what is delivered in courses and other learning experiences"(p. 2). Dodge et al. (2009) used this definition to establish that a goal of ATEPs might be to prepare their students to be competent practitioners by passing the Board of Certification exam. The authors identified that a critical component of a coherent program would be to develop appropriate learning experiences that foster the development of competent practitioners, who are capable of achieving certification as athletic trainers. These learning experiences should be properly sequenced and specifically designed to meet the mission and goals that are established (Tatto, 1996). Dodge et al. (2009) identified the most important aspect of coherence should be that students understand the program. Students should understand the relationships among learning experiences in a way that students recognize the applicability of those experiences to the practice of being an athletic trainer. The authors suggested these shared visions should be grounded with clear goals and mission statements.

Dodge et al. (2009) identified that development of a clear mission statement and program goals would encourage program coherence, which serves as a framework for ATEP. To ensure goals are both relevant and realistic, all program members should constantly review and revise program goals. These discussions should also reflect the constant change in the field. The final mission statement should be clear and concise so there is no mistake as to the purpose of the program. It is also extremely helpful to display the mission statement and goals in a highly visible area, such as the athletic training room, program website, and/or student handbook. Dodge and his colleges were

able to identify important aspects to an athletic training program, it is now important to turn the attention to understanding successful PETE programs.

Graber (1996) reported on an identified "High Impact" physical education teacher education program. The results identified factors that appeared to help students retain the influence of the program as: (1) thematic approach, (2) cohort groups, (3) constant programmatic reinforcement, (4) professional development courses, (5) professional conduct expectations, (6) progressive and compatible internships, (7) awareness of studentship, (8) faculty consensus, and (9) political involvement. Graber came to the conclusion that simple consistency, persistence, and integration offer one explanation for the reason students abandon or significantly alter their previous commitments to implementing a traditional curriculum – substituting instead beliefs which are congruent with those of their undergraduate mentors. It was also believed that when a clear faculty curricular message is not reinforced, the influence of pre-training cannot be overcome. Therefore, the faculty at the high impact school believed curricular messages must be reinforced and supported in all facets of the program.

Graber (1996) also reported faculty was often aware of what their colleagues had taught on any given day, and it was not unusual for them to integrate the material into their own lecture on that same day. There was some evidence that faculty had been successful in communicating the same messages to students. One 6-12 student stated that faculty "philosophies are parallel," and another in the K-8 track emphasized, "They're all teaching us the same thing. No one's contradicting each other."

Curriculum

Levine (2006) researched teacher preparation programs and identified attributes that led to success. One of the nine attributes that contributed to each successful program was curricular coherence. It was stated that in the exemplary programs, "Curricula… mirror their programs' purposes. They are coherent, integrated, and up-to-date, preparing students with knowledge of pedagogy, child development, and the content field in which they will teach" (2006, p. 41).

Ormond (2012) indicated the importance for teacher education curriculum writers to maintain at all times a cohesive sense of their courses. With this big picture concept of overall conceptual framework, a holistic and comprehensive framework is needed. One should pay equal attention to course principles, developing themes, content inputs, learning outcomes, practical experiences, the connections between theory and school-based practice, and ultimately, the achievement of the Natural Standards. Ormond claimed that comprehensiveness of approach in curriculum preparation is the key to success in a strong teacher education course.

Buchmann and Floden (1992) stated a curriculum should have a consistent message, just like a work of literature should have a story line, in which each event has a logical connection to those before it. The authors continued with the notion that education can be coherent without being consistent, and coherence is not merely a feature of a design – curriculum structures – or unifying intention, but a characteristic of the learners' formative responses. Wilson (2004) suggested the need for a connection between coherency and the ways in which students are assessed. Advocates of a program designed for coherence argue that tight alignment of goals, performances, and

assessments provide the necessary clarification of the relationship between the means and ends of instruction (Elmore, 2002; Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, & Bryk, 2001). Roy, Borin, and Kustra (2007) argued for curriculum change to be sustainable there needs to be departmental consensus. Using this consensus, people can work in teams, understand the rationale for change and are able to state their own role in the process.

Howey and Zimpher (1989) offered a framework for examination of preservice programs. The framework was motivated to move the field beyond findings described by Koehler (1985). After reviewing 220 studies on preservice teacher education, Koehler concluded the work was "piecemeal and particularistic" (p. 23), and offered little guidance for others who hope to design effective programs. Answering this call, Howey and Zimpher (1989) proposed an alternative model. This work was influenced by Purkey and Smith (1983) on effective schools. Using a synthesis of research studying effective and ineffective schools, the authors were able to describe a number of distinguishing features. This vision of effectiveness guided Howey and Zimpher to construct a series of six case studies of different but distinctive teacher preparation programs, culminating in a list of common program attributes.

Table 2.2

Indicators of Program Coherence

	Indicators
1.	**Programs of teacher preparation are driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching.**
2.	**Faculty appears to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations, and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles.**
3.	**A sense of reasonableness and clarity is associated with the major goals of the program.**
4.	**The program is rigorous and academically challenging, and students have to work hard to achieve.**
5.	**Themes run throughout the curriculum, like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences.**
6.	**There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development.**
7.	**Student cohort groups exist.**
8.	**At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal.**
9.	**Organizational and structural features of the programs enable an interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum.**
10.	**Adequate life space is found within the curriculum.**
11.	**There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program.**
12.	**There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities which occur on campus and those activities which occur in schools.**
13.	**There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education.**
14.	**A plan for systematic program evaluation exists.**

Howey, K.R., and Zimpher, N.L. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Howey and Zimpher (1989) do not refer to their list of program attributes as indicators of effectiveness. The authors instead identified the attributes as indicators of coherence. These indicators appear to support a promising path for examining teacher preparation programs and their ability to achieve state objectives such as the NASPE standards. Coherent programs are important because they demonstrate connectedness

and harmony among faculty members, while working together to produce effective prospective teachers.

Coherence Missing in Today's Teacher Education Programs

This study is a response to the call for more research on the coherence of teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman, 2005). Despite the awareness of developing coherent teacher preparation programs, the components that make up coherence remain a relatively underexplored area by researchers in teaching education. There have been few studies examining the practices and education of graduates in programs designed to cohere around a clear vision (e.g., Grossman Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999; Hammerness, 2006; McDonald, 2005; Kroll et al., 2004; Tatto, 1996).

McDonald (2005) stated there is little empirical research on the nature of coherence in practice and also limited research on how programs develop coherence. The research seems to focus on the level of coherency a program has as opposed to how to become a coherent program.

Summary Coherence/Shared Beliefs

We have little insight into what degree of influence program coherence has toward preparing future teachers. There should be more research to understand the shared vision of faculty, as well as that of students, to determine the roles of individual courses in a teacher preparation program. To study coherence broadly is more than can be adequately addressed in one study. Teacher preparation programs appear to be characterized more by differences and disarray than by similarity and coherence. In order

to reinforce this notion, it seems logical to propose a study concerning one facet of a single PETE program at its most basic level.

Research Design

Ducharme and Ducharme (1996) found that most of what is known about effective teacher education programs comes from limited studies of isolated program components. Teacher educators are within these unique teacher preparation programs and they may operate within the context of specific types of teacher education programs. Since the literature on teacher educators, teacher education, and coherence is limited, an isolated study concerning concerning one facet of a single PETE program seems appropriate.

Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, and Hanson (2003) described qualitative research as an inquiry process based on the understanding of social or human problems that attempts to build a complex, holistic picture using words and reporting detailed views of informants conducted in a naturalistic setting. Howey and Zimpher (1989) used both quantitative and qualitative methods to explore research in teacher education to identify 14 indicators for program coherence. Using qualitative methods to understand how one course fits into the holistic picture of a PETE program seemed appropriate.

Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) defined qualitative research as the investigation of the quality of relationships, activities, situations, or materials. The authors described five distinguishing characteristics associated with qualitative research. (1) The direct source of data is the natural setting, and the key instrument in this research process is the investigator. (2) Qualitative data are gathered as words or pictures, as opposed to numbers. (3) Researchers employing qualitative methodologies are concerned with the

process and the product. (4) Qualitative inquiries typically call for inductive analysis strategies. (5) A salient concern of the qualitative investigator is how people make sense of their lives. The direct source of data in the education setting is observing teachers and students in actual lessons. Through holistic picture research, the researcher is able to understand the perceptions of the process in the teaching episodes as well as the end product. Qualitative research has been increasingly used to explore teacher education, teacher preparation programs, and the concept of coherence.

Case Study

In reviewing literature in teacher education, case studies have been important to gain knowledge on enacted curriculums in teacher preparation programs. Yin (2008) defined a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p.13). Additionally, Merriam (1998, p. 21) described a qualitative case study as "an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit." Case studies are used frequently in the field of education in order to gain a better, in-depth understanding of specific situations and to identify the meaning for those involved in the situation. Merriam (2009) stated the difference of case studies, from other types of qualitative research, is the intensive descriptions and analyses one gains of a single unit or bounded system such as an individual, program, event, group, intervention, or community. Patton (2002) described the case study approach as a specific way of collecting, organizing, and analyzing data (process) and the result of the analysis process (product). Merriam (1998) also described

case studies as a way to gain insights which can often directly influence policy, practice, and future research.

Denscombe (2007) identified three key reasons for the implementation of the case study method. First, a case study can offer an in-depth study. Second, it enables a focus on relationships and processes and it can provide multiple sources and multiple methods. The case study allows for understanding of relationships and social processes that is denied to the survey approach. The explanations of "why" can be viewed as the real value of case studies. The techniques of data collection utilized in this study were chosen because the researcher believed that each technique would provide valuable information to contribute to the individual case study.

Most literature on coherence exists as conceptual work, not as research studies, with a few exceptions. Hammerness (2006) studied the concept of coherence with interviews and the analysis of the written curriculum. Graber (1996) studied "High Impact" teacher education programs. Both are considered case studies in which one teacher preparation program was studied.

Case studies have been used recently in teacher education (Butler, 2007; Byrd, 2011; Liu, 2010; Parker, 2007; Wang, 2009) as well as PETE (Lorenzi, 2008; Mays, 1989; McMullen, 2010; Waugh, 2010). Case studies in PETE programs will give in-depth information on the phenomenon being researched. Since little is known about the phenomenon of coherence in PETE programs, a qualitative case study design is appropriate to be utilized.

Interviews and Observations

Interviews as a methodology are important and used frequently in qualitative research. There are four types of interviews, which include structured, semi-structured, informal and retrospective interviews. A semi-structured interview can be utilized to elicit specific answers in which the information can be used to compare and contrast responses to questions. For the purposes of this study, interviews were used to allow the researcher the ability to gain valuable responses from faculty members and students. Participants were to give responses based on their own perceptions and values at the time of the interview.

Patton (2002) described five main advantages to using observations as a data collection tool: (a) direct observation allows the researcher to better understand and capture the context within which people interact, (b) firsthand experience with a setting and the people within a setting allows the inquiry to be more open, discovery oriented, and inductive, (c) the researcher has the opportunity to see things that may routinely escape awareness among the people in the setting, (d) direct observation provides a chance to learn things that people would be unwilling to talk about in an interview, and (e) getting close to people in a setting via firsthand experience permits the researcher to draw on personal knowledge during the formal interpretation stage of analysis.

Audio and/or videotapes are frequently used by qualitative researchers to support validity and reliability issues. An important advantage of recording observations and/or interviews is the creation of a permanent record of the event in question in order that the event may be replayed and interobserver and intraobserver agreement may be established. Interviews are effective ways to understand perceptions. Assaf at el. (2010) examined

the perceptions, practices, and coherence in one teacher preparation program using interviews. Volante (2006) used interviews to understand student teachers' perspectives on a program's design and delivery. Bolton (2008) and Bahneman (1996) both used interviews and artifacts to measure particular aspects of PETE programs.

Graber (1996) used interviews, but also used observations and artifacts, to study the "High Impact" physical education teacher education program. Mohr (2000) used the same methods to explore socialization. Using a case study involving observations, interviews, and artifact analysis will enhance the probability of acquiring an accurate representation of how a particular course fits into a PETE program.

Review of Literature Summary

If PETE programs play an important role in teacher effectiveness, then the aspects that make programs more effective should be studied. Coherence has been a variable that has been identified to improve teacher preparation programs. This study should further our understanding of one facet of coherence in a PETE program. It is understood having shared goals and a coherent program is important, but the literature is thin in physical education and teacher education.

One of the identified missing pieces of literature in teacher education is on teacher educators themselves (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Korthagen, 2001; Maguire, 1994). Using a case study of a single facet of one program can potentially produce a model of introspection of PETE faculty that is rare in the current literature. Understanding how the faculty in one program perceive and articulate the goals in one aspect of the program provides insight into the actual, rather than theoretical, existence of program coherence. More research is needed to understand the shared vision of faculty,

as well as students, for the roles individual courses serve in a teacher preparation program.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest is the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. To understand the role of a single course within a single program is almost a textbook definition for a case study. Hence, this qualitative approach was selected as the most appropriate design to answer the research questions posed.

Research Design and Rationale

Creswell et al. (2003) described qualitative research as an inquiry process based on the understanding of social or human problems that attempts to build a complex, holistic picture using words and reporting detailed views of informants conducted in a naturalistic setting. In particular, case study design was selected in order to answer the research questions by providing a rich description of how the role of one unique content course within the curriculum fits into the espoused goals of a teacher preparation program. This study includes a prolonged engagement in a selected content course in the PETE program at the University of South Carolina. The participants in this study included physical education professors and students in a major PETE program in the United States. This study used interviews, observations, and analysis of written curriculum to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program.

Research Questions

1. To what extent can PETE faculty articulate the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?
2. To what extent is there a consistent or shared vision of the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?
3. Does the view of the role of the unique content course as held by the instructor match the views of other faculty in the program?
4. Does the view of the role of the unique content course espoused by the instructor match the delivery of the course?
5. Do student views of the purposes of the unique content course match instructor and/or faculty views of the purpose of the course?

Instrument Development

Much of the data was obtained directly from the participants in face-to-face interviews with the researcher. The formal interviews were structured and in-depth. Open-response questions were used to elicit data. In a structured or standardized interview (Patton, 2002), the interviewer creates a set of questions before the interview and then asks the questions verbatim throughout the interview. An interview guide was utilized to structure the formal interview process for the faculty (Appendix A), students (Appendix B), and instructor (Appendix C & D). The guides were used to maintain focus and scope during the interview process.

The interview questions were pre-constructed from the literature on teacher educators, coherence, and teacher education. A portion of interview questions came from Mitchell (2000b). Mitchell's framework was influenced by the Howey & Zimpher (1989)

indicators of program coherence. The purpose of the faculty and student interviews was to provide a description of the espoused goals by which the six faculty members and students felt the unique content course should be guided. This purpose was used to gain information on research question one, two, and five. The second purpose of the faculty interviews was to identify department perspectives on course objectives for the educational gymnastics course and how the course fits into the overall goals of the program. This purpose was used to gain information for research question two. The faculty members were asked to identify what material they believed should be taught in the educational gymnastics course and experiences that should be included in the course to meet the overall program goals.

For research question four, the instructor participated in two separate interviews. In the first interview held before the course began, the instructor was asked to explain, in detail, the objectives of the course and to give examples in order for the researcher to fully understand the planned curriculum. The second interview with the instructor occurred after the completion of the course. The goal of this interview was to observe the instructor's perception of how well the objectives/goals were taught. The instructor was asked the purpose of the objective, did the instructor perceive the students met the objective, and what evidence supported these perceptions. Interviews were also used to match the objectives of the course with the researchers' field notes to examine whether the instructor taught all objectives in the course.

Selection of observation tool

PETE students in this program are expected to demonstrate behaviors that are captured in a tool created by teaching faculty. This tool created by faculty at the

University of South Carolina is the primary instrument to measure effective teaching. The evaluation tool (Appendix E) designed for this study is used to verify effective teaching by the instructor of the educational gymnastics course. The tool is an adaption of the tool used to assess PETE students in the methods courses.

The rationale to adapt the tool was based upon the idea that students are learning the material in the educational gymnastics course so the PETE students would be able to teach the content in the planned teaching episodes in the program. The instructor of the course should be modeling the effective teaching behaviors the program identifies, while teaching educational gymnastics. The purpose of the tool is to evaluate basic instructional skills. These instructional skills include teaching toward lesson goals, as well as using appropriate task presentations, management strategies, content progression, and feedback. An adaptation to the tool was a change in the objectives section in the lesson evaluation. Instead of having the instructor teach three objectives (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor), the tool was changed to two objectives/concepts from the list of objectives in course syllabus. It was changed from all domains to focus solely on the psychomotor domain due to the lack of instructor goals of teaching in all three domains of learning (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) in previous syllabi in the educational gymnastics course. Another reason for the change in the objectives section is the requirement that students turn in lesson plans with three objectives that cover the three domains of learning mentioned above. The instructor of the course was not required to turn in lesson plans so the only goals of the course that can be used are the written goals/objectives in the syllabus. Since there is no requirement for the instructor to teach toward the three

domains of learning, a reasonable expectation is the instructor teaches toward one or two objectives/concepts per class.

After analyzing the interviews with faculty, there was a shared belief that the instructor should model proper content progressions in the unique content course. To understand the content progression of the instructor, a content analysis tool (Appendix F) was used. With this tool, the researcher and grader recorded the tasks the teacher gave. After recording the task, the researcher had to decide whether the task was an informing, extending, refining, or applying task. To measure the success of the instructor, the researcher used frequency and percentages of the tasks in order to ensure the content was developed.

To establish reliability a simple percentage of agreement was utilized to establish inter-observer agreement. The researcher and another doctoral student in the instruction and curriculum area of study in physical education coded the lessons. The grader received training, during which, the researcher provided definitions of the components of the tool as well as ground rules. The researcher taught the grader the definitions and ground rules during training. Special attention was given to defining appropriate practices that the instructor should be modeling. During the training session the grader practiced coding the lessons under the guidance of the researcher. The researcher had the grader scored an additional lesson independently to assess inter-rater reliability. An 80% agreement with the graduate student and researcher was needed before the nine lessons were evaluated. To measure agreement, the agreement of categories that both graders identified the same score for was divided by the number of total categories overall. The grader and researcher then coded the nine lessons individually and checked for the same

80% reliability scores of the nine lessons. The same procedure to establish inter-observer reliability was used for the content development tool. By identifying and labeling a task between the grader and researcher divided by the total amount of task in the nine lessons provided the percent agreement. The overall inter-observer reliability for the evaluation tool was 88%. For the task progression tool, the overall reliability score was 93%.

Site and Participants

Context

Purposeful sampling was used to select the PETE program, course, and participants in order to answer the research questions. Patton (2002) described purposeful sampling within the case study research design as both information rich and illuminative, offering useful manifestations of the phenomenon of interest. Purposive sampling, as opposed to random sampling, is common in qualitative research. The sampling should work in conjunction with thick descriptions to enhance the detailed information about the context of the study. Such sampling techniques will provide readers with detailed information to make informed decisions about transferability.

The PETE program used for the study is housed in the College of Education at a division one university in the southeastern United States. The program offers undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees. The program has numerous professors who have presented at national conventions and have published widely. The program has a reputation as a major PETE program in the country.

PETE programs have a range of curriculums. There are many factors that may affect PETE curriculum: number and background of professors in department, location, students, etc. PETE programs choose different courses and instructional styles from their

beliefs. The purpose of NCATE is to hold individual programs accountable for teaching at least minimal requirements. A central feature of higher education is allowing programs to choose their goals and the ways in which they achieve those goals as long as they meet NCATE standards. The researcher believes the University of South Carolina exemplifies the rich case described by Patton (2002) and provides a setting that will elicit data which can answer the research questions.

The PETE students enrolled at the University of South Carolina are taught the content area of educational gymnastics and are expected to use what they learn in the methods course, as well as student teaching, if the opportunity presented itself. The educational gymnastics course is a unique activity course in the PETE program at the University of South Carolina. Educational gymnastics is a component of movement education, which is the framework for elementary education activity courses, in the department. The unique elementary activity courses include educational games, dance, and gymnastics. Since the department has adopted the movement education framework for their elementary curriculum, every physical education student is required to pass the course.

Participants

The professors, students, and the instructor were chosen with specific criteria. The process of selecting participants for the PETE faculty interview used particular criteria. The first criterion consisted of choosing PETE faculty members who had taught undergraduate and graduate physical education teaching method courses leading to initial certification. PETE methods instructors should have the most comprehensive understanding of the program goals and values. The second criterion consisted of each

faculty member's involvement in the program for at least five years. The last criterion was that the faculty members had been involved in the discussion of curriculum planning of the program. The faculty members chosen must have contributed to the field of physical education by preparing future teachers and have produced scholarship on teacher education. There were six faculty members who met the criteria to be interviewed.

The instructor who taught the educational gymnastics course Fall 2011 was interviewed. The instructor who was selected for the study had taught in the department for over ten years and had received tenure at the university. These criteria were used to ensure the instructor would have an adequate foundation of departmental expectations of the students' knowledge and skills. Being in the department for a prolonged amount of time should ensure the instructor has been involved in the planning processes in regards to the goals of the educational gymnastics course.

The instructor was selected using criteria directly related to this study. The instructor had prior teaching experience in the course with an extensive background knowledge in gymnastics. The rationale behind identifying an experienced instructor was to ensure proper knowledge and preparation to teach the course. Having ample background should give the instructor a greater opportunity to align the course with the goals and values of the PETE program. It also should be noted that adequate experience does not imply that the instructor will have a course that is aligned with the programs' goals.

The instructor chosen for this study had 3 years public schools teaching experience in physical education at the elementary school level. This ensured the instructor was comfortable in the framework to teach teacher candidates educational

gymnastics. The instructor also had experience teaching the educational gymnastics course at this particular university numerous times.

The undergraduate students who were interviewed were enrolled in the educational gymnastics course with the instructor during the Fall semester 2011. There were three students chosen for these interviews. Selection of the students was based on their enrollment in section two of the educational gymnastics course, Fall 2011. The students were also required to be an undergraduate student during the enrollment of the course. The students were recruited based upon their accessibility after the completion of the course. The group of students consisted of two males and one female. Two students are identified as top students in their cohort based upon grades and teaching performance, while the remaining student is identified as earning average grades in the cohort. All three students had never taken gymnastics lessons or a gymnastics course before participating educational gymnastics.

Collection of Data

All participants in the study participated in semi-structured interviews that were conducted individually and in person. All PETE faculty and students interviewed were asked the same set of questions, according to the separate interview guides, in the same order, regardless of their responses. Follow-up questions and probes related to the research questions were used when necessary to clarify responses. These questions were specifically related to the research questions.

Interviews lasted between 20-30 minutes for students and 45-90 minutes for faculty and took place in person at mutual convenience of participants and the researcher. After a brief introduction, the participants were asked for consent, and then the interview

proceeded. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Copies of transcriptions were given to the participants so they could clarify, change, or add information. The formal interviews were audiotaped while the researcher took notes. Participants were interviewed in June 2013.

The second instructor interview and all student interviews were conducted after the completion of the course to receive a full understanding of the students' and instructor's perceptions of the objectives/goals of the course. The faculty interviews were conducted after the course was completed due to time restraints of the faculty members.

Observations

The goal of this research question four was to validate that the educator followed the planned curriculum for the course. Data to answer this research question came from the interview with the instructor, interviews with selected students, document analysis and systematic observations of lessons. A majority of the data obtained from research question four was derived from direct observation. As recommended by Merriam (1998), the observations were used to triangulate and substantiate emerging findings. The researcher conducted the observations and served in a "peripheral membership role" described by Adler and Adler (1994) as the type of observation where, the researcher's main role was to "observe and interact closely enough with members to establish an insider's identity without participating in those activities constituting the core of the group membership." (p. 380). The researcher produced field notes from each observation, which included task descriptions and observer comments, among other things deemed to be relevant. Field notes provided "the fundamental database for

constructing case studies," (Patton, 2002. p. 305). Field notes were used to support the data collected via the semi-structured interviews and the document analysis (Bogdan & Bilken, 2006).

The researcher observed a total of 42 educational gymnastics classes over the semester. There were three major instructional units with three performance assessments assigned to each unit in the syllabus. Each class period was 50 minutes in length. The purpose of the observations was twofold. First, observations of the participants in the teaching context helped to cross-validate data gained through interviews and the instructors' syllabus. Second, the teacher was videotaped to determine the extent to which there was a modeling of effective teaching.

The researcher randomly selected three lessons for each of the units throughout the semester (total of nine) to examine the extent to which the instructor was modeling effective teaching. The following lessons were excluded from evaluation: lessons in which the assistant taught the majority; cognitive lessons; practice days where students practiced their performance assessments; and, testing days. Lesson samples are the primary means of obtaining information about PETE faculties' instructional skills in activity settings. These sample lessons may be structured in a wide variety of ways. In this study, the sample lessons were taken directly from the instructor teaching the unique activity course.

Measuring of coherence

Mitchell (2000b) suggested the self-assessment process to measure program coherence involved four key phases. The first phase involves identifying explicitly the program goals. I acknowledge this study will not cover all indicators, but will mainly

focus on the shared vision of faculty members, instructor, and students of the role of one unique content course within the teacher preparation program.

There are many ways to measure coherence. For the purpose of this study, I will measure the shared vision of faculty members according to how the research questions are stated and the connection or shared vision of the participants. Therefore, the highest level: *Strong evidence of coherence* can only occur when the number of statements meets or exceeds 80% of the number of total participants. *Moderate evidence of coherence* occurs when the number of statements meets or exceeds 50% to 79% of the number of total participants. *Low evidence of coherence* occurs when the number of statements meets or exceeds 25% to 49% of the number of total participants. The statement is said to have *No evidence of coherence* if its frequency occurred in less than 25% of the number of total participants.

Treatment of data

A major concern associated with qualitative research is the demonstration of truth-value, providing a basis for applying it, and allowing for external judgments of the findings or decisions to be made. A term associated with these concerns is trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified that the trustworthiness of the data is established by using rigorous naturalistic techniques that provide truth-value through credibility, applicability through transferability, consistency through dependability, and neutrality through confirm ability.

Credibility is a qualitative term for the internal validity in quantitative research. Credibility is the extent to which participants' interpretations and experiences match the researcher's reconstruction of the events. Trustworthiness is the dependability and the

ability to confirm the selected research approach and the corresponding findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These techniques include prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, referential adequacy, peer debriefings, and member checks. Prolonged engagement is a credibility technique requiring a researcher to spend enough time in the context being studied to overcome any misinterpretations that are due to the researcher's intrusiveness in the context. Prolonged engagement will also enable the researcher to completely understand the studied context.

Lincoln & Guba (1985) described prolonged engagement as the investment of "sufficient time to achieve certain purposes" (p. 301). This study includes a prolonged engagement in a selected content course in the PETE program at the University of South Carolina. The researcher observed a full semester of one section of the content course selected. For this reason, the observations period of this study took place for approximately four months, August through December 2011. The researcher collected data to the point of data saturation meaning every lesson was observed and all written material was collected throughout the entire semester.

A credibility technique that enables the researcher to elicit various and divergent constructions of reality that exist within qualitative methods is called triangulation. To triangulate, one should collect data using a number of different methods and sources such as statements from individuals, behavioral observations, records or documents, and questioning techniques. Triangulating data will provide a richer understanding of the context under investigation and help to establish credibility.

Another way to establish credibility is to conduct peer debriefings and member checks. Peer debriefings are discussions between the principle researcher and other

experienced professionals. During the discussions, the principle researcher is encouraged to review his or her perceptions, insights, and analyses and is provided with feedback to refine or redirect the investigation. Member checks are used to allow participants to review and verify their data and interpretations of that data.

Triangulation is defined as the process of cross-checking theories and/or data utilizing various techniques (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). Member checks also can be described as the process of sharing with participants various components of the research study, including the research questions, data, preliminary categories, and interpretations, in order to reduce misinterpretation and confirm the validity of the investigator's research approach to the perspectives and beliefs of the faculty members (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Transferability

Transferability is the main function of external validity and there are a number of naturalistic techniques that can be utilized to help establish applicability. These techniques may include thick descriptions and purposive sampling. Thick description of the data allows the readers to determine generalizability of the study. One should judge generalizability or transferability by the similarities between the findings and their particular context. The researcher has the responsibility of providing readers with vivid, thick descriptions of the data to allow for judgments about transferability.

Data were analyzed inductively based on the assumption that inferences can be developed by examining the transcripts of interview with the faculty members (Roulston, 2010). Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993) described inductive analysis of qualitative data as a progressive and ongoing process, not a stage or one-time event. The

purpose of this type of analysis is to organize and bring meaning to the data. Inductive data analysis should follow an interactive process that includes four elements. Erlandson et al. (1993) described these elements as (1) unitizing data where the data were disassembled into the smallest possible independent thoughts; (2) emergent category designation where data were sorted into ideas in a five step process; (3) negative case analysis where the researcher seeks examples of data that do not fit hypothesize relationships; and (4) bridging, extending and surfacing data where more thorough definitions of and relationships across categories are sought

A special focus during the analysis of these interviews was paid to the written curriculum (syllabus) and the perceived application of the written curriculum. Copies of transcriptions were given to participants to clarify, change, or add information. The purpose of this member check was to verify with interview participants that the transcription represented the intended response and it accurately reflected the content discussed in the interview (Thomas, Nelson, & Silverman, 2011).

Several different artifacts were analyzed in the study. Some artifacts were used to help understand how the instructor planned, taught, and assessed the course in terms of the program goals. The researcher examined the course syllabus, performance assessments, handouts, and quizzes to ensure the course was planned and taught according to faculty goals. The syllabus was analyzed by matching the objectives (goals of the course) to the faculty interview responses. Field notes, handouts, and assessments were also reviewed to understand the match between the content that was taught and assessed and the faculty perceived notions of the content taught and assessed.

Handouts, assessments, tools, and Power Point presentations were available and used for additional information. Field notes were used in providing a detailed picture of the operational (day-to-day) curriculum that was observed throughout the semester. Field notes also provided a description of the content that was taught and the progression used.

An average score of 90% for teacher effectiveness coming from the ten lessons was the average score of the instructor. A score of 22.5 out 25 would give the instructor a 90% for a teaching episode. Every lesson may not have included all criteria of the rubric, but an instructor of a method course should still average across nine lesson above 90%. Some classes required more content while others required more management. A cut off score above 90% may not have been fair to the instructor teaching the class to young adults instead of P-12 students.

Role of the Researcher

The nature of this qualitative investigation required the researcher to serve as the primary instrument collecting, recording and analyzing the data. This role required the researcher to strive for objectivity, but Patton (2002) argued the researcher must aim for neutrality, rather than true objectivity, because true objectivity is unrealistic due to the context and interest of the researcher. I am a doctoral student interested in research on teacher education. While reading teacher education literature, I came upon the topic of coherence as a topic to explore teacher preparation programs. An important line of research in teacher education has been to improve P-12 education through more effective teacher education programs. I reflect on my own teaching experiences and how unprepared I felt as I entered the public school sector. Literature has suggested that I was not alone in those feelings. Teacher educators have been criticized for failure to teach the

content future teachers need. There is limited research on teacher education programs and teacher educators. While studying curriculum in my graduate programs, I came across the idea of coherence. The topic is important because teacher preparation programs should be designed to have clear goals, the goals should be taught by all faculty members, and finally the content taught should be evaluated. The curriculum should also be coherent. To satisfy my desire for more knowledge in this area, I proposed this study to gain a better understanding of coherence, specifically using one unique content course, within a PETE program.

Based on my experiences in schools and higher education, I feel we can better prepare our students to become future educators. I have an educated guess there are teacher preparation programs that are not coherent and/or have courses that are not coherent. I believe higher education can sometimes hinder coherence. Hindrance may come from the amount of time spent on the tenure and promotion process or the notion of scholars teaching what they themselves feel is most important. I believe a coherent program influences not only students, but faculty as well. Faculty members in a coherent program work more efficiently and may find more ease in teaching knowing all their colleagues are on the same agenda. I find the topic of research on coherence interesting but also difficult. I do not know what level of coherence I will find in studying this particular unique content course within this program.

I am currently a thirty year old white male finishing my doctoral degree while conducting research in the program I am attending. I am a former student of each faculty member I interviewed. I am a former teaching assistant for two of the students who are part of this study. I am familiar with the content since I have taught elementary school,

but I would not say I have a high content knowledge in this content. I was the lead researcher in this study. I conducted the interviews as well as performed the observations. Being involved in the study, I felt would provide me the best understanding of the participants. The analyses of the interviews, as well as the observations, were reviewed by a panel of faculty members and graduate students to verify the results for any reliability or validity issues.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest was the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. The results of this study are organized around the research questions. In the first section the ability of PETE faculty members to identify the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program is presented. Next, the extent to which there is a consistent or shared vision of this role is presented. In the third section, the instructor's view of the role of the unique content course is compared with the views of other faculty members within the program. In the fourth section, the purpose for the unique content course espoused by the instructor is contrasted with the observed delivery of the course. The fifth and final section, is where the student views of the purposes of the unique content course are examined in the context of instructor and/or faculty member views.

The results of this study are presented in a manner consistent with the research questions posed in chapter one. For each research question, identifiable similarities and differences between the participants will be reported and discussed.

Research Question One

To what extent can PETE faculty members articulate the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?

The ability of faculty members to articulate the role of a unique content course will be gauged. The primary data source used to answer this question was a semi-structured formal interview with six PETE faculty members.

In the interview, the faculty members were asked to identify and label descriptive categories that comprise a PETE program. The categories were grouped by their description rather than the exact terms used by faculty members to label the categories. The categories identified are as follows: General Education, Methods/Pedagogy, Content, and Foundations. The Foundations category was subdivided into professional and physical education.

The faculty identified general education credits as being a critical component of the education a college student should receive. It is considered to be a "well-rounded understanding of the world around us" portion of a college education, and I think that's a critical piece for teachers---that they have some breadth of understanding of ways of thinking, of constructs that have an influence on the lives of all humans" (Faculty # 1). The faculty members identified the humanities, sciences, psychology, and university 101 courses as important to all college students.

The next category identified was methods/pedagogy. Lumped into this category were teaching courses, practicum, and student teaching. Faculty member #4 identified the courses as "…corresponding with research on effective teaching, and largely defined by skills and knowledge that underpins how to instruct and manage classes." Faculty members also identified a common characteristic of this category as the structured design of instructional experiences.

The content category was identified as the main component of subject matter in PETE programs. There were many examples of content given (sport based, dance, gymnastics, fitness-related). Remarkably, a few faculty members were able to list all content courses that are offered in the PETE program.

The last two categories are similar, but for clarification purposes were broken down into two foundations. The first foundation, labeled professional education foundations, consisted of courses that are professional knowledge related to the individual colleges or majors. Faculty member #3 gave an example of a general foundations course as related to education, "A course such as schools and society is a foundation course which every person who prepares to become a teacher takes, but this course does not necessarily advance the foundations specific to the profession [physical education]."

The second foundation, physical education, included sub-disciplinary courses. The courses were described as science-based courses, kinesiology, and measurement courses. Faculty member #4 identified these courses as the "scientific underpinnings of effective teaching."

The following table (Table 4.1) demonstrates the results of faculty member responses assigning percentages to the components of a teacher preparation program.

Table 4.1

Categories identified by faculty

	PE foundations	Methods/Pedagogy	Foundations Professional	Content	General Ed.
Faculty # 1	15	25	5	15	40
Faculty #2	8	25	8	9	50
Faculty #3	10	30-40	10	30-40	10
Faculty #4	30	25	10	25	10
Faculty #5	10	15	5	20	50
Instructor	20	30	5	5	40

Note. Numbers represent percentages assigned by participants

As shown in Table 4.1, there was a wide range of percentages given. Not one faculty member was able to assign percentages without giving the matter ample thought. Faculty members fought the urge to assign a higher percentage to physical education specific categories while understanding that one cannot take the credits from general education. Faculty member #3 had an extremely low percentage assigned to general education, but yet wanted to keep his percentage and stated.

> The general teacher education programs in the United States have a very weak content preparation program component, very weak. And part of the reason is because one can argue that the amount or the types of content are not enough. But I would argue that if we have, and I have listed here 12 activities, I would tell you that it's not so much the breadth of the content as it is the depth of the content that our students or physical education students at large in the United States hurt.

Similar to the other faculty members, the instructor had a difficult time assigning such a large percentage to general education: "I hate to give that much time, but if it [general education courses] really is two years then it would be 50 percent of the time. Why do we have to spend so much time there?"

The instructor matched the majority of the faculty members by having general education as the highest percentage and methods as the second highest. The biggest difference between the instructor and other faculty members was the percentage assigned to content courses. Even though the instructor expressed the need for more content, students are required to take so few credit hours in this component that it was assigned only five percent.

Increasing content was a common suggestion of the faculty members. Most felt the amount of content courses required of students was too low. "I think our students

should get more than a cursory exposure to the content that they currently get, be it Educational Games, Dance, Gymnastics, Soccer, Football, whatever it might be," (Faculty #1). Faculty #2 suggested, "I think {lack of} knowledge of the content is one of our biggest problems in pedagogy right now," (faculty #2).

Through examining the categories, the physical education specific category identified by most faculty members was pedagogy/methods. This faculty obviously feels the program should be grounded in courses that focus on teaching. Most faculty members agreed foundational general education courses are important, but should be relatively minimal compared to other pedagogy specific courses. There was a wide range of percentages within the other categories as well. The content category seemed relatively low for most, but much higher for a few others. The foundations courses related to physical education had a wide range as well.

Summary of the Components of a Teacher Preparation Program

The shared perceptions of faculty members as to the components of a teacher preparation program could be evaluated as moderate. Faculty members were able to create similar categories and assign percentages for the amount those categories comprise the program. There was disconnect in the number of general education credits students should be required to obtain, but there was a shared belief that if one area were to be increased, that area would be content.

The role of the educational gymnastics

To understand the unique role the educational gymnastics course has within the program, the faculty members answered several questions during the interviews specifically related to educational gymnastics. Faculty members were asked to state the

role of the educational gymnastics course in the program. The following roles were identified.

> It should be the foundation of what students should understand, be able to design appropriate experiences for students to be able to demonstrate and model what those things look like, and be able to see what quality looks like in an Educational Gymnastics kind of a format.(Faculty #1)

The PETE curriculum for elementary students at this university involves three content courses---Educational Games, Educational Dance, and Educational Gymnastics.

> Its purpose is to prepare the teacher candidates to teach the specific content to young learners with knowledge and skill. It deals with a set of specific principles, concepts, skills and strategies teacher candidates should know so they can teach the content in an informed and appropriate manner when in the field and working with children." (Faculty #3)

Faculty #5 believed, "It [Educational games, dance, and gymnastics] is the foundation of our entire elementary curriculum."

Some faculty members argued the purpose of the course could depend on the instructor assigned to teach educational gymnastics.

> I think there's different philosophies on what the Educational Gymnastics class should be---whether it's to teach them how to teach Educational Gymnastics or if it's improving their skill in Educational Gymnastics, which then makes them a better teacher. And I think it really depends on who's teaching the class sometimes. (Faculty #5)

Faculty #4 offered the notion of a blended approach:

> As far as I understand it, I watched a couple of those courses being taught by different people and it seems that students get the opportunity not only to practice Educational Gymnastics skills, as if they were students in a course, or in a Physical Education class, but they appear to also get some use out of peer teaching, perhaps, or getting to practice some effective teaching skills dealing specifically with Educational Gymnastics content. So that meshes with what we call pedagogical knowledge, but again I think that's essentially what the course offers. It's a blend of content and pedagogy, and I'm not sure if it would tap into other categories.

On the contrary, Faculty #1 does not see peer teaching as a purpose of the educational gymnastics course

> I'm not including in there anything related to pure teaching. I don't see that as part of what should be going on in this class. I'm not looking for a big chunk of this to be the instructor sitting back while students blindly try to teach each other stuff they can't do very well. I don't see that as appropriate use of time for that class.

The instructor response was:

> The educational gymnastics course supports our philosophy that students need to be able to perform certain activities in order to teach them effectively. Educational gymnastics is something that is very new to most students so the purpose of that course is to get them to understand more indirect content. First of all, become participants…..it's one of many activity courses they take but it is the only course that focuses solely on body management skills. So it's unique in the activities realm, in that regard. It feeds into the pedagogy and methods [courses] because the point that they really pick up with teaching educational gymnastics is when they hit the elementary methods course.

This directly relates to a response given by another faculty member:

> Most undergraduates have no experience coming in. So the role, basically, is to give them the content. To help them to understand the content through activity. To experience it [educational gymnastics], as well as to be able to articulate what that content is. (Faculty #2)

When asked where it could help in the other content courses, the instructor identified:

> It's part of the foundations, it feeds into the foundations because hopefully, and I'm thinking specifically of [PEDU] 190, we've got the shared movement language that goes on in both of those classes. I don't think it is very well pulled into motor learning and biomechanics, but it certainly could be.

Faculty #3 identified a possible connection to PEDU 190 as well.

> If the educational gymnastics, instructor, teaches the forward roll or a version of a roll, the body has to be performing certain actions in sequence. So certain critical elements must be performed before other critical elements, and so the principle of sequencing the cues in the appropriate order which is learned in the [PEDU] 190 course, I imagine that is followed and it informs the sequence with which the instructor in that course puts the critical elements in order for the students to perform the forward roll.

Summary of Research Question One

Data supports the notion that faculty members were aware of the educational gymnastics course and had an opinion of the role the course should play in the overall program. Faculty share a perspective of the educational gymnastics course as a part of the physical education content category. All faculty members were able to describe specific characteristics of the course and how it may fit into the teacher preparation program. Faculty members were able to create similar categories and assign percentages for the amount those categories comprise the program.

Research Question Two

To what extent is there a consistent or shared vision of the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program?

There are three major goals of content courses in physical education programs. These goals are: skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance), performance (the ability to actually do the skills), and pedagogy (the ability to select, sequence, present, provide practice and give feedback on pupil performances). The faculty members were asked to identify the emphasis of each of these goals and to provide examples of how to implement these goals into an educational gymnastics course.

Most faculty members placed a large emphasis on skill analysis, but little emphasis on performance. Skill analysis can be defined a number of different ways. Faculty #2 stated, "The emphasis in the educational gymnastics class on Laban's framework and giving people the language is a critical part of observation of movement across all activity."

Some believed the instructor should connect the (Analysis of Human Movement) PEDU 190 course with educational gymnastics. The PEDU 190 course teaches the observations skills needed to properly analyze both technical and mechanical aspects of skill performance.

One faculty member identified skill analysis as a weakness in the program.

> I think maybe that is an area that is weak programmatically. Our students struggle with their ability to critically analyze a skill to improve or enhance student performance. There have been instances where the course was taught where the students did evaluate their performance, but they evaluated really their own performance, which sometimes may be a smidge biased. Because they're---just like kids, they think that they're better than they really are. And so sometimes they have a hard time critically analyzing skill.(Faculty #5)

The same faculty member offered a reason for this perceived weakness.

> I think the ideal is built into the courses. I just don't know if it's been executed well. And it may be because, and this is not to be hateful to those who have taught it, they may not be teaching it from a biomechanical perspective. They're teaching it from, which I know sounds a little contradictory, a skill development perspective. And their focus is on how well did you perform (the skills) without understanding what they did well. (Faculty #5)

Most faculty members agreed the course seemed to focus more on the content or performance of educational gymnastics. The majority of the faculty indicated the focus should be on the quality of the fundamental movement skills.

> So if a person can do a backward roll, fine, but it needs to be done with quality. And if a person can just do a pencil roll, fine. So the emphasis is not on a high level skill, the emphasis is on the quality of the movement that they show. It is important to get the students skilled at performing fundamental movement skills and a high level…..I'm not sure what the current emphasis is and I'm not sure the current instructors have placed emphasis on that. (Faculty #4)

The faculty member based the argument on physical educators being able to role model and demonstrate effectively the motor skills that they are teaching. To further the point, the member added,

> I think it's not good enough just to be a kind of a modicum level of proficiency. Not to mention the research that is out there now that shows how important fundamental movement skills, specifically, are to physical activity behavior and later learning and so forth…….. I believe with certain content areas teachers they ought to be able to show proficiency in their own movement, certainly at an elementary level with fundamental movement skills.

Faculty #1 identified pedagogy as a smaller emphasis of the course.

> I'm looking for them to be able to analyze the skill and then be able to determine what would be the appropriate subsequent sequencing. I'm not looking for good set induction, good demonstrations, good feedback following performance---I'm not looking for any of that in this class.

Another faculty member agreed, "I don't think that course necessarily should involve giving them teaching experiences doing that [learning how to teach educational gymnastics]. But the teacher, by virtue of the way the teacher teaches, that would be modeled." (Faculty #2)

Table 4.2 shows the results of how faculty members identified the emphasis of the course within the three categories.

Table 4.2

Emphasis of the Course-Faculty Percentages

Participant	Skill Analysis	Pedagogy	Performance
Faculty #1	40	10	50
Faculty #2	40	20	40
Faculty #3	30	10	60
Faculty #4	30	10-20	50-60
Faculty #5	50	15	35

Summary of Table 4.2

The data shows a moderate amount of a shared vision between faculty members' beliefs of the emphasis of the course. A little over half of the faculty members seemed to have a shared vision of what the emphasis of the course. Most faculty members had a high emphasis placed on performance, followed by skill analysis and the smallest amount

of emphasis being dedicated to pedagogy. Some of the faculty even stated that skills analysis and pedagogy go hand in hand in this type of content course. Faculty member #5 viewed this course vastly different than the other members by placing the highest amount of emphasis on skill analysis, as well as placing the performance aspect the lowest. This view may have been skewed by the member's observation of students at the end of the semester.

Faculty #5 gave the following comment of a personal observation.

> At the end of Spring 2013 semester {taught by a different instructor identified in this study}, we were invited to come see their group sequence performances. I watched the students perform group sequences. You look at physical skill development and we all know that there's different compounding factors to skillfulness, but I don't know how many of them really learned a skill or if they just really performed a skill.

Faculty #5 explained that limited time to learn the skills may be a reason why the students appeared unskilled. Faculty #5 recalled,

> the students {get} turned off when they hear gymnastics because they categorize it. And typically, it's probably gender characterized. And they don't always have the most positive attitude towards the course. So great, they can develop skill, they develop some type of pedagogical knowledge, but do they really appreciate it?

Another faculty member extended the notion with:

> As with all teaching, I think the teacher ought to shape, design a plan for experiences that target students' attitudes toward that particular content, so that when they go out to teach it they won't inadvertently be sending messages to students that turn people off to gymnastics or that hopefully they themselves really have adopted a value that really prioritizes it [educational gymnastics]. (Faculty #4)

Faculty members were asked if the educational gymnastics course was planned to enhance student learning somewhere else in the curriculum. Table 4.3 represents faculty member responses.

Table 4.3	
Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program- Faculty	
Reponses	Number of Faculty who identified the response
Curriculum courses	3
Student Teaching	2
Sub-discipline courses	1
Practicum	4
Methods	5

Summary of Table 4.3

The table shows a fairly strong amount of evidence of shared beliefs between faculty members for where educational gymnastics may help students elsewhere in the program. All faculty members identified the educational gymnastics course as being important somewhere else in the curriculum. The main course for assistance identified was the elementary methods and practicum courses. The students should learn the content knowledge of educational gymnastics in the major activity course, and then apply that knowledge in the methods and practicum courses. It was identified that student teaching is less of a guarantee because the program has less influence of the content planned in the schools. If the curriculum at the placement includes teaching educational gymnastics at the time of the student teacher, the student teacher is expected to teach the content.

Faculty #1 provided an example of how educational gymnastics may help in other areas, specifically curriculum courses.

> To some extent it [educational gymnastics] would also provide them [students] some concrete kinds of examples or experiences to reflect back on when they're thinking about curriculum design…… in the 446 curriculum class, when they think in terms of what appropriate content would look like for elementary, middle, or high school levels.

The faculty members were asked to identify the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes a student should possess upon completing educational gymnastics. These attributes, given by faculty members, are listed in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Expected Student Knowledge/Skill - Faculty	
Reponses	Number of Faculty who identified the response
Movement Framework/Laban	5
Movement Wheel/George Graham	2
History and language specific to educational gymnastics	3
Know and develop appropriate content for different age groups	3
The unique role it plays in the curriculum	4
How to design elicit or exploratory movement responses	2
How to teach toward safety	2
Technical correctness at their skill level	3
Perform fundamental or basic skills of Educational Gymnastics	4

Summary of Table 4.4

There is a fairly strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members for the knowledge and skills students should have acquired upon the completion of the course. In the majority of responses given, three or more faculty members identified a shared belief. All faculty members identified students should know the framework the instructor assigns for the course. All faculty members felt the instructor should use the BSER, Labans, and/or Graham movement wheel as frameworks for the course. "They should know what the content is for educational gymnastics regardless of what framework the teacher is using, and there is several that can be used," (Faculty #2).

Another faculty member agreed,

> They should have an appropriate language that matches up with specific Educational Gymnastics terms and a vocabulary appropriate to the kinds of students that they're working with. Laban framework would probably be the most appropriate one that I would expect them to have some knowledge of. Again, it's part of that vocabulary to understand and characterize movement through a

> variety of different kinds of levels and speeds and directions and those kinds of things. So the Laban framework is probably the most generalizable for Educational Gymnastics as that kind of a language. So that would be the conceptual framework piece. I would also look for them to be able to use language that's going to be developmentally appropriate for the children that they are working with (Faculty #1)

Some faculty members have identified the history of educational gymnastics as being an important aspect of the course. It would be a relatively minor focus, but the faculty members agreed students should have some understanding of the history of this content area, and its overall placement in an Elementary Physical Education curriculum.

The skills students need to learn in the course should be skills from the language or framework used in the course. Basic skills of educational gymnastics were identified by faculty members, "They need to know basic skills that they would teach that are developmentally appropriate to their students. It is expected students should know how to develop skill, both for those that are on target and below target, and maybe above target," (Faculty #5).

The faculty member added

> It's tough if you look at all the different components that imbed Educational Gymnastics. There's individual skill development, sequencing of skill development, partner sequencing with equipment and without equipment, moving and traveling in space…. also I think that exploratory movement is important. So a beginning teacher needs to know how to foster that development in a student. How do you teach students to explore their own environment? And explore different ways to perform a forward roll, a log roll, a balance, a weight transfer. You know, even as simple as that. So I think even before they get into "this is a specific type of roll," they really need to have the knowledge on how to develop exploratory movement. (Faculty #5)

All faculty interviewed were able to identify that students should be able to perform all fundamental movement skills. Most denied the belief that highly skilled in educational gymnastics is defined by a good performance. One faculty member stated

> They should be able to identify what good performance is. They should be able to perform the educational gymnastics tasks that the teacher gives to the best of their ability, with a focus on the quality of the movement. ……..I don't think they have to be highly skillful, but I think they have to at least work toward getting better at it. (Faculty #2)

Another faculty member extended this notion

> They should be able to perform basic balances on multiple body parts in different shapes in relationship with others and equipment using levels. Can they develop that proficiency? They can elicit that same response from their K-5 student. That's something they should be able to do. I think that they should be able to mimic the pattern of a cartwheel, so hand-hand- foot- foot. They should be able to perform weight transfer on their hands. ….They should take weight transfer on their hands, even if it's as simple as a donkey kick or a mule kick….They need to learn enough, or they need to be able to do basic foundational skills to give their students options when they're teaching so that they can progress and allow for that exploratory movement. But I don't think that they should have to be able to do advanced gymnastics skills. I think that's above and beyond their scope and sequence, particularly for what this class is all about. (Faculty #5)

Table 4.5	
Expected Students values/attitudes - Faculty	
Reponses	Number of Faculty who identified the response
Role of gymnastics in overall physical education of students	3
Unique content- pure body management	3
Positive disposition that everyone can be successful	2
Look past gender bias	2
Commitment to content	2
Value of gymnastics as a content area	2
Appreciation for gymnastics and what it can do for people	2
Generalizability of skills	2
Exploratory teaching	2
Develop affective skills	2

Summary of Table 4.5

Table 4.5 shows a limited amount of shared vision between faculty members for expected student attitudes and values after completing the course. Many of the responses were only identified by two of the faculty members. Faculty members had a shared belief that students should gain an understanding that people involved in the activity perform at

all different levels. Faculty #2 identified this as, "They should value the process that is used in terms of allowing each child to perform at their own level."

Faculty #1 added,

> I'm looking for a positive disposition in terms of recognizing that physically moving is a desirable kind of skill that everybody can have some degree of success. There will be different levels of success, different levels of challenges for different levels of students. And that everybody can do this---that is boys and girls and highly skilled and low skilled. And regardless of race and ethnicity, gender, sexual preference or orientation or any of those kinds of categories/labels that we use for people, all can be successful and have some degree of success with Educational Gymnastics.

Another important value to be gained is that of diversity in performance and its social ramifications as expressed by faculty #3.

> One person may perform something at a very high level, and another person may perform something at a lower level but with an equal amount of effort, respect, and engagement to the specific movement form. So, maybe educational gymnastics and the way it's being framed and taught has the potential to reinforce a more open attitude toward acceptance of diversity not in terms of negotiating standards of performance or achievement but in terms of understanding the various meanings a movement form may have for different people……This course I believe provides opportunities for thinking about the potential a movement form may have in shaping prospective teachers' attitudes toward themselves, their future students' learning, and the nature and potential of the subject matter itself.

Faculty members also expressed the need for students to understand the important role educational gymnastics takes in the movement education of elementary aged children.

> Tied into the valuing part, I would look for them to value the opportunity to learn more about the content that they should be incorporating in an elementary curriculum and to understand the kind of contribution that successful performance in Educational Gymnastics can have for students to be able to have success in other play games and sports. (Faculty #1)

Some of the faculty members identified the need to focus on appreciation of the subject matter. Gymnastics gives students an opportunity to interact in unique ways in which the students support each other and give each other encouragement. Faculty #4 suggested to "integrate those kinds of affective skills and responses into the courses ….. teach tasks to my majors so that my majors, in turn, would know the value of the tasks and how they let themselves recognize and then categorize them for those purposes." The values and attitudes of the students may play an important role in student effectiveness in teaching the subject matter.

Faculty member #5 offered the thought that one should pay close attention to the values and attitudes of students entering the course at different skill levels and the impact skill level may have on a student's appreciation of the material.

> I think if they were a student who came in and they were already competent in basic Educational Gymnastics movements they'd probably appreciate it and value it a lot more…… I think they leave there already valuing it because they come in with an orientation towards the skill. I think it's a hard sell for students to develop the knowledge, or the attitude and disposition to appreciate the movement if they can't do it. And I think it's simply because it's either unfamiliar to them or they just are not skillful and so they relate their worth of the skill or the content area based on their ability to perform the skill. So I don't know how many of them really do appreciate it. And I think that it's a selfish orientation.

Faculty member #5 also continued with personal observations while teaching a methods course.

> I don't think they're truly appreciating the skills that they're teaching their students. And so their commitment to the content, I think, is very minimal. They just get through it. And then when we can get to the fun things, like games, they are all about it, "I love games. This is what Physical Education should be." When really, I think it could be quite different. And I think the Educational Gymnastics really becomes a core foundation of a Physical Education program. And that's just my experience with some students. Some students love it and others can't wait to get those three done. And knowing teachers out in the schools now, some teach it and some will never touch it again. And I think either they

didn't appreciate it when they went through it or they're not comfortable teaching it on their own. And I think that goes with the appreciation of it.

Assessment can play a major role in content courses. Faculty members were asked if there is an expectation that the instructor of this course use the SCPEAP Assessments and what should be the role of the SCPEAP assessments. The Table 4.6 represents what faculty members described.

Table 4.6

Thoughts on assessment/SCPEAP- Faculty	
Reponses	Number of Faculty who identified the response
Should be expected to use SCPEAP	1
Should not be expected to use SCPEAP	3
There should be more than just SCPEAP	4
Can be useful for NCATE	2
SCAPEP is a fundamentally sound type of assessment	2
Use SCAPEP only if it is mandated in the state	2
There are other valid instruments that an instructor could use	3
SCAPEP should be a formative assessment not a summary outcome	2
Practice facilitating SCPEAP	2
Assess performance level of students	2

Summary on Table 4.6

The table represents a moderate amount of evidence of a shared vision among faculty members in the use of SCPEAP assessment in this course. A majority did not feel the instructor should be expected to use SCPEAP assessments. There were few responses that were identified by more than two faculty members. Only one faculty member identified the instructor should be expected to use SCPEAP. There were many responses that at least two out of the five faculty members shared the same response.

Faculty #2 does not think the instructor of the course should be expected to use SCPEAP assessments.

> I think the teacher should be free to use whatever assessments they want. …….if the teacher teaches the class well enough at the skill level that college students are, that should be easy. You don't need to do the elementary assessments.

Other faculty members took time to reflect upon the expectation of the department as a whole. "I remember having discussions about this for program evaluation purposes, but I don't recall whether the instructor in educational gymnastics is expected to use the SCPEAP assessments." (Faculty #3)

Another faculty member reflected,

> If SCPEAP is thriving in the state, continues to be the expectation, by all means that should be the assessment template, or the assessment, let's say, rubrics, that teachers should be able to use, and be very familiar with. If it's not, why do we use it in the state if there's more diversity and if you're more on the decision of the course instructor---which assessment tasks the students might be expected to learn and use. (Faculty #4)

The faculty members mentioned the purpose of using SCPEAP assessments might contribute to program evaluation, specifically to NCATE. Another purpose of using SCPEAP, besides measuring skill level, is the assessment itself.

> The SCPEAP assessments are useful to learn because they give students a perspective of teaching that derives from. It was a backward design. What you should, in a sense, be able to do, and I'm going to teach toward that….. So having a structured assessment is very helpful in that sense, and SCPEAP was, for a long time, one of the only really structured assessment tests out there for these kinds of student performances, for these kinds of tasks, learning tasks……. one way or another students ought to be able to assess and know what they're learning to plan based on the assessment expectation. (Faculty #4)

One more faculty member chimed in on using SCPEAP for NCATE purposes.

> If we look at things we collect for NCATE and data that we have it does become kind of an enforced assessment simply because it's one way to collect systematically data for accreditation if we look at it simply from that lens. (Faculty #5)

This faculty member also reflected on whether or not SCPEAP assessments should be used in the activity courses.

> SCPEAP is not a mandated assessment program. It's a great program. ……..Lots of good elements to it, it's there. I think it could really help an instructor of the course and it could also help students of the course if we relate course outcomes to SCPEAP……But it would limit what gets done in a course as well. If we say we've got to get SCPEAP in there, what about all the other different ways to assess student learning in Educational Gymnastics? It's kind of a double-edged sword because we are a program that's heavily founded on SCPEAP for many reasons. I think to say exclusively that an instructor should be using it as a major form of assessment in the course is very limiting……. But honestly, I don't think that it should be structured so that you have to incorporate SCPEAP. There's different ways to show student learning in a class. (Faculty #5)

Faculty member #1 was the lone participant who thought an instructor should use SCPEAP assessments.

> One part would be for them to see us model something that we keep saying matters. SCPEAP assessments provide a more objective and more focused kind of way to assess specific skills within the content of gymnastics. It is something that I'd like for them to be using in the elementary schools, in the event that they're ever out there." Another reason identified was the "comfort level with it [SCPEAP assessments] and their confidence in being able to administer the assessment appropriately. So then seeing it modeled as to, I've got 30 kids, how the heck do I do a SCPEAP assessment with 30 kids……So seeing somebody manage a full class with the SCPEAP assessment, how do you do that?

Faculty #1 gave an example for how to use SCPEAP assessments.

> I would like them to see it modeled appropriately and then I'd like to see them actually go through it so they experience it as a learner, that is, "I've got to design my own movement experience and I've got to do it with form and all that good stuff." And I'd like them to be forced to actually look at the data and assess it. "So what does this look like?" "How would I grade this performance?" if you will.

Most faculty members identified the purpose of using the SCPEAP assessments is to assess the performance level of the students. It becomes problematic because the SCPEAP rubric was designed for elementary age students. Most identified that college

students should not only be able to reach a level of competence that would be expected of elementary students, but should be held to a higher standard.

As in all classes, the instructor is always under the microscope. All faculty members identified that the instructor should model effective teaching. Table 4.7 contains a list of behaviors that are expected to be modeled by the instructor.

Table 4.7

Behaviors of Effective Teaching - Faculty	
Reponses	Faculty Number of Faculty who identified the response
Use effective pedagogical skills (basic instructional skills) for the course	5
Use developmentally appropriate practices	3
Explicitly use effective content development skills (extension, refinement, application)	3
Model the safe design of instructional space and equipment	2
Establish expectations and routines	2
Know the content and how to teach it	3
Use exploratory teaching	2

Summary of Table 4.7

Table 4.7 shows a strong amount of evidence of shared vision among faculty members in identifying behaviors of effective teaching. All faculty members identified the instructor should be using basic instructional skills. Many of the responses were given by a majority of faculty members. Some of the highest frequency responses consist of the following.

Faculty member #1 referred to an encounter with a student on the reason behind why there should be expectancy that instructor model effective teaching

> I say that because I have witnessed students in our Methods classes, being told what effective instruction looks like and then going out into an activities class and then having most, if not all of those expectations for what effective instruction looks like be violated. Where two students are working and 28 are sitting down. Where there are no good demonstrations given. In this kind of a class I would

look for those kinds of indicators of effective instruction to be modeled by the teacher as well.

An important piece some faculty members identified is proper handling and use of equipment. Educational Gymnastics is an activity that uses a number of different kinds of equipment. Faculty #1 expressed,

> I expect them also to model the safe design [of] instructional space. For example, mats aren't pushed up against the wall where people are going to do the forward roll and slam into the wall. So that if there is some sort of a vault and there's a run up to it, the run up isn't right beside a door, mid-path. I've seen in school settings that when there's anybody going to do anything in an elevated way there are mats set up to deal with anybody falling and spotters are trained. I'm looking for that kind of modeling of safety in instructional design and in delivery of the content.

Faculty members agreed the instructor should have a large amount of content knowledge and the ability to properly progress the content and refine student skills.

Faculty #2 identified the teacher should try to use more instructions.

> I think it should be explicit. And I think that if, in these courses the teacher would share why they do something, the kids would pick up the pedagogy. Just as, I think if our teachers out there in the field, when teaching PE, if they would share why do something, kids would learn the discipline knowledge. They learn why practice is important and what's good practice and they learn about physiology with really just sharing what you are doing.

Faculty member #3 stated that the type of teaching should align with the content. "It's context that drives this kind of decisions on, let's say, assigning value to a pedagogical technique. So, in educational gymnastics, for example, a movement education perspective superimposes the teaching approaches that the particular instructor employs."

Faculty #4 related it to the way effective teaching is measured in the methods course.

> All of the stuff that you'd essentially assess a methods student on you would be able to demonstrate in a highly effective way to your majors. And it may not always---they won't be paying attention to a lot of those things in the program of study, but they will probably recall you doing those things when they begin to learn more explicitly about them in the methods course.

Faculty member #5 believed effective instruction is important because of the time restraints.

> They need to plan realistically and understand they only have a certain amount of time to get their students skillful in "x" number of things. And so we need to be realistic about what should be taught in the course and how it should be taught so that when our students become a little more independent and they're out teaching it themselves they have something to potentially mirror and say, "Oh, this is something we did in class." And they can try it based on the model that they were taught with. That doesn't mean that it won't require some manipulation, but it gives them a place to start, particularly for students who do not have any experience with the content area.

Faculty #5 stated to be an effective teacher one needs to be"…making sure that everybody in a department is on the same page in regards to what should be happening in all of our classes."

Summary of Research Question Two

There were a wide range of shared visions among faculty. The three major areas of emphasis in content courses is getting students skilled in the particular content, teaching students how to teach the content, and teaching the students how to analyze skill within the content. Two faculty members identified pedagogical content and skill analysis as influencing one another in this particular content course. The members described this connection as using skill analysis to assist in student learning of content progression. This content progression would be focused on "I saw this error, what feedback would I give

and what task would I assign to correct the error." When establishing the ways pedagogy and skill analysis go hand in hand, it may be beneficial to lump the categories together. Like previously mentioned, faculty members were asked to respond to a question and the level of shared vision was measured by the frequency of faculty member responses. The question of the knowledge and skills a student should possess as well as whether a teacher should model effective teaching had strong shared responses. Faculty members were all able to identify the need for students to acquire the vocabulary associated with the framework assigned by the instructor. Faculty members also identified the need for students to be able to perform all fundamental movement skills upon completion of the course. Modeling effective teaching was the last strong coherence indicator under research question two. The faculty members wanted the instructor of the course to model basic instructional skills and to have high content knowledge in the course. Faculty members expected the instructor to not only model the behaviors, but also explicitly inform the students of the actions used, as well as the language of the behaviors, the instructor was modeling.

Research Question Three

Does the view of the role of the unique content course, as held by the instructor, match the views of other faculty in the program?

As mentioned earlier, there are three major goals of content courses in physical education programs. The three major goals are skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance) , performance (the ability to actually do the skills), and pedagogy (the ability to select, sequence, present, practice and give feedback on pupil performances). The instructor was asked to identify the emphasis of each of these goals

and to provide examples of how to implement these goals into an educational gymnastics course. The following table compares the instructor responses to that of the other faculty members.

Table 4.8

Emphasis of the Course- Faculty/Instructor Percentages

Participant	Skill Analysis	Pedagogy	Performance
Faculty# 1	40	10	50
Faculty #2	40	20	40
Faculty #3	30	10	60
Faculty #4	30	10-20	50-60
Faculty #5	50	15	35
Instructor	25	15	60

Summary of Table 4.8

The table shows a moderate amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor for the placement of emphasis in the course. The response given by the instructor during the faculty interview seemed to align with the overall vision of the faculty members. A little over half of the faculty members seem to have a shared vision of the emphasis of the course and the instructor seemed to match this vision. The instructor ranked performance higher, followed by skill analysis and the smallest emphasis on pedagogy, like the majority of faculty members.

The instructor offered some insight to the assigned percentages. The instructor identified time as being a major constraint to emphasizing skill analysis in this course.

> …….in the ideal world I would make this a 2 credit hour course. The one credit hour for trying to learn and become skillful with the content, I don't think is really enough. By the time you take equipment in and out and set up and take down, there is just a lot of management in that way.

In order to overcome the constraints of time, the instructor identified using flip cameras in the course to enhance student learning in skill analysis. The students were

assigned partners and a task. One student would perform a roll and the partner would video tape. The students were expected to analyze their skill by identifying the basic skill cues and critical features of the skill. The instructor also reserved time at the end of class to watch a performance and then discuss what the performers did well and what the performers could improve on.

The instructor assigned performances as the primary emphasis of the course. The instructor identified it as an activity course so the basis of this type of course is to become more skillful at moving. The instructor found this to be a very difficult task due to the decreased level of skill of students as they enter the course.

> I think it is one of the more difficult courses because I don't think they're coming to us very skilled anymore…. to have the appropriate flexibility or the appropriate strength to get to a high, high level of skill in a semester is really nearly impossible. I typically see improvements in skill that excites me, but those improvements are still far less than what we would consider good performance, for most of them.

The instructor did not identify pedagogy as a major emphasis of the course. A solution to improve this was offered;

> Now if it were a two credit hour course, that's definitely the direction I would move it in. And I guess this is probably an example of a more integrated approach to the program, where it would be very helpful if they were taking gymnastics concurrently, with being in the school site and you could approach it in more of an applied…more authentic way.

Like the faculty members, the instructor was asked to identify other major goals of the educational gymnastics course. The instructor voiced the use of the movement framework as being important, as well as using a method of teaching that allows all children to succeed, which may be thought of as diversity.

Another goal of the course identified by the instructor was the unique teaching style of educational gymnastics.

> it's indirect instruction which really as we talk about this more and I think back more to that class, it is an important pedagogical skill that they're learning more directly. If they're learning indirect learning more directly, I say that is because they're performing using an indirect kind of method. But we don't spend… I'm trying to think of how I would want to say that {pause} yeah, getting them to recognize that it is one of the few core courses that we have that do not use direct instruction. So that whole ability of being able to put yourself in that role of a performer, as a creator, as an initiator and as a teacher, as a facilitator are things that they see in that class……. but in terms of goals, we always have some goals related to motor performance, some goals are related to cognitive things that they should know. Some of them are more affective. There are certain affective goals that go along with that class too.

Faculty members were asked to establish areas where the educational gymnastics course was planned to help somewhere else in the curriculum. Table 4.9 represents what the faculty identified.

Table 4.9

Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program-Faculty/Instructor

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor
Curriculum courses	3	
Student Teaching	2	1
Sub-discipline courses	1	1
Practicum	4	
Methods	5	1

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.9

The table shows a fairly strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor in identifying courses in the program where educational gymnastics may be helpful. All faculty members and the instructor identified educational gymnastics as being complimentary in other areas of the curriculum. The main courses educational gymnastics assists, identified by faculty were also matched by the instructor. Even though the faculty member did not identify educational gymnastics

as helping in other areas of curriculum, the instructor did connect the course with the major teaching courses.

> I think it's kind of like eventually you want to bake a cake and that provides the initial ingredients for being able to teach it into the school. They have to become familiar and skillful with that content, then they learn a little bit more about content specific pedagogy for educational gymnastics and the elementary methods course. And then hopefully they will carry out teaching it independently once they are in a student teaching setting.

The faculty members and instructor were asked to identify the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes a student should possess upon exiting the course. The results of the perceptions of these attributes are represented in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

Expected Student knowledge/Skills –Faculty/Instructor

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor
Movement Framework/Laban	5	1
Movement Wheel/George Graham	2	1
Know how to use movement concepts across content	1	1
History and language specific to educational gymnastics	3	
Know and develop appropriate content for different age groups	3	1
The unique roll it plays in the curriculum	4	1
How to design elicit or exploratory movement responses	2	1
How to teach toward safety	2	
Technical correctness at their skill level	3	1
Know what a good performance is	1	1
Perform fundamental or basic skills of Educational Gymnastics	4	1

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.10

The table shows a fairly strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor regarding the knowledge and skills a student should gain in this course. Shown in the table, many of the behaviors the faculty identified were identified by the instructor as well. The instructor also supplied an example, which goes

beyond basic knowledge and skills, of horizontal and vertical progressions, progressing using the stages of learning and the movement wheel.

> I'm going to use the effort concept of fast and I'm going to use a foundational skill of rolling, speed in general, I could vary the rolling skill by rolling fast or slow and we know that and if I'm at the stage one level and my focus might be on a rolling action fast or rolling action slow or a rolling action that moves fast to slow or slow to fast. It's possible and those are all stage one, focusing on individual skill development, across a wide variety of concepts. And then I would move into stage two, where I am combining actions together and in that particular year, if I was out in the schools and I had already taught step-like actions, I would work with kids with the idea of combining a rolling action with a step-like action, using an appropriate transition and maybe I might say that the rolling action or you might have to show fast and slow. So either the roll could be fast or the step-like action could be fast. But the key there is I'm using linking two actions together. They are using a transition. Stage three would be beginning a sequence and those are usually, a sequence framework that has been specified by the instructor. So I want a beginning shape, a fast roll, transition, fast step-like action, transition, slow roll transition, slow step-like action. I think that's what the sequence was and then an ending shape. And stage four would be a more advanced sequencing where I may say put together a four/five part sequence and that sequence needs to show rolling and step-like actions, as well as variations in your use of time. It needs to have a beginning and ending shape. So then I've got that concept, the concept of time, the foundational skill of rolling, the development progressively, skill-wise across stages. But then there's another element that adds to that progression in there and that's whether or not, these are activities. I'm trying to think of how I want to say this. Even if I'm at the stage one level, there is actually, more progression that can happen than the stage one level if I want to perform on a mat, if I want to add equipment. If I want it to be a solo performance, a partner performance or a group performance.

The instructor identified the complexity of the content and learning the movement wheel. There are a lot of different parts to the wheel and the instructor felt through a lot of practice, students will be able to learn the content. The instructor related it to putting a puzzle together.

> If you understand those things [components of the movement wheel], it is so easy to develop content in educational gymnastics. It's like pushing pieces of the puzzle around. So again, I look at the movement wheel. I've got my foundational skills. I've got my stages and then it branches out into people and equipment.

Since it is a hard content area, time was identified as being problematic. The instructor recalled learning educational gymnastics and how hard it was to fully understand the content. It was not until the instructor started teaching in this area that the full grasp of the content was attained. Understanding the process of learning the material, the instructor identified she might evaluate skills differently than other instructors.

> There are, I am almost positive when another professor taught this course, she did a much more direct skill base to evaluation. I'm really a sort of purist in educational gymnastics that I don't do that to the extent that she did when she taught the course. I'm not saying at all that she taught it well and I taught it poorly, but I think we are a little bit different there.

The instructor explains the method behind her approach to the course.

> Because true to the nature of educational gymnastics, it's a conceptual approach. It's a concept. A rolling action is a concept, not a skill. But it is hard to stay away from certain skills like teaching a forward roll or a backward roll or a cartwheel. That is going to come into it, but I don't dwell on that. And I know it's not, and you've heard me say this all the time, it's not the person who can do the best round-off that is going to get the best grade.

Table 4.11

Expected Student Values/attitudes- Faculty/Instructor		
Reponses	Faculty	Instructor
Role of gymnastics in overall physical education of students	3	1
Unique content- pure body management	3	1
Appreciate the diversity with which people can accomplish a task	1	1
Promote that all leaners are not the same	1	1
Positive disposition that everyone can be successful	2	1
Look past gender bias	2	
Value individual creativity and effort	1	1
Commitment to content	2	
Value of gymnastics as a content area	2	
Appreciation for gymnastics and what it can do for people	2	
Generalizability of skills	2	
Exploratory teaching	2	1
Develop affective skills	2	

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.11

The table shows a strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor. Faculty members and the instructor agreed on these attributes more than half the time.

The instructor identified the value of educational gymnastics as

> the unique spot of educational gymnastics [has] in the overall physical education of the student. Because it is the only place in the, I'm going to say, elementary curriculum that we teach movement in the pure sense of body management. You don't have a ball, you don't have a piece of equipment. This is body management. A lot of people would argue going all the way back to the ancient Greeks, where you know, that type of body movement gymnastics is where it all started. And I think if you develop a strong foundation in kids who have body awareness, body control. They're going to be able to pick up on other sports. So hopefully, they value that uniqueness of educational gymnastics is a very, very different kind of content than any other kind of things that they do and they appreciate that in offering that to students. Not every student is going to like dance, not every student is going to like games. Not every student is going to like gymnastics but we have to give the opportunity across a program to meet, what do I want to say, to meet the needs of the most students.

The biggest value component the instructor tried to address is diversity.

> I think the other value that I really, I really hope I stressed in that class was to appreciate the diversity with which people can accomplish a task. And again to promote that not all learners are the same. Not all learners are at the same skill level, but this is one content area that if taught conceptually, all kids can succeed. So can you value the unique place? Can you value the unique contribution to the child in terms of being able to be successful at a variety of different levels. And an attitude, I think I said it all along, we're going to laugh at everyone at least once in this class but we're going to be laughing with you, not laughing at you. So, be willing to laugh, be willing to make a mistake. We're all in this together. That may not be an overt objective on the syllabus but it is certainly I think an attitude you have to bring to the course that I hope that students adopt.

Assessment can play a major role in content courses. The instructor's response to the expectation that an instructor of this course should use the SCPEAP Assessments and to identify the role of the SCPEAP assessments compares similarly/not similarly to faculty members.

Table 4.12 represents what was described.

Table 4.12		
Thoughts on assessment/SCPEAP- Faculty/Instructor		
Reponses	Faculty	Instructor
Should be expected to use SCPEAP	1	
Should not be expected to use SCPEAP	3	1
There should be more than just SCPEAP	4	1
SCPEAP limits variety and depth of sequences	1	1
Can be useful for NCATE	2	
SCAPEP is a fundamentally sound type of assessment	2	
Use SCAPEP only if it is mandated in the state	2	
There are other valid instruments that an instructor could use	3	
SCAPEP should be a formative assessment not a summary outcome	2	
Practice facilitating SCPEAP	2	
Assess performance level of students	2	

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.12

Shown in the table is a moderate amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor for the role of SCPEAP assessments. The instructor agreed with the majority of faculty members that SCPEAP assessment is not a required element to use in the course. The instructor also agreed with most faculty members that there are other valuable methods of assessment other than SCPEAP.

The instructor identified there is a use for SCPEAP assessments, but it should not be the main assessment focus in the course.

> We have said that the activity courses should end with skill level being determined at a high school level by the SCPEAP assessments. I personally think, but this could be argued either way, I like to give an experience in educational gymnastics that if I'm going to use that as a summative thing at the end of a course, I would want them to know way more than what is listed on, I would want them to create a sequence with much more variety and depth than what could possibly be done using the SCPEAP assessment. And the reason is, I want to clearly think of it using the framework that I've described. I want all the foundational skills in there. I want variety of concept. I want you to have some of this as individual movement, partner movement, group movement or skills. So, I don't know if I'm using that as a way out, but It's not something I have typically done in this class.

As in all classes, the instructor is always under the microscope. Faculty all identified that the instructor should model effective teaching. The following Table 4.13 is the list of behaviors that are expected to be modeled by the instructor.

Table 4.13

Behaviors of Effective Teaching-Faculty/Instructor

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor
Use developmentally appropriate practices	3	1
Use effective pedagogical skills (basic instructional skills) for the course	5	1
Explicitly use effective content development skills (extension, refinement, application)	3	1
Model the safe design of instructional space and equipment	2	
Establish expectations and routines	2	
Know the content and how to teach it	3	1
Use exploratory teaching	2	1

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.13

The table shows a strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor in identifying behaviors of modeling effective teaching. The instructor was successful in identifying many of the important behaviors the faculty members identified. The instructor concluded whoever teaches the course should have a high level of content knowledge.

Summary of Research Question Three

There were many strong or moderate levels of a shared vision between faculty members and the instructor. The instructor was able to identify, along with the majority of faculty members, the different roles and/or purposes of the educational gymnastics course. The instructor was able to match the majority of faculty of the different roles and or purposes of the course. She expressed views of the contribution of this course to the overall program in support of methods, consistent with the views of the entire pedagogy

faculty interviewed. The instructor was able to identify what should be taught in the course as the teacher behaviors that the faculty identified as being important. Overall, the instructor shows a moderate level of coherence with faculty members.

Research Question Four

Does the view of the role of the unique content course espoused by the instructor match the delivery of the course?

For this research question, the instructor participated in two separate interviews. In the first interview, the instructor was asked to explain, in detail, the objectives of the course and to give examples in order for the researcher to fully understand the planned curriculum. The second interview with the instructor occurred after the completion of the course. The goal of this interview was to observe the instructor's perception of how well the objectives/goals were taught. The instructor was asked the purpose of the objective, whether the instructor perceived the students met the objective, and what evidence can be given to show achievement.

Table 4.14 represents the results of the interviews.

Table 4.14

Objectives for course

1. **As a result of this class students will increase their ability to skillfully perform basic individual and partner gymnastics skills (rolling actions, step-like actions, flight actions and balances) alone, in combination and in sequence while using mats, small equipment and large equipment.**
2. **As a result of this class students will understand how the BSER movement framework serves as a theoretical base for content development in educational gymnastics.**
3. **As a result of this class students will appreciate the unique role of gymnastics in the elementary school physical education curriculum.**
4. **As a result of this class students will use extension, refinement and application tasks to design content that accommodates individual differences in gymnastics ability.**
5. **As a result of this class students will systematically observe, identify and correct skill errors in various gymnastics skills and sequences using DVD recording and flip video analysis of their performance.**
6. **Design and carry out a basic lesson in educational gymnastics with the 5 year olds from the USC Children's Center.**
7. **Know and apply safety considerations for teaching gymnastics in a school setting.**

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
1	Master primary motor skills	Depends on definition… but Yes	Performed skill sequences, students improved over semester, all grades were C or better
2	Learn concepts of movement wheel	Yes	Quizzes as well as applied to sequences
3	Feels it is important	Not measurable but taught to	Stressed throughout semester how important it was to teach to children.
4	Reinforce what is happening in 340-360 Model effective teaching	Not a main focus	Read an article, quizzes, assignments, ERA for early childhood kids
5	Ensures students can observe movement for correction	Would have liked to spend more time on	Students observed movement and made corrections using flip videos and just watching
6	Students experience teaching children the content	Yes	Did not go as planned but the assignment was done and the children as well as the students had fun.
7	Important to learn safety considerations with this particular content	Did the basics	Read an article, showed proper care of equipment, stayed in range of tasks, proper etiquette

Each objective will be deconstructed to fully understand in what way the instructor taught each objective and whether the instructor viewed the objective as successful or not.

Table 4.15

Objective One

1. **As a result of this class students will increase their ability to skillfully perform basic individual and partner gymnastics skills (rolling actions, step-like actions, flight actions and balances) alone, in combination and in sequence while using mats, small equipment and large equipment.**

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
1	Master primary motor skills	Depends on definition… but Yes	Performed skill sequences, students improved over semester, all grades were C or better

A major theme in all the interviews with participants in the study was the idea of skillfulness and the means to determine skillfulness in this course. During the first interview the instructor gave the following points as to the goal of skillfulness was for the course,"So I would say I'm 25% interested in specific skills and 75% interested in skill level appropriate of responses to students."

To understand what skillfulness means in the course, the instructor commented that it comes out of the performance rubrics used in the course. The instructor explained for any of the foundational skills there are qualities of movement that have to be shown, regardless of the open ended response that you may receive from students. Even though students may perform different skills, the instructor may still look for skillfulness in quality across the variety of skills. The instructor gave an example of using common elements in skilled performances, regardless of what kind of rolling action you are doing.

> For example, if I am looking for a rounded body shape, a clear body shape, something that is smooth, that is without bumps and pauses, those qualities can be applied to assessing skillfulness across variety and probably the key article that

> will be helpful to read there is refining skill in educational gymnastics seeing quality across variety.

The instructor referenced Nilges (1997) as a required reading to better understand stages of content development for educational gymnastics as an example given to students to identify quality combinations. The instructor indicated an important element to performing complex sequencing is to be able to see gymnastics, not as an individual skill, but a series of skills that are smoothly linked together.

The instructor was asked how she felt the students did according to the first objective. The instructor was careful in the way she defined skillful after the course:

> How skillful? And then you could say how skillful needs to be determined by me as the instructor. If they were totally skillful, for example, any time they did step-like actions that involved weight transfer between the feet and hands they should have had real good extension in the legs, probably even pointed toes, arms without a lot of elbow bend. That's skillful. I would not say the majority of students reached that level of skill.

The instructor identified that not all students ended at a high level of skill. The instructor felt it was nearly impossible to get students to high level in such a short amount of time. The instructor kept going back to the definitions of skillfulness

> skillfully is defined if you look at every single one of those sequence sheets that outlines the criteria for skillfulness. So was there variation in grades in sequences? Yes. So that does mean that some students performed to a higher level of skill than other students. But how many of them were high skilled across two classes? My guess would be five or less percent. But you need to step back and you say is that possible for this age of learner in a movement content that is so unique? On the other hand, what if they were great at unspecific skills? You will all do a cartwheel, you will all do this, you will all do that.

The instructor also discussed the reason why she defined skillfulness in this particular way and the methods behind her approach to the course.

> I don't think a good way to encourage a favorable relationship with the content is teaching them in a way that sets them up to fail. Now there's a lot of arguments

> around that. You could say that a good teacher's going to get them there no matter what. I don't agree with this content, I just don't agree with that (laughs). You know? So, what's tying me up here is skillful. Yes, they progressed. Yes, they learned a lot. They learned a lot across the range of Educational Gymnastics content. Four different foundational skills, four stages of content development, and multiple movement concepts.

Upon request for evidence of students being successful, the instructor referenced the performed sequences that she was 100% certain all students passed with a C or better. Something the instructor identified that made her happy about this particular class was,

> The thing that you really see the difference in with these kids across the semester is their ability to surrender to being creative. And to surrender to coming up with your own idea. Because initially, they are not creative, and they look around to others, and they steal ideas, and then they get very busy on their own and they get into it. That's a huge progression in the course.

Table 4.16

Objectives Two

2. As a result of this class students will understand how the BSER movement framework serves as a theoretical base for content development in educational gymnastics.

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
2	Learn concepts of movement wheel	Yes	Quizzes as well as applied to sequences

During the first interview the instructor expressed wanting to change the objective from using a Laban's framework to using the movement wheel. The instructor explained the objective in more detail

> Well, you have to have knowledge of the concepts on the movement wheel to start from kind of a conceptual place for concept development and Educational Gymnastics. This isn't the first class that they get the movement wheel but they get a heavy dose of it. I mean, I remember oftentimes pulling out cards that had the different concepts on them. I'm talking about this concept and I'm just going to use time and again because we talked about it before. What area of the

movement wheel is that from, or if we talked about close to or far from, where does that come from? So I think they have, again, a functional understanding---a functional and applied understanding--of the use of the concepts from the movement wheel.

For evidence showing achievement of the objective, the instructor identified the high scores students received on the written quizzes and the students were able to apply the movement concepts to the performance task. The instructor identified all students scoring well on the two assessments.

Table 4.17

Objective Three

3. As a result of this class students will appreciate the unique role of gymnastics in the elementary school physical education curriculum.

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
3	Feels it is important	Not measurable but taught to	Stressed throughout semester how important it was to teach to children.

The instructor identified multiple purposes of this objective

First of all, this is a content area that many of them probably wouldn't consider as a component of an elementary school curriculum, especially if they haven't had it. So many of them don't understand the unique role of gymnastics in a fully physically educated individual. So, and just again to stress, again, we owe it to students, not all of whom might be apt to like games or dance, but there's some that will love gymnastics. To have at least a component of our curriculum that hopefully throws them over the edge, to help them find something that they may become life-long learners.

She also admitted that this was not a measureable objective, but discussed the importance of the objective.

The uniqueness of gymnastics is that it is functional use of the body. It is not a game where it is functional use of manipulation of equipment. It is not dance where it expressive, but it is accomplishment task with the body alone. So that makes it unique in the elementary school curriculum.

When asked if the instructor thought she achieved the object:

> That's something that's not measurable at all……..I didn't technically assess it there because I'd talk about it on the first day, I'd bring it up over and over about why we owe it to students to include this in the curriculum. I would hope that that leads to a sense of appreciation……Yeah, not measurable, but I would hope based on what you saw it's something that I took the time to stress at various points with them.

Table 4.18

Objective Four

4. As a result of this class students will use extension, refinement and application tasks to design content that accommodates individual differences in gymnastics ability.

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
4	Reinforce what is happening in 340-360 Model effective teaching	Not a main focus	Read an article, quizzes, assignments, ERA for early childhood kids

The purpose of the objective identified by the instructor was to show consistency with the 340/360 (early methods) course. The goal was to reinforce the content students receive in elementary methods courses. The instructor also tried to model using extensions, refinement, and application. A goal was to model the content progression as well as use the language of the program.

The instructor identifies if there were more time, she would spend more time on this area

> And I think alternately if I had my way I would want to spend more time with content development in this class, but there is really not enough time to do that. I wish they had a class that was skill development in educational gymnastics and then content development. So alternately we do talk about you know how to extend this basic idea. I add equipment I add people I add another movement concept. We talk about the refinements the basic. I probably deal with a lot more extension and refinement than the application to be truthful with you.

She identified the sequences as the main portion of application tasks for the course. After completion of the course, the instructor admitted this objective comprised a minor emphasis of the course. Once in a while the instructor would give a task in which the students had to write extensions, refinements, or application task. The students read an article on the content progression, were quizzed on the material, and had to write a mini lesson for early childhood students. The instructor felt the only true way to determine whether or not students understand content progression is contingent upon the students ability to apply the content learned in the course to the methods courses.

Table 4.19

Objective Five

5. As a result of this class students will systematically observe, identify and correct skill errors in various gymnastics skills and sequences using DVD recording and flip video analysis of their performance.

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
5	Ensures students can observe movement for correction	Would have liked to spend more time on	Students observed movement and made corrections using flip videos and just watching

From the first interview, the instructor identified the word systematically should be removed from the objective because the students were not going to observe in such a way. The instructor identified the purpose of the objective was to ensure students had the ability to observe movements for correction. The instructor identified this as an important skill whether students become teachers or whether they become performers, one must be able to identify the changes needed to improve skill.

The instructor planned to use flip cameras before formal sequences. Minimally she planned to pick out two or three really good performances and have the class make comments on the skillfulness and quality of the actions.

The instructor identified that she met the objective.

> We pretty consistently did do flip, you know, we used the flip cams probably at least once for every foundational skill. They did a lot of use of the flip cams when they thought their sequence was about ready to get a look at it and see how it looked while they were actually performing it. So that allowed them to hopefully correct some skill errors. A lot of times we use those. They'd look at it. We'd go back and we'd try it again, try to improve performance, so I do think that one was made.

Table 4.20

Objective Six

6. Design and carry out a basic lesson in educational gymnastics with the 5 year olds from USC Children's Center.

Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
6	Students experience teaching children the content	Yes	Did not go as planned but the assignment was done and the children as well as the students had fun.

The purpose behind this objective in the course was

> that first stab at applying some of what we're learning, and this probably comes at about ¾ of the way through the class, in the context of real kids, and being in a station teaching kind of format, is pretty low stakes. One of the reasons of how this class is positioned in our curriculum---the kids really come, our students come in (teacher candidates), we just talked about this, at such different places in their program, so there's a huge variation in what they know.

Another purpose identified by the instructor was the ability to group experienced students with novice students. The instructor tried to pair a student who has completed the methods sequence with a student just entering into the program. This allowed the students to reinforce the content progression. This was not formally graded or stated, but it was more of an experiential thought by the instructor.

The planned lesson, to be used with the early childhood students, entailed 6 or 7 teaching stations set up by the college students. Each station was going to include a

handful of children and the college students would teach about 5 or 6 minutes, after which the children would rotate. The college students would repeat the content development lesson they had planned with each group of children. The goal of the assignment was to allow college students to have just enough freedom to be able to create a small amount of extensions, and to apply pedagogical knowledge with regards to teaching children with advanced or less advanced skills.

After the course, the instructor was not as satisfied with the student's teaching performance as in previous years for the same assignment.

> The only thing with that assignment is we ended up with not as many kids as I would have liked. The little kids and too many big kids, so I would have liked for those groups to be a little bit smaller than they were, but I think we did that, the young children seemed to enjoy it, our kids seemed to enjoy it.

She believed she met the above objective.

Table 4.21

Objective Seven			
7. Know and apply safety considerations for teaching gymnastics in a school setting.			
Objective	Purpose	Perceived achievement	Evidence
7	Important to learn safety considerations with this particular content	Did the basics	Read an article, showed proper care of equipment, stayed in range of tasks, proper etiquette

When asked how to approach safety in the course, the instructor identified an article that she assigned the class called the *11 safety tips for educational gymnastics*. She identified that safety can be covered in ranges

> ranges for things like making sure your equipment is in good working order to making sure that mats are securely fashioned together. That you don't have uneven ledges and things, that kids don't have mats placed too close to each other, you teach them how to carry mats, you teach them how to respond to signals. All

> those things just to maintain a good learning environment. How to fold up a mat correctly, how to carry it correctly

An example of safety:

> placing the equipment not too close to walls, there was a group that initial set up in the first section, the end of their mat was much too close to the cages. Like if you came out of a roll you just walked forward four or five steps you're drilling your head into the cage. To me that stuff should be obvious like I would never put a mat this close to a wall.

She identified that she covered the basics. This included teaching them how to carry equipment, how to take care of equipment, where you should stand if someone is performing, how many should be on a mat at one time, etc. These basic concepts were reinforced throughout the duration of the course.

There are 3 major goals of content courses in physical education programs. The three major goals are skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance), performance (the ability to actually do the skills), and pedagogy (the ability to select, sequence, present, practice and give feedback on pupil performances).

The following are results of how the instructor identified the perceived taught of the emphasis of the course Table 4.22.

Table 4.22

Emphasis of the Course – Faculty/Instructor/Instructor Perceived Percentages

Participant	Skill Analysis	Pedagogy	Performance
Faculty 1	40	10	50
Faculty 2	40	20	40
Faculty 3	30	10	60
Faculty 4	30	10-20	50-60
Faculty 5	50	15	35
Instructor	25	15	60
Instructor perceived taught	20	10	70

Summary of Table 4.22

The table shows a limited amount of vision between faculty members and the instructor for the emphasis of the major components of the course. The response given by the instructor during the faculty interview seemed to align with the overall vision of the faculty members. The percentages the instructor assigned to what she actually taught are much different than the faculty members. The percentage allocated for performance was the highest among faculty and skill analysis was the lowest among faculty. It would seem the students coming from the educational gymnastics course taught by the instructor would not match the emphasis the remaining faculty members would perceived was taught.

Observations of the Course

The researcher observed a total of 42 educational gymnastics class sessions over the duration of the course. There were three major instructional units with three performance assessments assigned to each unit in the syllabus. Each class period was 50 minutes in length.

The first day of the course the instructor introduced herself as well as her assistant. The instructor had a graduate student to assist her in teaching the course for two reasons. (1) The instructor was about to have hip surgery and did not feel comfortable demonstrating many of the task. (2) The instructor was training the graduate student to teach a future section of Educational gymnastics.

The instructor presented her syllabus by explaining each learning outcome. She discussed the importance of gymnastics and the role it could play in a child's life. The

instructor discussed administrative tasks like attendance policy, dress code, and what the course calenderer looked like.

Before moving into the movement side of the course, the instructor presented a series of cognitive lessons. These consisted mostly of Power Points as well as handouts. Pertaining to one of the handouts, the instructor showed the difference between educational and traditional gymnastics. The power points covered the following: gymnastics history, benefits of gymnastics, foundational skills of educational gymnastics, South Carolina Physical Education Curriculum Standards, and Manipulating task difficulty in Educational Gymnastics.

In a typical lesson, the instructor taught the students the procedures of the course. The students practiced getting the equipment out and putting the equipment away appropriately. The instructor discussed the importance of taking care of the equipment and the importance to keep the equipment organized and clean (sterile). The instructor also went over her expectations of management and the stop and start signals that she would use throughout the course (when the music stops, when I say stop, when I say go).

In the first part of the course there was a high amount of practice with locomotor skills and learning how to do the skills with a quality acceptable to gymnastics. The instructor discussed the fundamental skills and movement wheel by walking students through the process of using the movement wheel and how it relates to educational gymnastics. A good portion of each class was devoted to a meaningful warm-up. These warm-ups consisted of a series of yoga stretches to warm the muscles and also many attempts of practicing the fundamental movement skills and concepts. The warm ups during most classes lasted about 20 minutes in length. In the beginning of the course, the

warm ups were longer and toward the end shorter, to devote more time to practicing higher advanced skills.

The instructor progressed through the content according to difficulty of the skills. The instructor always taught lead up activities as well as progressed the content with extensions/refinements. Many of the times she explained why she was extending the task and how children may look trying to perform the skills. The instructor also used the handouts listed in Table 4.23

Table 4.23
Handouts From Course
Handouts given to class
Sample partner balances
Handstand progression – steps, clues, safety
Critical features of balancing kills
Article on refining skills in Educational Gymnastics: Seeing quality through variety
Critical rolling actions
Possible warm-up activities
Sample Routine (start, balance, inverted balance, forward roll, weight on hands, end balance)
Critical features of flight
Forward roll using game stages

For each unit, there was a performance task which progressed in difficulty. The first sequence was individual and consisted of using rolling actions taught in the course. The second sequence progressed with step like actions in partners, and the last sequenced used the concept of flight in small groups. All sequences included components of skillfulness of performance as well as many movement concepts.

The following is a sample rubric the instructor used to grade the students. For sequence two, the students were asked to create a sequence with a partner. Each of the criteria was graded on a 3 point scale.

Table 4.24	
Criteria for Sequence Two	
Criteria of sequence	Criteria for quality
Matching traveling actions around mat	Strong arms and flat hands in SLA
Beginning contrasting step-like actions on mat	Legs are straight and extended in advanced SLA
Beginning or advanced matching or contrasting step-like actions using a hurdle on mat	Arms are purposefully placed
Beginning or advanced matching or contrasting step-like actions off, on top of, or over equipment	Body is placed lightly/quietly placed with good control
Step-like actions over or under the still shape of a partner showing continuous interchange	Sequence has good/smooth flow
Matching rolling actions on a mat	Matching is exact in terms of time, body shape, arm positioning
Contrasting rolling actions using equipment	Contrasting actions are clearly different
3 count beginning and ending partner shape	TMs are varied and used consistently to link actions

Note. SLA = Step Like Action, TM = Transitional Movements

For each sequence, the instructor gave clear details of expected components of the performance, a visual description, and how the performance would be graded. She also gave students plenty of time to create and practice sequence. Before the end of each unit performance task, the students used flip cameras to practice evaluating and refining their performance. It was consistently stressed to students to observe the quality of movement, body management, and whether or not the students applied movement concepts correctly.

On days of performance, the instructor gave students 15 minutes to practice. Students would practice and then watch their peers perform their sequence. While observing the performances, students were expected to give group feedback on refinements or things the student did well.

Model Effective Teaching

Through interviews, the faculty members identified instructors in the program should specifically model effective teaching in the educational gymnastics course. The program required PETE majors to achieve effective teaching during the methods and practicum courses and a tool created by faculty at the University of South Carolina is the primary instrument used to measure effective teaching

According to the second interview, the instructor felt she modeled effective teaching. One thing that the instructor identified was the way she organized the class to present the material progressively across the skills. The instructor identified the consistency of her demonstrations. She remembered circulating the gym, giving individual and group feedback, and providing adequate practice time for students. It was hard for her to identify specific teaching behaviors, but she felt she was successful. To verify effective teaching, the evaluation tool appearing in appendix E was used. The Table 4.25 provides a summary of scores the instructor achieved in each section of the observation tool.

Table 4.25

Teacher Evaluation Scores- Points per category		
Teaching Skills	Range over nine lessons	Average score over 9 lessons
Objectives	5 to 5	5
Task Presentation	3.5 to 5	4.5
Management and Organization	5 to 5	5
Content Progression	3 to 5	4.5
Feedback	5 to 5	5
Total		24 (96%)

The average score of the instructor using the teacher evaluation tool was a 24. The instructor had a range of scores from 22 to 25 out of a possible maximum score of 25. The most commonly missed teaching skills by the instructor were in the task presentation

category. During the task presentations, the instructor missed summarizing the critical elements, objectives of the lesson, and the conclusion of class. The second commonly missed criterion, which was within task presentation, was the lack of an application task for each lesson. The instructor identified that application task in the course would mostly consist of practice of the sequences. The instructor always taught toward at least two of her objectives and the majority of students seemed to learn the expected material. The two most common objectives taught was improving basic gymnastics skills and using the BSER framework in the course. Tasks were structured, directed, and reinforced. There were many times the instructor had to correct a management issue, but recognized the opportunity to make the moments teachable by relating the behavior to elementary children. The instructor gave a large amount of feedback, which was mostly congruent and specific. Lastly, the feedback given by the instructor was to all students regardless of gender or skill level. The instructor moved throughout the gym stopping to correct or praise skills throughout the lessons. An average score of 90% from the nine lessons using the teacher evaluation tool was the standard score the instructor needed to be labeled as effective. The average score of the professor was 96% clearly demonstrating effective instructional skills.

To explore the content development of her lessons, a content analysis tool was used. With this tool, the researcher and grader recorded the tasks the teacher gave. After recording the task individually, the researcher and grader had to decide whether the task was an informing, extending, refining, or applying task. To measure the success of the instructor, the researcher used frequency and percentages of the tasks in order to ensure the content was developed.

Table 4.26 summarizes the content development of the course.

Table 4.26		
Content Development		
Task	Total number in nine lessons	Percentage use during nine lessons
Informing	10	13
Extensions	38	50
Refinements	15	20
Applications	13	17
Totals	**76**	**100**

The lessons were coded starting from the informing task after the students completed the warm ups. Coding was started after the warm-ups to understand the progression of the main skill for each lesson. Task development occurred during the warm ups, but the warm ups ranged from 8 minutes to 28 minutes in length and the goal of understanding content development was focused more on the body of the lesson.

The instructor clearly demonstrated content development. The instructor progressed through the content with a high amount of extensions and used refinements and application tasks when needed. The numbers may seem low over nine lessons, but one should factor in the limited time after warm-ups, the time it takes to learn the content, time spent working with a partner, and time used to put equipment away.

Summary of Research Question Four

Overall the instructor taught a majority of the intended curriculum. The instructor was able to identify the purposes of the objectives and decide whether students achieved those objectives. Through observations and analysis of written material, it was determined the instructor taught the planned curriculum. The second part of this question addressed the quality of instruction students were receiving in the course. Faculty

members identified the instructor should model basic instructional skills and content development. After observing and evaluating nine lessons, it is determined the instructor modeled effective teaching and showed content development.

Research Question Five

Do student views of the purposes of the unique content course match instructor and/or faculty views of the purpose of the course?

In order to understand the role of the educational gymnastics course in the PETE program, the students were asked several questions (Appendix B), specifically about educational gymnastics during the interviews. One of the questions involved simply asking participants to state the role of the educational gymnastics course in the program. The following were identified: All students identified the course as helping them learn more about gymnastics, specifically educational gymnastics. One student focused specifically on body management skills.

> To prepare students to be able to not only understand fundamental, like, body management skills but how to properly teach certain skills at different levels that are appropriate in sequence. Basically, just getting them ready to teach gymnastics in the schools. (Student #3)

There are three major goals of content courses in physical education programs. The three major goals are Skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance), performance (the ability to actually do the skills), and pedagogy (the ability to select, sequence, present, practice and give feedback on pupil performances). The students were asked to identify the emphasis of each component of educational gymnastics and to provide examples of the perceived emphasis.

The following are results of how students identified the emphasis of the components in educational gymnastics Table 4.27.

Table 4.27			
Emphasis of the Course- Faculty/Instructor/Student Percentages			
Participant	Skill Analysis	Pedagogy	Performance
Faculty 1	40	10	50
Faculty 2	40	20	40
Faculty 3	30	10	60
Faculty 4	30	10-20	50-60
Faculty 5	50	15	35
Instructor	25	15	60
Instructor perceived taught	20	10	70
Student 1 (low skilled)	45	15	40
Student 2 (high skilled)	25	25	50
Student 3 (high skilled)	20	60	20

Summary of Table 4.27

The table shows a very limited shared vision among student responses as well as limited shared vision comparing student scores to the instructors and faculty members' scores. Between the three students, not one category had similar scores. Only student #2 had somewhat matching scores to what the instructor perceived she taught. Analyzing the content students remembered from the course is important because it identifies the actual material students are taking away from the course.

The students mostly recalled peer observations at the end of the semester using skill analysis tasks assigned by the instructor. One student described it as:

> we did a lot of peer observation in that class, from what I remember. Not only on just the sequences, but you would observe your partner within groups at times, I remember. You know, she would give us a set of cues and what we should be doing, and of course we'd all practice together, but, you know being on the same mat with the same person almost every day we would tell each other, kind of like, we would sort of evaluate and then give feedback to our partners. And she wouldn't always ask for that. It would just sort of happen. (Student #3)

Even though some of the percentages were lower, two of the students identified performance as being the major emphasis of the course. One student described learning many skills in the course and being able to teach them to three little girls that she babysat

for. Without the course, she identified should would never have been able to perform the skills she taught the little girls.

One student described more of a skill analysis task when discussing performance.

> Like we had written quizzes where we were asked like the critical features of movement or maybe some specific cues of like a cartwheel and you'd be graded a little bit heaver on that than you would certain performances, especially like, you might be able to do a movement, but not perfectly but you didn't really get knocked off for that because some of us aren't able to do stuff that others were. (Student #1)

For performance, one student recalled teaching a mini lesson to children. Another student discussed again the observational notes and giving feedback to a partner for pedagogy. The last student seemed to focus on the pedagogy of the instructor.

> And then we progressed through that starting with a smaller sequence at the beginning, going to a more advanced one towards the middle, and obviously the culminating one at the end. And I was able to myself do it, but then also with a partner, help teach them and let's work through it, let's figure this out so that we could perform it and then analyze it through the flip cameras to make sure we had everything we needed. (Student #2)

After reviewing the answers and examples of the students, I do not think we can fully go off of what the students perceived the emphasis of the course was. Many of their examples did not represent the categories asked of them. The important piece to remember is the actual examples the students remember. The students remember performing skill analysis tasks and progressing the content. Regardless of what the instructor taught, this is the knowledge and skills students are taking away from the educational gymnastics course.

When asked if there were any other major purposes for the course, two students stressed the social aspects of the course. They discussed how they were asked to work with partners repeatedly in that class. This at first felt uncomfortable to the students due

to the close proximity required to perform different skills. It was also uncomfortable because the students were not confident in the content. The students felt the purpose of the course was to help build relationships, improve communication, and gain experience cooperating/collaborating with each other.

One student also stated that it helped him learn more about his own body management.

> personally what it meant, was how to teach body management. Not necessarily to make good gymnasts out of everybody, but how to manage your body aesthetically, tight body movements and everything free-flowing and where it's supposed to be. Not reckless moving…….the instructor hammered this many times. (Student #3)

Students were asked if educational gymnastics course was planned to help somewhere else in the curriculum. Table 4.28 represents the students shared perceptions with the faculty members and instructor.

Table 4.28

Course May Help Elsewhere in the Program- Faculty/Instructor/Student

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor	Student
Curriculum courses	3		
Student Teaching	2	1	
Sub-discipline courses	1	1	
Practicum	4	0	1
Methods	5	1	3

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.28

The table shows a fairly strong amount of evidence of a shared vision between the students and faculty members/instructor for how the course may help elsewhere in the program. All students identified the educational gymnastics course as being important somewhere else in the curriculum, specifically the elementary methods course.

The students described some of the course concepts overlapping with educational dance. The students appreciated the course because it not only helped with planning lessons in the elementary methods course, it also helped in teaching at the elementary school level. They all identified it as a useful course before taking the elementary methods course.

The students were asked to identify the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes the students should possess upon leaving the course. The results of the perceptions are shown in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29

Expected Student Knowledge/skills – Faculty/Instructor/Student

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor	Student
Movement Framework/Laban	5	1	1
Movement Wheel/George Graham	2	1	
Know how to use movement concepts across content	1	1	1
History and language specific to educational gymnastics	3		
Know and develop appropriate content for different age groups	3	1	2
The unique role it plays in the curriculum	4	1	
How to design elicit or exploratory movement responses	2	1	
How to teach toward safety	2		
Technical correctness at their skill level	3	1	1
Know what a good performance is	1	1	
Perform fundamental or basic skills of Educational Gymnastics	4	1	2
Analyze movement	5	1	2

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.29

The table shows a moderate amount of evidence of a shared vision between students and the faculty/instructor for the knowledge and skills students should acquire upon completion of the course. The students were able to identify half the amount of responses of the faculty members. This was pretty impressive since there are only three

students. Only one student was able to identify importance in understanding the movement framework. No students identified the unique role educational gymnastics plays in the curriculum. The students seemed to focus on the developmental of appropriate content, fundamental skills, and how to analyze movement. One student described the most important thing that he learned was:

> I think they would know how to safely…. back to scope and sequences, where to start, where to safely start, and then what you can sort of get students to by the end in terms of like leading them towards performances or whatever it is you are looking for as teacher, you know, what I might be looking for if I was teaching in a school might not be the same thing she would have been looking for up there, but if I was teaching the same way I'd kind of, I'd kind of be looking for the same thing. Just making sure that everybody's doing safe movements, they're following the critical features, and I would kind of stick along more with the same partner feedback and stuff like that. A lot of, I'd kind of go more on the analysis route I guess you'd say. Just to, I mean, if you can spot it you can teach it. (Student #3)

Table 4.30

Expected Student Value/Attitudes – Faculty/Instructor/Student			
Reponses	Faculty	Instructor	Student
Role of gymnastics in overall physical education of students	3	1	
Unique content- pure body management	3	1	1
Appreciate the diversity with which people can accomplish a task	1	1	1
Promote that all leaners are not the same	1	1	
Positive disposition that everyone can be successful	2	1	
Look past gender bias	2		1
Value individual creativity and effort	1	1	1
Commitment to content	2		1
Value of gymnastics as a content area	2		
Appreciation for gymnastics and what it can do for people	2		1
Generalizability of skills	2		
Exploratory teaching	2	1	
Develop affective skills	2		

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participants responses

Summary of Table 4.30

The table shows a moderate amount of a shared vision between the faculty/instructor and students. The students were able to identify many of the responses identified by the faculty members. The students failed, however, to identify the faculty considered important to most faculty as to the role of gymnastics in the overall physical education of students.

One student discussed the amount of respect of the content after leaving the course.

> I think just the importance of gymnastics. Going into that class, I've never done gymnastics, this course is going to be silly. But just seeing how much skill it really does take to do gymnastics. And upper body strength is huge in gymnastics. And I just think that's so good as a teacher to value that. When, if I was in elementary school, valuing that for your students and just showing them, like, this is important, like, you need to have upper body strength, and this is a huge way to accomplish that and to have fun while you're doing it. (Student #2)

One of the students stressed that after leaving the course, one should value the content as important and significant to the field. A student leaving the course should be motivated by what they were doing in terms of making sure the course was challenging to them.

One student identified a type of exploratory task which improved his motivation.

> I think that's important with how she taught it is because she gave you choice..... she always gave us choices to do like, do this roll, do this roll, do this roll, feel free to do which one you want based on what you can do. And it's a personal thing. Kind of, listening to your body sort of thing. (Student #3)

When asked if the student felt it was important to teach educational gymnastics in that style, the student replied:

> Yeah, because there was certain things I definitely didn't want to do all the time. Like, I would try them because it was part of exploring, but there was certain things I didn't feel as comfortable with. Especially with my body being as injury-riddled as it is I couldn't do certain things as well as others, but that's why she always had that. You know, especially in selecting our own performances. But

> even in the practice stages of it, it was sort of explore, but kind of, you had the choice to do, you know, upward and downward extensions, so. (Student #3)

Table 4.31

Thoughts on assessment/SCPEAP- Faculty/Instructor/Student

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor	Student
Should be expected to use SCPEAP	1		2
Should not be expected to use SCPEAP	3	1	
There should be more than just SCPEAP	4	1	
SCPEAP limits variety and depth of sequences	1	1	
Can be useful for NCATE	2		
SCAPEP is a fundamentally sound type of assessment	2		
Use SCAPEP only if it is mandated in the state	2		
There are other valid instruments that an instructor could use	3		
SCAPEP should be a formative assessment not a summary outcome	2		
Practice facilitating SCPEAP	2		1
Model something that we find important	1		2
Assess performance level of students	2		

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.31

The table shows a low amount of evidence of shared vision between students and faculty members for the emphasis of SCPEAP assessment in the course. The faculty moderately shared a vision that the instructor should not be expected to use SCPEAP assessments, while two out of the three students felt the instructor should use the assessments in the course. The students seemed to focus more on modeling and practicing the SCPEAP assessments than the instructor or the majority of the faculty.

Even though the program [SCPEAP] is not in effect anymore, the students still feel it is important. The students felt it was not only important to use but also to see modeled by the instructor.

> Why wouldn't you use it? I mean, it would get students used to already using them and especially if they stick in the state you'd be sort of prepping them to use it because it's going to be on their own will whether they do or don't. (Student #3)

Another student adds the purpose of using the assessment as

> Probably just to kind of get us ready for the practicum. We can see how they're graded. See how to effectively present the assessment because even with us, it was 20, 30 students over there [in the class]. The instructor is not going to be able to watch every single one at one time but definitely with the video with her walking around, she'd have one or two people at a time, definitely helped. Kind of shows us how to assess without stopping the entire class and spending three days on it. (Student #1)

As in all classes, the teacher is always under the microscope. The students agreed the instructor should model effective teaching. The following Table 4.32 is the list of behaviors that are expected to be modeled by the instructor.

Table 4.32

Behaviors of Effective Teaching – Faculty/Instructor/Student

Reponses	Faculty	Instructor	Student
Use developmentally appropriate practices	3	1	1
Use effective pedagogical skills (basic instructional skills) for the course	5	1	3
Explicitly use effective content development skills (extension, refinement, application)	3	1	3
Model the safe design of instructional space and equipment	2		1
Establish expectations and routines	2		3
Know the content and how to teach it	3	1	3
Use exploratory teaching	2	1	

Note. Numbers represent frequency of participant responses

Summary of Table 4.32

The table shows a moderate amount of evidence of shared vision between faculty members, the instructor, and students in identifying behaviors of modeling effective teaching. All students identified the instructor should model effective teaching. A majority of the responses made by faculty members where matched by the students. The students by far had the most input on this discussion. Students were eager to express how effective the instructor was in the course. All students went through a list of

effective teaching behaviors and related them to what they learned in the method courses. The content knowledge of the instructor seemed to make a big impression on the students. They consistently discussed the content progression of the course and how comfortable they were doing the skills because of the content progression taught by the instructor.

> And I think that [content knowledge of instructor] was always key for me---looking at if I was going to teach it, putting myself in her shoes, it was always sort of like, safety and effective movement was top on the list and I dug that because it's important. And she---through her being able to perform a lot of those things and also show us what we were going to get to, it's kind of motivating when you have a teacher who can do that, you know. Not that every teacher can be an expert in their field necessarily, but she was always clear and concise with what she wanted, she stated what we were going to do each day. We knew at the end of class what we were going to do next class. We knew what we were working to at the end of that unit. You know, we were going to get to the next one. So in that regard she was a very clear and effective teacher all around. I mean her entire presence was just good. (Student #3)

The students were asked if they had anything else to share, one student wanted to stress the value of the course.

> I thought that it was very important that we learned it in general because without that class, without Ed Gymnastics, most of us wouldn't have seen the importance of a lot of the body management stuff, especially with a teacher like ours teaching it. So I felt like it instilled in us a good understanding to want to teach, of why it's important to teach gymnastics for body management reasons. (Student #3)

Summary of Research Question Five

All tables showed a wide range of beliefs between students, faculty members, and the instructor. The one limited amount given may have been attributed to students having a difficult time assigning percentages to the different areas of skill analysis, performance and pedagogy. More information from students should be gathered to understand the

students perceived purpose of the course. The rest of the categories showed moderate to strong levels of a shared vision.

Summary of Chapter Four

The results of this investigation have been presented around the five research questions that drove the study. Data supports the notion that faculty members were aware of the educational gymnastics course and had an opinion of the role the course should play in the overall program. Faculty members shared a perspective of the educational gymnastics course as a part of the physical education content category. There is less agreement on the emphasis of the course across skill analysis, pedagogy and performance, on how the course helps elsewhere in the program, or on student outcomes. The instructor also placed the course in the physical education content category within the program. She expressed views of the contribution of this course to the overall program in support of methods, consistent with the views of the entire pedagogy faculty interviewed. However her perspective of the course supporting other parts of the program matched fewer of her colleagues. In matching what the instructor believed to be important and what she did, there appeared to be strong parallels. Finally, the perspective of what the students took away from this course appeared to reinforce her effective teaching delivery and to reinforce their growth in appreciation for the importance of the course.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to examine the coherence of one facet of a single PETE program. Of particular interest was the role of one unique content course within the curriculum. What follows begins with significant conclusions that can be drawn from these findings. Following the conclusions, the implications of this study will be addressed, along with recommendations for future areas of research associated with teacher educators, teacher education, and coherence. The four main sections will serve as a guiding framework for this chapter.

Conclusions

Research question one asked to what extent PETE faculty can articulate the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program. Data supports the notion that faculty were aware of the educational gymnastics course and had an opinion of the role the course should play in the overall program. There has been criticism of higher education as existing in silos where there is no awareness of what other faculty members are doing. The first conclusion suggests that these faculty members have some shared understanding of the components of the total program, and where this course "fits" into that program. This would appear to be at least an initial indicator of some consistency, potentially leading to a program with the prospective to have a positive impact on students. Not all faculty members had a shared belief in the percentages assigned as to what type of knowledge should comprise a teacher preparation

program. Shulman (1987) stated in teacher education programs, one of the most important questions to ask is what comprises the knowledge base for programs. Howey (1996) stated effective teacher education programs should be defined by a conceptual framework, part of which, in the case of a PETE program, is the vision of physical education they are preparing students to deliver as teachers. When faculty members disagree, it can result in students receiving contradictory expectations, information, and sanctions, which may limit program effectiveness (Lawson, 1981). The results appears to show a fundamental "drift" in the perception of significance of content courses ranging from 5% to 40% of program emphasis, which was an unexpected finding.

Research question two asked to what extent is there a consistent or shared vision of the role of a unique content course within the overall teacher preparation program. Beyond identifying the educational gymnastics course in the content category, there is less agreement on the specific components of the course or how it fits into the overall program. There is some evidence of "drift" from a shared perspective on the program and its component parts. These would be the seeds of erosion in a cohesive program and a potential step toward undermining the shared technical culture of what an effective program should be communicating to students. Buchmann and Floden (1992) stated a curriculum should have a consistent message, just like a work of literature should have a story line, in which each event has a logical connection to those before it. All faculty members were able to identify how the course conceptually fits into the program by categorizing it as a content course.

There are many differences in teacher education programs that contribute to the complexity of the socialization of physical education teachers. Lawson (1983) identifies

professional socialization as the means by which would-be and experienced teachers acquire and maintain the values, sensitivities, skills, and knowledge that are deemed ideal for teaching physical education. Lortie (1975) refers to the knowledge and skills that comprise professional socialization as the "shared technical culture" for teachers. Collective socialization is more powerful than an individualistic approach, meaning recruits should feel in the same position as others, rather than being isolated and alone (Becker, 1964; Bishop, 1979). Lawson (1983) believed teacher education programs with a shared technical culture and professional ideology will have a greater impact on recruits than programs in which this has not occurred. Lawson added curricula that integrate knowledge, skills and ideology to teaching will have greater impact on students than curricula that do not. The results from this study appear to suggest more discussions are needed to improve the shared technical culture and professional ideology of how the unique content course fits the overall goals of the teacher preparation program.

Research question three asked whether the view of the role of the unique content course as held by the instructor matches the views of other faculty members in the program. Similar to the rest of the faculty members, the instructor identified the educational gymnastics course as a content course. The level of consistency between instructor and faculty beliefs seems to be connected more than research question two. Perhaps the faculty members need to revisit the scope and sequence of the components of the program and develop some consensus as to what objectives and where those objectives are addressed in the program. When faculty members disagree, it can result in students receiving contradictory expectations, information, and sanctions, which may limit program effectiveness (Lawson, 1981).

Research question four asked does the view of the role of the unique content course espoused by the instructor match the delivery of the course. Paris (1993) stated the importance of observing the course to ensure the set goals of the instructor matched the taught curriculum. This study provided deeper insights into the notion of coherence by exploring the intentions, delivery, and received messages surrounding one significant course in a PETE program. The instructor's delivery of the course was largely consistent with her espoused purposes for the course. The early systematic observation research identified a common disconnect between what instructors thought was going on in their instructional setting and what was actually happening. Most would agree that teacher educators should be good models of the kind of teaching they are trying to promote in order to support their student teachers' learning. Korthagen et al. (2001) stated how teacher educators teach in a way to role model for future teachers. It is important that teacher educators 'teach as they preach', as well as explain their choices. The instructor in this study appropriately developed content in educational gymnastics and modeled the basic instructional skills the department desired students to perform in their teaching episodes.

Research question five asked does the views of students as to the purposes of the unique content course match instructor and/or faculty views of the purpose of the course? The views between the students and faculty members had some disconnect. Faculty members lacked a strong shared vision as to the role of the course within the program so it should not be surprising that the students' model this disconnect as well. Again, the need for the faculty members to develop consensus could be an important step toward ensuring the positive impact of their program on students.

Implications

Coherence or consistency does not happen naturally and it can be studied. These findings are not an end but a beginning. A case study of a single facet of one program can potentially produce a model of introspection of PETE faculty that is rare in the literature. With the kind of information generated in this type of study, faculty can explore where their agreements and disagreements exist and decide what steps they want to take to reinforce or change program attributes. The methods outlined in this study could be replicated with any course(s) in any program to determine the same levels of agreement or disagreement. Understanding how the faculty in one program perceive and articulate the goals of one aspect of the program provides insight into the actual rather than theoretical existences of program coherence. The literature on the benefits of coherence suggests that greater coherence will increase the probability of greater impact on the beliefs and behaviors of students. This study was a critical first step to identify and quantify what coherence looks like in a PETE program. If coherence can be more explicitly identified and quantified in the field, then comparisons across programs can be explored and accompanying indicators of effectiveness can be pursued.

New Directions

What does the faculty think about these results in terms of their interest in addressing the apparent disconnects regarding emphasis and purpose? Are they interested in pursuing change in their program, or do they consider this to be interesting but irrelevant? If the faculty use the data provided in this study, how do they do so and what are the consequences or outcomes (potentially a longer term study, here or elsewhere – it is a professional development kind of focus).

As another follow up, with students in the program, do they actually model their own content development and instructional delivery based upon what they experienced in this class (i.e., when student teaching or when teaching elementary PE- longitudinal or cross sectional with others who took the educational gymnastics course with the same instructor and are now out teaching), or was that just lip service?

A replication of this study with different courses would benefit the understanding of the shared goals of a program. Given the different categories of courses in a program, is there consistency across faculty perspectives on what students should achieve in foundational classes, methods or pedagogy classes, general education classes, or other content classes (e.g., secondary level activities, vs. this elementary level activity)? Also when faculty members were asked to identify categories and place courses from the PETE curriculum into the categories there were differences between what category to place the coaching and teaching fitness courses. Faculty had a difficult time identifying these courses as a content course or a pedagogy course. A study exploring the shared beliefs of these particular courses could be helpful for programs.

Future research on teacher educators, teacher education, and coherence are all needed. The ultimate goal of this line of research is to understand how to better prepare pre-service physical education majors. Since one of the identified missing pieces of literature in teacher education is on teacher educators themselves (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; John, 1996; Korthagen, 2001; Maguire, 1994), research on teacher educators planning, teaching, and assessing specific courses in a curriculum is needed. Research on the knowledge that comprises a teacher education program and other knowledge that might be needed would be beneficial. Last, we have little insight into what degree of

influence program coherence has toward preparing future teachers. There should be more research conducted to understand the shared vision of faculty, as well as that of students, to determine the roles of individual courses in a teacher preparation program. It is believed once coherence can be more explicitly identified and quantified in the field, then comparisons across programs can be explored and accompanying indicators of effectiveness can be pursued. This study was a critical first step in identifying and quantifying the role of coherence in a PETE program. More research is needed to explore indicators of effectiveness in regard to program coherence.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 377-392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Amade-Escot, C. (1998, July). *Student teachers's reflection and development of their competence in didactics.* Paper presented at the AIESEP World Sports Science Congress, Adelphi, USA.

Amade-Escot, C., Amans-Passaga, C. (2007). Quality physical education: A review from situated research (1995-2005). Part two: "Teacher education" and "Student learning". *International Journal of Physical Education, a Review Publication, 44*(1), 4-11.

Assaf, L., Garza, R., & Battle, J. (2010). Multicultural teacher education: Examining the perceptions, practices, and coherence in one teacher preparation program. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 115-135.

Bahneman, C.P. (1996). An analysis of the undergraduate physical education teacher certification requirements within institutions which offer a doctoral degree in physical education. *The Physical Educator, 53*, 198-205.

Bateman, D., Taylor, S., Janik, E., & Logan A. (2007). *Curriculum coherence and student success.* Saint-Lambert, QC: Champlain Saint-Lambert Cégep.

Becker, H.S. (1964). Personal change in adult life. *Sociometry, 27*, 40-53.

Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. McGraw Hill/Open University Press.

Billett, S. (2009). Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(7), 827-843.

Bishop, J. M. (1979). Institutional and operational knowledge in work. A sensitizing framework. *Sociology of Work and Occupations, 6*(3), 328-352.

Blume, R. (1971). Humanizing teacher education. *PHI Delta Kappan, 53*, 411–415.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and practice* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolton, N. (2008). *Teacher education: Assessing the National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Michigan.

Borrowman, M.L. (1965). Liberal education and the professional education of teachers. In M.L. Borrowrnan (Ed.), *Teacher education in America: A documentary history* (pp. 1-53). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000*). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bruner, J. (1977). *The process of education: A landmark in educational theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (1992). Coherence, the rebel angel. *Educational Researcher, 21*(9), 4–9.

Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (1993). Coherence: The rebel angel. In M. Buchmann & R. Floden (Eds.), *Detachment and concern: Conversations in the philosophy of teaching and teacher education* (pp. 222-235). London: Cassell Press.

Butler, A. (2007). *Lessons learned from the case study of a university-based teacher education program for second career adults: Stakeholder views over 18 years.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University, Colorado.

Byrd, S. (2011). *Middle school students' participation in extracurricular activities: Relationships to school identification and achievement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The College of William and Mary, Virginia.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Centur*y. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Carter, H.L. (1981). *Teacher educators: A descriptive study*. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249-305.

Copeland, G., Finley, S., Ferguson, C., & Alderete, K. (2000). *A flashlight and compass: A collection of tools to promote instructional coherence*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. http://www.sedl.org.

Corbin, C.B. (1993). Clues from dinosaurs, mules, and the bull snake: Our field in the 21st century. *Quest, 45,* 546-556.

Corbin, C., & Eckert, H. (1990). *The evolving undergraduate major. American Academy of Physical Education Papers, No. 23.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research (*pp. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crooks, T.J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research, 58,* 438-481.

Cruickshank, D.R. (1977). *Toward identifying the abilities of teacher educators.* Unpublished manuscript: The Ohio State University.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57,* 300-314.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 35-47.

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

Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: the challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Denscombe, M. (2007*). The good research guide for small-scale social research projects* (3rd ed.). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dodge, T., Walker, S., & Laursen, M. (2009). Promoting coherence in athletic training education programs. *Athletic Training Education Journal, 4*, 46-51.

Ducharme, E.R., & Ducharme, M. (1996). Needed research in teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 1030-1046). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Egan, K. (1978). Some presuppositions about curriculum. *Curriculum Studies, 10*(2), 123–133.

Elmore, R. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achieve*ment*: The imperative for professional development in education.* Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review, 100*, 363–406.

Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). *Conceptual orientations in teacher education.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Galluzzo, G.R., & Craig, J.R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W.R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (1st ed., pp. 599-616). New York: Macmillan.

Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. (1992). Teaching mind in society: Teaching, schooling, and literate discourse. In L. C. Mol (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 175–205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giroux, H., & Penna, A. (1983). *Social education in the classroom: The dynamics of the hidden curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

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

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, K., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). *Places where teachers are taught*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Graber, K. (1993). The emergence of faculty consensus concerning teacher education: The socialization process of creating and sustaining faculty agreement. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12,* 424-436.

Graber, K. C. (1996). Influencing student beliefs: The design of a "high impact" Teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 72*(5), 451-466.

Graham, K. (1991). The influence of teacher education on pre-service development: Beyond a custodial orientation. *Quest, 43*(1), 1-19.

Griffey, D.C., & Podemski, R.S. (1990). Conceptions in teaching: What should we be testing for? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 9*, 240-245.

Grossman, P., Smagorinsky, P., & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education, 108*(1), 1-29.

Grundy, S., & Hatton, E. (1995). Teacher educators' ideological discourses. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 21*(1), 7–24.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hammerness, K. (2006). From coherence in theory to coherence in practice. *Teachers College Record, 108*(7), 1241-1265.

Hashweh, M. Z. (1985). *An exploratory study on teacher knowledge and teaching: The effects of science teachers' knowledge of subject-matter and their conceptions of learning on their teaching.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Stanford University, California.

Hill, G., & Brodin, K.L. (2004). Physical education teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of university coursework in preparation for teaching. *The Physical Educator, 61*, 75-87.

Holmes Group. The (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Howey, K. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In. J. Sikula, T. Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.*), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 143-170). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs.* Albany, NY: SUNY.

Ingvarson, L., Elliott, A., Kleinhenz, E., & McKenzie, P. (2006). *Teacher Education Accreditation: A review of national and international trends and practices*. Canberra: Teaching Australia.

John, P. (1996). The subject-method seminar and the role of the teacher educator. In J. Furlong, & R. Smith (Eds.), *The role of higher education in initial teacher training* (pp. 119-138). London: Kogan Page.

Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad* (Report to the Ford Foundation). New York, NY: Ford Foundation.

Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. *Oxford Review of Education, 32*(4), 505-519.

Koehler, V. (1985). Research on preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(1), 23-30.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001). *Linking practice and theory. The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Korthagen, F. A. & Kessels, J. P. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 28*(4), 4–17.

Korthagen, F., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: the pedagogy of realistic teacher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kramer, R. (2000). *Ed School Follies.* Lincoln, NE: iUniverse.

Kroll, L., Donahue, D., Galguera, T., LaBoskey, V.K., Richert, A.E., Tucher, P., et al. (2004). *Teaching as principled practice: Managing complexity for social justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lamb, L, & Jacobs, V. (2009). Establishing and maintaining program coherence in a cohort-based graduate program. *The Teacher Educator, 44*(2), 126-142.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 527–569). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Lawson, H . A. (1981*). Undergraduate physical education programs: Issues and approaches.* Washington, D.C.: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.

Lawson, H. A. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (Part 1). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2*(3), 3-16.

Lawson, H. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5*, 107-116.

Lawson, H. (1990. Beyond positivism: Research, practice, and undergraduate professional education. *Quest, 42*, 161-183.

Lawson, H. (1991). Future research on physical education teacher education professors. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 10*, 229-248.

Levine, A. (2006). Will universities maintain control on teacher education? *Change, 38*(4), 36–43.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Liu, L. B. (2010). *A case study of multicultural infusion across a teacher preparation program in secondary education.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan. Michigan.

Lorenzi, D. G. (2008). *A case study of two schools' inclusion practices in elementary physical education.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), West Virginia University, West Virginia.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Maguire, M. (1994). *The job of educating teachers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of London, London.

Massanari, K., Drummond, W.H., Houston, W.R., & Edelfelt, R.A. (1978). *Emerging professional roles for teacher educators.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Mays, A. (1989). *Case studies of physical education teachers from a research-based preparation program.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of South Carolina, South Carolina.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1994). Values, coherence and the school. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 24*(3), 453–470.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Metzler, M.W., & Freedman, M.S. (1985). Here's looking at you PETE: A profile of physical education teacher education faculty. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4*, 123-133.

Metzler M., & Tjeerdsma, B. (1998). PETE Programs Assessment within a development, research, and improvement framework. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*, 468-492.

Metzler, M., & Tjeerdsma, B. (2000). *Assessment of physical education teacher education programs.* Reston, VA: NASPE.

McMullen, J. (2010). *Experiences of PETE majors participating in an out-of-class-time physical activity promotion and facilitation-based internship course.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation*)*. University of Michigan, Michgian

Mitchell, M.F. (1990, March). *Professional implications of the scholarship behaviors of physical education methods teacher educators*. The National Convention of The American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, New Orleans.

Mitchell, M. (2000a). An approach to program assessment: Locating indicators of a coherent program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 19*(Monograph), 522-537.

Mitchell, M. (2000b). Assessing PETE program coherence. In M. Metzler & B. Tjeerdsma (Eds.) *Physical education program assessment* (pp. 113-128). Reston, VA: NASPE.

Mitchell, M. (2001, August). *Assessing program coherence as one tool for examining effectiveness.* Paper presented at the 2001 Seoul International Sport Science Congress, Seoul, Korea.

Mohr, D. (2000). *A qualitative analysis of the socialization factors experienced by induction phase physical education teachers from one university.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.) West Virginia University, West Virginia.

Murray, J., & Male. T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 125–41.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education (1995*). National standards for beginning physical education teachers*. Reston, VA: NASPE.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996*). What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

Newmann, F., Smith, B., Allensworth, E., & Bryk, A. S. (2001). *School instructional coherence: Benefits and challenges*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Nilges, L. (1997). Educational gymnastics: Stages of content development. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 68*(3), 43-48.

Ormond, C. (2012). Balancing detailed comprehensiveness with a big vision: A suggested conceptual framework for teacher education courses. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(5), 36-64.

O'Sullivan, M. (2003). Learning to teach physical education. In S. Silverman & C.D. Ennis (Eds.), *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction* (2nd ed., pp. 275-294).

Paris, L.C. 1993. *Teacher agency and curriculum making in classrooms*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Parker, J. (2007). *A case study: Becoming a teacher through the Arkansas Non-Traditional Teacher Licensure Program.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arkansas, Arkansas.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Placek, J., & Dodds, P. (1990, March). *Teacher educators' perception of success and failure in their work.* Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance national convention, New Orleans, LA

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. D. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal, 83,* 427-452.

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*(2), 417-458.

Rink, J. (1993). Teacher education: A focus on action. *Quest, 45*, 308-320.

Ross, S. (1987). Humanizing the undergraduate physical education curriculum. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7*, 46-60.

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rovegno, I. (1992). Learning a new curricular approach: Mechanisms of knowledge acquisition in preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 8,* 253-264.

Rovegno, I. (1993). The development of curricular knowledge: A case of problematic content knowledge during advanced knowledge acquisition. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 64*, 56-68.

Roy, D., Borin, P., & Kustra, E. (2007). Assisting curriculum change through departmental initiatives. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 112*, 21-32.

Ryan, K.A. (1974). If I had it to do all over again…*Theory into Practice, 13*(3), 159-166.

Schempp, P., & Graber, K. (1990, April). *An ethnography of a teacher educator.* Paper presented at the national convention of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Scott, M.W. (1990, March). *Teacher education reform and institutional involvement.* Paper presented at the national convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, New Orleans, LA.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57* (1), 1-22.

Siedentop, D., & Locke, L. (1997). Making a difference for Physical Education; What professors and practitioners must build together. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 68,* 4, 25-33.

Tatto, M. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students; Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(2), 155-180.

Thomas, J., Nelson, J., & Silverman, S. (2011). *Research methods in physical activity (6th ed.).* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Tom, A. R. (1997). *Redesigning teacher education.* Albany, NY: SUNY.

Volante, L. (2006). Essential elements in teacher education: Preservice student perspectives. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52*(2), 167-180.

Waugh, L. (2010). *PETE professors' perceptions of teaching behaviors of effective general physical educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas Woman's University, Texas.

Wang, Y. (2009). *A case study of an accelerated blended teacher education program.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Indiana.

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose, and limits of testing*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Williamson, K. (1990, March). *Physical education teacher educators' multiple work roles: Busy, not so happy and not so good.* Paper presented at the national convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, New Orleans, LA.

Wilson, M. 2004. Assessment, accountability and the classroom: A community of judgment. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 103,* 1–9.

Wisniewski, R., & Ducharme, E.R. (Eds.) (1989). *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* Albany, NY: Suny.

Wubbels, T., Korthagen, F., & Broekman, H. (1997). Preparing teachers for realistic mathematics education. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 32*, 1–28.

Yin, R. K. (2008). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 643–670.

Zeichner, K. (1986). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. *Advances in teacher education, 2,* 135-163.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89-99.

Zeichner, K.M., & Tabachnick, R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washout' by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 7-11.

APPEDIX A
FACULTY INTERVIEW GUIDE

Preamble:

You have been selected as a participant for this investigation on the basis of the following criteria:

A: Have you taught at least one undergraduate and/or graduate physical education teaching methods course which leads to initial certification?

B: Have you been involved in this PETE program for at least five years?

C: Have you been involved in discussions surrounding the delivery of the PETE curriculum?

Are all three true? [If NO, terminate this interview. If yes, continue]

The focus of the present investigation is to determine how one particular course "fits" into the teacher preparation program. I am going to ask you about your perceptions of how the Educational Gymnastics course fits into the PETE program goals.

All information gathered for this study will remain strictly confidential. Not even my dissertation chairperson will know the identity of individual respondents. When the data have been gathered, it will be presented in such a fashion as to further preserve your identity.

There are no right or wrong answers. It would be helpful if you would try to be as honest as you can be. If you cannot remember some information, that is fine. If at any time I ask you a question you would prefer not to answer, please indicate this and we will move on. Further, if for any reason you choose to terminate this interview, we will stop.

I have structured specific questions to form the basis for this interview. After piloting and revising the questions, I can tell you that it will likely take little less than one hour to complete the interview.

If at any time during this interview, our discussion sparks a thought from you that is relevant to this study which I have not specifically asked you, please feel free to add the comment or observation.

Choosing to continue with this interview will be considered to be your consent to participate. Do you have any questions before we begin?

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for consenting to participate in this investigation. We will now begin.

The PETE program

Let's begin with the PETE program at USC. Then I will ask more specifically about the role of Educational Gymnastics course within this program.

1. What categories of courses are there in a PETE program?

Prompt: I will give a couple examples (general education, content) if needed.

If they are having a hard time listing some, hand them a sheet with the following categories: **General Education, Professional studies, Content, Foundational subdisciplinary courses, Pedagogy, and Practicum**

2. To get a better understanding, could you take this list of courses and place a couple courses in the different categories you identified in questions one?

Give them the list of courses in USC's PETE curriculum.

Prompt: Give the participant the following courses if they are having a hard time: motor learning, elementary methods, and intro to physical education.

3. How would you assign percentages (adding up to 100%) to the categories in the USC PETE program?

Prompt: Use the guide that most students need 120 credits

Now, I'm going to shift the interview questions to focus specifically on the Educational Gymnastics course.

Educational Gymnastics

4. What is the role of the Educational Gymnastics course in the PETE curriculum?

Prompt: Where does it fit into the categories you previously listed in question one? Is this course specially taught with the idea it will help somewhere else in the curriculum? If yes, how?

5a. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance)? Can you give examples of what a skill analysis task in this course would look like?

5b. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on performance (the ability to actually do the skills)? Can you give examples of what a performance in this course would look like?

5c. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on pedagogical skills (the ability to select, sequence, present, practice and give feedback on pupil performances)? Can you give examples of what a task using pedagogical skills in this course would look like?

Prompt: Are there any other major goals for the course?

5d. Could you assign percentages (adding to 100) for what you would expect the course to consist of with regarding skill analysis, performance, and pedagogical skills?

6. Using the categories of Knowledge, Skills, Values, and Attitudes, how would you characterize an ideal student who completed the Educational gymnastics course of this physical education teacher preparation program?
    - What should an ideal student know?
    - What should an ideal student be able to do?
    - What values should an ideal student demonstrate?
    - What attitudes should an ideal student demonstrate?

Prompt: Educational gymnastics is unique content compared to traditional gymnastics. Are there knowledge, skills, values, and/or attitudes associated with Educational gymnastics that are important to the program goals?
Prompt: know – foundations of Educational gymnastics, BESR framework
Able to do - basic balances, rolls, flight
Values – spirit of educational gymnastics, challenge by choice
Attitudes – gender bias, encouragement/motivation

7. Is there an expectation that the instructor of this course should model effective teaching? Can you give examples of ways the instructor should implicitly and/or explicitly model effective teaching to the students?

Prompt: Does the expectations of how we evaluate effective teaching in this program match what we want the instructor to do?

8. Is there an expectation that the instructor of this course use SCPEAP assessments? If yes, what is the role of using the SCPEAP assessments in this course within the overall teacher preparation program

<u>Thank you</u>
As we wrap up this interview, is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to share or that you believe would better help me to understand the program and how Educational Gymnastics fits into the program?

I would like to thank you again for taking the time to talk with me. I am now going to transcribe our conversation and give you the opportunity to read it in case you would like to clarify any of the statements made during this interview.

Thanks

APPENDIX B
STUDENT INTERVEIW GUIDE

Preamble:

You have been selected as a participant for this investigation on the basis of the following criteria:

A: During the fall of 2011 you were a physical education undergraduate who was seeking a teacher education certification?

B: During the fall of 2011 you were enrolled in Educational Gymnastics course section two (12:00-12:50 that I videotaped).

Are both true? [If NO, terminate this interview. If yes, continue]

The focus of the present investigation is to determine how one particular course "fits" into the teacher preparation program. I am going to ask you about your perceptions of how the Educational Gymnastics course fits into the PETE program goals.

All information gathered for this study will remain strictly confidential. Not even my dissertation chairperson will know the identity of individual respondents. When the data have been gathered, it will be presented in such a fashion as to further preserve your identity.

There are no right or wrong answers. It would be helpful if you would try to be as honest as you can be. If you cannot remember some information, that is fine. If at any time I ask you a question you would prefer not to answer, please indicate this and we will move on. Further, if for any reason you choose to terminate this interview, we will stop.

I have structured specific questions to form the basis for this interview. After piloting and revising the questions, I can tell you that it will likely take less than a half hour to complete the interview.

If at any time during this interview, our discussion sparks a thought from you that is relevant to this study which I have not specifically asked you, please feel free to add the comment or observation.

Choosing to continue with this interview will be considered to be your consent to participate. Do you have any questions of me before we begin?

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for consenting to participate in this investigation. We will now begin.

Educational Gymnastics

1.What are your perceptions of the role of the Educational Gymnastics course in the PETE curriculum?

Prompt: Do you think this course specially is taught with the idea it will help somewhere else in the curriculum? If yes, how or what course?

2a. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on skill analysis (the ability to "see" and remediate pupil performance) Can you give examples of what a skill analysis task in this course would look like?

2b. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on performance (the ability to actually do the skills). Can you give examples of what a performance in this course would look like?

2c. How would you characterize the emphasis of this course on pedagogical skills (the ability to select, sequence, present, practice and give feedback on pupil performances). Can you give examples of what a task using pedagogical skills in this course would look like?

Prompt: Are there any other major goals for the course?

2d. Could you assign percentages (adding to 100) for what you would expect the course to consist of with regards for skill analysis, performance, and pedagogical skills?

3. Using the categories of Knowledge, Skills, Values, and Attitudes, how would you characterize an ideal student who completed the Educational gymnastics course of this physical education teacher preparation program?
    - What do you think an ideal student should know?
    - What do you think an ideal student should be able to do?
    - What values do you think an ideal student demonstrates?
    - What attitudes do you think an ideal student demonstrates?

Prompt: Educational gymnastics is unique content compared to traditional gymnastics. Are there knowledge, skills, values ,and/or attitudes associated with Educational gymnastics that are important to the program goals?
Prompt: know – foundations of Educational gymnastics, BESR framework
Able to do - basic balances, rolls, flight
Values – spirit of educational gymnastics, challenge by choice
Attitudes – gender bias, encouragement/motivation

4. Can you give examples of ways the instructor implicitly and/or explicitly modeled effective teaching to the students?

Clarifying question: Can you give ways the teacher modeled or showed effective teaching Does the expectations of how the program evaluates effective teaching match what the instructor did?

5. Do you think there is an expectation that the instructor use SCPEAP assessments in this course? If yes, why do you think there are used?

Thank you

"As we wrap up this interview, is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to share or that you believe would better help me to understand the Educational Gymnastics course?

I would like to thank you again for taking the time to talk with me. I am now going to transcribe our conversation and give you the opportunity to read it in case you would like to clarify any of the statements made during this interview.

Thanks

APPENDIX C
FIRST INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE
PEDU 194 Educational Gymnastics Interview protocol

First part will be going through the learning objectives from the syllabus:

a) Increase their ability to skillfully perform basic individual and partner gymnastics skills (rolling actions, step-like actions, flight actions and balances) alone, in combination and in sequence while using mats, small equipment and large equipment.
    a. I would like to get a little more detail of what gymnastic skills you plan on teaching. Can you give me examples of what rolling……, step-like actions…….., flight actions…… and balances you plan on teaching?
    b. What do you expect "skillfully perform" to look like?

        You are much more skilled at this than me and I want to make sure I know what this means in educational gymnastics.
    c. If a student performs an action beyond the scope of the course, does this fit the course or do you plan to redirect the student? Why or why not?
    d. Combination and in sequence- Can you give me examples of this? What do you expect your students to learn from this? *prompt* why?

b) Understand how the BSER movement framework serves as a theoretical base for content development in educational gymnastics
    a. In terms of BSER, Graham's book seems to be missing the B. Which framework do you think applies more with what you plan on teaching this semester? (I will have a framework that has movement concepts to show you)

        This question is not to quiz you or try to trap you. I only want to know more information of BSER and what you plan to teach. I keep trying to find a way to ask this question without making it sound like I am a reporter

c) Appreciate the role unique role of gymnastics in the elementary school physical education curriculum
    a. This course objective addresses appreciation: Can you elaborate on this a little bit

b. Prompt* Can you give me an example of something you do or something you may say to teach your students appreciation?

d) Use extension, refinement and application tasks to design content that accommodates individual differences in gymnastics ability
    a. I would like to get a better understanding for this outcome. I know what extension, refinement, and application tasks are and why you would want to use them to design content in gymnastics lessons. Can you tell me more about the difficulties of teaching this in this setting or what level do you expect the students to be able to use these concepts to design content?

I know you have students that are at different levels in the program and I want to make sure I understand what you expect for this class

e) Systematically observe, identify and correct skill errors in various gymnastics skills and sequences using DVD recording and flip video analysis of their performance
    a. Could you help me understand this better? What skills do you plan to teach in reference to systematically observe……., identify and correct skill errors?

In my experiences as a graduate student I have found identifying and correcting skill very important. I am interested what you plan to teach or how you plan to teach it

f) Design and carry out a basic lesson in educational gymnastics with the 5 year olds from the USC Children's Center
    a. Can you tell me more about what you expect the student to do for this outcome?
    Promt* Can you tell me what a basic lesson should consist of or look like?

g) Know and apply safety considerations for teaching gymnastics in a school setting
    a. Can you elaborate on this a little more?
    b. Prompt*Can you give me an example so something you do or something you may say to teach your students safety?

h) Grading
    a. Can you elaborate a little more about 60% skill competency, analysis and error detection?

Is there anything else that you would like to share about what you expect from this course?

APPENDIX D
SECOND INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

Preamble:

You have been selected as a participant for this investigation on the basis of the following criteria:

A: You have been involved in the PETE program for at least five years.

B: You taught Educational Gymnastics at USC before the fall 2011 semester.

Are both true? [If NO, terminate this interview. If yes, continue]

As you recall in the faculty interviews, the focus of the present investigation is to determine how one particular course "fits" into the teacher preparation program. I am going to ask you about your perceptions of how the Educational Gymnastics course fits into the PETE program goals.

All information gathered for this study will remain strictly confidential. When the data have been gathered, it will be presented in such a fashion as to further preserve your anonymity.

There are no right or wrong answers. It would be helpful if you would try to be as honest as you can be. If you cannot remember some information, that is fine. If at any time I ask you a question you would prefer not to answer, please indicate this and we will move on. Further, if for any reason you choose to terminate this interview, we will stop.

I have structured specific questions to form the basis for this interview. After piloting and revising the questions, I can tell you that it will likely take about one hour to complete the interview.

If at any time during this interview, our discussion sparks a thought from you that is relevant to this study which I have not specifically asked you, please feel free to add the comment or observation.

Choosing to continue with this interview will be considered to be your consent to participate. Do you have any questions before we begin?

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for consenting to participate in this investigation. We will now begin.

Educational Gymnastics

1) The goal of the first interview was to acquire a better understanding of your learning objectives that you planned for the course. The first set of questions for this interview will revisit your course objectives for educational gymnastics. I want to acquire an understanding on how well you thought the students achieved the objectives. The format of these questions will start with me recalling your objective, asking you what was the purpose of the objective, if you felt you achieved the objective, and finally what evidence can you recall for knowing the students achieved it.

Prompt: If she has a hard time giving a yes or no answer, ask her to assign a percentage of meeting the objective.

The questions are as follows:

a) Your first learning objective was: As a result of this class students will increase their ability to skillfully perform basic individual and partner gymnastics skills (rolling actions, step-like actions, flight actions and balances) alone, in combination and in sequence while using mats, small equipment and large equipment.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?
b) As a result of this class students will understand how the BSER movement framework serves as a theoretical base for content development in educational gymnastics.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?
c) As a result of this class students will appreciate the unique role of gymnastics in the elementary school physical education curriculum.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?
d) As a result of this class students will use extension, refinement and application tasks to design content that accommodates individual differences in gymnastics ability.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?

Can you explain to me how you know?

e) As a result of this class students will systematically observe, identify and correct skill errors in various gymnastics skills and sequences using DVD recording and flip video analysis of their performance.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?
f) Design and carry out a basic lesson in educational gymnastics with the 5 year olds from the USC Children's Center.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?
g) Know and apply safety considerations for teaching gymnastics in a school setting.
   What was the purpose of the objective?
   Do you think you achieved it Y/N?
   Can you explain to me how you know?

Okay that concludes the questions on the objectives, there are just a couple more questions that I have about the course.

2) Could you assign percentages (adding to 100) on time spent regarding teaching skills analysis, performance, and pedagogical skills for the Educational Gymnastics course?
3) Can you give examples of ways you implicitly and/or explicitly modeled effective teaching to the students?

Prompt: Was there anything that you did that would match what the USC program would call effective teaching in the methods courses?

<u>Thank you</u>

As we wrap up this interview, is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to share or that you believe would better help me to understand how you taught the Educational Gymnastics course?

I would like to thank you again for taking the time to talk with me. I am now going to transcribe our conversation and give you the opportunity to read it in case you would like to clarify any of the statements made during this interview.
Thanks

APPENDIX E
TEACHING EVALUATION TOOL

Lesson Date_____ **Evaluator _____**
Score _____/25

Teaching Skills	Scoring
Objectives and Assessment of Learning • 2 objectives/concepts from the syllabus are taught • Students learned what was intended	_____ **Excellent:** 2 objectives/concepts taught, most students learned what was intended _____ **Good:** 1 objective/concepts taught, most students learned what was intended _____ **Fair:** 1 objective/concept taught and/or there was limited (less than 50 %) evidence that students learned what was intended _____ **Poor:** 1 objective/concept was taught and/or there was no evidence that students learned what was intended _____ **Unacceptable**: Objectives based teaching was not evident and there was little or no evidence that students learned

Task Presentation • Dynamic (voice inflection, nonverbal behavior, movement) • Set Induction (brief, states objectives, personalizes) • Closure (ending review provided, preview for next lesson) • Full demonstrations used (accurate, full action done in context, done more than once, emphasizes important information [cues], checks for understanding) • Cues (few in number, accurate, capture critical features)	_____ **Excellent:** All 5 indicators of quality task presentation are effectively demonstrated _____ **Good:** 4 of 5 indicators of quality task presentation are effectively demonstrated _____ **Fair:** 3 of 5 indicators of quality task presentation are effectively demonstrated _____ **Poor:** 2 of 5 indicators of quality task presentation are effectively demonstrated _____ **Unacceptable:** One or fewer elements of quality task presentation are effectively demonstrated
Management and Organization • Rules and protocols are established or used • Tasks are structured, directed and reinforced • Signals are established or used consistently	_____ **Excellent:** Classroom management and organization is strong; all four indicators are effectively demonstrated _____ **Good:** Classroom management and organization is good; no more than one indicator needs improvement _____ **Fair:** Two indicators of classroom management and organization need improvement _____ **Poor:** Three indicators of classroom management and organization need improvement _____ **Unacceptable:** Classroom management and organization is unacceptable; performance is weak or absent on all indicators
Content Progression • Extension tasks are appropriate, increase in difficulty and show intratask development • Refining tasks (addressing skill quality and where the whole	_____ **Excellent:** Use of extension, refinement and application [ERA] is effectively shown; pacing is appropriate _____ **Good:** Use of extension, refinement and application[ERA] is appropriate but pacing is

class is stopped) are given and match the extension • An application task was used • Progression is well paced (an appropriate amount of time is spent on each task)	off in a small part of the lesson _____ **Fair:** Use of one aspect of content development [ERA] could be improved and/or pacing could be improved at several points in the lesson _____ **Poor:** Use of two aspects of content development [ERA] could be improved and/or numerous pacing errors are evident _____ **Unacceptable:** Content progression is so poor that it does not contribute to the achievement of objectives
Feedback • Skill-related feedback is given to individual students for every task assigned • Feedback is mostly specific • Feedback is congruent • Feedback is given equitably to students (e.g., high- and low-skilled, boys and girls, etc.)	_____ **Excellent:** Skill feedback is given for every task; feedback is mostly specific and congruent; feedback is given equitably _____ **Good:** Skill feedback is given for every task; feedback is mostly specific OR congruent; feedback is given equitably _____ **Fair:** Skill feedback is given for most, but not all tasks OR feedback is more general than specific and/or incongruent in some cases _____ **Poor:** Feedback is not given for most tasks AND/OR feedback is not given equitably _____ **Unacceptable:** Specific and congruent feedback are not given

Excellent = 5 pts. Good = 4 pts. Fair= 3 pts. Poor= 2 pts. Unacceptable= 0 pts.

Comments:

APPENDIX F

GROUND RULES FOR TEACHER EVALUATION TOOL

Objectives and assessment of learning

Objectives/concepts from the syllabus are taught – Looking at the syllabus for the course, were you able to witness concepts or objectives taught in the lesson observed.

Most in this tool means approximately more than 50% of students.

Limited in the tool means approximately less than 50% of students.

To claim there was student learning, one should observe students progressing upwardly toward the objectives/concepts for that particular day.

Task Presentation (not feedback)

Dynamic (voice inflection, nonverbal behavior, movement) –

One full point should be rewarded when the instructors' task presentations include all the following criteria:

- Spoke one or more words louder than the others, thereby emphasizing or "stressing" a point.
- Model effective nonverbal behaviors- close proximity, established eye contact, and taught with a confidence and a positive vibe.
- Movement – the teacher moved to different parts of the gymnasium during the class.

A half a point should be rewarded when the instructors' task presentations only include two of the criteria listed above.

No point should be reward if only one or none of the above criteria were met.

Set Induction (brief, states objectives for the day, personalizes)

One full point should be rewarded when the instructors' set induction includes all the following criteria:

- Brief – does not take longer than a couple of minutes (attention not drifting away).
- Teacher states objectives for the day (before or after warm-up).
- Personalizes the objectives or the lessons of the day - when the instructor refers directly to the experiences of the participants.

A half a point should be rewarded when the instructors' set induction only includes two of the criteria listed above.

No point should be reward if only one or none of the above criteria were met.

Closure (ending review provided, objectives summarized)

One full point should be rewarded when the instructors' closure includes all the following criteria:

- Ending review provided – the instructor reviewed what they did for the day and critical points about the lesson.
- Preview for next lesson– The instructor previews what will be learned next lesson OR puts what they learned today into the larger picture of the course.

A half point should be rewarded when the instructors' closure only includes one of the criteria listed above.

No point should be rewarded if none of the above criteria were met.

Full demonstrations used (accurate, full action done in context, done more than once, emphasizes important information [cues], checks for understanding)

One full point should be rewarded when the instructors' demonstrations include four or more of the following criteria:

- Accurate – to the best of the graders knowledge, what the instructor demonstrated was accurate.
- Full action done in context – the demonstration include a live full speed example and was used in the context of how the teacher wanted the students to perform.
- Done more than once – the instructor performed the demonstration more than once (could be slow or full speed, different angles, etc.)
- Emphasizes important information -During the demonstrations the instructor pointed out the critical features of the skill before or after the instructor demonstrated the skill.

- Checks for understanding- Before letting the students practice, the teacher asked questions or ask for an example by a student to make sure the students understood what was demonstrated. (any kind of CFU will work)

A half point should be rewarded when the instructors' demonstrations include two or three of the above criteria.

No point should be rewarded if one or less of the above criteria were met.

Cues (few in number, accurate, capture critical features)

One full point should be rewarded when the instructors' cues include all the following criteria:

- Few in number – should not include more than four per concept or skill.
- Accurate- to the best of the graders knowledge, the cues given were accurate.
- Captured critical features – to the best of the graders knowledge, the critical features given were accurate.

A half point should be rewarded when the instructors' cues include only two of the criteria listed above.

No point should be rewarded if one or none of the above criteria were met.

Management and Organization

Rules and protocols are established or used

A full point should be rewarded if the instructor explicitly stated rules or protocols in the lesson OR if the grader could clearly see the students following some sort of rules or protocols

A half point should be rewarded if there were parts of the lesson where the instructor explicitly stated rules or protocols in the lesson but other parts of the lesson rules and protocols were needed. Same as above, if the grader could clearly see the students following some sort of rules or protocols, then rules and protocols were used.

No point should be rewarded if rules and protocols were not established or the grader could not observe any that were used.

Tasks are structured, directed, and reinforced

A full point should be rewarded when the instructors' tasks are structured, directed, and reinforced by including all the following criteria:

- Structured – The instructor makes clear what students are expected to do and how they are expected to do it ahead of time.
- Directed- The instructor directs organizational procedures by breaking apart complex organizational tasks and communicates them effectively and efficiently.
- Reinforced – The instructor reinforces behavior by holding children accountable for expectations and appraising their responses.

A half point should be rewarded if tasks only include two of the criteria listed above.

No point should be rewarded if tasks only include one or none of the above criteria.

Signals are established or used consistently (consistently in this context means more than 50 % of the opportunities, the instructor modeled the behavior)

A full point should be rewarded if there was evidence that signals were established or were used consistently in the lesson.

A half point should be rewarded if the signals were used inconsistently

No points should be rewarded if the lesson established or used no signals

Content Progression and Feedback

Appropriate extensions – 1) Most performers are successful in the task before progressing to the next task. 2) Task are developmentally appropriate –Most students are able to cognitively, physically and emotionally do the task assigned.

Pacing- appropriate pacing is when most students are engaged in the lesson and are still practicing toward the purpose of the task.

The scoring is pretty clear in the content and feedback column. There should not be a need for half points. Use the scoring guides in the tool.

Category Definitions for Content Development

Refining task – A refining task seeks to qualitatively improve the way in which students are performing a previous task. This is to the entire class in which all students have stopped what they were doing.

Extending task – An extending task seeks a variety of responses or adds complexity or difficulty to a previous task.

Applying/assessment task- An applying task asks students to use their motor skill in an applied, competitive, or assessment setting.

Informing tasks-An informing task states or presents a motor task that is not an extending, refining, or applying tasks. This task is usually the first task and merely describes what the students are to do.

Definitions are from Rink (2010) pg. 339

APPENDIX G

CONTENT DEVELOPMENT TOOL

Teacher: _____ Observer: _____

Date: _____ Class/Grade: _____

Directions: Record the tasks the teacher gave. Decide whether the task is an informing, extending, refining, or applying task. Do a polygraph of the tasks in order. Evaluate the appropriateness of the teacher's content development.

Task	Task Type
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

*Note***:** If more tasks are presented, use the back of the sheet to record them.

POLYGRAPH

	#	%
Informing: _____	__	
Refining: _____	__	
Extending: _____	__	
Applying: _____	__	
Task #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 **Total #:**		

Directions: Place a dot in the row and column of the graph in the sequence the tasks are presented, and then connect the dots.

APPENDIX H
COURSE SYLLABUS
Educational Gymnastics PEDU 194 Fall 2011

I. Descriptive Information:
   a. Course Number and Title: PEDU 194 Educational Gymnastics
   b. Bulletin Description: Development of knowledge and skill in educational gymnastics. Designed to develop a content base for elementary school physical education programs.
   c. Course Credit and Location: 1 credit hour; BPEC 307
   d. Prerequisites: Upper division undergraduate physical education major or MAT student.
   e. Intended audience: Physical education majors
   f. Instructor:
   g. Office:
   h. Phone:
   i. email:
   j. Office hours: T/TR 2:00- 3:00 or by appointment

II. Statement of Learning Outcomes: As a result of this class students will:
   a. Increase their ability to skillfully perform basic individual and partner gymnastics skills (rolling actions, step-like actions, flight actions and balances) alone, in combination and in sequence while using mats, small equipment and large equipment.
   b. Understand how the BSER movement framework serves as a theoretical base for content development in educational gymnastics.
   c. Appreciate the role unique role of gymnastics in the elementary school physical education curriculum.
   d. Use extension, refinement and application tasks to design content that accommodates individual differences in gymnastics ability.
   e. Systematically observe, identify and correct skill errors in various gymnastics skills and sequences using DVD recording and flip video analysis of their performance.
   f. Design and carry out a basic lesson in educational gymnastics with the 5 year olds from the USC Children's Center.
   g. Know and apply safety considerations for teaching gymnastics in a school setting.

III. Required Text and Supplemental Readings:

a. Graham, G., Holt-Hale, S., & Parker, M. (2009). *Children moving: A reflective approach to teaching physical education*. Dubuque, Iowa: McGraw-Hill. (REQUIRED)
b. NASPE, (2004). *Moving into the Future: National Standards for Physical Education.* (2nd Ed.). Reston, VA: Author.
c. SC Physical Education Curriculum Standards (Available from http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/Standards-and-Learning/Academic-Standards/old/cso/standards/pe/index.html)
d. SCPEAP Grade Level Notebook for Elementary School (Available from http://www.scahperd.org/SCPEAP_Grade_Level_Notebooks.html
e. Nilges, L. (1997). Educational gymnastics: Stages of content development. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 68*(3), 43-48. (Available on Blackboard)
f. Nilges, L. (1999). Refining skill in educational gymnastics: Seeing quality for variety. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 70*(3), 50-55. (Available on Blackboard)
g. Nilges, L. (2005). Assessment in educational gymnastics. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 68*(3), 43-48. (Available on Blackboard)
h. Nilges, L., & Lathrop, A. (2000). Eleven safety tips for educational gymnastics. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education, 11*(4), 10. (Available on Blackboard)

IV. Academic Course Requirements:

a. Students will complete three quizzes.
b. Students will analyze the movement performance of themselves and others using flip video and/or DVD analysis to refine and improve skill.
c. Students will design and perform 4 educational gymnastics sequences that will be formally assessed.
d. Student will design and teach one short lesson to the 5 year olds at the USC Children's Center.

V. Administrative Course Requirements:

a. ATTENDANCE: Regular class attendance is expected. This is a practical class in which you learn and develop skill by participating. Daily attendance will be taken by the instructor or another student in the class. Students are obligated by university policy to attend class regularly, complete all assigned work promptly, and to participate in whatever class discussion may occur. ***Three absences without penalty are permitted in this class. More than three absences, whether excused or unexcused, is considered excessive and will result in the lowering of the final grade by one letter grade per absence over three.*** Doctor's appointments do not automatically excuse you from class. Doctor's appointments should be scheduled outside of class time. On time arrival to class demonstrates professional courtesy. ***Arrival to class after attendance is taken will***

result in a tardy. Three tardies will result in one absence.

b. DRESS: Most class sessions will involve participation in gymnastics activity. Comfortable clothes should be worn that do not restrict movement. Clothes should not be so baggy that you reveal something you do not want to be revealed. Pants should be worn at the waist or slightly below the waist (not at the buttocks!). Jeans, khakis or cords are not allowed. *If jeans, khakis, cords or other pants with that have rivets, snaps and zippers are worn, you will be asked to sit out and will accrue an absence for the day.* Inappropriate clothing is dangerous to you and has the potential to scratch equipment and tear mats. Student fees pay for equipment.
c. DVDs: Students must purchase 1 mini DVD- RW for recording sequences (DVD must say video mode on the disk).
d. CELL PHONES: Cell phones, pagers and other electronic devices must be turned OFF when in class. If one is found to be on, on vibrate, etc, you will be asked to leave class and will be counted absent. There is no text messaging, web-browsing, etc. during class. Failure to adhere to this rule may result in your being dismissed from class.
e. DISPOSITIONS: Professional dispositions including respect, acceptance of varying skills levels, prompt completion of work, responding appropriately to corrective criticism, actively participating for the duration of class and a sense of excitement for learning is expected.
f. FITNESS COMPETENCY: Beginning in fall 2010 physical education majors are expected to achieve Healthy Fitness Zone levels in at least 4 of the following 5 areas, (1) Pacer test, (2) Curl-Up, (3) Sit and Reach (4) Push-Ups and (5) Body Composition. The Curl-Up test and Sit and Reach test will be practiced in this class so students are aware of their level of fitness on each of these tests. Formal fitness testing will take place October 28 during scheduled class time.
g. PROFESSIONAL POINTS STATEMENT: Physical education majors must adhere to the Professional Point Requirement of the department:

VI. Evaluation and Grading:

a. 30%- Quizzes (3)
b. 60%- Skill competency, analysis and error detection (including movement sequences, observation and analysis of skill, and instructor assessment)
c. 10%- Lesson Plan for Preschoolers

Grading Scale:

90-100%	A
85-89%	B+
80-84%	B
75-79%	C+
70-74%	C
65-69%	D+
60-64%	D
59 – 0%	F

VII. Course Outline:

PEDU 194
Weekly Calendar
(Subject to Change)

Week 1

August 19	Course intro

Week 2

August 22	Traditional vs. Educational Gymnastics/Foundational Skills
August 24	BSER Movement Wheel Traveling actions using the feet varying with movement concepts
August 26	Basic rolling actions; Read: Nilges, L. (1999). Seeing Quality through Variety

Week 3

August 29	Basic rolling actions continued
August 31	Rolling actions using equipment
September 2	Read: Nilges, L. (1997). Stages of Content Development

Week 4

September 5	Labor Day Holiday
September 7	Introduce Sequence #1 (Individual Rolling Sequence)
September 9	Sequence 1 Practice

Week 5

September 12	Sequence #1 Practice with Flip Video Observation and Analysis
September 14	Sequence #1 Performance and Recording
September 16	Quiz 1
September 19	Sit and Reach and Sit-up tests
September 21	Basic step-like actions using hands, feet and knees
September 30	Advanced step-like actions (Wheeling)

Week 6

September 26	Advanced step-like actions (Wheeling)
September 28	Step-like actions using equipment
September 30	Step-like actions with a partner (varying relationship concepts)

Week 7

October 3	Step-like actions and rolling combination
October 5	Introduce Sequence 2 (Partner Sequence focusing on step-like actions)
October 7	Sequence #2 Practice

Week 8

October 10	Sequence #2 Performing and Recording
October 12	Balancing on patches and points
October 14	Inverted balancing (headstand and handstand)

Week 9

October 17	Partial and total support partner balance
October 19	Countertension/Counterbalance
October 21	Fall Break/No Class

Week 10

October 24	Quiz #2
October 26	Introduce Sequence #3
October 28	Fitness testing

Week 11

October 31	Sequence #3 Practice
November 2	Sequence #3 Performance and Recording
November 4	Assign planning assignment for Children's Center

Week 12

November 7	Small group work on Children's Center lessons
November 9	Section 1/USC Children's Center (section 2 no class)
November 11	Section 2/USC Children's Center (section 1 no class)

Week 13

November 14	Flight/Jumping and landing
November 16	Flight/Partner assisted
November18	Introduce Final Sequence #4

Week 14

November 21	Practice Sequence #4
November 23	No Class/Thanksgiving
November 25	No Class/Thanksgiving

Week 15

November 28	Practice sequence #4
November 30	Practice Sequence #4
December 2	Sequence 4- Performance and Recording

Finals Week

Quiz #3