

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2013

The Role of Dispositions in Teacher Candidate Education

William Alexander Kinderwater
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Kinderwater, William Alexander, "The Role of Dispositions in Teacher Candidate Education" (2013).
Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 1388.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/1388>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

THE ROLE OF DISPOSITIONS IN TEACHER CANDIDATE EDUCATION

By

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KINDERWATER

B. P. E., The University of Alberta, 1993
B.Ed., Concordia University College of Alberta, 1999
M. Ed., University of Southern Queensland, 2003

Dissertation

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Education
In Curriculum and Instruction

The University of Montana
Missoula, Montana

May, 2013

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Dean of the Graduate School
Graduate School

Matthew Schertz, Chair
Phyllis J. Washington School of Education and Human Sciences

Lisa Blank
Phyllis J. Washington School of Education and Human Sciences

Bridget Clarke
Department of Philosophy

Scott Hohnstein
Phyllis J. Washington School of Education and Human Sciences

Jean Luckowski
Phyllis J. Washington School of Education and Human Sciences

© COPYRIGHT

by

William Alexander Kinderwater

2013

All Rights Reserved

The Role of Dispositions in Teacher Candidate Education

Chair: Dr. Matthew V. Schertz

The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly NCATE) have stated that teacher preparation programs must enact formal processes for monitoring and assessing the essential knowledge, skills, and forty-three critical dispositions of teacher candidates. While the monitoring and assessment of knowledge and skills appears to be well understood and confidently applied, dispositions do not. This study evaluated the claim that the monitoring and assessment of dispositions are confounded by: (1) ambiguous language and a lack of explicit definition of 'dispositions', and (2) that moral knowing cannot predict moral action.

Ten nationally recognized teacher-preparation programs were selected from the U.S. News and World Report lists of top twenty-five institutions. A case study policy analysis was conducted through the use of applying five guiding research questions to the published institutional literature and procedures related to candidate dispositions. The research questions were: (1) How many of the forty-three InTASC dispositions were stated by each institution? (2) Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? (3) Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed? (4) Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated? (5) Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action, moral knowing, or some combination of the two?

Contrary to expectations, none of the teacher preparation programs stated the forty-three InTASC dispositions verbatim. Rather, the selected programs each identified their own unique desirable candidate dispositions in their own expectational language. In some programs this language was vague and deferred to broad institutional philosophies and missions while the language of other programs was explicit, itemized, and hopefully observable. Common to the majority of programs was the use of varied qualitative and quantitative assessment measures, carried out by both student and teacher educator, at checkpoints along the preparation program.

The results of this study suggest that while *critical dispositions* still possess ambiguous language and a confounding lack of predictability, schools of education have engaged their obligation to monitor and assess the moral/ethical composition of their candidates with confidence. Further, they have done so by tailoring their own dispositions to articulate with their broad, yet unique institutional philosophies and missions. It is suggested that efforts must be made by teacher educators to continuously evaluate program expectations and the assessment tools used to evaluate candidate dispositions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of individuals whom I wish to acknowledge and to whom I express my appreciation for the successful completion of this project:

I offer my sincere gratitude to Dr. Matthew Schertz, Chairperson, and to my committee members, Dr. Lisa Blank, Dr. Bridget Clarke, Dr. Scott Hohnstein, and Dr. Jean Luckowski for maintaining their high standards of scholarship. The patience, guidance, and instruction they have modelled for me over the years confirm their excellence as scholars, mentors, and teachers.

Special recognition must be conferred to Mrs. Candace Johnson, Principal of Hellgate Elementary School. Candy has been my employer, colleague, roll model, matriarch, and friend for the last thirteen years. She singularly embodies those dispositions for which *all* teachers should strive to possess.

To Mr. Steve Harris and Dr. Douglas Reisig. Their early, practical, and perpetual support and enthusiasm for this endeavour will be forever appreciated.

I must acknowledge the contributions of Dr. William McCaw for his assistance with helping clarify the methodology used for this project.

To my parents, William Sr. and Diane: Thank you for demonstrating the value of real life long learning.

Thank you to Claire and Jack for taking the occasional trip to the library or the Education building on the way home. Big Dipper buys loyalty.

Finally, this project could never have been completed, or frankly conceived of, without the loving sacrifice and support of my wife, Elizabeth. The journey continues to surprise!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction	1
NCATE/CAEP and InTASC Dispositions: Concerns	3
Two Concerns: Sharpening the Focus.....	7
Significance of Study	10
Research Questions.....	12
Definitions.....	13
Delimitations and Limitations	13
Summary	15
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction	16
InTASC and NCATE/CAEP Documents.....	16
Problem One: The Complex Interpretations of Dispositions	
<i>Terminology</i>	19
<i>Dispositions Further Defined</i>	22
<i>Critical Disposition 1(1): The Learner and Learning</i>	26
<i>Critical Disposition 9 (1): Professional Responsibility</i>	34
Problem Two: Moral Knowing vs. Moral Action.....	41
Placement of Study Among Relevant Scholarship	43
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	51
Strengths and Limitations of Document Analysis	51
Role of Researcher.....	53
Data Sources – Collection	54
Analysis of Data / Rationale / Reliability	56
Verification.....	63
Documents from which data was obtained	64
Plan for Narrative	66
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF DATA	67
Huntington University	68
Stanford University	70
Alverno College.....	74
Duke University	77
Rocky Mountain College.....	81
The University of Memphis.....	83
Brigham Young University.....	86
Teachers College-Columbia University	89
The Ohio State University.....	92

The University of Minnesota.....	96
Aggregation of Data Applied to Guiding Research Questions.....	100
<i>Analysis 1: Communication of InTASC dispositions</i>	100
<i>Analysis 2.1: Did document attempt to define dispositions?</i>	101
<i>Analysis 2.2: Did document make explicit what was assessed?</i>	103
<i>Analysis 2.3: Were tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?</i>	105
<i>Analysis 2.4: Did procedures of assessment endorse moral action or moral knowing?</i>	105
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	108
Section One: Research questions revisited	108
Section Two: Discussion.....	119
<i>Two assumptions</i>	119
<i>Sufficiency</i>	121
Section Three: Conclusion	124
<i>Recommendations</i>	124
<i>Conclusion</i>	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	130
APPENDIX 1: List of InTASC Critical Dispositions	146
APPENDIX 2: Huntington University - 9 Goals of Program.....	150
APPENDIX 3: Huntington University: - Dispositions survey (Excerpt)	151
APPENDIX 4: Huntington University: - Mission of the Institution	152
APPENDIX 5: Stanford University – Teaching Performance Expectations	153
APPENDIX 6: Stanford University – California Standards for the Teaching Profession.....	154
APPENDIX 7: Alverno College – Teacher Candidate’s Disposition Commitment.....	155
APPENDIX 8: Alverno College – Professional Behaviors of Undergraduate Teacher Candidates Checklist.....	156
APPENDIX 9: Duke University – Institutional Mission.....	158
APPENDIX 10: North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards	159
APPENDIX 11: Duke University – Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions: Observable Indicators.....	162
APPENDIX 12: Rocky Mountain College Teacher Candidates’ Dispositions	163
APPENDIX 13: Rocky Mountain College – Dispositions Letter	165
APPENDIX 14: The University of Memphis – College of Education Norms...	166
APPENDIX 15: The University of Memphis – Behavioral Examples by Category of Professional Dispositions	167
APPENDIX 16: Brigham Young University – Key Components of the Conceptual Framework.....	173
APPENDIX 17: Brigham Young University – Candidate Dispositional Scales.....	176
APPENDIX 18: Teachers College – Conceptual Framework.....	182

APPENDIX 19: Teachers College – Expectations of Teacher Preparation Program	183
APPENDIX 20: Teachers College – Attributes of a Social Justice Stance As Chosen By Faculty	184
APPENDIX 21: The Ohio State University – Philosophy of Unit, Initial Teacher Preparation.....	185
APPENDIX 22: The Ohio State University – Proficiencies Expected of All Candidates: Dispositions	186
APPENDIX 23: The Ohio State University – Professional Dispositions Assessments I, II.....	187
APPENDIX 24: The University of Minnesota – List of Undergraduate Disposition Expectations.....	193
APPENDIX 25: The University of Minnesota – Clinical Experiences Handbook: Responsibilities and Dispositions Expected Of Student Teachers.....	194
APPENDIX 26: The University of Minnesota – Dispositions Assessment	195

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1. Communication of InTASC critical dispositions.....	100
TABLE 2. Explicit vs. implied definition of dispositions	101
TABLE 3. Location of documented institutional definitions	103
TABLE 4. Documented language choice by institution.....	104
TABLE 5. Tools/mechanisms of assessment by institution	105

THE ROLE OF DISPOSITIONS IN TEACHER CANDIDATE EDUCATION

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Educators at every level bring to the profession moral orientations that direct and mediate the spectrum of roles and responsibilities that the profession requires. Making sense of the connection between the moral orientation of teachers and the practice of meeting socio-moral and institutional obligations has been fertile ground for education scholars.

One group of scholars has viewed the connection between moral theory and practice as a *neo-classical* (Nash, 1997) or *traditional* (Posner, 2004) model in which specific moral ideas and explicit expectations of conduct are inculcated, demonstrated, and monitored. This includes core values education (Bennett, 1997; Likona, 1991), and core curricular knowledge (Finn, 2004; Hirsch et al. 1987, 1993). Another group of scholars has researched a cognitive-developmental link between moral knowing and action. Drawing on the work of Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg (1958) developed his six stages of moral development. From Kohlberg's work, James Rest (1979) created the Defining Issues Test, intended to support and quantify Kohlberg's stages. This tradition of inquiry continues to flourish among such scholars as Darcia Narvaez (2006, 2008), Muriel Bebeau (2002), Daniel Lapsley (2006, 2008), and Larry Nucci (2006, 2008).

An additional branch of scholarship is that of teacher reflective practice. According to this group of scholars, teachers must become proficient in reflecting upon their practice in contexts described by such vocabulary as *moral languages*

(Nash, 2002), *introspective dexterity* (S. Hare, 2007), *professional judgement* (Johnson, 2008), *reflective intelligence* (Dottin, 2009), *open-mindedness* (W. Hare, 2007; Phelan, 2009), or one of the more well known, *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action* (Schon, 1983, 1987).

Communicated largely through the works of Carol Gilligan (1982) and Nel Noddings (1984, 1995), the ethic of *caring* represents another tradition at work in education. In an ethic of caring, moral agency necessarily includes attending to the relationships that interplay within education, especially the relationship between teacher and learner (Noddings, 2002).

However, the foundational moral language, or reflective capacity of teachers, is not the only variable influencing the responsible execution of the moral obligations of the profession. The interplay of stakeholder groups (e.g., parents, community members, board members), the intersection of pedagogical philosophies, and the diverse nature of the students themselves all contribute to a moral dynamic that often proves difficult for practitioners to articulate or measure (Colnerud, 2006; Husu, 2004; Husu & Tirri, 2001, 2003; Klinker & Hackmann, 2003; Johnson, 2008; Lunenberg, et al, 2007; Nash, 1997, 2002; Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2011; Sockett & Lepage, 2002; Thornberg, 2008; Willemse et al, 2005, 2008).

Such moral orientations to teaching, be they neo-classical, empathic, caring, or cognitive-developmental, are represented in a teacher as a mediating philosophical imperative, in addition to a body of personality/behavioral traits influenced by this same moral orientation. In this way, the teacher makes three important contributions to the classroom. The first contribution is the expert knowledge of discipline-specific content in addition to appropriate pedagogical

content knowledge. Second are the skills of a professional pedagogue, demonstrating the artistry and competence of instruction. Finally and perhaps most importantly, the teacher brings to the classroom a moral orientation and attendant character traits, manifested as behaviors, that relate to their proficiency as a professional educator - their *dispositions*.

NCATE /CAEP/ InTASC Dispositions : Concerns

The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) is a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The CCSSO is a non-profit, non-partisan organization committed to improving the quality of public education. Of interest in this study, InTASC is the arm of the CCSSO involved specifically with teacher improvement via prescribed knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Many teacher preparation programs, as well as school districts around the country, use as their professional competency standards for pre- and in-service teachers those indicated by InTASC. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is an accreditation body that endorses approximately 675 teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities in the United States. At the time of writing, NCATE was merging with a second accreditation body, the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to form a single accreditation body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This accreditation body will be referred to as NCATE/CAEP for this study. While many teacher preparation programs adhere to the InTASC standards, not all are accredited by NCATE/CAEP, nor obliged to be.

NCATE/CAEP have stated that teacher preparation programs of member institutions must enact formal processes of monitoring and assessing the essential knowledge, performances, and critical dispositions (previously knowledge, skills, and attitudes) of teacher candidates. To this end, InTASC has specified forty-three *critical dispositions* that teacher preparation programs are expected to cultivate, monitor, and assess (see Appendix 1) among their teacher candidates. These forty-three critical dispositions have been adopted by NCATE/CAEP. However, the adoption of these critical dispositions by teacher preparation programs has not been free of tension or confusion.

Notwithstanding the different interpretations and definitions of the term *dispositions*, many teacher preparation programs have had to wrestle with the theory and practice of dispositions' monitoring and assessment as part of their accreditation obligations (Albee & Piveral, 2003; Koeppen & Davison-Jenkins, 2007), as well as how dispositions fit into the larger philosophical mandate of the academic unit (Diez, 2006a; Diez & Murrell, 2010; Schussler, 2006; Shiveley & Misco, 2010). More specifically, teacher education programs have debated the definition of dispositions (Burant et al, 2007; Damon, 2007; Duplass & Cruz, 2010; Ginsberg & Whaley, 2006; Grootenboer, 2010; Katz & Raths, 1985, 1986; Raths, 2007; Shiveley & Misco, 2010; Splitter, 2010; Stooksberry et al, 2009), program construction and monitoring (Albee & Piveral, 2003; Diez, 2006b; Duplass & Cruz, 2010; Raths, 2007), the monitoring and assessment of virtues in adults/teacher candidates (Damon, 2007; Diez, 2006b; Grootenboer, 2010; Sockett, 2006; Wasicsko, 2007, Wasicsko et al., 2009; Wayda & Lund, 2005), and more fundamentally, whether or not faculty members within schools of

education “...have the right to determine what kind of person someone else is and should be” (Splitter, 2010, p. 206; see also Murray, 2007).

Splitter’s critique calls into question the evaluative role of the teacher educator vis-à-vis their endorsement of the teacher candidate whilst engaged in the program, in addition to application, completion, and licensure phases. The teacher educator is required to monitor and assess the knowledge, performances, and dispositions of the teacher candidate throughout the duration of the program. The tacit goal of this process of monitoring and assessment is to endorse the competency of the teacher-graduate, based on measurable, observable mastery of the aforementioned three realms. Knowledge components are almost exclusively assessed by teacher educators during participation in the prerequisite course work taking place within the program. InTASC defines the essential knowledge components of the teacher as “...declarative and procedural knowledge as necessary for effective practice” (InTASC, 2011; p. 6). The assessment of performance components (skills) is split between the college classroom and the field-placement classroom. The performance / demonstration of teaching competencies by the teacher candidate are those aspects “...that can be observed and assessed in teaching practice” (p. 6). In most instances, the observation of performance competencies is done by cooperating teachers and/or teacher education faculty.

The third realm of competencies – critical dispositions - is more complex. According to InTASC, critical dispositions “...indicate(s) that habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie the performances play a key role in how teachers do, in fact, act in practice” (InTASC, 2011; p. 6). In this

way, dispositions are imbued with an elevated status owing to the aforementioned assertion that dispositions potentially mediate the execution of the other two realms. This idea was similarly stated in an earlier version of the umbrella NCATE/CAEP document. It stated that dispositions are “The values, commitments and professional ethics that influence behavior toward students, families, colleagues, and communities, and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth” (NCATE, 2002; p. 53).

Although this definition no longer exists, it did influence unit disposition planning and assessment. This emphasis of dispositions as ethical precursor to action permits, and even requires, us to place added urgency on ‘getting right’ the assessment of pre-service teacher dispositions. In one recent report, Anderson and Brydges (2010) asserted that fully 75% of teacher candidate dropouts, removals, and failures were directly attributable to dispositions. The University of Minnesota too has asserted that low scores on dispositional assessments at that institution are “...predictive of difficulty in the program” (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p. 41). However, two problems regarding the assessment of dispositions as observable behaviors become apparent. The first concern is that the vocabulary used in stating the critical dispositions of the pre-service teacher is ambiguous. What, for example, does it mean to be *committed* to something, to *value* something, or even to possess a disposition? The second concern is that moral orientation or knowing what is the right or moral and ethical thing to do cannot predict right or moral/action, nor does it guarantee that dispositional behavior will be explicitly observable in college or field settings. Given these concerns, it forces us to consider the possibility that

the instruction, observation, and evaluation of critical dispositions as discrete observable behaviors are insufficient in endorsing the desirable moral orientation(s) of the teacher candidate. If this proves accurate, then we must ask ourselves what that might mean for teacher preparation programs. Perhaps dispositions, in the behaviorist sense, ought to be abandoned in favor of deferring to broader institutional philosophies, such as “Educators who demonstrate scholarship within a Christian ethic of care” (Southern Wesleyan University, 2007; p. 28) or “Liberal Education, Advocacy, Reflection, Nurture, Engagement, and Respect - L.E.A.R.N.E.R.” (Duke University, 2011a). Perhaps schools of education are better served by limiting their responsibilities to knowledge and skills alone, and avoiding the muddy business of dispositions altogether. This dissertation is an investigation into how ten teacher preparation programs monitor and assess dispositions, and how these practices enhance and inform our understanding of this complex subject. The following brief summary is offered to inform the thesis of this dissertation. A more comprehensive discussion follows in Chapter Two.

Two concerns: sharpening the focus

As noted above, two problems regarding the assessment of dispositions are apparent: The first concern is that such terminology as *values* and *commitment* as stated in the InTASC document, obfuscate the teaching, monitoring, and assessment of dispositions. Evidence that a candidate is *committed* to, or *values*, a tenet of good pedagogy may exist as different standards among more than one assessor or even among candidates. Further, universities and schools of education within the United States communicate distinctive value sets through

conceptual frameworks, mission statements, and other statements of institutional philosophies, e.g., a private or religious college. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that with different missions or values might come different dispositional expectations because, as NCATE/CAEP (2008) states: “Based on its mission, the unit may determine additional professional dispositions it wants candidates to develop” (p. 22).

A related problem with imprecise language is observed in the definitions of disposition itself. While NCATE/CAEP (2008) “...expects teacher candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions” (p. 22), it fails to categorically define a disposition. An early definition of dispositions (in the context of the desirable traits of the teacher) was provided by Donald Arnstine (1967), in which he characterized dispositions-as-behavior that “...allows for the making of a prediction” (p. 32). Later, Katz & Raths (1985) similarly stated, “...because it is reasonable to assume that human behavior is stable, the summary of the trends of a teacher’s behavior, fundamentally descriptive, can also serve as a basis for predicting future trends in behavior” (p. 302). Many similar examples of defining dispositions can be found in the broader scholarship (Borko et al, 2007; Diez & Murrell, 2010; Katz, 1993; Mullin, 2003; Villegas, 2007). Another useful definition of a disposition was offered by John Dewey (1922): “A disposition means a tendency to act, a potential energy needing opportunity to become kinetic and overt. Apart from such a tendency, a ‘virtuous’ disposition is either hypocrisy or self-deceit” (p. 44). Dewey’s definition, as with the others just mentioned, are fundamentally illustrative of how schools of education have attempted to classify and assess dispositional

expectations in their program. To borrow Dewey's metaphor from physics, some teacher preparation programs consider dispositions the 'potential' – a more broad conception of a philosophical orientation such as social justice, honor diversity, or appreciation for subject matter. Conversely, some programs consider dispositions the 'kinetic.' Here, dispositions are actual statements or expectations of specific, observable action, such as: "Integrate life experiences of students and teaching into curriculum" (Teachers College, 2005; p. 60), or "Dresses in a professional manner" (Alverno College, 2011; p. 18). In this way, a disposition can be characterized either as a discrete observable behavior that implies/ confirms a philosophical/ethical orientation, or conversely as a philosophical/ethical orientation that predicts/implies/explains action.

The second concern raised in this dissertation regarding dispositions is in the apparent disconnection between reasoned knowledge and action. Even if educational stakeholders could come to overwhelming hypothetical consensus regarding the moral obligations that are required of teachers through membership in the profession (thus legitimizing a potential list of teacher dispositions), there is no assurance that the capacity for moral action, or agency, would become manifested in real action by the P-12 teacher. In other words, a teacher who is faced with a moral decision or dilemma derives a morally correct course of action in a given situation, but then fails to carry out that action. Such factors as cowardice or mistrust might disproportionately affect the teacher's decision on whether or not to act. In addition, there has been concern expressed about the capacity of the pre-service teacher to demonstrate dispositional expectations as a function of their comparative inexperience:

...she may be disposed to a particular level or quality of practice without necessarily having the capacity to enact it. Likewise, a teacher may have knowledge and skill needed to work effectively with young learners, but lack the commitment, persistence, and creativity to overcome external challenges (Murrell & Diez, 2010; p. 9).

I chose to focus on these two confounding elements regarding the monitoring and assessment of teacher dispositions because they are effective in demonstrating the tenuous nature of the language used in the formal dispositions document. Consider for example NCATE/CAEP critical disposition 2.1, which states: “The teacher believes that all children can learn at high levels and persists in helping all children reach their full potential.” Even a cursory evaluation of this statement invokes innumerable permutations and variability of possible behavior on the part of the teacher. By extension, the language of teacher preparation institutional documentation also comes into question. The more pointed claim here is that specific, frequently used vocabulary (such as *values*, and *responsibility*) does not enjoy a more explicit, universally accepted consensus understanding than does *dispositions*. Even if it is assumed that there is a consensus on the definition, it cannot guarantee a causal or predictable link between such knowledge and action. It does not hold true that because teachers “value collaboration as an essential learning strategy” that they will act to collaborate with peers or stakeholders.

Significance of Study

For teacher preparation programs in North America, an assessment of outcomes is a necessary requirement for the successful licensure of a teacher

candidate. In addition, NCATE/CAEP has mandated such assessments as a requirement of institutional accreditation. However, if a lack of consensus exists regarding dispositions and their related vocabulary, and the recognition of desirable courses of action or the exercise of reason cannot guarantee specific, predictable outcomes or moral agency, then of what use are the dispositional frameworks and assessments that are created by member institutions? McKnight (2004) critiqued this point by suggesting that, for Aristotle,

...the positive effect is the attainment of virtue and possibility of human flourishing and communal friendship, though none of this is guaranteed. One can only help the conditions favourable for the virtue to emerge, but not secure the outcome with certainty. For NCATE, certainty of outcomes is the whole point. This situation is problematic when understood via Aristotle's virtue ethic, which does not operate in such a strategic and narrow manner (p. 222).

Vocabulary found in the NCATE/CAEP and InTASC documents suggests a motive contrary to McKnight's charge: "Professional dispositions are not assessed directly; instead the unit assesses dispositions based on observable behavior in educational settings" (NCATE, 2008, p. 22), and that "...indicators are not intended to be a checklist, but rather helpful ways to picture what the standard means" (InTASC, 2011; p. 6). This is an effective demonstration of the contradictory, and sometimes inaccessible nature of how the goals, languages, and processes of dispositions' assessment are understood among the greater community of educators. This concept of varied, and often problematic, understanding among stakeholders is succinctly communicated in the 'five tensions' outlined by Diez & Murrell (2010) which were as follows: entity vs. increment, separate vs. holistic, screening device vs. professional learning community, narrow ideology vs. institutional philosophy, and culture of

compliance vs. culture of improvement. In the case of this study, specifically aimed at monitoring and assessment, all of these five tensions are salient.

This study is significant in helping the entire community of educators enhance their understanding of the complexity of monitoring and assessing critical teacher dispositions because, whether they like it or not, they are required to act in the capacity of assessor – of some very personal facets of our human condition. This is clearly an enormous responsibility. The monitoring and assessment of dispositions is a deceptively complicated endeavor, and professionals in education ought not underestimate their role in ensuring the legitimate endorsement of teacher candidates.

Research Questions

This case study policy analysis utilized the institutional documents of ten national teacher preparation programs. These documents were analyzed through the filter of four guiding research questions. These research questions were formulated in an attempt to better inform the earlier assertion that assessment is confounded by ambiguous language and a lack of acknowledgement of the gap between moral knowing and action. An explanation for the formulation, and rationales for the inclusion, of these research questions will be elaborated in Chapter Three:

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?
2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?
3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?
4. Do the results of questions 1-3 suggest an endorsement of moral action, moral knowing, or a combination of the two?

Definitions

Critical Dispositions – Any or all of the forty-three ‘Critical Dispositions’ that are listed in the document: *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*.

Institutional Documentation – Literature that specifically identifies the role of dispositions for teacher candidates is decidedly non-standard. The documents used for data collection will be publications from the ten selected teacher preparation institutions that outline the processes of monitoring and assessment of teacher dispositions. Example titles included, but were not limited to: *The Conceptual Framework for Teacher Preparation Programs, NCATE Institutional Report, State Standards, Education Student Handbook, and Program Institutional Report*.

InTASC Document – *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*.

NCATE/CAEP Document – *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study was delimited to the ten institutions chosen for analysis. All of the institutions selected for this study are located in the contiguous United States. Further, they were selected based on their inclusion in the U.S. News and World Report top schools publication.

A second delimitation is the fact that only partial use of the off-voluminous institutional documentation was conducted. Specifically, many subsections dealing with the statements, and/or processes, for the monitoring and assessment of dispositions were utilized.

A final delimitation of the study is that the data collection, data analysis, and discussion phases are restrained by the four guiding research questions.

There are a number of limitations to this study that must be communicated. First, only ten teacher preparation programs were chosen from among the hundreds that exist within the United States. These ten programs were purposefully selected, not randomly sampled, and as such this study yields no generalizability.

A second limitation to the study is embedded within the thesis critique itself, that of how 'dispositions' are defined. As suggested, there is no universally accepted or benchmark definition of a disposition, and the author recognizes a bias related to definition. Borko, Liston, & Whitcomb (2007) have also stated that research into the area of dispositions, due to the lack of agreed upon definition of the construct, is vulnerable to ideological author bias. Efforts were made to ameliorate this limitation by using, as baselines, definitions of dispositions that are found in the scholarship on the subject, and not my own.

A third limitation of this study is the absence of observable, field-level support for the conclusions that will be made. As the data for this study is limited only to paper documentation, claims of how such entities as instruction and assessment manifest in actual teaching/learning practice must necessarily be restrained.

Each of the NCATE/CAEP institutional reports used in this study was authored by individuals, teams, or committees within teacher preparation units, each with their own institutional/philosophical orientations. As such, a fourth

limitation of the study was acknowledging the possibility of author bias in the planning, construction, and dissemination of the institutional reports.

Summary

This case study policy analysis was intended to inform and enhance the understanding of educators and teacher educators regarding the subject of teacher critical dispositions. The two major concerns outlined in Chapter One were that dispositions' monitoring and assessment are confounded at once by ambiguous language and by the gap between moral knowledge and moral action. As such, I investigated the claim that the instruction, observation, and evaluation of critical dispositions as discrete observable behaviors may not be sufficient in endorsing the desirable moral orientation(s) of the teacher candidate. In Chapter Two, the relevant scholarship on these issues is reviewed in more depth.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study is a document analysis of the monitoring and assessment of critical dispositions in selected teacher preparation programs. A thorough review of the literature requires description of the current InTASC and NCATE/CAEP documentation and their relationship to institutional accreditation and teacher preparation and how each of two concerns regarding dispositions can be described and understood via historical and contemporary scholarship on the subject. In addition, I will place this study within the broader scholarship dealing with dispositions' different conceptualizations, architecture, and assessment.

InTASC and NCATE/CAEP Documents

All scholarship regarding teacher dispositions is informed by two primary documents: the NCATE/CAEP *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions*, and the InTASC *Model Core Teaching Standards*. Pursuant to the investigation of this dissertation, the first standard regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teacher candidates is relevant:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions – Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards (NCATE, 2008, p. 16).

Within this standard, seven sub-classifications of the knowledge, skills and dispositions of teacher candidates are organized, the last of which is *Professional Dispositions for All Candidates*. Regarding the last category, professional dispositions, the following target standard is issued:

Candidates work with students, families, colleagues, and communities in ways that reflect the professional dispositions expected of professional educators as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all students. Candidates recognize when their own professional dispositions may need to be adjusted and are able to develop plans to do so (NCATE, 2008, p. 20).

When reading this NCATE/CAEP target standard, it is not clear which professional dispositions NCATE/CAPE would like teacher candidates to possess. In the supporting explanation for the inclusion of dispositional content into their standards document, NCATE/CAEP states that in order to obtain the actual list of dispositions (those that informed their document and mandate), one must refer to the InTASC (2011) *Core Teaching Standards* document (NCATE, 2008; p. 22). It is within this document that forty-three actual *critical dispositions* are stated across ten standard areas or categories. These ten standards are sub-classified under four general organizational categories. In short, NCATE requires member teacher-preparation programs to assess the competency of teacher candidates related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions as detailed by InTASC's core standards (see Appendix 1).

The current InTASC critical dispositions, however, are not indicative of a perennial understanding of dispositions or their role in teacher improvement. In 1992, InTASC, with the inclusion of state department representatives, teacher union representatives, and teacher educators, reconstituted its model standards

(Deiz & Murrell, 2010). One of the outcomes of this revision was the replacement of the standards knowledge, skills, and attitudes with knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Diez, 2007a; Freeman, 2007). Freeman (2007) asserted that the impetus for revision had been a response to the supposed impossibility or inability of teacher preparation programs to monitor and assess an *attitude*. *Dispositions*, as similarly stated by Katz and Raths (1985), were a manifestation of attitude, but distinct from attitudes because dispositions could be embodied in observable behavior. Further, Katz and Raths emphasized that dispositions were neither attitudes nor personal traits because the latter two were not mediated or bound by agent choice or preference; a disposition was indeed habitual, but also a conscious choice. According to Freeman, the claim that teacher educators could make ephemeral attitudes concrete and observable as dispositions is manifestly important:

What we know for sure is that attitude is not a reliable predictor of behavior: It is the gap between intention and actual behavior that renders attitudes unsuitable as a domain of teacher education, particularly when attention moves from what one intends to do to actual performance. Performance, not intention, has been emphasized in recent standard setting, accreditation, and administration of state level rules and regulations (Freeman, 2007, p. 6-7).

Clearly, knowledge and skills could be monitored and assessed with a high level of consensus or reliability, and it was asserted that so too could teacher attitudes. However, this codification could only be made legitimate through the demonstration of observable and predictable dispositions, written as critical learner standards or required candidate competencies. Dispositions heretofore understood as character/personality traits or attitudes are now conceptualized

(in their ideal state of possession) as conscious, demonstrable choices that become habituated over time, thus possessing convenient predictability.

Problem One: The Complex Interpretations of Dispositions

Terminology

The first concern is the ambiguity of dispositions' terminology. In order to demonstrate some of the limitations of dispositions-as-measurable behaviors, it is important to illustrate how legitimate, but complex, historical-philosophical support of dispositions do not necessarily lend themselves to tidy itemized assessment. While the characterization of these dispositions as measureable behaviors might be legitimate because they enjoy a history of scholarly support, this same complex history exposes the disposition to different interpretations. According to McKnight (2004), the mistake that entities like NCATE/CAEP made was to believe that dispositions and virtues could be assessed "...according to the criteria framed within the historical context of professionalization" (p. 227). However, teacher professionalization vis-à-vis caring, responsibility, and social justice, for example, have never been universally understood or consistently applied. McKnight similarly warned that the assessment of discrete, observable behaviors might be putting the 'cart before the horse':

(we are expected to)...accept the notion that the virtues and dispositions have universal characteristics that can be identified in any given situation and hence can be framed within some sort of rubric...to be checked off. This is to believe that dispositions and virtues can be defined and refined to control every contingency in a schoolroom (p. 227).

This blunt critique emphasizes at once the problems of universality of understanding, and of universality of application, given different classroom environments and circumstances.

The problem of universality of understanding is an important one in contextualizing the ambiguity of dispositions language. Could this problem be the by-product of the education profession making too many concrete assumptions regarding the composition of the desirable teacher? In his critique of dispositions, Murray (2007) questioned the depth of research upon which the InTASC standards are given foundational legitimacy:

A disposition associated with the INTASC ninth principle, for example, is that “the teacher is willing to give and receive help,” but no work has been undertaken to establish what context dependably yield this kind of willingness or whether a willingness of this sort even exists to any measurable degree.

The amount of scholarship and research that currently justifies the meaning of most constructs in the behavioral sciences...is enormous and a career-long undertaking for many scholars. Efforts of this magnitude have simply not taken place in teacher education, and none of the putative teacher dispositions, cited by INTASC and others, has the credibility that the psychological disposition, field experience, has, for example.

In fact, there is almost no basis for distinguishing the so-called teaching dispositions from the teacher’s behavior in a context or situation (p. 385).

This critique illuminates a legitimate point of concern. If teacher preparation programs are required to monitor and assess dispositions among candidates, they must set out appropriate and measureable procedures as a prerequisite of their accreditation and of candidate licensure. But they generally have done so by taking for granted the foundational and supporting research on each disposition. This point has been inferred owing to the lack of documented scholarship in support of institutional dispositions. Exceptions for this study

were The Ohio State University, Brigham Young University, and Duke University. Further, the language of these procedures and standards must simultaneously fulfil the varying requirements of such stakeholders as education faculty, institutional administrators, and teacher candidates. In addition, legal concerns must be addressed, as demonstrated in episodes at Washington State University, LeMoyne College, and Brooklyn College (F.I.R.E., 2005, 2006). In the Washington State University case, a student was threatened with expulsion after receiving an evaluation that charged him with failing to adhere to the disposition dealing with respect for cultural diversity. In the Brooklyn College case, a professor was intimidated by fellow faculty members after aggressively challenging the utility and efficacy of dispositions' monitoring and assessment.

It follows from Murray's criticism that a legitimate disposition must at once satisfy stakeholder interests and have been properly considered within scholarly and historical contexts. In certain specific critical dispositions, these requirements are not met, for they can be interpreted in a variety of ways by a variety of relevant parties.

In the following section, I demonstrate this conundrum of different interpretation by briefly reviewing three bodies of literature. The first sub-section reviews the literature that purports to define a disposition, and how that definition modifies our orientation toward deriving and assessing candidate expectations. The second sub-section reviews the literature supporting the InTASC disposition that asserts the importance of embracing and utilizing learner differences. The third sub-section reviews literature supporting the disposition that asserts the importance of reflective practice for in- and pre-service teachers. I have selected these two InTASC dispositions in order to

demonstrate that specific dispositions have been, and continue to be, variably interpreted, even as they exist today as recognizable facets of desirable teacher expertise.

Dispositions Further Defined

As stated previously, the problem of defining dispositions acts as both a theoretical and a practical variable that confounds the legitimacy of the NCATE/CAEP mandate. This concern regarding a lack of definition amongst scholars was well stated by Shiveley and Misco (2010),

For over 100 years, our department of teacher education has graduated successful teachers who were well-grounded in their content areas and who often possessed the skills equivalent to a teacher with several years of experience. Regarding dispositions, however, we could not honestly make a similar statement, not only because we had little evidence, but because we weren't even sure what they were (p. 10).

As Shiveley and Misco pointed out, there was uncertainty regarding the nature of dispositions. Efforts have been made by contemporary scholars to address this problem by defining what is meant by a disposition.

Early scholars of this topic, Arnstine (1967) and Mayo (1958), offered the following definitions of dispositions:

A disposition, then, is not some sort of a thing or mysterious unobservable property of a thing; rather, it is a concept that has its use in predictive statements. To ascribe a disposition to something or to someone is to say he has a tendency to behave in certain ways when certain conditions are realized. Ascribing a disposition, then, allows for the making of a prediction (Arnstine, 1967, p. 32).

A person's character is not merely a list of dispositions; it has the organic unity of something that is more than the sum of its parts (Mayo, 1958, p. 214).

In the first definition, it is clear that predictability and the utilization of predictive statements support the manner of assessment that regards dispositions as observable behaviors. Further, these behaviors have been characterized as action that is consistent across similar contexts (Katz & Rath, 1985, 1986), and "...that is intentional and oriented to broad goals" (Katz, 1993, p. 16). If this characterization is accurate, it begs the question: what are the broad goals? Regarding NCATE/CAEP and its mandate, the broad goals are open to interpretation and differentiation. One suggestion is that the goal of teacher preparation is to produce a moral or ethical teacher. Another suggestion is that the broad goals are simply to be understood as institutional adherence to the ten InTASC standards. In either case, this leaves insufficient parameters with which to distill a definition of the moral teacher vis-à-vis the measurable possession of dispositions.

Consistent with the characterizations of dispositions by Arnstine and Katz & Rath, some educational scholars have assumed a quasi-behaviorist posture toward the design of monitoring and assessment procedures for dispositions within their institutions and programs because "...dispositions are dimensions of human personality that have a consistency about them and are characterized, exemplified, or typified in behavior patterns" (Mullin 2003, p. 5). Generally, as was asserted by Borko et al (2007), it is these predictable, behavioral characteristics that typify and undergird the language and response of some scholars attempting to assess dispositions. (see also Edwards, 2007; Johnson & Reiman, 2007; Juujarvi et al, 2010; Rike & Sharp, 2008; Singh & Stoloff, 2008; Wasicsko et al, 2009).

In the second definition of dispositions, the emphasis diverges from observable behavior and predictability. While stopping short of aligning wholly with Mayo's assertion, some scholars have characterized dispositions as a more conscious or deliberate motivation for action- emblematic of a more broad philosophical orientation. Patricia White (1996) provided such an example of defining and characterizing a disposition as an overarching imperative *toward* action:

Certainly citizens need a very great array of knowledge and skills for life in a democracy, but they also need to be disposed to use their knowledge and skills democratically. They need democratic dispositions (White, 1996, p. 1).

Here, skills for life (action/behavior) are imbued with legitimacy only to the extent they can be related to a democratic ideal or ethos.

This sits in contrast to a prescriptive framework. This dichotomy is also referred to as the *deficit reduction model*, a model to be avoided in the assessment of dispositions (Diez, 2006b, Osguthorpe, 2008, Sockett, 2006) and *entity/increment tension* (Diez, 2007a; Diez & Murrell, 2010). In this case, if the ethical teacher is one whose dispositional orientations can be critiqued and modified, how might institutional monitoring and the assessment of dispositions be manifested in institutional policy? Richert (2007) provided the insight that "...dispositions embodied in a teacher's stance bring together – in important, unique ways - cognition, affect, and action" (p. 413). Further, she asserted that these constituents must each be attended to by means of the cultivation of reflective practices over the long term. It is the observance of this epistemological variance that characterizes the body of literature supporting the necessity of teacher

dispositions and their integration into teacher-preparation programs (Diez, 2006a, 2007a, 2007b; Dottin, 2006, 2009; Jung & Rhodes, 2008; Sanger, 2001, 2008; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2005; Sockett, 2006, 2009).

The letter and the spirit of dispositions are difficult to pin down, owing largely to these different interpretations. Clearly, such ambiguous but familiar characterizations of dispositions possessed by teachers as “what makes a teacher great” or “the kind of person a teacher ought to be” are of little practical or instructional use. Dispositions, as just summarized, can be understood as an ethos, an action, a pre-disposition, a meta-disposition, or any number of combinations. Regarding the NCATE/CAEP list of critical dispositions, additional vocabulary choices come into similar question. The inclusion of such vocabulary as *respects*, *responsible*, *committed*, and *values* all represent similar problems of ambiguity. However, it is not only the inclusion of specific vocabulary that presents this problem. The broader dispositional statements themselves also fall prey to different interpretation, resulting in ambiguous behavioral expectations of teachers.

In the next section, I will demonstrate that an elaborate historical/foundational body of support at once undergirds and confounds an explicit understanding of what is behaviorally required of teacher candidates.

The Learner and Learning

Critical Disposition (1.1): The teacher respects students' differing strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to further each student's development (InTASC, 2011; p. 10).

This disposition claims the need for teachers to observe and be responsive to individual differences among learners. However, teacher responses are mediated by interrelated, yet divergent philosophical orientations toward those differences. Thus, the perceived root causes of learner differences can be situated on a continuum that is demarcated by (1) behaviorism in the context of cognitive, or stage developmentalism/readiness on one side, and (2) constructivism through response to environmental factors, including community, culture, and family on the other. If a teacher wishes to internalize and demonstrate the aforementioned disposition, then the question of how the teacher variably understands, or is oriented to, learner differences becomes strikingly important. Put another way, of interest to us is which end of the continuum the teacher or candidate leans. Teacher candidates and in-service teachers generally do not find themselves at either extreme, but rather possess a philosophical combination that is synergistically informed by both. However, depending upon which philosophical posture the teacher may favor, the behavioral manifestation of this seemingly static disposition has the potential to look different in practice. Two challenges thus present themselves. First, the challenge for the pre-service, and in some cases in-service, teacher is how best to adapt individual instruction for diverse learners using the aforementioned continuum as conceptual delimitations. The second challenge is for teacher educators, in the context of

acknowledging the variability and causes of learner differences, to monitor, facilitate, and enhance a candidate's capacity to move from synthesis to praxis.

Interestingly, this very challenge has been illuminated by scholars over the centuries and endures in contemporary teacher education. We know from *The Republic* that Plato opposed the notion that education was the mere transfer of content from teacher to learner. Further, Plato believed that rejecting this unidirectional conception of education was imperative in order for individuals to think (*dianoia*) and then to acquire/internalize knowledge (*episteme*) in his allegory of the cave. This, according to Plato, could be achieved through the use of the dialectic. The dialectic method requires bilateral participation (in our case between teacher and learner) in the interests of deriving truth through the processes of questioning and challenging assumptions and/or preconceptions. Plato believed that the realization of the good, or truth, could not be achieved through direct inculcation or transfer of knowledge from teacher to student, or as it was put to Glaucon: "...putting sight into blinded eyes" (518c). This is Plato's critique of conceptualizing education strictly within the behaviourist realm. Rather, truth or knowledge of the good could be constructed or discovered, albeit in a more laborious, and sometimes more uncomfortable manner. Interestingly, this critique sits in contrast to Plato's first conception of education in which he supported the propagation of certain explicit virtues through the study of literature. Poetry, tales, and literature were useful, but only the right kind: those that taught courage, self-control, independence, and religious principle (395b). In this way, Plato (as teacher) is a useful illustration of the aforementioned complexity of recognizing one's own teaching philosophy in the presence of legitimate, but often opposing pedagogical forces.

This concept of internalization and legitimization of knowledge through the use of the dialectic was later illuminated literally by Michel de Montaigne, in the publication *On the Education of Children* (1579). Here, Montaigne bemoaned the practice of tutors, who: "...never stop bawling into our ears, as though they were pouring water into a funnel..." (Montaigne, 1579/1943; p. 11). Again, the challenge for educators (tutors), according to Montaigne, was to reject the classic rote and rod methods and move toward practices of modelling and providing a more broad and worldly set of experiences for the student, all tailored to the different needs of students: "...according to the capacity of the mind he has in hand..." (Montaigne, 1579/1943; p. 11). Thus, Montaigne illustrates his hope that the function of education is to build upon the existing capacities of the student. This education would ideally take the form of experiential learning as the manifestation of one's orientation toward healthy scepticism.

Locke and Rousseau would later share nearly identical critiques of 'contemporary' European education between the 17th and 18th centuries. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, Locke would again challenge the idea that the predominantly singular and severe methods of education were optimal, much less useful. Locke would advocate for the increased profile of mental discipline and the use of reason for instruction, in addition to modelling "...those things you would have them do or avoid..." (Locke, 1693/1902; p. 61). Make no mistake, while Locke represents a transitional or bridging perspective, latitude was suggested in the dispensation of drill, or of corporal punishment. However, his suggestion that alternative perspectives toward the practice of education could also be valued should sound very familiar to both teachers and teacher educators today:

Begin therefore betimes nicely to observe your Son's temper; and that, when he is under least restraint in his play, and as he thinks out of your sight. See what are his *predominate passions* and *prevailing inclinations*; whether he be fierce or mild, bold or bashful, compassionate or cruel, open or reserv'd. For as these are different in him, so are your methods to your different, and your authority must hence take measures to apply itself in different ways to him (Locke, 1693/1902; p. 83).

Locke's assertion here was a variation of the maxim that one size doesn't fit all.

Again, this is familiar in theory and practice to the notion of legitimately getting to intimately know and understand one's students in the interests of

differentiating instruction and optimizing teaching and learning. Locke also

asserted, as Rousseau would later, that the experiential learning and play of

children was undervalued. Put another way, classroom drill and practice was

not only of questionable use in the context of delivering content, it tainted the

child's intrinsic desire to actually learn or internalize a concept. Locke, referring

to the drill method of teaching/learning Latin and Greek, lamented that rather

than being "...chained to the oar, seven, eight, or ten of the best years of his

life...", the student might do just as well and, "...at a great deal cheaper rate of

pains and time, and be learn'd almost in playing?" (Locke, 1693/1902; p. 128).

This set up Rousseau to later expand both the critique of traditional methods,

and the advocacy of non-traditional methods, such as experiential learning, and

the acknowledgement of the concept of learner readiness. An illustrative

example is found in Emile regarding science education where Rousseau asserted

(similarly to Locke) that "The lessons which schoolboys learn of one another in

the playground are a hundred times more useful to them than any which they

will ever say in class" (Rousseau, 1762/1961; p. 123).

As these and other scholars have demonstrated, differing orientations toward pedagogy and epistemology can influence the way a student (or teacher

candidate) demonstrates his/her profile of competencies. This in turn influences the teachers' understanding of different student needs. The scholar who has put the most contemporary face on the issue of the competing conceptions of learner difference was John Dewey. Dewey (1893/1997) stated in *Teaching Ethics in the High School* that a conception of educational ethics must include attention to the relationships that exist between a human and the physical and social institutions with which he interacts:

Ethics rightly conceived, is the statement of human relationships in action. In any right study of ethics, then, the pupil is not studying hard and fixed rules for conduct; he is studying the ways in which men are bound together in the complex relations of their interactions (4.54).

This demonstrates Dewey's understanding that an ethics of *hard and fixed* rules of conduct was insufficient because both the actions and the languages of communities were contextual, not arithmetic. Later, in *Human Nature and Conduct*, Dewey maintained his belief in the importance of environmental influence on human development by stating: "Until we know the conditions which have helped form the characters we approve and disapprove, our efforts to create the one and do away with the other will be blind and halting" (Dewey, 1922/2002; p. 19). It is important to provide a context to Dewey's claim, as "the characters" he referred to are habits or virtues that we find desirable or undesirable. In what way, he asked, are we to best understand the acquisition and manipulation of such habits? To this Dewey has stated: "They (virtues) are not private possessions of a person, but working adaptations of personal capacities with environing forces" (p. 16). These environing forces are the formative inputs and experiences to which we are exposed from our earliest

ages, and throughout our lives. In other words, our development as human beings necessarily depends on attending to the social contexts within which we interact. Further, these contexts of human environment are incessant, omnipresent, and interrelated. Even though virtue and environing forces merited reflection owing to their broader societal influence, Dewey also invited us to consider how we use language, and how language can be variably obtained and understood. He asserted: "...no sound, mark, product of art, is a word or part of language in isolation. Any word or phrase has the meaning which it has only as a member of a constellation of related meanings" (Dewey, 1939; p. 49). This is Dewey's invitation for us not only to reflect upon our interaction with virtue and the variables that influence it, but to also attend to the language of instruction. Acknowledging the teacher's use of language has obvious importance given the diversity of learners and their varied backgrounds. This cuts in two directions. First, the teacher must acknowledge that different vocabulary might be appropriate in different circumstances, with different groups of learners. Second, Dewey reminds us that teachers must at once acknowledge the vocabulary used by students to communicate thoughts and ideas, and help students recognize their own uses of language and individual word choices.

A parallel struggle regarding learner differences has taken place. It concerns how learner differences theoretically occur in the first place, largely detached from teaching/learning practice. Some scholars of education believe(d) that learner differences can be understood as a product of the natural development of human beings progressing through predictable, generally

universal stages of readiness to learn. Here, the role of the teacher would be to facilitate the exchange of information and experiences consistent with the developmental level or 'learner readiness' of the student. In *The Republic*, Plato asserted the importance of music and gymnastics instruction for the elementary learner. This would be followed by the curriculum of the Trivium (logic, rhetoric, and grammar) at the Academy. Finally, the Quadrivium (arithmetic, astronomy, music, and geometry) would round out the seven liberal arts disciplines. Aristotle, in Book VII of the *The Politics*, stated clearly that education ought to follow developmental intervals of readiness for instruction. The first stage was the first year of infancy. The second stage was from infancy to five years of age. The third stage is from ages five to seven, during which children would be required to "Observe lessons in whatever they will be required to learn" (1336b; 35). The fourth and fifth developmental stages of readiness are from ages seven to puberty, and puberty to twenty-one, respectively.

Rousseau too, advocated for developmentally appropriate learning for varied learners in *Emile*, stating, "...the education of man begins at birth" (1762/1961, p. 79). Rousseau made suggestions for the early acquisition of speech during the first stage of development, infancy to age five. Rousseau's second stage is from age five to twelve. It is at this interval that Rousseau most aggressively advocated the benefits of experiential learning.

Attempts to derive and assert more formal codifications of human development have characterized some education research in the twentieth century. This interesting lineage of research sought to explain individual difference in humans as a function of their cognitive-developmental stages, one

of the most famous being the stage theories of Jean Piaget. In turn, Piaget's student, Lawrence Kohlberg (1958) asserted that our capacity for moral reasoning followed predictable, measurable stages. Building upon this model, Kohlberg's student, James Rest published the influential book *Development in Judging Moral Issues* in 1979, which contained the influential Defining Issues Test (DIT). The DIT was influential because it purported to neatly quantify and classify the broad arena of moral theory and ethical teacher conduct vis-à-vis cognitive developmentalism. As will be clearly demonstrated in the following chapters, attempts at quantifying ethical conduct and teacher dispositions continue in the nation's teacher education institutions.

The disposition just reviewed, knowing how to recognize and utilize learner differences for differentiation of instruction, can be understood many ways. The teacher candidate may contextualize learner differences in the cognitive-developmental realm, the environmental-relationship realm, or a combination of both. Notwithstanding the problematic inclusion of such terms as "respect" and "responsibility" in this critical disposition, it is unclear exactly what specific dispositional expertise the teacher candidate is to demonstrate. It is reasonable to anticipate that an in-service teacher might favor one realm over the other as a result of professional training and career experience. This is less likely for the teacher candidate whose experiences with differentiated instruction and diverse learners is, at licensure phase, largely theoretical. Perhaps the candidate has been exposed in college coursework to the theories of Piaget, Gardner, Montessori, Vygotsky, Dewey, or Rousseau, but has not observed their practical applications or limitations. Further, a disposition that makes a claim as to

whether or not a teacher candidate respects learner differences might be confounded by philosophical differences between student and candidate (at higher grade levels), candidate and professor/facilitator, or even candidate and cooperating teacher

Professional Responsibility/Reflective Practice

Critical Disposition (9.1): The teacher takes ethical responsibility for student learning and uses ongoing analysis and reflection to improve planning and practice (InTASC, 2011; p. 18).

The concern of this disposition is what “ethical responsibility for student learning using analysis and reflection” looks like in actual teaching practice. This is a difficulty for NCATE/CAEP because, as we shall see, reflection and continuous professional growth can at once be understood as an institutional mandate, a process of personal self-improvement, or as a pursuit of broader societal good or obligation. For Plato, analysis and reflection was both the desirable process and product of engaging the dialectic or Socratic Method. Knowledge, or knowledge of the good was possible only to the degree one could successfully engage the dialectic, a method of truth-seeking through self-reflection. The process of the dialectic further served to illuminate our intellect and reason while helping us ascend from mere imagination, or from faith. While the dialectic is a favored pedagogical technique, and in some contexts, a favored disposition, in public schools it remains a delicate variable in negotiating a diverse learner and stakeholder base because the exercise of reason is not a universally cherished endeavor.

Contemporary schools of education appear to engage the processes of teacher preparation influenced by Plato, but also a kindred philosophical stance

consistent with John Dewey's assertion that "...One of the chief problems of our dealings with others is to induce them to reflect upon affairs they usually perform from unreflective habit..." (Dewey, 1922/2002; p. 279). The sentiment here is that while virtue perhaps cannot be taught, desirable states of thoughtfulness, introspection, and moral or virtuous thought/conduct might be achieved by teachers and teacher-educators facilitating processes of, and opportunities for, reflection. More to the point of this dissertation, even if facilitation is possible, it is questionable whether or not we can truly assess how pre- or in-service teacher self-inquiry improves planning and/or practice. Rorty, (2009) asserted the value of reflective practice via a variety of open-mindedness, stating: "For genuine self-correction, a rational person must be actively able and disposed to consider beliefs – to trace their presuppositions and consequences – without forthwith affirming or denying them..." (Rorty 2009; p. 351). Here, Rorty was forwarding the foundations of individual rationality, in itself a potential disposition. Despite the very similar sentiments represented by Plato, Dewey, Rorty, and others, we are left wondering (assuming self-correction was indeed a motivator) how self-correction, reason, or reflective habit ought to be observed, measured, or assessed in the sense of an NCATE/CAEP disposition? The documents presented in this dissertation go some length toward illuminating this question by outlining the procedures of different teacher education programs. However, it is important to first demonstrate how reflective practice might potentially be understood in different ways.

As previously referenced, Plato represented the perspective that reflective practice, embodied by the dialectic, was both an emancipatory force and a

necessary skill set for a member of the ruling class. What was just as important to Plato was that the exercise of reason evoked truth: that being both the possession of knowledge as well as the possession of ignorance. The process of investigating what one knows and what one doesn't in the interests of improving teacher quality is clearly an important goal for teacher education. Sentiments similar to Plato's were later made by the Stoic body of philosophy. Self-reflection and principled reason were necessary skills for a leader to govern a dynamic citizenry honestly, effectively, and selflessly. In the case of education, the citizenry we are concerned about is a dynamic learner base that must be governed. Marcus Aurelius communicated this sentiment in effectively in *Meditations* by stating: "At every action, no matter by whom performed, make it a practice to ask yourself, What is the object in doing this? But begin with yourself, put this question to yourself first of all" (p. 164). This challenge is robustly observable in both pre- and in-service practice as the "why are you making this decision?" challenge that is applicable to almost every facet of the teaching profession. Additional Stoic references made by the likes of Epictetus and Epicurus, while communicated in a more urgent and solemn manner, are clearly applicable to contemporary teaching and learning in the contexts of dilemma resolution, self-improvement, and professional growth, among others. Epicurus challenged us to enhance our sound judgement through the "...investigation of the reasons for every act of choice..." (Epicurus, p. 184). This investigation, according to Epicurus, was not only necessary to derive truth, it was the route to a truly pleasant life. However it appears that the power of deliberation was not limited to the illumination of truth, principled guidance, or wisdom. In addition to possessing a seemingly obligatory responsibility, the

exercise of reason had an emancipatory tenor in the Platonic and Freireian senses. This can be observed in these brief excerpts from Marcus Aurelius in

Meditations:

Treat with respect the power you have to form an opinion. By it alone can the helmsman within you avoid forming opinions that are at variance with nature and with the constitution of a reasonable being. From it you may look to attain circumspection, good relations with your fellow men, and conformity with the will of heaven (p. 58).

Nothing so enlarges the mind as this ability to examine methodically and accurately every one of life's experiences, with an eye to determining its classification, the ends it serves, its worth to the universe, and its worth to men... (p. 59).

These excerpts are applicable to today's teaching and learning contexts, both in PK-12 environments as well as post-secondary candidate preparation environments. While stand-alone practices/achievements such as circumspection or rational examination can be considered important proficiencies for the candidate or teacher educator, it is imperative to remember the transcendent goals that are present – and to which we are obliged. To Marcus Aurelius, these transcendent obligations were good relations with fellow men, the will of heaven, and the “universe” of both. For contemporary education, it behoves us to make salient, for teacher candidates, the often muddy and frustratingly dynamic distinction between introspection-as-practice and introspection as a higher professional obligation, perhaps toward fulfilling a social contract, incubating critical thinkers, or to provide skills for employment in a 21st century economy.

The role of reflective practice in classic philosophy is more representative of an ideal expectation for wisdom, competence, and truth-seeking. However,

with regards to the previous section, these philosophical positions were not necessarily intended to reform a mass public education that did not yet exist. In the next section, the investigation into the different understandings of reflective practice begins to narrow. Specifically, the focus begins to sharpen on those scholars who view reflective practice as a necessary facet, specifically of legitimate teaching and learning.

In *Human Nature and Conduct* (1922/2002), John Dewey devoted an entire chapter to the subject of deliberation. For Dewey, deliberation had two functions. First, the exercise of deliberation allowed us to “look before we leap.” That is, to imagine the effects of a multitude of different responses to situations and events, before ever making them corporeal. This was the powerful luxury of reason because “...an act overtly tried out is irrevocable, its consequences cannot be blotted out. An act tried out in imagination is not final or fatal. It is retrievable” (p. 190). The importance of this idea for teachers at all levels is salient. How do I measure and administer consequences following a classroom outburst? How do I respond to the heated accusations of a protective parent? Do I allow the student to fail the exam, course, or program? In Dewey’s opinion, many practical and theoretical scenarios could be addressed through the exercise of deliberation.

The second function of deliberation was that it allowed the participant to derive meaning from situations and events that might not have been readily apparent: Dewey stated that, “There is no limit to the amount of meaning which reflective and meditative habit is capable of importing into even simple acts...” (Dewey, 1922/2002, p. 209). In a contemporary illustrative example, a teacher

might use deliberation to investigate the significance of a student's bullying behavior on the playground. If we cultivate the skill of deliberation as a habit, it becomes a powerful tool of insight and practical utility.

Dewey's functions of deliberation, acts without enacting - and the derivation of meaning, should be obvious to the teaching professional. However, these functions appear to require the luxuries of time, practical detachment, and of appropriate. All of these seem to be in short supply in the contemporary public education setting. Donald Schon, in his 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*, seemed to recognize the need for professional reflection to become a more pointed and immediate tool of professional improvement. He asserted the importance for educators to both reflect-in-action and reflect-on-action. Briefly, reflection-in-action referred to instances in which a teacher must make a decision in the midst of an educational encounter, in real time. Reflection-in-action, according to Schon, was "...intuitive knowing implicit in the action" (p. 56). This reflection-in-action could be enhanced through further reflection and experience. Reflection-on-action referred to mentally revisiting a situation, given the luxuries of time and space removed from the situation, and evaluating the courses of action taken, or the courses of action to come.

Again, contemporary scholarship regarding reflective practice for educators seems to distance itself from the more grandiose perspectives offered by Aristotle (good of man), Marcus Aurelius (circumspection toward the will of Heaven), or Dewey (progressive reform). Rather, the focus has been narrowed to

the explicit practice, or the *agency* of the teacher within the context of teacher improvement:

From an individual perspective, teachers are continually exhorted to reflect on their practice, to look inward in a deep sense to examine and question the value of what they teach, how they teach, and how they can learn and improve (Campbell, 2003, p. 117).

Campbell asserted that teacher improvement involved a reflection upon problem solving or dilemma resolution. The tenor of this manner of reflection was made more urgent when represented by such claims as “Most of the ethical issues for teachers are not hypothetical but are here, now” (Dunn, 1999, p. 72). While some contemporary scholars have advocated for a more collegial approach to dilemma resolution (Albee & Piveral, 2003; Diez, 2006a; Husu & Tirri, 2001, 2003; Koeppen & Davison-Jenkins, 2007; Malm, 2009; Maslovaty, 2000) within broader social contexts other scholars defer to individual introspection and personal agency (Freeman et al, 2004; Strike & Soltis, 2004).

Stooksberry et al. (2009) represent a common contemporary orientation to dispositions delivery and assessment as mediated by reflective practice. Here, individual agency was supported within a broader and more collegial institutional mandate. Personal reflective journal writing was later followed by more elaborate exchanges between teacher candidate and instructor in the hope of illuminating the influence(s) of external environment (*convergence*). This, according to Stooksberry et al., was an attempt to allow teacher candidates to “...become aware of their dispositions when they uncover their assumptions and understand how their pre-existing ideas affect their decisions related to their teaching” (p. 720).

This variety of reflection and evaluation that focuses on personal agency using educational dilemma (both real and fabricated) is utilized in a number of relevant scholarly contributions: *The Ethical Teacher* (Campbell, 2003), *The Teacher as a Reflective Professional* (Dahlin, 1994), *The Ethical Teacher* (Haynes, 1998), *The Ethical Educator* (Israel & Lassonde, 2007), *Ethics in the Classroom* (Mahoney, 2008), and *The Ethics of Teaching* (Strike & Soltis, 2004).

In considering this disposition of "...ethical responsibility for student learning...and reflection to improve planning and practice" the breadth of potential interpretation is apparent. Notwithstanding the problematic and ambiguous use of the term "responsibility," the purposes of reflection to improve planning and practice are vague. In Dewey's case, reflection allows us to derive hidden or more profound meanings from our decisions, and to imagine their consequences before carrying them out. Schon ushered reflection into the arena of teacher agency. Here, the value of reflection was measured by the degree to which it could illuminate and inform the teacher at a given classroom moment, and in post-facto practice.

Problem Two: Moral Knowing vs. Moral Action

I have at times lain long awake in the night, thinking how other lives than mine have been shattered; and I believe that such misfortune does not arise from inborn folly, since often those who suffer are wise and good. But this is how we should regard the matter: we know and see what is right, yet fail to carry it out (Euripedes, p. 75).

Educators and laypersons alike can attest to the times in which they have, for a multitude of reasons, fallen short in virtuous action. Furthermore, they have fallen short despite a lucid understanding of what the appropriate course of

action ought to be. Phaedra, in the excerpt above, knows that her longing for Hyppolytus is wrong, but emotion overtakes her. She realizes that the virtuous course of action is to suffer in unrequited silence, but her actions betray this, and she confesses her shortcomings to her confidante. Why do we allow this to happen? A lifetime of reflection upon the human condition will likely fail to provide an adequate answer. For the purposes of this project, it is enough to acknowledge that this dichotomy between moral knowing and action does exist, and we can certainly observe its examples within educational settings (Splitter, 2010).

Salient instances of this shortcoming in education can be observed as teachers engage in the realities of moral choices and dilemmas in daily classroom situations. Consider, for example, a teacher who finds cheating morally repugnant and has a known cheater in their class. In addition, this student has intrusive, hovering parents that make the teaching day an unpleasant experience. Rhetorically speaking, might this teacher overlook the cheating, thus passing on the student and his problems to the next teacher or grade level? However, it is not only adherence to personal moral codes that are at question. Professional or institutional prescriptions and proscriptions, sometimes stated as codes of ethics or handbooks of professional conduct, are also subject to instances of *couldn't*, *wouldn't*, or *didn't* on the part of the teacher. Adherence to InTASC critical dispositions is one such prescriptive expectation. But does it follow that because it is stated as a critical behavioral or philosophical impetus, it will be manifested in action? Consider an additional critical disposition from the InTASC document:

Critical Disposition (6.6): The teacher is committed to the ethical use of various assessments and assessment data to identify student strengths and needs to promote student growth (InTASC, 2011, p. 16).

Notwithstanding the problematic nature of assessing the degree to which somebody is *committed* to something, conflict may confound the teacher's ability to act. He or she may well embrace the concept of differentiated instruction justly preceding and legitimizing differentiated assessment. Indeed, this inability to act may be a result of professional apathy or moral indifference. However, it could also be a function of an institutional imperative to favor only one manner of testing; this is a variable out of the control of the practitioner. Further, the practitioner may act unethically out of the gate. They may manipulate assessment data to meet external expectations, or to make themselves appear more effective.

Relatedly, Murray (2007) has stated that teacher preparation in dispositions overlooks the fact that, "Although prospective teachers may have acquired the appropriate skills, they may not use or apply them (i.e., they may not be disposed to use them, in other words)" (p. 385). This concession would suggest that attempts to assess dispositions are largely doomed from the start, again, because there is no guarantee that even if the teacher candidate were in possession of a disposition, that it would manifest in observable action or agency (Diez & Murrell, 2010, Freeman, 2007).

Placement of study among relevant scholarship

When the scholarship cited in the first two chapters was compiled and analyzed, three major themes, or bodies of literature emerged: definition, program construction, and assessment. Those three elements were also asserted

by Stooksberry (2007) to be elements upon which all debate on the subject of dispositions ought to be based. On their faces, these three themes appear quite reasonable and thorough in the context of program planning, implementation, and continuous assessment and improvement. However, this dissertation called into question some of the foundational assumptions undergirding the definition, planning, and assessment of teacher candidate dispositions.

The scholarship regarding the definition(s) of dispositions is diverse, and falls into two major areas in which the bulk of literature is found. The first is the scholarship dealing with the question of whether or not dispositions are observable (thus assessable) acts. The second area is scholarship that asserts that dispositions are observable *and* have a predictable element. The first body of scholarship questions whether or not we can actually observe a disposition. This sentiment was stated effectively by Murrell and Diez (2010), that while teacher educators ought to be required to attend to moral and ethical domains, "...it is hard to operationally represent an individual's moral stance" (Murrell & Diez, 2010; p. 12). Burant, Chubbuck, & Whipp (2007) too suggested that while the work on teacher moral sensibilities and codes of conduct was necessary, behaviors in isolation were not necessarily indicative of a dispositional set. The reason isolated in this case was that desirable growth-activities such as conversation, qualitative measures, interviews, open-ended questions, talk, and reflection were all resource-heavy, and thus difficult to assess. In a more recent study, Grootenboer (2010) argued that universities must be charged with the responsibility of helping students "...develop the affective qualities and attributes that have been deemed appropriate for their field or discipline" (Grootenboer, 2010; p. 732). However, the familiar confounding variables of

limited time and inadequate policy structures made this a difficult enterprise. It is important to add that the aforementioned scholars proceeded on the assumption that we could know a disposition-in-action if we were to see it. Raths (2007) offered a critique of this assumption by stating that there is little or no inter-rater reliability with current dispositions assessments. Owing to this shortcoming, there is no conceivable 'x' score/threshold from which to deny candidate admission or licensure. As will be illustrated in the following chapters, these varieties of threshold assessments are common within schools of education.

The second overlapping body of scholarship deals with the extension of dispositions manifested as observable behaviors into the realm of predictability for teacher candidate action. As referenced earlier in this chapter, it was Arnstine (1967) who first forwarded a definition of dispositions that included an assertion that moral composition manifested as action had a predictive power. Similarly, many scholars have forwarded a definition of dispositions that is characterized by explicit reference to observable action as both proof of dispositions, and predictive of future action. (Damon, 2007; Edwards, 2007; Hyde, 2010; Johnson & Reiman, 2007; Juujarvi et al, 2010; Katz & Raths, 1985; Mullin, 2003; Rike & Sharp, 2008; Singh & Stoloff, 2008; Villegas, 2007; Wasicsko, 2009; Wilkerson, 2006). Regarded individually or collectively, the exercise of attempting to compose and refine a definition of disposition necessarily invites an analysis into what a disposition actually is. In this dissertation, I have neither claimed to define, nor attempted to define, a disposition. Rather, the focus is to identify parallels and distinctions among NCATE/CAEP

expectations/ definitions, scholarship, and the published procedures/ definitions of existing teacher preparation programs.

The scholarship highlighting teacher preparation institutions' attempts to construct and implement programs for the teaching, monitoring, teaching, and assessment of teacher dispositions are also becoming more frequent and detailed. In *Teaching as a Moral Practice* (Murrell, Diez, Feiman-Nemser, & Schussler, 2010, Eds.), the successes, challenges, and downright failures of seven teacher education programs were shared: The University of Denver, Winthrop University, The University of Cincinnati, The University of Chicago, The University of Southern Maine, The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, and The University of North Carolina-Wilmington. Additional institutional scholarship dealing with program construction and implementation vis-à-vis dispositions was found for The University of Memphis (Rike & Sharp, 2008), State University of New York-Potsdam (Anderson & Brydges, 2010), Alverno College (Breese & Nowrocki-Chabin, 2007), University of Northern Kentucky (Wasicsko, 2007, Wasicsko et al., 2009), The University of Nebraska-Omaha (Edwards, 2007), University of Miami-Ohio (Shiveley & Misco, 2010), Ball State University (Wayda & Lund, 2005), and The University of South Florida (Duplass & Cruz, 2010). This study adds an additional ten teacher preparation programs to this body of scholarship. A distinction should be made here that while the aforementioned studies dealt in large part with the processes of program construction, this dissertation deals only with the products derived from those processes, namely, the published definitions, and monitoring and assessment procedures of the selected institutions.

Finally, the most prolific scholarship has been conducted and published on the subject of dispositions' assessment. In the majority of scholarship on dispositions' assessment, teacher education programs forward processes and products of their engagement with the dispositions mandate. The results of this engagement illustrate the inevitably dichotomous contextualizations of the nature and role of dispositions, found within broader philosophical mandates (i.e. conceptual frameworks, mission statements, unit goals/philosophies, etc.). These dichotomies are once again best represented by the five tensions identified by Mary Diez (2010): entity vs. increment, separate vs. holistic, screening device vs. professional learning community, narrow ideology vs. institutional philosophy, and culture of compliance vs. culture of improvement. To these five dichotomies, or tensions, I would suggest an additional tension related to the first two of Diez' tensions, qualitative context vs. quantitative context.

Quantitative scholarship, and approaches to studying and assessing dispositions are evident. Albee and Piverval (2003) utilized the chi-square method in measuring the varied importance of ten dispositions. Welch, Pitts, Tenini, Kuenlen, and Wood (2010) used the *Rokeach Value Scale* to measure the relationship between reported values and dispositions, and teaching longevity. Johnson and Reiman (2007) used the *Defining Issues Test (DIT-II)* and the *Guided Inquiry Analysis System (GAIS)* to examine the relationship between participant scores and the demonstration of moral/ethical action. Further, scholars have been active in formulating additional quantitative instruments specifically intended to assess dispositions. Some examples of these are the *Teacher Dispositions Index* (Schulte, Edick, Edwards, & Mackiel, 2004; Edwards, 2007), the

Eastern Teacher Dispositions Index (Singh & Stoloff, 2008), and the *Dispositions Assessment Aligned with Teacher Standards (DAATS)* (Wilkerson & Lang, 2007).

Qualitative assessment of dispositions represents the view that, according to Burant, Chubbuck, & Whipp (2007), a more 'nuanced' approach to assessment must be engaged. Here, such assessments are characterized by conversation/discussion, interviews, open-ended questions, video analysis, and in an increasing number of scholarly writings, rubric analysis (Almerico, Johnston, Henriott, & Shapiro, 2011; Anderson & Brydges, 2010; Karges-Bone & Griffin, 2009; Koeppen & Davison-Jenkins, 2007; Melin & Walker, 2009; Shiveley & Misco, 2010; Wayda & Lund, 2005). In a more recent study, Carroll, (2012) used artefact analysis (transcripts, videotape, observation analyses, class syllabi) to track the development of dispositions in a teacher candidate.

This progression of definition, program construction and implementation, and assessment again appears well researched and functional from the standpoint of practical administration. The research and eventual conclusions reported in this dissertation are intended to occupy the largely ignored space that exists beneath some important foundational assumptions about teacher preparation vis-à-vis critical dispositions. Those assumptions appear to be motivated by the sentiment that dispositions can and ought to be defined, that their monitoring can and ought to be institutionally operationalized, and that they can and ought to be assessed. Critiques of these assumptions are rare within the scholarship on teacher dispositions. One notable exception was Burant et al (2007). In this paper, the authors asserted that schools of education were not assessing dispositions at all. Rather, what was actually being measured

and recorded were personality traits, belief statements, and inferences from behavior. Further, Burant et al. criticized the dispositions mandate for being a homogenous skill set intended to serve a heterogeneous population. Another exception was the critique by Duplass and Cruz (2010) in which the authors illuminated the problematic nature of endorsing a teacher candidate based on their disposition(s):

But, we would argue, in the modern university with typically thirty teacher candidates to a course and faculty research, service, and administrative obligations-all of which must be balanced with our interactions with teacher candidates-making an affirmative judgment of most teacher candidates' dispositions with any degree of confidence is suspect (Duplass & Cruz, 2010; p.146).

This lends support to the claim that current disposition protocols are insufficient in endorsing the moral orientation of the teacher candidate. In this excerpt though, Duplass and Cruz' critique was not a foundational one. Rather, the shortcomings of monitoring and assessment were the familiar result of an already overburdened program faculty. The foundational assumptions supporting dispositions are never investigated or critiqued, only their procedures. Damon (2007) saved the majority of his critique for how and if dispositions ought to be defined or assessed, largely ignoring the potential benefit of attending to the moral composition of teacher candidates. McKnight (2004) came closest to a foundational critique by attacking the efficacy of dispositions on two fronts. The first was the tension created by conflict between the entrenched cultivation of historically female-dominated virtues as a result of public education being a female dominated profession, and the rigid rationality of the Academy. Second was the perceived intractability of ethical composition. Here, McKnight questioned the ability of teacher education programs to

inculcate dispositions because "...dispositions are developed early and difficult to excise or replace" (McKnight, 2004; p. 244). Sockett (2006) made a similar concession, stating "...if we admit that a student is already grounded in some kind of moral perspective, the pedagogical task then becomes one of building on that moral grounding" (Sockett, 2006; p. 66). Sockett, while acknowledging the potential foundational problem, moved directly into the remedies of practice and assessment.

It is important not to overstate or otherwise misunderstand the intended breadth of this study. Specific to the thesis of this dissertation, the interest was investigating two foundational assumptions: ambiguity of language is *not* a confounding issue in assessing a disposition and moral knowledge and institutional expectations *can* predict moral action. If the language of critical dispositions is indeed ambiguous, it confounds efforts to define expectations, to communicate operational and behavioral expectations to candidates, and to assess behavior and moral orientation. Regarding the gap between moral knowing and action, if there is no predictive element to teacher dispositions, then what other means of practical assessment are at the disposal of teacher educators? What varieties of assessment are currently in formal use among well-regarded teacher education programs? Further, if it is the case that the importance of predictability is minimal, does it follow that knowledge and performances/skills will be subject to a kind of evaluative erosion?

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This case study policy analysis is an investigation into how ten teacher-preparation institutions monitor and assess dispositions and how these practices enhance and inform our understanding of the complexity of the subject pursuant to the concerns of ambiguous language and the moral knowing/action gap.

Strengths and limitations of document analysis

The qualitative research paradigm differs from the quantitative in that the manipulation of variables, artificially taken out of their natural contexts, is absent. The methodological design of case study was considered appropriate for this research because the data collection and analysis was derived not from the manipulation of variables, but rather solely from stable, accessible documents. According to Yin (1994), case study research as empirical inquiry "...investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context..." and "...benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis" (Yin, 1994; p. 13). In this dissertation, two propositions were used: that dispositions' language was ambiguous vis-à-vis assessment, and a gap exists between knowledge and action. These propositions informed the construction of the guiding research questions.

The guiding research questions were applied to the documentation of ten teacher preparation programs. Yin (1994) stated four major strengths and four major weaknesses of utilizing documents as a/the source of evidence. These strengths are evident in the literature that was procured for this study. The

strengths are (1) that documents are stable, and can be reviewed repeatedly, (2) that they are unobtrusive to the subject and/or institution, (3) that they are exact, containing exact names, references and details, and (4) that broad coverage is enjoyed – many events over many settings.

The first limitation asserted by Yin (1994) is that a document analysis can suffer from *low retrievability*. Many colleges considered but not used for this study did not make their documentation publicly available. Those that did clearly differed in their degrees of elaboration. For the purposes of this dissertation and its inquiry, retrievability was not problematic. More than enough relevant literature was available, given the number of institutions from which to draw. This issue of retrievability is relevant to both the second and third weaknesses: *biased selectivity* and *lack of access*. While the acknowledgement and amelioration of bias were constant concerns, the ease with which data was available and collected blunted this potential weakness. One example was the attempt by the author to be inclusive of public and private schools, small and large enrollments, and religious and public programs. The fourth and final weakness is *reporting bias*. It was important to formulate guiding research questions with an a-priori goal of minimizing reporting bias. In this study, four guiding questions were applied to the institutional documentation. In reporting the findings, attempts were made to answer each question as concisely as possible using the available information. Efforts were also made to avoid drawing explicit meaning(s) from imprecise language typical of institutional statements or documents constructed by-committee.

Role of Researcher

Mirroring the potential weaknesses of case study research just outlined by Yin, Creswell (2003) has stated that scholarly research, especially that which utilizes a qualitative framework, must address concerns of bias on the part of the researcher because qualitative research is necessarily interpretive. As such, the researcher is obligated to "...explicitly identify their biases, values, and personal interests about their research topic and process" (Creswell, 2003; p. 194).

Qualitative research, while still empirical, is unable to claim complete detachment from its researcher/author. This is a salient concern, obviously owing to the fact that, first and foremost, the author's own interest and motivation for this project may be considered a disposition or dispositional motivator. An additional source of bias may well come from the researcher/author's occupation. The researcher/author of this study is a general education classroom teacher with thirteen years of K-8 teaching experience, and one year of post-secondary teaching experience. Concurrent with this teaching experience, the author has participated in approximately fifteen teacher candidate field placements in the role of cooperating teacher at varied stages of candidacy. As such, it is acknowledged that the analysis and discussion sections of this dissertation may inadvertently skew more toward daily classroom practice and practical assessment procedures for candidates than toward more general analysis and improvement of educational policy, or toward the theoretical improvement of teacher candidates. The attempts of ameliorating this, and doubtless additional, bias is addressed in the *analysis of data/reliability* and *verification* sections in this chapter.

Data Sources - Collection

The methodology that was utilized in this study was guided by two primary questions:

1. How is alignment with the NCATE dispositions mandate communicated or embodied in the accreditation documents of ten teacher-education programs?
2. How are the aforementioned concerns of language/ definition and the moral knowing/ action gap addressed in these same documents?

In the previous chapter, I reviewed the InTASC and NCATE/CAEP documents, and elaborated on the two concerns of this investigation: ambiguous vocabulary and the moral knowing/ action gap. This was done in the interest of setting a more general stage for the problematic nature of a dispositions requirement, and how this requirement might be variably understood and made actionable by different teacher preparation programs.

The strength of the previous claims was evaluated through the application of analyses to existing dispositions documents selected from national and regional teacher-preparation institutions. The first analysis was a simple comparison of NCATE institutional accreditation reports with the formal InTASC dispositions document. The second analysis was an investigation of how each document addressed the aforementioned concerns regarding definition and moral knowledge/ action.

The data collected provided examples of dispositions' monitoring and assessment documents in use at the current time within teacher preparation programs. The 2011 National University and College Rankings of *US News and World Report* was the primary source from which the majority of institutions were selected. For this study, two categories of "top twenty-five" institutions were used: (1) national universities, and (2) regional institutions. These institutions were selected for three reasons. First, they appeared on the *U.S. News and World Report* list. Second, these institutions possess positive popular reputations, both nationally and internationally. The third consideration was the ability to access the relevant documentation. The acquisition of these documents was achieved by use of public Internet access for all institutions, in addition to e-mail request for additional materials (Brigham Young University, Huntington University, The University of Memphis). The institutional documentation of the teacher-preparation programs for the following institutions was collected and analyzed for this project:

1. Duke University (*)
2. Teachers College (*)
3. Stanford University (*)
4. Huntington University (#)
5. Rocky Mountain College (#)
6. Brigham Young University (#)
7. The Ohio State University (@)
8. The University of Minnesota (@)
9. The University of Memphis
10. Alverno College

(*) Top 25 National Universities
(#) Top 25 Regional Colleges
(@) Top 25 Public Universities
(source: U.S. News and World Report, 2011)

It is notable that two universities listed above did not appear in the top twenty-five ranking(s). I advocated their inclusion owing to specific contributions they made relative to the goal of better understanding the phenomenon of teacher dispositions.

Alverno College was selected owing to the frequency of its representation in dispositions literature. Mary Diez, the Dean of Graduate Studies for this institution is a former president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), serves on the NCATE Board of Examiners, and has provided the most prolific scholarly writing on the subject of teacher dispositions (Diez, 2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b, Diez & Murrell, 2010).

The University of Memphis was included because its teacher education program was among the first to disseminate, through scholarly publication, its specific program of communicating, monitoring, and assessing teacher dispositions (Rike & Sharp, 2008). This was done through the use of a “dispositions talk,” self-reporting checklists, and a self-evaluation of dispositions. The University of Memphis has also been an institution that has conceded that their dispositions’ requirements were in need of immediate revision (The University of Memphis, 2008a; p. 24).

Analysis of Data

Each institutional accreditation report, or related documentation, was subject to two analyses. In the following section, the nature of each analysis is elaborated upon, with the inclusion of theoretical rationales. In addition, elaboration of the research questions will be accompanied by an explanation of

how the researcher attempted to maintain empirical reliability for the purpose of maintaining a legitimate *chain of evidence* (Yin, 1994; p. 98). This chain of evidence refers to the linkage of the guiding theoretical propositions to the analysis/organization of data and to the discussion/conclusion narrative in chapter five. In order to maintain this chain of evidence and enhance study reliability, the researcher attempted to adhere to the narrowest practical parameters for extracting relevant information pursuant to the analyses and guiding research questions. These parameters took the form of identifying specific vocabulary contained in the documents (“disposition”, “dispositions”, “knowledge, skills, and dispositions”, “KSD’s”), as well as specific references to other relevant documents and/or procedures (InTASC, New York State Standards, North Carolina State Standards, etc).

Analysis #1:

This analysis took the form of a comparison of the InTASC list of critical dispositions to those explicitly communicated in the institutional reports. In this analysis, the author’s goal was to report the degree to which institutions had reproduced the forty-three critical dispositions from InTASC. The institution might have identified their own institutional dispositions, or provided a combination of the two.

Rationale: By comparing the InTASC list of forty-three critical dispositions to the institutional documentation, it would be possible to observe which, if any, items were repeated across documents. Which InTASC critical dispositions did schools of education choose to propagate in their own monitoring and assessment

documentation? Which were omitted? This variety of data is valuable because it would suggest a degree of agreement between the conceptions of required dispositions of the desirable teacher for InTASC, and for individual schools of education. What agreement, if any, exists between the two? Further, instances of complete reproduction of InTASC critical dispositions for students invites the concern of Diez' culture of compliance tension. In other words, is the institution simply parroting an accreditation requirement?

Reliability: An institutional document was said to reproduce the forty-three InTASC dispositions in three ways. The first way will be that the document provided a verbatim list of the InTASC critical dispositions. The second was explicit mention of InTASC dispositions as required candidate competencies, but referenced to a separate and related institutional document, website, or education initiative (such as State standards, or regional goals/standards). The third means of reproduction was a list of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions, but with marginal changes in vocabulary. Some institutional documents reference the InTASC standards prior to the 2011 amendments. As such, some institutional documents used the older term 'student,' rather than the recently amended 'learner.' In addition, the manipulation of word order is noted in some cases, but the meanings and insinuations were preserved (i.e. community of learners vs. learning community).

Analysis #2:

In this analysis, four interrelated guiding research questions were applied to the content of the institutional documents in an attempt to provide a

framework to critically and empirically guide an analysis of the collected data. As the analysis proceeded, it was expected that patterns of dissemination, expectations, and assessment would become apparent. The first three guiding questions build upon one another, and were intended to inform the inquiry into the potentially ambiguous language of dispositions. The fourth and final guiding question was intended to illuminate the inquiry into the realms of ethical-dispositional assessment on the part of schools of education, that is, knowing and/or action. The final guiding question does not stand alone, however. While some conclusions might be drawn from indications of which realm might be explicitly emphasized, it is necessarily informed by the preceding inquiries into what institutions are assessing, and how they are assessing.

Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Rationale: This question was intended to highlight attempts by teacher preparation programs to apply language that was perhaps more rigid or narrow than that suggested by NCATE/CAEP. To review, an older definition of disposition stated by NCATE/CAEP was “The values, commitments and professional ethics that influence behavior toward students, families, colleagues, and communities, and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth” (NCATE, 2002; p. 53), but this manner of definition no longer appears in their standards. It was expected that some institutions would defer to the older NCATE/CAEP definition or the current general conception of desirable teacher dispositions while others would state their own, institutionally specific, definition of desirable teacher

dispositions. Further, of interest in this project was whether or not the definition was stated explicitly. Perhaps the definition of a disposition was implied, subsumed under other institutional goals, missions, or ethos.

Reliability: Evidence of an explicit definition of dispositions being communicated was considered demonstrable in two ways. First, the institutional document made a statement to the following effect: “A disposition is defined as...” or “The University of X defines a disposition as...” or “The teacher education program at X College defines a disposition as...”. The second conception of evidence regarding the inclusion of definition would be any reference made to an outside definition. For example, “Kinderwater (2013) defines dispositions as...” or “NCATE has defined dispositions as...”.

Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

Rationale: This question is an extension of question one, and is proportionally relevant to the number of dispositions that the institutional document lists. Notwithstanding the explicit or implied nature of dispositions’ definitions, of interest was what the teacher preparation programs actually reported to assess. Did a teacher education program, for example, purport to assess more critical dispositions within Standard #2: Learning Differences, at the expense of critical dispositions from Standard #6: Assessment? Another important consideration was how each institution chose to state its dispositional requirements. How, if at all, was the language of dispositional requirement reflective of the general language used in the InTASC document? Put another way, when stating their

dispositional requirements, is there evidence of an effort to utilize explicit expectations in terms of observable action vs. an implied ethical set?

Reliability: This guiding question was informed by the institutional documentation in two ways. The first variety of evidence was the documented inclusion of a listing or referencing of dispositional expectations, to either internal or external sources. The second source of evidence was the statement of dispositions using language that better lent the statements to explicit behavioral or observable assessment. An illustrative example of this distinction is appropriate at this point:

Critical Disposition 2(m). The teacher respects learners as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents, and interests (InTASC, 2011; p. 11).

Here, the standard “respects” must be implied through the use of behavioral indicators. In the case of this research project, the majority of teacher education programs reformulated this dispositional expectation in terms of explicit, observable action:

Candidates adapt instruction in consideration of individual differences among students (Duke University, 2010).

(The candidate) Constructs lessons that include the perspectives of different groups (The University of Memphis, 2008b; p. 118).

In these examples, “adapts instruction” and “constructs lessons” are more explicit examples of observable conduct that imply an orientation to the broader disposition of respecting diversity.

Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

Rationale: Schools of education use a variety of assessment techniques and mechanisms in evaluating their teacher candidates. Of interest with this research question, and an extension of question one was how each institution chose to communicate its assessment procedures. These procedures could be written explicitly as measurable goals, outcomes, or competencies (as performances and essential knowledge are intended to be assessed), *or* more general implications of possible behaviors, given desirable moral/ethical orientations. It was expected that institutions would demonstrate a variety of assessment methods and internally, but that these would generally be repeated across institutions.

Reliability: Again, evidence of stated tools and/or mechanisms of assessment are varied. These tools and procedures fall under some more general classifications of identification. These general classifications under which assessment tools and procedures were identified and reported were Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Pursuant to the goals of this investigation, of more particular interest would be the stated assessment of the Dispositions component.

Do the results of questions 1-3 suggest an endorsement of moral action, moral knowing, or a combination of the two?

Rationale/Reliability: While it is possible that the selected institutional documentation may have provided explicit statements of preference in this area, conclusions would more likely be formulated from that data demonstrating the

broader accumulated body of teacher candidate evaluation material. The claim of a suggested endorsement on the part of the institution was inferred from the presence and comparative frequencies of the following assessment forms.

In the realm of moral knowing, such evaluation took the forms of: Prerequisite participation in ethics and foundations course work, statements of teaching philosophy, demonstrations of adherence to institutional missions and philosophies, or stakeholder participation in any of the numerous quantitative inventories available to schools of education as a means to demonstrate evaluations of moral knowing.

Moral action was evaluated/evidenced in the form of undergraduate course performance, in addition to observations in field placements and related practical experiences. It was expected that institutions would provide a number of dispositional checklists, performance indicators' lists, observational rubrics, and self-improvement plans. In addition to institutional documentation and statements of assessment or expectation, professional artefacts such as reference letters admissions letters, and resumes might also demonstrate dispositional behavior, habits, or tendencies.

Verification

In the case of Huntington University, the document entitled *Huntington University Institutional Report-NCATE Focused Visit, Standard 4 (2007)* was incomplete. Communication with its author, Dr. Steven Holtrop, verified both the missing content, and accurate characterization of the existing content as consistent with current practice.

In the case of Brigham Young University, verification regarding the content and delivery method of the *Candidate Dispositional Scales* was conducted through communication with Dr. Nancy Wentworth, current Chair of the David O. McKay School of Education.

Documents from which data was obtained

The data used for this dissertation was collected from the websites of each institution in addition to the NCATE/CAEP and InTASC websites. Additional documentation was obtained through e-mail requests.

Huntington University

Documents from which data was obtained: Huntington University Teacher Education Candidate Handbook (2011). Huntington University Institutional Report-NCATE Focused Visit, Standard 4 (2007).

Stanford University

Documents from which data was obtained: Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP) Teacher Performance Expectations (2011a). Stanford Teacher Education Program Mission Statement (2011b). Stanford Teacher Education Program - NCATE Institutional Report (2008). California Standards for the Teaching Profession (2009).

Alverno College

Document from which data was obtained: Handbook for Undergraduate Teacher Education Candidates, Part 1: Policies and Procedures (2011).

Duke University

Documents from which data was obtained: Duke University: Institutional Report. Prepared for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2011b). Conceptual Framework: Duke University Teacher Preparation Programs (DUPTT). (2011a). North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (NCPTS) (2011). Duke University ETPP Candidate Handbook (2010)

Rocky Mountain College

Document from which data was obtained: Rocky Mountain College, Education Department Handbook (2011).

University of Memphis

Documents from which data was obtained: The University of Memphis College of Education Institutional Report (2008a). Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidate Dispositions at the University of Memphis (2008b). The University of Memphis – Clinical Student Teaching Handbook (2011).

Brigham Young University

Documents from which data was obtained: David O. McKay School of Education, Brigham Young University: NCATE Institutional Report (2005). Brigham Young University: Candidate Dispositional Scales (2012a). Brigham Young University: Clinical Practice Assessment Form (2012b). Brigham Young University: Educator Preparation Program – Conceptual Framework (2012c).

Teachers College – Columbia University

Documents from which data was obtained: Teachers College, Columbia University: Institutional Report prepared for NCATE Board of Examiners Visit. (2005). Student Teaching Handbook (2011).

The University of Minnesota

Documents from which data was obtained: NCATE Institutional Report: University of Minnesota-Twin Cities (2005). The University of Minnesota: Clinical Experiences and Dispositions (2012a). The University of Minnesota: Clinical Experiences Handbook (2012b). Minnesota State Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (2012).

The Ohio State University

Documents from which data was obtained: 2008 NCATE Accreditation Institutional Report (2008). Professional Dispositions Assessment (2012a). Conceptual Framework of The Ohio State University Initial Teacher Preparation (2012b).

Plan for Narrative

In Chapter Four, the guiding research questions will be applied to the documentation collected for each of the teacher preparation program. First, the guiding research questions will be elaborated for each institution in turn. Second, aggregate data for both the guiding questions accumulated from the institutions will be reported.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter reports the results obtained from the analyses of the selected Institutional Reports and documentation outlined in the first three chapters. In this chapter, the guiding research questions will be applied to the documentation collected for each of the preparatory institutions. First, the guiding research questions will be elaborated for each institution in turn. Second, aggregate data for both the guiding questions and trends of interest will be reported.

The reporting for Analysis #1 (Statement of InTASC dispositions) was intended to take the form of a comparison of the InTASC list of critical dispositions to those explicitly communicated in the institutional reports. In this analysis, the goal was to report the degree to which institutions had reproduced the forty-three critical dispositions from InTASC, provided their own institutional dispositions, or combined the two. The rationale for this report was based on the assumption that the inclusion and/or exclusion of certain dispositions could shed light on institutional priorities for its teacher candidates. Upon analysis of the documents, it became clear that this report needed to be modified. The first reason for this modification was that none of the selected institutions stated the forty-three InTASC dispositions verbatim. Second, some institutions that did list or explicitly communicate their desired dispositions were very similar to, and perhaps derivative of, the InTASC list (Alverno College, Rocky Mountain College). Therefore, the reporting or listing of specific critical dispositions is in some instances subsumed within the more elaborate

reporting of data that follows for each institution. Dispositions used by each institution (if any) are referenced as appendixes where appropriate.

Huntington University

Documents from which data was obtained: Huntington University Teacher Education Candidate Handbook (2011). Huntington University Institutional Report-NCATE Focused Visit, Standard 4 (2007).

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated in the documentation. However, an expectation that the candidate demonstrate competence in the ten InTASC principles is stated in the Candidate Handbook (p. 10).

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Huntington University does not define dispositions explicitly. Nine goals of teacher education are stated, one of which explicitly references teacher dispositions. However, the list of goals might also be considered more general classifications under which potential dispositions could exist. (see Appendix 2). The closest statement to that of a definition for dispositions is found in the Candidate Handbook Requirements for Admission:

Dispositions: Candidates who wish to be admitted must exhibit qualities of personal character, integrity, high moral conduct, and possess positive personality traits (Huntington University, 2011; p. 5).

2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

The most explicit statement of expectations communicates the institutional expectations of the candidate upon completion of the program:

By the end of student teaching, a candidate should be able to use the portfolio to show competence in each area of the Teacher As Effective Steward model, each of the ten InTASC Principles, and each state standard pertinent to the candidate's chosen content areas and developmental levels (Huntington University, 2011; p. 10).

Here we observe reference to the InTASC principles and competencies, but nothing more. The unit purports to assess student dispositions on three occasions, or checkpoints. These checkpoints are located at admission to the program, application to student teaching, and program completion. At each of these checkpoints, the candidate is expected to "...exhibit professional dispositions in all coursework and field experiences" (Huntington University, 2011; p. 8)

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

Huntington University states that dispositions can and will be assessed.

Evidence of these qualities be demonstrated by candidate responses on the application forms, by responses in the candidate interview with members of the Teacher Education Committee by recommendation from faculty / staff, and by conduct in classes and field experiences (Huntington University, 2011; p. 5).

In addition to this list of evidences, candidates are required to complete three *Dispositional Surveys*. These are Likert-scale, self-reporting instruments (Appendix 3).

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

Huntington University states layered expectations communicated through institutional and unit goals and missions. The expectations for moral knowing are communicated, top down, from Institutional Mission, to its seven intellectual, physical, social, emotional, and religious objectives (Appendix 4), to the four stewardships that comprise the unit Conceptual Framework (Steward of Knowledge, Steward of Learner Development, Steward of the Learning Environment, Steward of Instruction), to the nine teacher goals, and in the end to the final portfolio evaluation, intended to communicate evidence of the lot.

Moral action in the observable realm is the domain of undergraduate classroom observations and assignments, and field placement observations. Specific opportunities to observe dispositions are stated in questions 2 and 3, and appear to be done so on a program-breadth basis at each of the three checkpoints.

In dealing with candidates of concern regarding dispositions, Huntington University allows a “Dispositional Hearing”:

Each candidate is subject to a dispositional hearing for any class or field placement. The purpose of this hearing is to share concerns that have been raised by feedback from the dispositional survey, university supervisor, cooperating teacher, or university faculty. This hearing will be conducted by the appropriate professional personnel. Specific dispositional concerns will be documented along with a plan to monitor these concerns (Huntington University, 2011; p. 9).

Stanford University

Documents from which data was obtained: Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP) Teacher Performance Expectations (2011a). Stanford Teacher Education

Program Mission Statement (2011b). Stanford Teacher Education Program - NCATE Institutional Report (2008). California Standards for the Teaching Profession (2009).

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated in the documentation.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

In the Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP) NCATE report, the section detailing what a disposition is, and which dispositions are to be cultivated, monitored, and assessed, one paragraph is offered. This paragraph does not explicitly define a disposition, but does suggest institutional imperatives and general candidate competencies for the STEP program.

Candidate Dispositions: STEP seeks to prepare teachers who can create equitable classrooms and schools in which all learners meet high intellectual, academic, and social standards. Therefore, the program aims to cultivate candidates; professional commitment to the learning and growth of all learners. In creating equitable classrooms, candidates organize the learning environment so that all students participate actively as they engage with intellectually challenging curricula. Candidates treat students fairly and equitably. Students interact with equal status, and their voices are heard by peers and by the teacher. An ethic of care pervades an equitable classroom; students serve as academic, linguistic, and social resources for each another and are accountable to each other as members of a classroom community. Candidates also develop a disposition toward inquiry by learning to reflect on their own practice and to question existing school and societal structures that promote inequity (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16).

Clearly, equity is a theme that is given elevated importance in this statement of dispositions. Of note is the particular attention given to Nel

Noddings' Ethic of Care. While the content of this excerpt loosely resembles the ten InTASC standards, there is no discernable attempt to adhere to them in a more deliberate manner.

A second document, the STEP Teaching Performance Expectations, states thirteen expectations divided among six general standards (see Appendix 5). These six standards are in fact the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

As just reported, STEP does make an attempt to communicate desired teacher candidate dispositions in a general sense. However, among the six CSTP standards are listed thirty-eight behavioral indicators (Appendix 6). These are explicit indicators, characterized not as KSD's, but rather "...knowledge, skills, strategies, and concepts..." (California Department of Education, 2009).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

The assessment of teacher candidate dispositions in the STEP takes place on a program-long basis. The first assessment is the Statement of Purpose, a component of program admission. Here, the statement readers/evaluators "...pay attention to how applicants describe their prior experience working with children and youth and how that experience has shaped the applicant's beliefs about children and youth" (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16). It is unclear whether or not the Statement of Purpose is compared/contrasted to the aforementioned paragraph of standards, InTASC standards, or some other criteria.

In mid-program, STEP purports to assess candidate dispositions in both course work and field work settings. In particular, assignments from the following courses are highlighted: ED167: Educating for Equity and Democracy, ED246 Secondary Teaching Seminar and Elementary Teaching Seminar, ED284: Teaching and Learning in Heterogeneous Classrooms, and ED244: Classroom Management. In field placements, STEP asserts "...the formal observations, reflections, and quarterly assessments that occur throughout the year provide additional data from the supervisors and cooperating teachers about the extent to which candidates demonstrate these dispositions in the field placement" (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16). In concert with these field observations are STEP expectations of written reflections, field video analyses, portfolio work, and supervisory observations.

Quarterly quantitative assessments are collaboratively conducted with candidates for the duration of their time in clinical practice (usually three consecutive quarters: Autumn, Winter, Spring). This quarterly assessment is a four-point likert-scale instrument rating each of the thirty-eight items listed in the CSTP (Appendix 6). The instrument also explicitly prompts the identification of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate for the purpose of reflective discussion and improvement planning.

At the conclusion of the program, STEP formally looks for *Evidence of Dispositions* in two ways. First, candidates participate in a June exit survey, in which they communicate their employment for the fall, their program final reflection, and their plan for continued growth. Second, candidates complete "Summary Reflections" which are reflective activities intended to "...assess their progress with regard to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and

identify areas for their continued growth. These reflections consistently offer insights into the dispositions with which they leave the program..." (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16).

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

Reflection in the context of a growth model is an appropriate way to conceptualize the bridge between moral knowing and moral action for STEP. However, the constituents of moral knowing are elusive. In addition to the two documents summarized in question one, the Stanford University School of Education (SUSE) Mission Statement states as one of its aims "...to cultivate teacher leaders who share a set of core values that includes a commitment to social justice, an understanding of the strengths and needs of a diverse student population, and a dedication to equity and excellence for all students" (Stanford University, 2011b).

Alverno College

Document from which data was obtained: Handbook for Undergraduate Teacher Education Candidates, Part 1: Policies and Procedures (2011).

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated or referenced explicitly in this document. However, the document references Wisconsin State standards that are a revision of InTASC standards, and Alverno College states seventeen of their own dispositions. These dispositions are communicated in a subsection of the Candidate Handbook entitled *Teacher Candidate's Disposition Commitment* (Appendix 7).

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Alverno College does provide a definition of dispositions. The definition that is stated is an earlier definition provided by NCATE/CAEP.

Dispositions are defined as the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behavior toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honest, responsibility, and social justice. (NCATE, 2006) (Alverno College, 2011; p. 19).

But Alverno College fleshes out the definition a little more in a deliberate attempt to demonstrate to teacher candidates the interplay of dispositions with knowledge and skills.

Your development...depends upon an integration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Your faculty wants you not only to be disposed to a particular quality of practice, but also to have the capacity to enact that practice through your development of knowledge and skill (Alverno College, 2011; p. 15).

2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

Alverno College explicitly states seventeen observable dispositional indicators under five general dispositional categories for teaching: respect, reflection, responsibility, collaboration, and communication. (see Appendix 7). I have regarded these statements as explicit because the language used to state them deviates from the InTASC language. In the Alverno College indicators, such terms as *displays*, *uses*, *demonstrates*, *responds*, and others are present. However,

the Wisconsin standards, which are stated in the same document are written with original InTASC vocabulary such as *values, respects, committed*, etc.

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

The assessment of candidate dispositions is carried out in two concurrent modes. The first is the completion of a dispositional checklist entitled *Professional Behaviors of Undergraduate Teacher Candidates* (Appendix 8). This checklist is completed at mid-term and again at mid-term of the following intervals: 1. Admission to the Preprofessional Level (ED116, ED201), 2. Admission to the Professional Level (ED215/215ER, ED216, ED225 or ED325), 3. Admission to Student Teaching (ED321/338, ED315, ED325), and 4. Student Teaching. In this first mode of assessment, the intent of assessment is made clear:

The candidate and faculty will evaluate each candidate's demonstration of beginning teacher dispositions in a series of required education courses. The progress of a candidate will be dependent on his/her successful demonstration of these characteristics (Alverno College, 2011; p.19).

The second mode of assessment is candidate articulation with Wisconsin state standards. Included in the Alverno College candidate handbook, these standards, based on the InTASC standards are written in continuum form as performance indicators for three stages of candidacy: Admission to program, admission to student teaching, and completion of program.

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

Alverno College demonstrates attempts to foster moral knowing through the statement of the School of Education's Four Purposes (Creating a curriculum,

Creating a Community of Learning, Creating Ties to the Community, and Creating Relationships with Higher Education), and the unit Mission: "...prepares professionals committed to developing the abilities of all learners, to building community as a context and support for learning, and to continuing their own ongoing growth through thoughtful reflection" (Alverno College, 2011; p. 6). I have included the mission statement because it is representative of an obvious effort on the part of Alverno College to cultivate reflective skills. In their rationale in support of the dispositional checklist, they encourage candidates not to see a behavioral checklist, but an invitation "...to use it as a lens to examine your behavior and ask yourself questions..." (p. 15). Further, Alverno acknowledges a variety of growth model by stating, "Some dispositions for teaching can be developmental and the reflection tool becomes a lens to look at one's growth in relation to program expectations" (p. 16).

Duke University

Documents from which data was obtained: Duke University: Institutional Report. Prepared for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2011b). Conceptual Framework: Duke University Teacher Preparation Programs (DUPTT). (2011a). North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (NCPTS) (2011). Duke University ETPP Candidate Handbook (2010)

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated or referenced explicitly in this document. Two different statements or declarations

of specific expected dispositional competencies come from two different places in the documentation. This will be elaborated in Analysis #2.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Duke University does not explicitly define a disposition. However, it provides two sets of dispositions from different sources. The first list of dispositions comes from Duke University's Institutional Mission (Appendix 9).

Duke's mission includes seven intertwined components that outline Duke's commitment to...Promote three key dispositions among students:
Deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential,
Sense of obligation and rewards of citizenship,
Commitment to learning, freedom, and truth (Duke University, 2011b; p. 3-4).

The second set of dispositions is found in Duke's Conceptual Framework for the teacher preparation program. From 2003-2010, Duke provided sixteen statements of expected knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Of these, four were explicit statements of dispositions. In its current revised form (adopted 2010), these sixteen statements have been streamlined into five, more general, statements of expected candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Candidates exhibit the characteristics of professional teachers and emerging leaders.
Candidates understand the needs of diverse learners and model the behaviors of culturally responsive teachers.
Candidates demonstrate core content knowledge in the academic areas for which they seek licensure.
Candidates believe all students can learn and use a variety of effective instructional methods to positively impact student learning.

Candidates practice regular reflection to increase their effectiveness in the classroom and to grow and thrive in their profession (Duke University, 2011a; p. 5).

These five statements mirror the five North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (NCPTS), which were revised and adopted in 2007. (Appendix 10).

2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

Duke University uses a modestly revised version of the NCPTS. Within these standards are twenty-three “observable indicators” for candidates (Appendix 11) that are intended to subsume candidate knowledge, skills, and critical dispositions within purportedly observable candidate behaviors.

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

Duke University makes a point of specifically addressing the assessment of dispositions.

Field experiences, clinical practice, and course assignments are intentionally designed to cultivate and nurture the Professional Dispositions related to leadership, ethical behavior, fairness, diversity, and critical reflection. Candidates are informed of the expected dispositions early and often across all courses. Progress toward the development of professional dispositions is monitored throughout the field experiences and clinical practice, during which time faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers provide candidates with feedback and suggestions for growth (Duke University, 2011b; p. 9).

These largely in-program assessments represent formative evaluations for teacher candidates. In addition, five major assessment “collection points” are used to monitor candidate progress. These five points are pre-admission/application, pre-internship/post-admission, mid-internship, end of internship, and end of first independent year of teaching. At each of these

collection points, assessment materials include faculty / supervisor surveys, GPA's, coursework, and self-evaluations/reflections. In addition to these assessments, Duke University also administers a pre- and post- program rubric assessment intended to "...keep candidates abreast of the Professional Dispositions they are expected to demonstrate..." (Duke University, 2011b; p. 11). This rubric, and others, are lengthy and are not included here. They can be accessed at

[http://educationprogram.duke.edu/uploads/assets/Exhibit_1_14\(2\).pdf](http://educationprogram.duke.edu/uploads/assets/Exhibit_1_14(2).pdf)

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

The Duke University Teacher Preparation Program states a unit theme of teacher as LEARNER (Liberal Education, Advocacy, Reflection, Nurture, Engagement, and Respect). In the case of Duke University, a detailed battery of assessments is evident, and performance indicators and expectations are clearly and explicitly stated in the candidate handbook and in the NCPTS. Further, in the aforementioned two lists of dispositions and the NCPTS observable indicators, behavioral language is abundant (exhibits, uses, demonstrates, models, monitor, present, etc.). As indicated earlier, there are five collection points across the program during which self-analysis or reflective assignments are required. Duke University highlights this point, especially in communicating expectations for clinical practice/field experiences.

Critical reflection is a signature practice of the Unit. Candidates begin learning how to critically reflect in their early field experiences and continue to develop their reflection skills through their clinical practice. Candidates think systematically about their teaching and use critical reflection to inform their teaching (Duke University, 2011b; p. 18).

Rocky Mountain College

Document from which data was obtained: Rocky Mountain College, Education Department Handbook (2011).

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced verbatim in this document. However, the ten InTASC standards are included as part of twelve institutional standards beneath which forty-six individual dispositions are organized (Appendix 12). The additional two standards are “ ‘Withitness’ / Intrapersonal Skills”, and “Work Ethic.” Regarding the dispositions found within the first ten standards, the stated dispositions are very similar to the stated InTASC ones.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Rocky Mountain College does not explicitly define dispositions. Rather, they are implied first through the forty-six candidate dispositions and through statements in the conceptual framework: “The education department faculty believes that the process of training a teacher is based on the notion that teachers should possess certain knowledge, skills, and dispositions...the dispositions necessary for successful teaching and learning” (Rocky Mountain College, 2011; p. 5). Second, in the admission requirements, dispositions are implied to be skills and abilities:

The professional, behavioral, dispositional, and social aspects of the performance of the teacher: These skills and abilities may be described, in part, as the ability to think critically, to reflect deeply, to both give and receive help, and to continually refine those practices that address the individual needs of future students (Rocky Mountain College, 2011; p. 12).

2. Do the documents attempt to make explicit what is being assessed?

Rocky Mountain College states their dispositions, as written, as assessable indicators in checklist form.

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

In the admittance phase, the institution states that appropriate dispositions are required, but does not elaborate on how they will be assessed, giving reference only the dispositional checklist.

In addition to the dispositional checklist, Rocky Mountain College makes use of a Dispositions Letter (Appendix 13). The intents of this letter are to highlight perceived dispositional concern on the part of faculty, or to reinforce a candidate's demonstration of a desirable or exemplary disposition.

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

One of the more significant assessment pieces is entitled the INTASC Evaluation Form. This instrument is a combination of checklist and likert scale that includes the ten InTASC standards. Under each standard are three to six performance indicators. This evaluation form does not include the additional two standards of Intrapersonal Skills and Work Ethic. It is to be completed by the field placement cooperating teacher. This evaluation form can be accessed at

<http://www.rocky.edu/academics/academic-programs/undergraduate-majors/education/pdf/EducationDepartmentHandbook2011.pdf>

The University of Memphis

Documents from which data was obtained: The University of Memphis College of Education Institutional Report (2008a). Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidate Dispositions at the University of Memphis (2008b). The University of Memphis – Clinical Student Teaching Handbook (2011).

Analysis #1

None of the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced in the documents.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

The University of Memphis Teacher Education Program (TEP) does provide a definition of dispositions for its candidates:

As noted in both the College's Conceptual Framework and the Pillars of Practice, teacher candidates at the University of Memphis must demonstrate the dispositions (attitudes, values, and professional ethics and behaviors) required of professional educators. The NCATE define dispositions as: *Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development....* (The University of Memphis, 2008b; p. 1).

An additional attempt to define, or make concrete, the institution's dispositional expectations are found in the College of Education's Norms

(Appendix 14). The inclusion of these seven norms, or similar derivatives of them, are required on every undergraduate course syllabus. This practice replaced an earlier requirement that candidates be given a “dispositions talk” at the beginning of term for all undergraduate classes (Rike & Sharp, 2008).

2. Do the documents make explicit what is being assessed?

The University of Memphis TEP states one hundred and thirty explicit observational items within 16 general dispositions, which are subsumed under the standards of Social Justice, Integrity, Excellence, Respect, Accountability, and Continuous Learning. An attempt has been made to state the majority of these one hundred and thirty observational items as observational by using such behavioral language as *models, interacts, shows, demonstrates*, etc. However, with this large number of items, a small number possess more classic ambiguous terminology like *considers, respects, appreciates*, etc. It should be stated the TEP considers these one hundred and thirty items as representative examples of dispositions in practice (Appendix 15).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

Candidates applying to the TEP must sign a dispositions verification form indicating they “...understand the dispositions they are to demonstrate in all course work, field/clinical experiences and other activities associated with them becoming a licenced teacher or other support personnel” (The University of Memphis, 2008b; p. 6). The signing of the dispositions verification form represents the first of three assessment points along the breadth of the TEP.

The second opportunity to assess dispositions is prior to the “capstone experience,” or field placement (assessment point 2) when all candidates will be assessed on the disposition outcomes.

The third and final assessment of candidate dispositions takes place at the conclusion of the capstone, or field experience. Results of the dispositions assessments at each assessment point are entered into a central database.

The University of Memphis TEP also has detailed procedures regarding the retention of a teacher candidate, and the disqualification of a teacher candidate from the program. The unit also uses a dispositional deficiency form in the event faculty /instructors feel the need to alert the candidate to a perceived area of concern. These procedures and forms can be accessed at

<https://www.memphis.edu/tep/pdfs/dispositions-and-retention.pdf>

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

In the case of The University of Memphis, we again see a multi-layered approach to institutional expectations. In the TEP alone, there are three layers of potential dispositional expectations. The first are the unit’s six pillars of educational leadership (Content Knowledge and Skills, Knowledge of the Learner, Pedagogy and Instruction, Assessment and Responsive Practice, Management of Class and Individuals, Personal and Professional Growth and Development), followed by the sixteen general dispositions’ categories, and finally the seven College of Education norms. Given this breadth of expectation, the assessment of sixteen dispositions with the help of one hundred and thirty behavioral indicators over the course of the program appears not only a credible,

but necessary endeavor. In these ways, both expectations of knowledge and action are emphasized.

Brigham Young University

Documents from which data was obtained: David O. McKay School of Education, Brigham Young University: NCATE Institutional Report (2005). Brigham Young University: Candidate Dispositional Scales (2012a). Brigham Young University: Clinical Practice Assessment Form (2012b). Brigham Young University: Educator Preparation Program – Conceptual Framework (2012c).

Analysis #1

None of the forty three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced in the documents.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Brigham Young University (BYU) does not explicitly define a disposition. Rather, definitions of dispositions are implied through an interpretation and elaboration of Goodlad's (1994) *Moral Dimensions of Teaching*. How this is attempted will be more clearly reported in the following section.

2. Do the documents make explicit what is being assessed?

Brigham Young University communicates three distinct variations of how dispositions are to be understood and utilized. Each of these variations appears

to fill different needs for the University: a foundational philosophy piece, an institutional reporting piece, and a formal candidate assessment piece.

In the first case, BYU purports to use the work of John Goodlad as the foundational philosophical motivation for their teacher education program. They state: “From its view of education as a moral undertaking, the unit has adopted Goodlad’s *Moral Dimensions of Teaching* as the foundation for its preparation of all education professionals...” (Brigham Young University, 2012c; p. 2). Further, BYU asserts that this philosophical foundation is “highly compatible” with the InTASC standards, to which the program also adheres. In this case, dispositions exist as subsets of BYU’s Educator Preparation Aims. Appendix 16 is a synopsis of these aims and their attendant dispositions.

The second way in which dispositions are communicated by BYU is in the form of an institutional statement from the NCATE/CAEP accreditation report. In this excerpt, twelve general dispositions are listed:

The EPP seeks to develop candidates who understand and apply the Moral Dimensions. Targeted dispositions that reflect the Moral Dimensions include but are not limited to the following: acting with integrity, contributing to learning communities, assuming responsibility, demonstrating initiative and flexibility, exhibiting commitment and loyalty, being punctual, dressing professionally, responding appropriately to all students, using effective instructional strategies, demonstrating a desire and capacity to communicate effectively, showing commitment to quality assessment of student learning and development, and reflecting on professional practice (Brigham Young University, 2005; p. 30).

The third and final way dispositions are communicated by BYU is in the *Candidate Dispositional Scales* (CDS). This is a likert-type instrument that includes a total of forty-six items divided among three sections (Appendix 17). The rationale given for these items is included in the NCATE report:

The Candidate Disposition Scales are constructed to provide data regarding candidates' locus of control and aspirations. The locus of control items in this scale examine the extent to which candidates take responsibility for their teaching. The aspiration terms probe the degree to which candidates are motivated to improve their teaching and professional performance over time (Brigham Young University, 2005; p. 30).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

In the BYU program, five assessment procedures regarding knowledge, skills, and dispositions are stated. The first is course-level assessment. The second is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). The third is the Professional and Interpersonal Behavior Scale (PIBS). The PIBS is a behavioral rubric of ten items including, among others, candidate dress, promptness, and respecting authority. The PIBS is intended to be a collaborative mentoring document. The fourth assessment mechanism is the Clinical Practice Assessment (CPA). The CPA is completed at the end of student teaching. It requires the reporter to record a score between 1-5 on the demonstrated strength of the candidate in each of the ten general InTASC standards. The final assessment tool is the Candidate Dispositional Scales (CDS). In the BYU program, there are four specific *transition* points at which candidates are assessed: admissions, preclinical, post-clinical, and alumni. The candidate self-completes the CDS online at transition points one and three and is intended a reflective tool. The results of the CDS are available to candidate and to relevant BYU staff. The CDS is currently under revision.

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing?
Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

BYU is an exceptional case in its endorsement of both realms. In the case of moral action, classroom work, the CPA, and the PIBS all are measures of candidates based on behavioral conduct. Further to this, BYU requires its'

students to sign and adhere to an honor code, or code of conduct during their tenure at the institution. This honor code is enforced, and thus is directly applicable to the notion of the endorsement of moral action because the honor code applies equally to residency and candidate field placements. The BYU honor code can be accessed at <http://saas.byu.edu/catalog/2011-2012ucat/GeneralInfo/HonorCode.php#HCOfficeInvovement>.

In the case of moral knowing, all BYU institutional procedures and unit frameworks are super-ceded by the gospels and doctrines of the Mormon faith. As such, dispositional orientations toward the institutional articles of faith appear to be more favorable to the candidate than orientations to InTASC dispositions. While, as indicated earlier, BYU states that institutional standards and InTASC standards strongly articulate with one another, the Candidate Dispositional Scales do not share the similar high stakes attached to them vis-à-vis continuous enrolment or unit intervention/assistance. As if a microcosm of some of the major issues presented in this dissertation, the CDS self-reports moral knowing, but does not then articulate into observable, consistent, or predictable moral action.

Teachers College – Columbia University

Documents from which data was obtained: Teachers College, Columbia University: Institutional Report prepared for NCATE Board of Examiners Visit (2005). Student Teacher Handbook (2011).

Analysis #1

None of the forty three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced in the documents.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

Teachers College (TC) does not explicitly define dispositions. Dispositions are implied in the TC conceptual framework and the institutional statement of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, in which candidate proficiencies are stated (Appendix 18).

2. Do the documents make explicit what is being assessed?

TC states that their standards are aligned with New York State and InTASC standards, and that: “Program core courses and major assessments reflect the conceptual framework and are aligned with the five Teachers College standards and knowledge, skill, and disposition outcomes (KSDs)” (Teachers College, 2005; p. 12). TC states dispositional expectations in two documents. TC’s three philosophical stances and their attendant five professional standards (Appendix 18) are found in the Student Teaching Handbook. Here, dispositions are implied. In the NCATE Institutional Report, six specific, *essential*, dispositions are formally distinguished from knowledge and skills within each of the five institutional professional standards. The relationships between TC’s three philosophical stances, five professional standards, and operational knowledge, skills, and dispositions are included in Appendix 19.

Of further interest in the case of TC is that it claims a historic commitment to addressing social justice and equality. This has resulted in special attention given to education for diverse learners. As such, TC has formally expanded institutional standards three (Learner Centered Educators) and five (Advocates of Social Justice and Diversity) to include an additional five statements of observable action for faculty, teacher candidates, and other professional programs (Appendix 20).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

TC assesses candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions at three decision points, admissions, academic coursework, and fieldwork/student teaching.

At the admissions decision point, the candidate is rated on a four-point likert scale as to the degree he/she possesses three dispositional orientations. These three dispositions are amalgams of the six essential dispositions. They are: Career goals and commitment to profession, Attitudes toward diverse populations, and Experience working with children and youth.

At the academic coursework decision point, TC states that performance-based assignments will illuminate evidence of the appropriate candidate dispositions. TC more specifically states that "...reflective journals and papers, research papers/literature reviews, fieldwork/action research projects, and curriculum planning projects as...major sources of evidence of candidates' dispositions..." (Teachers College, 2005; p. 29). Further, TC has asserted the role of professional faculty in communicating and embodying the six essential dispositions;

Professional education faculty model these dispositions in their own teaching, research, and service by using data-driven reflective practice, putting teaching and learning at the center of their work, and collaborating with colleagues within their programs and practitioners in the field to develop

and refine curriculum and teaching for our candidates and P-12 students (Teachers College, 2005; p. 10).

During the final decision point, dispositions are to be assessed by observable behaviors in field and/or internship settings. Here, the candidate is referred to the Student Teaching and Internship Handbooks for detailed expectations of professional conduct. Speaking specifically to assessment of dispositions and potential consequences of decision points two and three, TC states:

Candidates' dispositions are constantly evaluated through observations, journal writing, and conferences. Whenever negative dispositions or lack of professionalism arise during programs, supervisors conduct a conference with candidates. If the problem is severe, the appropriate program faculty members review the case and make a decision regarding remediation and retention (Teachers College, 2005; p. 29).

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

TC emphasizes both areas. The three philosophical stances (inquiry, curricular, and social justice) appear throughout TC reports and teacher candidate materials. Further, these three stances provide the foundation for five institutional standards under which specific dispositions are stated. However, TC also communicates actionable assessment procedures that are intended to capture candidate demonstration of the stated dispositions. TC states that journals, reflective journals, papers, coursework, research projects, and conferences all contribute to the assessment of teacher candidate dispositions.

The Ohio State University

Documents from which data was obtained: 2008 NCATE Accreditation Institutional Report (2008). The Ohio State University: Professional Dispositions

Assessment (2012a). The Ohio State University: Conceptual Framework for Initial Teacher Preparation (2012b).

Analysis #1

None of the forty three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced in the documents.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

The Ohio State University does not offer its' own definition of dispositions. Rather, second and third - party definitions were included in their Conceptual Framework document – a collection of essays in support of the institutional philosophy:

According to Helm (2006a), few educators would refute that exemplary teachers have and exhibit particular behaviors and beliefs that wholly separate them from their less effective, less successful colleagues. These characteristic behaviors, better known as dispositions, typically encompass kindness, caring, having high expectations for their students and themselves, a dedication to fostering critical thinking, an appreciation for the subject matter they teach, a strong work ethic, and an awareness of and appreciation for the cultural diversity of the students and families in the school community.

Lund, Wayda, Woodard, and Buck (2007) cite Katz and Raths (1986) who define dispositions as attributions which summarize a trend of a teacher's actions across similar contexts (The Ohio State University, 2012b; p. 54).

2. Do the documents make explicit what is being assessed?

The Ohio State University states: "In keeping with the mission, philosophy, and knowledge-bases of each conceptual framework, candidate proficiencies are articulated, specifying what a candidate is expected to know and be able to do

and the dispositions he/she is expected to demonstrate by the conclusion of a program” (The Ohio State University, 2008; p. 15). Specifically regarding teacher candidate dispositions, The Ohio State University forwards two levels of expectation. The first level of expectations is found in their effort to contextualize the Unit’s philosophical foundation. This is done through communicating twelve general statements of expected candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Appendix 21). Of these twelve statements, only four are explicitly classified as dispositions. The more explicit second level of dispositional statements contains the formal *Professional Dispositions Assessment*. This is a likert-scale instrument that is used to track candidate performance throughout the program. Here, there are seven dispositional proficiencies communicated in both the *Conceptual Framework* document (Appendix 22) and in the *Professional Dispositions Assessment* (Appendix 23).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

In the Ohio State program, assessments of knowledge, skills, and dispositions are carried out at some or all of four decision points in the program: (1) admission to the program, (2) completion of unit assessment field experience, (3) admission to clinical practice, and (4) completion of clinical practice.

Dispositions are assessed at three of the four decision points: (1), (2), and (4). At each of these decision points, assessment is conducted using the *Initial Teacher Preparation Assessment: Professional Dispositions Assessment* (PDA) (Appendix 23).

There are three versions of this Assessment, one for each of the three decision points. At decision point one, the PDA is completed only by the admissions committee. At decision points three and four, the PDA is completed by the

university supervisor, the candidate, and the mentor teacher(s). The data/results of these instruments are recorded in an *Educator Preparation Assessment System*. This computerized system compiles assessment scores for knowledge, skills, and dispositions' assessments. University supervisors are expected to review this profile of the candidate at each decision point, and to render one of three judgments: candidate may move to next decision point, candidate needs to demonstrate further performances before moving to next decision point, or candidate to be removed from program.

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

The Ohio State University documents communicate broad, but concise institutional missions, visions, and philosophy. It is only the philosophical outline (Appendix 21 and remainder of Conceptual Framework document, 2012b) that at once states broad behavioral expectations and lays out the foundational motivations (in essay form) for the knowledge, skills, and dispositions the program will later assess. In this program, the assumption that candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are demonstrable, thus assessable, is evident. To restate an earlier excerpt, the program purports to articulate "...the dispositions he/she is expected to demonstrate by the conclusion of a program" (The Ohio State University, 2008; p. 15). In addition, the PDA II, and PDA III forms (Appendix 23) clearly state that the candidate *never, sometimes, or always* demonstrates a certain disposition. Finally, the philosophical outline of knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Appendix 21) is communicated in a manner that rigidly classifies such entities as reflective practice, content expertise,

communication, and collaboration, etc., as knowledge and skills. This is an important distinction because this manner of classification gives the impression that the aforementioned entities and others do not or ought not possess dispositional components, as is the case in the InTASC and other program documents.

The University of Minnesota

Documents from which data was obtained: NCATE Institutional Report: University of Minnesota-Twin Cities (2005). The University of Minnesota: Clinical Experiences and Dispositions (2012a). The University of Minnesota: Clinical Experiences Handbook (2012b). Minnesota State Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (2012).

Analysis #1

None of the forty three InTASC critical dispositions were stated explicitly or reproduced in the documents.

Analysis #2

1. Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions? How (explicit vs. implied)?

The University of Minnesota implies a definition of dispositions through the practice of tying specific competencies to the unit conceptual framework. The conceptual framework centers around three central guiding themes: (1) Promoting inquiry, research, and reflection, (2) Honoring the diversity of our communities and learners, and (3) Fostering a commitment to lifelong professional development. Using these guiding themes as a base, the unit

asserts: “Candidates at all levels demonstrate the dispositions associated with the central themes of the conceptual framework. The initial program faculty have articulated these dispositions and related them to the standards for licensure” (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p. 27). In a more specific manner, the undergraduate foundations overview states, “The College of Education and Human Development has identified the following as dispositions that students must demonstrate in order to be recommended for teacher licensure” (The University of Minnesota, 2012a). The specific dispositions are stated as twenty-two explicit items divided among three general headings: Professional Conduct, Professional Qualities, and Communication and Collaboration. (Appendix 24).

2. Do the documents make explicit what is being assessed?

In the case of candidate dispositions, the unit is clear about how the aforementioned twenty-two items will be used in the program: “It is the expectation of the college faculty that candidates at all levels will demonstrate the dispositions associated with these themes” (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p.12). In addition to these twenty-two general program dispositions, The University of Minnesota also forwards an additional specific set of *Responsibilities and Dispositions Expected of Student Teachers* intended to be applied during the clinical, or student teaching experience (Appendix 25).

3. Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

The anchor assessment piece for dispositions is the *Dispositions Assessment* (DA) (Appendix 26). This instrument is divided into two forms: the *evaluation form* (DA-E), and the *comment form* (DA-C). The evaluation form is a formal

likert-type battery of the twenty-two initial candidate dispositions. This instrument is first introduced to students during their spring orientation *prior* to beginning the program. Following this initial exposure, the evaluation form is "...completed on each initial licensure candidate by the program faculty prior to the final student teaching experience...(and) at the end of the full-time clinical experience by the University supervisor..." (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p. 28).

Emphasizing the importance of including a more qualitative assessment instrument, the *comment form*, the University of Minnesota asserts that, "...low scores on the Dispositions Assessment are predictive of difficulty in the program" (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p. 41). As such, the Dispositions Assessment-Comment form is intended to "...document candidates who struggle in certain dispositional areas or those who stand out as exemplary in these areas" (p. 41). This form provides space to record concerns or complements about a candidate on one or more of the twenty-two items. Reported data from either form of the Dispositions Assessment is recorded in the unit's *Teacher Education Data System* for future reference by permitted individuals.

More informal assessments of candidate dispositions, it is stated, are conducted throughout the program. However, the documentation does not specifically identify how. The following sentiment of the following excerpt is repeated at least three times in the documentation:

Your performance on these professional competencies will be evaluated during your clinical experiences as well as in your university classes (The University of Minnesota, 2012a).

4. Do the assessment procedures endorse moral action or moral knowing? Or, does it endorse some combination of the two?

In addition to the assessment tools just reviewed, the unit also encourages student teacher reflection and the completion of formal formative assessments collaboratively with the cooperating teachers during field placements. The Clinical Experiences Handbook outlines general strategies and suggested content for collaborative reflection, but says only "...opportunities for pre- and post-conferencing should be planned to engage and assist student teachers in reflection on their practice" (The University of Minnesota, 2012b). As for the completion of the formative assessment tool, another likert-scale, it is to be completed during the midterm of field placement.

With the exceptions of the student teacher reflections and formative assessments from clinical practice, and the first theme from the conceptual framework, promoting inquiry, research, and reflection, the assessment of observable action appears to dominate. The documentation consistently purports to link the twenty-two dispositions with both the three conceptual framework themes, and the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers. Further, that these standards (adapted from InTASC) are embedded in course syllabi, curriculum, and assessments. Based on the data just reviewed, exemplary or deficient dispositions are only illuminated by the completion of either of the Disposition Assessments. At the point of regularly / institutionally required reflection or formative assessment, the candidate is already in the midst of the clinical / field placement.

Aggregation of Data Applied to Guiding Research Questions

Analysis 1 was concerned with the number of institutions that stated verbatim or reproduced the forty-three InTASC critical dispositions in their institutional documentation.

Table 1: Communication of InTASC critical dispositions

Institution	Stated InTASC dispositions	Implied adherence to InTASC standards
Alverno		*
BYU		*
Duke		
Huntington		*
Memphis		*
Minnesota		*
Ohio State		*
RMC		*
Stanford		
Teachers College		*

In the case of Analysis 1, none of the institutions stated the InTASC critical dispositions as performance competencies for their programs. As shown in Table 1, many institutions stated or implied adherence to NCATE/CAEP and InTASC standards by referring to these accreditation bodies in their documentation. Two illustrative statements to this effect are as follows: “The dispositions demonstrated by the candidates meet the high standards of the BOT, NCATE, professional organizations, and those established by the faculty articulated in the conceptual framework” (The University of Minnesota, 2005; p. 12). “Initial licensure programs follow the INTASC standards, which are highly compatible with the missions and aims that have been expressed” (Brigham Young University, 2012c; p. 3).

Analysis 2.1 concerned whether or not each institution attempted to define dispositions, or what a disposition might be in the context of their individual programs. If they did, were the definitions explicit or implied?

Table 2: Definition of Dispositions provided in documentation.

Institution	Explicit Definition Provided	Implied Definition/ Referenced Definition
Alverno		* (NCATE)
BYU		*
Duke		*
Huntington		*
Memphis		* (NCATE)
Minnesota		*
Ohio State		* (2 nd party)
RMC		*
Stanford		*
Teachers College		*

In the cases of Memphis and Alverno College, teacher candidates are referred to the NCATE/CAEP Professional Standards document in regards to the definition of dispositions. However, each institution uses a different definition:

Dispositions are defined as the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behavior toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice. (NCATE, 2006) (Alverno College, 2011; p. 19).

As noted in both the College's Conceptual Framework and the Pillars of Practice, teacher candidates at the University of Memphis must demonstrate the dispositions (attitudes, values, and professional ethics and behaviors) required of professional educators. The NCATE define dispositions as:

Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development.... (The University of Memphis, 2008b; p. 1).

For The Ohio State University, their institutional Conceptual Framework document references specific definitions of dispositions selected from scholarly literature:

According to Helm (2006a), few educators would refute that exemplary teachers have and exhibit particular behaviors and beliefs that wholly separate them from their less effective, less successful colleagues. These characteristic behaviors, better known as dispositions, typically encompass kindness, caring, having high expectations for their students and themselves, a dedication to fostering critical thinking, an appreciation for the subject matter they teach, a strong work ethic, and an awareness of and appreciation for the cultural diversity of the students and families in the school community.

Lund, Wayda, Woodard, and Buck (2007) cite Katz and Raths (1986) who define dispositions as attributions which summarize a trend of a teacher's actions across similar contexts (The Ohio State University, 2012b; p. 54).

For the remainder of institutions, the definition of what a disposition is, or looks like, is implied through statements found in conceptual frameworks, institutional philosophies, teacher candidate handbooks, statements of candidate KSD proficiencies, and institutional mission statements. One illustrative example of an implied definition of dispositions is found in the Stanford NCATE/CAEP report:

Candidate Dispositions: STEP seeks to prepare teachers who can create equitable classrooms and schools in which all learners meet high intellectual, academic, and social standards. Therefore, the program aims to cultivate candidates; professional commitment to the learning and growth of all learners. In creating equitable classrooms, candidates organize the learning environment so that all students participate actively as they engage with intellectually challenging curricula. Candidates treat students fairly and equitably. Students interact with equal status, and their voices are heard by peers and by the teacher. An ethic of care pervades an equitable classroom; students serve as academic, linguistic, and social resources for each other and

are accountable to each other as members of a classroom community. Candidates also develop a disposition toward inquiry by learning to reflect on their own practice and to question existing school and societal structures that promote inequity (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16).

In additional cases similar to this excerpt, an explicit definition of dispositions is absent, but the statement of general or specific candidate competencies is intended to illustrate what in fact an education program expects or values.

Analysis 2.2 investigated whether or not each institution made explicit what was being assessed for teacher candidates. In this analysis, statements of explicit candidate competencies vis-à-vis dispositions were extracted from the institutional documents. Table 3 summarizes this data.

Table 3: Explicit dispositions stated by institution.

Institution	Explicit Dispositions Stated	Document Source
Alverno	17 dispositions	Candidate Handbook
BYU	12 targeted dispositions 46 Candidate Dispositional Scales	NCATE Report CDS Instrument
Duke	5 KSD statements 23 observable indicators	North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards
Huntington	6 dispositions	Dispositions Survey Instrument
Memphis	16 dispositions 130 observable indicators	Candidate Handbook
Minnesota	22 dispositions	Candidate Handbook, Dispositions Assessment
Ohio State	4 philosophical dispositions 7 dispositions	Conceptual Framework Professional Dispositions Assessment Instrument
RMC	46 dispositions	Candidate Handbook
Stanford	0	n/a
Teachers College	6 essential dispositions 5 social justice approaches	NCATE Report NCATE Report

In the case of Duke University, dispositions were considered inseparable from knowledge and skills. Thus, the five dispositional statements that mirror

the North Carolina Standards (NCPTS) are not discrete like the other institutions. Rather, discrete observable behaviors are intended to assess KSD’s holistically. Stanford University presents a similar case. Here, Stanford defers candidate competencies to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), which are stated in a manner similar to the NCPTS. However, Stanford differs because it does not claim a “dispositional” component to any of its items.

In addition to the institutional statements of expected candidate dispositions, Analysis 2.2 intended to report those institutions that diverged from the language of the InTASC critical dispositions in favor of more explicit behavioral language. Table 4 summarizes which institutional statements of candidate dispositions used divergent language in a majority (over half) of their assessment items.

Table 4: Explicit dispositions communicated using divergent language.

Institution	Explicit Dispositions Stated	Divergent language used to state dispositions
Alverno	17 dispositions	*
BYU	12 targeted dispositions 46 Candidate Dispositional Scales	*
Duke	5 KSD statements 23 observable indicators	*
Huntington	6 dispositions	*
Memphis	16 dispositions 130 observable indicators	*
Minnesota	22 dispositions	*
Ohio State	4 philosophical dispositions 7 dispositions	
RMC	46 dispositions	
Stanford	0	
Teachers College	6 essential dispositions 5 social justice approaches	*

Analysis 2.3 dealt with the manner in which the tools and/or mechanisms of dispositions assessment were stated by each institution. In table 5, an indication of whether or not the institution uses the assessment procedures at transition or checkpoints during the program is also included.

Table 5: Tools/Mechanisms of assessment for dispositions.

Institution	Stated Assessments	Checkpoints/ Transition Points used
Alverno	Coursework, Reflections, Behaviors Checklist, Field Placements	*
BYU	Coursework, Reflections, Field Placements, Candidate Dispositional Scales, Clinical Practice Assessment, Professional and Interpersonal Behavior Scale	*
Duke	Coursework, Reflections, Field Placements, NCPTS rubrics	*
Huntington	Interview, Coursework, Reflections, Field Placement, Dispositions Survey	*
Memphis	Coursework, Field Placement	*
Minnesota	Admission, Coursework, Field Placement, Dispositions Assessment – Evaluation Form and Comment Form	*
Ohio State	Admission, Professional Dispositions Assessment I, II, III	*
RMC	Reflections	
Stanford	Interview / Admission, Coursework, Reflections, Observations, Field Placement, Faculty Modelling	*
Teachers College	Interview, Coursework, Reflection, Faculty Modelling	*

Analysis 2.4 was intended to illuminate how the gap between moral knowing and candidate action might be bridged. This was to be assessed by concluding which realm of assessment each institution favored. As summarized in chapter three, moral knowing was to be evidenced by the inclusion of participation in ethics and foundations course work, statements of teaching

philosophy, demonstrations of adherence to institutional missions and philosophies, or participation in quantitative inventories. Moral action would be evaluated/evidenced in the form of undergraduate course performance, in addition to observations in field placements and related practical experiences. It was expected that institutions would state a number of dispositional checklists, performance indicators' lists, observational rubrics, and candidate self-improvement plans. In addition to institutional documentation and statements of assessment or expectation, professional artefacts such as reference letters admissions letters, and Curriculum Vitae might also demonstrate dispositional behavior, habits, or tendencies, especially in initial phases such as interviews and admissions.

Referring again to Table 5, the majority of teacher preparation programs demonstrate the utilization of assessment tools that satisfy both knowledge and action realms. In these cases, it is difficult to assert that most institutions favor one realm over another. Further, as a result of this investigation, it became clear that the author's suggested evidences were not necessarily discrete indicators of institutional preference. Rather, assessment tools such as likert-scales could be considered evidence of a dispositional knowing or dispositional action, depending upon the method and intent of delivery. For example, the *University of Minnesota Dispositions Assessment-Evaluation form* and *The Ohio State University Professional Dispositions Assessments* are intended to be evaluative pieces that are completed by program faculty. These are attempts to evaluate observable action. In contrast, the *Brigham Young University Candidate Dispositional Scales* is a self-reporting instrument that invites candidates to clarify moral knowing.

A second example of assessments that are used differently is the use of reflection and reflective tools. Duke University states an expectation that: “Candidates engage in systematic reflection to analyze the impact their instruction has on student learning” (Duke University, 2010). Similarly, The University of Memphis states that candidates demonstrate: “...life-long learning and personal growth through reflection, seeking constructive feedback, and being willing to learn from others and past experiences” (The University of Memphis, 2008; p. 6). These are examples of behavioral assessments of candidate action, and are in fact considered *observable indicators* and *behavioral examples*, respectively. Reflection assessments are also intended to solicit and facilitate thoughtful candidate improvement, such as an example from Stanford University: “In the written reflections that candidates complete...they often wrestle with issues of equity and their efforts to meet the needs of all students” (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16). Here, reflection can be considered an exercise in collaboratively attenuating moral knowledge, as well as an observable exercise (action) or demonstrable evidence of possessing a broader state or institutional mission.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Five presents a discussion and analysis of the data collected from the institutional documents of the selected teacher preparation programs. Section One will discuss the findings of this research project, specific to each of the guiding research questions. Section Two will revisit and discuss how the findings of this project relate to the two assumptions upon which this project was based. Section Two will also offer a discussion regarding the sufficiency of current dispositions' assessment, and how the findings of this project contribute to the sufficiency argument. Finally, Section Three makes recommendations for future study in the arena of teacher dispositions and suggestions for improvement specific to the assessment of teacher candidates.

Section One: Research questions revisited

This section discusses the consistencies, trends, and differences among the selected teacher preparation programs in the contexts of the guiding methodological questions.

Reproduction or restatement of InTASC critical dispositions.

One of the findings of this project was that none of the selected teacher preparation programs restated the InTASC list of critical dispositions as expectations for their teacher candidates. In Chapter Three, it was expected that patterns of similarity and difference would present themselves based upon those critical dispositions that each program chose to restate. The fact that none

restated the dispositions as candidate expectations cannot be explained easily. One possibility is that dispositions' requirements are implied as a result of NCATE/CAEP accreditation. All but one of the institutions in this study have NCATE/CAEP accreditation. It is this institution, Rocky Mountain College, that comes closest to a verbatim restatement of the InTASC dispositions. The granting of NCATE/CAEP accreditation depends upon successfully demonstrating that the institution is attending to the teaching, monitoring, and assessing of teacher candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Critical Dispositions. The critical dispositions are not stated/included in the NCATE standards document, rather, NCATE refers to dispositions as a footnote:

This list is based on the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). The complete INTASC document includes knowledge, professional dispositions, and performance related to each principle. It is available on the website of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) www.ccsso.org/intasc.html. (NCATE, 2008; p. 22).

Therefore, it is fair to suggest that successful accreditation and candidate success do not require adherence to the InTASC critical dispositions explicitly. Rather, more general interpretations of the ten InTASC standards in institutionally-specific contexts are appropriate. These contexts could either be the maintenance of consistency with institutional missions, or in some more explicit cases, dispositions were intended to embody state standards (Alverno, Stanford, Duke). The assessment procedures and dispositional statements of the programs do in fact appear to support this, even though there is broad variation in how each program chooses to communicate them.

Given the multitude of assessment procedures and expectations, in addition to the varied way in which dispositions are stated, the absence of

assessments with content specifically comparable to those found in the InTASC document is conspicuous. As stated earlier, only one institution came close to a reproduction of the InTASC list. In many respects, this could be considered positive as it suggests that teacher preparation programs are taking seriously the task of reconciling both the process and product of their candidates completion vis-a-vis their institutional mission(s). Here, the programs' concerns become: *What kind of dispositional set(s) does the institution wish to contribute to the profession?, and, What are the institutional processes that will give the best chance of achieving this dispositional composition?* Extending this line of thinking necessarily invites us to consider the degree to which the profession requires universal institutional consistency regarding dispositions that the InTASC document may or may not be intended to provide. Is it enough, for example, to have programs share a few tacit universal dispositions such as *communication, reflection, or respect equity*, and their variations that appear across institutions? The project data suggests that this could be the case. In other words, despite sometimes voluminous dispositions and observable indicators (Memphis, Duke), it may be possible in future research to identify just a few perennial dispositions common to all teacher preparation programs. Further, it would be of topical interest how common dispositions are reflective of broader national teacher improvement initiatives such as National Board Certification, or what the composition of the *Highly Qualified Teacher* might be.

Does the institutional documentation define or attempt to define dispositions?
How (explicit vs. implied)?

One surprising finding of this study was how few institutions attempted to communicate an explicit definition of dispositions. Of those that did, the definitions were implied (Stanford, Minnesota) or third-party references (Alverno, Memphis). Why were preparatory programs generally unwilling or unable to assert an explicit definition of candidate dispositions for the benefit and clarity of their stakeholder groups, the most important of which are NCATE/CAEP, program faculty, and finally the candidates themselves? There are three possible explanations to this question that can be inferred from this study: 1) Teacher preparation programs have a firm grasp of what dispositions are and how to teach them, 2) they struggle with defining dispositions, or 3) asserting an explicit definition of dispositions places colleges in uncertain legal territory.

In the first case, the lack of explicit definition in the face of a multitude of institutional assessments might appear unfair to candidates and assessors. How, for example, can candidates be explicitly and methodically assessed on a facet of personality or behavior that is not publicly or universally defined? A candidate might wonder whether or not the institution is really able to assess something that neither the candidate nor the institution can/will explicitly articulate? In this case, the lack of explicit definition is a moot point because each institution has ultimate confidence in the efficacy of their methods and mission. Put another way, there is no imperative for the program to state an explicit definition because they believe that the layers (top to bottom) of institutional philosophies, missions, unit goals, and behavioral indicators already systematically inculcate

the candidate. This was observed in the study, as each of the programs stated guiding institutional missions, unit standards, or some variety of dispositional expectation. That *dispositions* are not defined does not appear to be a concern, because it is assumed that the successful candidate, through their time in the program, will come to know what dispositions are, and how the program expects dispositions become manifested in the ideal teacher.

A second explanation for this lack of definition is a reiteration of an original concern of this research project. It is that uncertainty exists as to what dispositions are and how they ought to fit into the unit framework, from both instructional and evaluative points of view. Here, previous concerns endure regarding which domain dispositions occupy. Are dispositions merely observable behaviors? Are they predictable patterns of action? Are they unique and individual, but unmeasurable, moral compositions? How are dispositions distinct from habits, attitudes, or traits? (Katz & Raths, 1985). In his critique of the dispositions mandate, Freeman (2007) suggested that dispositions used in teacher preparation programs could be classified into three realms that generally mirror the aforementioned concerns: (1) Meta-dispositions (candidate's ideal moral set), (2) A-Priori dispositions (declarations of how we ought to behave), and (3) Dispositions-in-action (observable). In some elaborate cases, such as Duke University and The University of Memphis, we observed an attempt at all three of these domains represented in their documentation. In the study documents, *Meta-dispositions* were represented by institutional philosophies and conceptual frameworks, and *A-Priori* dispositions were communicated as candidate expectations or performances. However, the statement of elaborate or voluminous dispositional expectations does not in itself demonstrate evidence of

unit mastery over dispositions. Again, does this suggest that detailed elaboration and layered standards and expectations naturally induce the inculcation of dispositions among candidates without complete stakeholder understanding of what they are? While there is a near-total lack of original definition presented by these programs, it is credible to assume that each program would be supremely confident in their endorsement of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of their completed candidates.

A third and final potential explanation for the lack of definition is that an institutional commitment to narrow, explicit interpretations of dispositions constrains a program's ability to monitor candidates and intervene on behalf of the profession as a legal, moral, or professional obligation. For example, if a program asserts that dispositions are defined as a list of twenty specific, observable indicators, does the program have the legal authority to remove a candidate for failure to demonstrate some of the indicators? Conversely, does the candidate have any legal standing for claiming that, in the face of censure or expulsion, they possess a disposition, but were unable to adequately demonstrate it? Challenges to dispositions over the last decade do not appear to support the idea that a lack of explicit definition is problematic. To date, only four legal challenges related to dispositions have occurred at Teachers College, Brooklyn College, LeMoyne College, and Washington State University, and none of them have claimed the definition of dispositions as a point of contention. The reason for this comparative lack of legal tension may well be explained by the absence of narrow, explicit definitions among the ten programs. In the place of narrow definitions, units have opted for more broad statements of institutional philosophies, goals, or missions. Examples are the Brigham Young University

Key Components (Appendix 16), the Stanford Teacher Education Mission Statement, or the Huntington University Institutional Mission (Appendix 4). This suggests that the use of broad dispositional statements or implications allow units room to manoeuvre around the inevitably complex interventions sometimes necessary with a candidate. As such, seven of the ten institutions, and many more considered for this study, stated intervention procedures for candidates of concern. These interventions took the forms of conferences (Teachers College, Huntington, Stanford, BYU), and letters or statements of concern (Alverno, Rocky Mountain College, Memphis, The University of Minnesota).

Does the document make explicit what is being assessed?

Eleni Katsarou, in *Teaching as a Moral Practice* (2010), emphasized the value of using explicit dispositional expectations with candidates at the University of Illinois-Chicago:

It is the explicitness of the definitions, performance indicators, and possible actions that the structured conversations materialize between the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate, as well as with the university instructor. Across the critical student teaching semester, it has been our experience that the suggested actions in particular, which are clear and unambiguous, become the major tool with which we continually discuss how theory relates to practice and with which we document and are able to rate the teacher candidates' progress (Katsarou, 2010; p. 169).

In this case, the major tool for assessing student dispositions was the statement of clear, unambiguous expected actions (see also: Burant, Chubbuck & Whipp, 2007). The following are some examples of dispositions taken from this study that arguably meet Katsarou's criteria:

KSD 5.4: Candidates modify their practice accordingly to ensure all students exhibit growth (Duke University, 2011a).

Adapts instruction to meet varying needs and abilities, for example, fulfils instruction as detailed on an IEP for a student (The University of Memphis, 2008; p. 2).

I willingly try new teaching methods even if it means I have to step out of my comfort zone (Brigham Young University, 2012a; p. 3).

In this study, it was observed that seven of the ten programs used this kind of explicit behavioral language in stating dispositional expectations. But all ten programs identified at least some statement(s) of those dispositions that were valued by the unit. However, the degree of explicitness varied greatly. Contrast the selections above with excerpts from Stanford and The Ohio State University:

STEP seeks to prepare teachers who can create equitable classrooms and schools in which all learners meet high intellectual, academic, and social standards. Therefore, the program aims to cultivate candidates' professional commitment to the learning and growth of all learners (Stanford University, 2008; p. 16).

Disposition 1.1: The candidate demonstrates an appreciation of the subject matter he/she plans to teach (The Ohio State University, 2012a).

In these kinds of cases, expectations are not explicit in the context of specific, observable behaviors. But it would be a mistake to limit the concern of explicit assessment only to an observation of dispositional language as was suggested in Chapter Three. As the results of this study demonstrate, explicitness was presented both as dispositional expectations in some cases, but also as the instruments of assessment themselves. Both summative and formative, and qualitative and quantitative varieties of dispositions' assessment were often clearly published and were easily accessible to the candidate. In most cases, as evidenced in the supporting documentation, the stated methods of

assessment were explicit, regardless of whether or not definitions or explicit expected dispositions accompanied or supported them.

Are the tools/mechanisms of assessment stated?

The tools and mechanisms of assessment were clearly stated for the majority of programs chosen for this study. As demonstrated in Chapter Four, these tools took the forms of interviews, conferences, reflective pieces, coursework assessments, clinical observations, dispositional checklists, and participation in a number of quantitative instruments. The access to these assessment pieces represents an open book for candidates, faculty, and the broader body of stakeholders involved with teacher preparation.

One of the questions that must be raised is whether or not the statements of assessment tools and procedures ought to be considered evidence of authentic and continuous evaluation of candidate dispositions. Considering the variety of the stated assessments, coupled with the consistency with which these assessments appear across institutions, there is support for the position that teacher preparation programs are heeding their own dispositional advice and: "...using multiple types of assessment processed to support, verify, and document learning" (InTASC, 2011; p. 15). In addition to the presence of varied assessment, nine of the ten institutions were very clear about their use of evaluation checkpoints at different intervals throughout the program. Speaking generally, dispositions are assessed at the beginning, middle, and end of each program. Further, the results of these assessments represented a balance of external (e.g., admissions letters, faculty-report, cooperating teacher report, test

evaluations, Likert scales, classroom observations, and reflections.) and internal (e.g., self-reporting instruments, Likerts, reflections.) methods.

The systematic use of varied assessments across the breadth of these programs would appear to indicate clearly that instruction, monitoring, and assessment of candidate dispositions are being taken seriously by teacher preparation programs. However, a limitation of this study was that teacher educators and researchers have only experiential and anecdotal understandings and expectations of how each teaching, monitoring, and assessment procedure actually is manifested in classroom and clinical practice. In other words, do we have any certainty regarding what the application of stated evaluations look like in practice? An interesting example of this problem is illustrated in the LeMoyne College case in New York State. Here, a teacher candidate was summarily expelled for stating alternative viewpoints on multiculturalism and corporal punishment in a class essay. Application of the data from this study would suggest that rather than summary expulsion, The University of Minnesota might first issue an alert form, Stanford, Teachers College, and Huntington might convene a dispositions hearing, Rocky Mountain College might issue a dispositions letter, and so on. Considering a less perilous example, we must also recognize that differences likely exist regarding the calibre of classroom feedback that is shared between program teacher and learner that is intended to inform and nurture candidate dispositions.

While the previous claim that varied and systematic evaluations are taking place can be supported by the evidence in this study, one could also make the claim that Diez' institutional *culture of compliance* is present in these same documents. Among the programs selected for this study, only The University of

Minnesota, Brigham Young University and The Ohio State University report disaggregated data regarding the results of their quantitative dispositions' assessments. NCATE/CAEP does not require this elaboration of data, but the variability in detail among the institutional reports is notable.

Do the results of questions 1-3 suggest an endorsement of moral action, moral knowing, or a combination of the two?

The discussion of this guiding research question necessarily requires a brief review of the evidence/verification criteria that was presented in Chapter Four. In the realm of moral knowing, suggested evidence was: prerequisite participation in ethics and foundations course work, statements of teaching philosophy, demonstrations of adherence to institutional missions and philosophies, and participation in required quantitative inventories. In the realm of moral action, suggested evidence was: course performance, observations in clinical placements and practicum, dispositional checklists, performance indicators, observational rubric, and candidate self-improvement plans.

If we first consider these items as the fundamental means of orienting ourselves to answer this research question, we can assert that a combination of moral knowing and action, in addition to the recognition of interplay between the two, is present in current teaching and evaluative practice. In each of the ten programs, institutional goals and missions broadly contextualized the desired moral and behavioral composition of the candidate. Further, each of the programs stated behavioral and quasi-behavioral dispositional expectations for their candidates. The representation of both ethical ideals and behavioral expectations are evidence that teacher education programs recognize the

importance of both realms. But to what degree does this endorsement of both realms in teaching and evaluation of dispositions accurately represent NCATE/CAEP accreditation expectations? The NCATE/CAEP standards document states that: “Teachers must have sufficient knowledge of content to help all students...” and that candidates: “...are expected to demonstrate the candidate learning proficiencies...” (NCATE, 2008; p. 21), which include dispositions. As this study illustrates, schools of education endorse and perpetuate the importance of pedagogical knowing and the demonstration of dispositions on the part of their candidates, and they do so in ways that are consistent with NCATE/CAEP accreditation expectations. But is this fundamental adherence to seemingly broad expectations sufficient in: 1) closing the classic gap between theory and practice? and 2) endorsing the candidate for licensure and/or classroom employment? These concerns will be elaborated in the next section.

Section Two: Discussion

Two Assumptions

In Chapter Two, I asserted that the findings of this research project would serve to fill a gap in the broader literature within which two philosophical assumptions undergirding the dispositions movement. Those assumptions were that ambiguity of language is *not* a confounding issue in assessing a disposition and moral knowledge and institutional expectations *can* predict moral action.

The assumption that ambiguous language is not problematic was touched upon in the earlier discussion regarding definition. There, one explanation as to the lack of original definitions was that inculcation of the candidate was an inevitable and unspoken product of institutional missions and/or procedures. However, if this were the case, evidence would be present to the effect that programs devoted little attention to the monitoring and assessment of dispositions in their public documentation, save for minimum accreditation, graduation, and licensure requirements. This study found the opposite to be the case. One can assert that teacher preparation programs do in fact find ambiguous language a confounding element in dispositions teaching and instruction, as a majority of programs in this study have used their own observable, specific language in this area. Again, related to the earlier discussion regarding definition, this suggests that programs continue to wrestle with the complexity of a dispositions requirement. What will continue to be unclear is the degree to which teacher education programs are reflective and responsive to legal concerns, or to what degree a culture of compliance is rooted.

The second assumption, that moral knowledge can predict moral action, has been addressed on two levels. First, moral knowing was addressed as a function of the observation/embrace of institutional missions and philosophies. Second, moral knowing was stated as an understanding of, and adherence to, the stated moral competencies and/or explicit dispositional expectations of the program on the part of the candidate. Specific to this study, both levels are abundantly evidenced among the collected documentation. However, neither the expectation of a candidate embracing the concept of learner equity, nor an observational standard requiring evidence of cross-cultural content can

definitively prove to us that the candidate actually is in cognitive possession of a dispositional orientation in favor of learner equity. We can, and do, provide the tools of evaluation in addition to institutionally *ideal* constituent interpretations of the InTASC standards, but certainty remains elusive. This concession produces two questions that will be addressed in the following section: Is certainty what we want/need? What degree of certainty is actually achievable?

Sufficiency

In Chapter One, I asserted that a case could be made, owing to two major concerns about dispositions monitoring and assessment, that endorsing the moral orientation of teacher candidates was potentially problematic. These concerns remain, but, as a result of this inquiry, they appear to fade in importance.

Current assessment procedures are included in institutional documentation, and are evidently considered sufficient for such program responsibilities as: classwork grading, program completion, graduation, licensure, and deficiency interventions or other manner of dispositional alert. Sufficiency is also demonstrated in the linkage between teacher education programs and state licensure bodies. Regarding the dispositional/ethical/moral composition of the prospective teacher, state licensure in most cases depends only upon demonstrating completion of an accredited teacher education program and passing a criminal background check. Thus, in the absence of external or additional dispositions' assessment, we observe a seemingly long-unchallenged chain of endorsing *the dispositionally ethical teacher*, through a cycle of implied trust that is rooted in the implied initial contexts of InTASC

knowledge, skills, and dispositions: community endorses parents, parents endorse school, school endorses state licensure, state endorses college, college endorses candidate, and candidate endorses community and greater social contract. The temptation here is to conclude that the *college* link in this cycle is the one and only opportunity to inculcate or facilitate the acquisition of dispositions. This thinking is inaccurate. Although the preparation program is likely the only link at which dispositions are defined or codified, assessment of teacher ethics is continuous and involves all stakeholders. Parents, administrators, and the community (often with school board-as-proxy) all are engaged in the perpetual monitoring of the moral composition of the in-service teacher as observed through professional/classroom conduct. As such, the dispositional composition of the teacher is constantly being shaped and re-shaped on a macro-level by the same microcosms selected and utilized for this study. Specifically, this dispositional dynamism is influenced by variable institutional/district philosophies (charter schools, parochial schools, magnet schools, public schools), mentoring programs, professional development plans, job performance evaluations, and board/community expectations.

On their face, current institutional monitoring and assessment procedures appear to be sufficient because they enjoy widespread use inter-institutionally, and are generally accepted as legitimate by assessor, teacher candidate, and as just mentioned, additional stakeholders. Further, both licensure and employment proceed on assumptions that teacher candidates have been adequately prepared and as such, their knowledge, performances, and dispositions have been endorsed. Digging deeper though, the results of this study demonstrate that the existence and repetition of current dispositional

assessment procedures (summative/formative, qualitative/quantitative, and report/self report) represent the profession's best compromise to the stated concerns. In other words, current teaching and assessment procedures give us the best possible chance of educating and licensing an ethical teacher who possesses the attendant knowledge, skills, and critical dispositions of an ideal teacher, even in the face of definitional, contextual, or content uncertainty. Thus, it is difficult not to take an actuarial position on the induction of candidate dispositions in classroom and clinical settings. Schussler (2006) argued that dispositions ought not be assessed in the same manner than skills and knowledge (see also: Grootenboer, 2010). The observation of a skill, according to Schussler, was an accident, or just plain absent. Rather, she asserted that by looking at dispositions, one could make a more accurate prediction about the likelihood of a desirable skill emerging. According to this logic, focusing on dispositions, and their attendant influences on actual observable behavior gives a candidate the best possible chance to succeed in teaching. This could be achieved, in general terms, by: "...helping teacher candidates engage in self-exploration of their personal theories and identify their own values and assumptions related to teaching" (Schussler, 2006; p. 251). This is demonstrated not only by the presence of formal assessments such as reflective writing assignments, self-reporting instruments, and clinical observations, but more fundamentally by the broader tacit and explicit expectations of expecting the embodiment of institutional ideals.

While we might desire a more foolproof teaching and assessment framework in order to enhance teacher quality in the area of dispositions, and

know clearly how to achieve it, we must defer to a context of more patient and thoughtful evolution on the subject.

Section Three: Conclusion

Recommendations

This section makes recommendations for both teacher educators and in-service teachers, who share the responsibility for formally assessing teacher candidate dispositions. Embedded within this section are recommendations for future study in the area of teacher candidate and in-service teacher dispositions.

In the interests of making practical recommendations based on this study, a useful way of summarizing the conclusions from sections one and two is to state that two processes of transition, or evolution, are taking place regarding teacher candidate dispositions. The first evolving facet is how dispositional language reflects, or is responsive to, uncertainty regarding dispositions. The second evolution is how the assessment of candidate dispositions continues to find its place next to candidate knowledge and skills.

In the case of dispositions language, there is evidence that programs are attempting to modify, revise, and tailor language that 1) represents the goals of the institution and program, 2) attempts to achieve a universality of understanding for stakeholders, and 3) provides legal support for candidate intervention. Again, the processes of language modification and tailoring ought not be limited to pre-service teacher education. Institutional goals, stakeholder understanding, and legal obligation are clearly concerns that influence the daily operations of the nation's schools. If that is the case, both pre-service and in-

service protocols for monitoring and assessing dispositions must necessarily include processes of regular self-review. An excellent example of this self-review is the *Teachers College Institutional Effectiveness Plan* (Teachers College, 2010). Current trends toward increased accountability in education require attending to language used not only for granting candidate completion, graduation, and licensure, but also for granting the continuous employment of in-service teachers. In this way, protocols of monitoring and assessing candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, including those selected in this study, will inevitably and necessarily trickle down in modified forms to the monitoring, and renewal of practicing teachers within the nation's school districts. This places obvious urgency on teacher preparation programs at the collegiate level to persevere with the investigation of the effects of their unique institutional language on 1) candidates who are embarking on a teaching career and, 2) employed in-service teachers. A recommendation for future study in this area would be to compare teacher self-efficacy among those having graduated with no exposure to explicit dispositions language, those having exposure only to general unit goals, and those having explicit dispositional expectations. An extension of this kind of study might include an indication by teachers whence they acquired their dispositional composition, provided they are able to articulate one.

In the University of Illinois-Chicago example cited earlier, explicit language was everything, in a positive sense regarding expectations of candidates. This perspective was supported by an earlier, highly publicized example. In 2006 NCATE/CAEP was pressured into removing a dispositional reference to "social justice" because "...Groups such as the Foundation for

Individual Rights in Education (F.I.R.E.) and the National Association of Scholars (NAS) had identified that ambiguous language as an attempt to enforce particular social and political beliefs among accredited schools...” (F.I.R.E., 2007; p. 1). While this statement cautioned against the abuse of top-down philosophical policy edicts, it was a contradictory one because as this study demonstrates, ambiguous language clearly allows programs to distill, evaluate, and modify dispositions specific to the goals and needs of their institution and to their greater education constituents. An avenue of future research in this area might be to investigate the frequency and depth with which teacher education programs self-evaluate and revise dispositional content outside of the mandatory NCATE/CAEP continuing accreditation windows. This would shed light on how schools of education reconcile the critical dispositions needed of the ideal teacher, with the evolving needs of education influenced over time by social, economic, policy, and political change.

The evolution of assessment as it relates to dispositions must also be attended to, going forward. Restating an earlier contextualization of assessment for dispositions, Sockett (2006) believed that assessment should be primarily concerned with recognizing the candidate’s existing dispositions as they are largely fixed in adult learners (see also: McKnight, 2004; Mills, 2009). This view represents the common perspective that tools of self-improvement, self-reflection, and self-reporting will help the candidate progress toward a more self-actualized, positive feedback loop that serve to clarify and enhance their moral judgment. These kinds of assessment tools were abundantly evidenced in this study. Further, I have made the claim that the varieties of assessment stated in this study represent a comfortable compromise for preparatory programs –

implying that current assessments are both necessary and sufficient for candidates.

Current assessments, even if they currently provide a level of comfort for teacher education programs, cannot remain static. It is imperative that we continue to facilitate the evolution and improvement of dispositions understanding and assessment. Given the inclusion of observable dispositions in the majority of institutions, one avenue of improvement seems obvious, but elusive, that is, the frequency of clinical visits and the attendant expectation of dispositional growth. Teacher educators, in the form of facilitators, faculty assessors, professors, etc., are caught in the catch-22 of at once desiring that the candidate demonstrate professional independence in the clinical setting, and that they are concurrently engaging processes of dispositional improvement that is intended to be collaborative. However, generally speaking based on my own experiences, only limited visits by assessment professionals are made with the candidate. In short, if we are truly interested in legitimate assessment based on the observations of behaviors as manifestations of dispositions, and not just hoping to see good things during our inconsistent visits, then the frequency and quality of observations elevate in importance. Welch (2010), in his study of candidate and in-service teacher dispositions, strongly advocated for increased observations of all teachers in the interests of observing "...typical performance rather than on a few random observations..." (p. 182). In addition, in their 2008 accreditation report, The Ohio State University included a quantitative summary of the assessment of successful dispositions as reported by candidate, mentor, and university supervisor. Interestingly, the percentage of high ratings on dispositional items begins low as the program begins, peaks during mid-

program, and plummets during the final assessments (The Ohio State University, 2008; p. 21). This strongly suggests that added support might be required for the candidate during the field or clinical placement, when they are arguably at their most vulnerable, and where their dispositional composition as Welch's *typical performance* is being tested. A spurious but natural response to this suggestion is that the responsibility for assessment of dispositions during the clinical phase is transitioned to the cooperating classroom teacher. The common reason given is that the cooperating teacher is in a much better position to identify dispositional qualities and trends as a function of spending many consecutive weeks together. This abdication of responsibility is tempting, but would be proportionally legitimate to the degree the cooperating teacher is familiar and conversant with the concept, contexts, nuances, and concerns regarding dispositions – some of which were highlighted in this study. It is my view that there can be no credible opposition to the advocacy of increased training for cooperating teachers in this area. That stated, an opportunity for further research here (and in testing the previous claim) would be to compare and contrast dispositions as understood/stated by teaching veterans with little or no knowledge of the current dispositions mandate, with the understandings of candidates or recent graduates who have been steeped in dispositions instruction and assessment.

Conclusion

Speaking to the elevation of the profession of teaching and teacher education, Fenstermacher (1990) stated that "The rhetoric of the professionalization of teaching is grounded primarily in the knowledge base of teaching, not the moral base" (p. 132). It was in this spirit of enhancing our

ability to examine that moral base, that this study was conducted. The ability to teach, monitor, and assess dispositions is much more problematic than the entities of candidate knowledge and skills because dispositions are mediated by the internal moral composition of the candidate. As such, they are more difficult to define, codify, observe, and communicate. This study sought to illuminate some of these difficulties associated with the concept of dispositions by comparing the approaches of ten national teacher preparation programs.

The conclusions of this study were mixed, but generally optimistic. It was my original contention that ambiguous language, the lack of a universal or specific definition of dispositions, and the lack of predictability would all contribute to a worst-case scenario in which the profession would find itself under the perpetual threat of evaluative paralysis. This position could not be supported. Although all three of these concerns remain, schools of education continue to educate and graduate high quality teachers who later procure licensure and embark on successful teaching careers. It is currently impossible to assert categorically the role of dispositions monitoring and assessment by schools of education in taking credit for at least a part of teacher success or satisfaction. However, it is hoped that this study demonstrated the varied attempts of different national programs to wrestle with, and use to their advantage, the very challenges that this study was intended to critique.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albee, J., & Piveral, J. (2003). Management process for defining and monitoring teacher dispositions. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(7), 346-356.
- Almerico, G., Johnston, P., Henriott, D., & Shapiro, M. (2011). Dispositions assessment in teacher education: developing an assessment instrument for the college classroom and the field. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 11 (June, 2011).
- Alverno College. (2011). *Handbook for Undergraduate Teacher Education Candidates, Part 1. Policies and Procedures*. Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College.
- Anderson, D. & Brydges, B. (2010). *Dispositional field of dreams*. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Symposium on educator dispositions. Northern Kentucky University, Nov 18-19, 2010.
- Aristotle. (1992). *The Politics*. (T. Sinclair, Trans.). London: Penguin Books
- Arnstine, D. (1967). *Philosophy of Education: Learning and Schooling*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bebeau, M. (2002). The defining issues test and the four-component model: Contributions to professional education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(3), 271-295.
- Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. (2007). Apples and fishes: the debate over dispositions in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 359-364.
- Breese, L., & Nowrocki-Chabin, R. (2007). Social-cognitive perspective in dispositional development. In M. Diez & J. Raths (Eds.), *Dispositions in Teacher Education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

- Brigham Young University. (2005). *David O. McKay School of Education. NCATE 2005 Institutional Report*. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Utah State office of Education Joint Visit. April 9-13, 2005.
- Brigham Young University. (2012a). *Candidate Dispositional Scales*. http://education.byu.edu/livetext/present_instruments.html Accessed 5 April 2012.
- Brigham Young University. (2012b). *Clinical Practice Assessment Form*. <http://education.byu.edu/cpse/forms.html> Accessed 3 April 2012.
- Brigham Young University. (2012c). *Educator Preparation Program – Conceptual Framework*. <http://education.byu.edu/cpse/forms.html> Accessed 3 April 2012.
- Burant, T., Chubbuck, S., & Whipp, J. (2007). Reclaiming the moral in the dispositions debate. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 397-411.
- California Department of Education. (2009). *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Commission on Teacher Credentialing. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CSTP-2009.pdf> Accessed 6 June 2012.
- Campbell, E. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Carroll, D. (2012). Examining the development of dispositions for ambitious teaching: one teacher candidate's journey. *The New Educator*, (8), 38-64.
- Colnerud, G. (2006). Teacher ethics as a research problem: Syntheses achieved and new issues. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 12(3), 365-385.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.
- Dahlin, A. (1994). The Teacher as a Reflective Professional. *College Teaching*. 42(2), 57-61.

- Damon, W. (2007). Dispositions and teacher assessment: The need for a more rigorous definition. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 365-369.
- Dewey, J. (1893/1997). Teaching ethics in the high school. Folio Corporation and InteLex Corporation. *The Collected Works of John Dewey - 1882-1953, The Electronic Edition*. Charlottesville, VA: InteLex Corporation.
- Dewey, J. (1922/2002). *Human nature and conduct*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1939). *Logic: The theory of inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Diez, M. (2006a). Assessing dispositions: Five principles to guide practice. In H. Sockett (Ed.), *Teacher Dispositions*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE Publications.
- Diez, M. (2006b). Assessing dispositions: Context and questions. *The New Educator*, 2(1), 57-72.
- Diez, M. (2007a). Looking Back and Moving Forward: Three tensions in the teacher dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 388-396.
- Diez, M. (2007b). The role of coaching in working with dispositions. In M. Diez & J. Rath (Eds.), *Dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 203-218). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Diez, M., & Murrell, P. (2010). Dispositions for teacher education-starting points for consideration. In P. Murrell, M. Diez, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. Schussler (Eds.), *Teaching as a moral practice: Defining, developing, and assessing professional dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 7-26). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dottin, E. (2006). A Deweyan approach to the development of moral dispositions in professional teacher education communities. In H. Sockett (Ed.) *Teacher dispositions: Building a teacher education framework of moral standards* (pp. 27-47). Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

- Dottin, E. (2009). Professional Judgement and Dispositions in Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Study*, 25(1). 83-88.
- Dunn, C. (1999). The ordinary schoolteacher. Ch. 4 in *Ethics in Education*. (D. Fenner, Ed.). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Duke University. (2010). *Elementary Teacher Preparation Program – Candidate Handbook*.
http://educationprogram.duke.edu/uploads/assets/Exhibit%202_8.pdf
 Accessed 22 February 2012.
- Duke University. (2011a). *Conceptual framework. Duke University Program in Education*.
<http://educationprogram.duke.edu/teacherpreparation/conceptual-framework> Accessed 25 September 2011.
- Duke University. (2011b). *Institutional Report for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*. <http://educationprogram.duke.edu>
 Accessed 18 February 2012.
- Duplass, J. & Cruz, B. (2010). Professional dispositions: What's a social studies education professor to do? *The Social Studies*, 101, 140-151.
- Edwards, S. (2007). *Dispositions: Research, Assessment, and Defensibility*. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York City.
http://www.aacte.org/Programs/TEAMC/sarah_edwards_paper.pdf
 Accessed 2 Mar 2009.
- Epicurus. (1963). *The Philosophy of Epicurus*. (G. Strodach, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.
- Euripedes. (1980). *Medea, Hippolytus, The Bacchae*. (P. Vellacott, Trans.). Norwalk, CT: The Easton Press.

- Fenstermacher, G. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. Goodlad, R. Sodor, K. Sirotnik (Eds.). *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 130-154). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Finn, C. (2004). Faulty engineering. *Education Next*, 4(2), 16-21.
- Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (F.I.R.E.). (2005). *Education programs may have a 'disposition' for censorship*. September 21, 2005. <http://thefire.org/article/6280.html>. Accessed 12 December 2010.
- Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (F.I.R.E.). (2006). *Unconstitutional 'dispositions' criteria wither under public scrutiny*. February 28, 2006. <http://thefire.org/article/6832.html>. Accessed 12 December 2010.
- Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (F.I.R.E.). (2007). *"Social Justice" Removed from NCATE Standards, But Freedom of Conscience Issues Remain*. October 26, 2007. <http://thefire.org/article/8541.html> Accessed 1 Sept 2012.
- Freeman, S., Engels, D., & Altekruze, M. (2004). Foundations for Ethical Standards and Codes: the Role of Moral Philosophy and Theory in Ethics. *Counseling and Values*, 48, 163-173.
- Freeman, L. (2007). An overview of dispositions in teacher education. In M. Diez & J. Rath (Eds.), *Dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 3-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ginsberg, R. & Whaley, D. (2006). The disposition on dispositions. *Teacher Educator*, 41(4). 269-275.
- Grootenboer, P. (2010). Affective development in university education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(6), 723-737.
- Hare, S. (2007). We teach who we are: The intersection of teacher formation and educator dispositions. In M. Diez & J. Rath (Eds.), *Dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 139-152). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

- Hare, W. (2007). *In defense of open-mindedness*. Montreal, PQ: McGill University Press.
- Haynes, F. (1998). *The ethical school*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirsch, E., Kett, J., & Trefil, J. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage.
- Hirsch, E. (1993). What your sixth grader needs to know: Fundamentals of a good sixth grade education.
- Huntington University (2007). Huntington University Institutional Report: NCATE Focused Visit, Standard 4, October 28-30, 2007. www.huntington.edu/education Accessed 4 May, 2010.
- Huntington University (2011). Teacher Education Candidate Handbook. www.huntington.edu/education Accessed 14 Feb, 2012.
- Husu, J. & Tirri, K. (2001). Teachers' ethical choices in socio-moral settings. *Journal of Moral Education*, 30(4), 361-375.
- Husu, J. & Tirri, K. (2003). A case study approach to study one teacher's moral reflection. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 19, 345-357.
- Husu, J. (2004). A multifocal approach to study pedagogical ethics in school settings. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(2), 123-140.
- Hyde, B. (2010). A dispositional framework in religious education: learning disposition and early years' religious education in Catholic schools. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 31(3), 261-269.
- Israel, S., & Lassonde, C. (2007). *The ethical educator: Integrating ethics within the context of teaching and teacher research*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011). *Model core teaching standards: a resource for state dialogue*. Draft document. http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2010/Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_DRAFT_FOR_PUBLIC_COMMENT_2010.pdf Accessed 22 October 2010.
- Johnson, L., and Reiman, A. (2007). Beginning Teacher Disposition: Examining the moral/ethical domain. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 676-687.
- Johnson, L. (2008). Teacher candidate disposition: Moral judgement or regurgitation? *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(4), 429-444.
- Jung, E., & Rhodes, D. (2008). Revisiting dispositions assessment in teacher education: Broadening the focus. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(6), 647-660.
- Jung, E., Larson, A., Molfese, V., & Thompson, C. (2008). Research-based teacher candidate dispositions assessment system: moving forward. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 34(2). 155-156.
- Juujarvi, S., Myyry, L., & Pessa, K. (2010). Does care reasoning make a difference? Relations between care, justice and dispositional empathy. *Journal of Moral Education*, 39(4), 469-489.
- Karges-Bone, L., & Griffin, M. (2009). Do they have the right dispositions? Teacher education in the new conceptual age. *SRATE Journal*, 18 (2), 27-33.
- Katsarou, E. (2010). Making the path by walking. In P. Murrell, M. Diez, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. Schussler (Eds.). *Teaching as a moral practice: Defining, developing, and assessing professional dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 163-176). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Katz, L. (1993). *Dispositions: Definitions and implications for early childhood practices*. ERIC Clearinghouse of Elementary and Early Childhood Education. Urbana, IL: Monograph Series #4. (ERIC # 360-104)
- Katz, L., & Raths, J. (1985). Dispositions as goals for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1(4), 301-307.

- Katz, L., & Raths, J. (1986). *Dispositional goals for teacher education: Problems of identification and assessment*. Paper presented at the 33rd World Assembly of the International Council of Education for Teaching (Kingston, Jamaica, July 20-24, 1986).
- Klinker, K., & Hackmann, D. (2003). *An analysis of principal's ethical decision making using Rest's four component model of moral behavior*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Koeppen, J., & Davison-Jenkins, J. (2007). *Teacher dispositions: Envisioning their role in education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Kohlberg, L. (1958). *The Development of Modes of Thinking and Choices in Years 10 to 16*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Chicago
- Lapsley, D. (2006). Moral stage theory. Ch. 2 in M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Development*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lapsley, D. (2008). Moral self-identity as the aim of education. In L. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*, New York: Routledge.
- Locke, J. (1693/1902). *Some thoughts concerning education*. Cambridge: At the University Press.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F., & Swennen, A. (2007). The teacher educator as a role model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 586-601.
- Mahoney, D. (2008). *Ethics in the classroom: Briding the gap between theory and practice*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Malm, B. (2009). Towards a new professionalism: Enhancing personal and professional development in teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 35(1). 77-91.
- Marcus Aurelius. (1964). *Meditations*. (M. Staniforth, Trans). London: Penguin Books.

- Maslovaty, N. (2000). Teachers' choice of teaching strategies for dealing with socio-moral dilemmas in the elementary school. *Journal of Moral Education*, 29(4), 429-444.
- Mayo, B. (1958). *Ethics and the moral life*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McKnight, D. (2004). An inquiry of NCATE's move into virtue ethics by way of dispositions (Is this what Aristotle meant?). *Educational Studies of the American Educational Studies Association*, 35(3), 212-230.
- Melin, L., & Walker, D. (2009). A data driven dispositions model for teacher candidates and programs review. *Action in Teacher Education*, 31(1), 58-74.
- Mills, C. (2009). Making sense of pre-service teachers; dispositions towards social justice: can teacher education make a difference? *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(3), 277-288.
- Minnesota State Legislature. (2012). *Minnesota Administrative Rules. Standards of effective practice for teachers*.
<https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/rules/?id=8710.2000> Accessed 3 April 2012.
- Montaigne, Michel de. (1579/1943). *Selected essays*. (Donald M. Frame, Trans.). Roslyn, NY. Walter J. Black Inc.
- Mullin, D. (2003, January). *Developing a framework for the assessment of teacher candidate dispositions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC document #479255)
- Murray, F. (2007). Disposition: a superfluous construct in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 381-387.
- Narvaez, D. (2006). Integrative ethical education. Ch. 26 in *Handbook of Moral Development* (M. Killen & J. Smetana, Eds.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Narvaez, D. (2008). Human flourishing and moral development: Cognitive and neurobiological perspectives of human development. In L. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Nash, R. (1997). *Answering the virtuecrats: a moral conversation on character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nash, R. (2002). *Real world ethics: Frameworks for educators and human service professionals*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, D.C.: NCATE publications.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, D.C.: NCATE publications.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (1995). A morally defensible mission for schools in the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(5), 365-369.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission, (2011). *North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards*. <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/prodev/standards/teachingstandards.pdf> Accessed 10 February 2012.
- Nucci, L. (2006). Education for moral development. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Development*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Nucci, L. (2008). Social cognitive domain theory and moral education. In L. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Osguthorpe, R. (2008). On the reasons we want teachers of good disposition and moral character. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4). 288-299.
- Phelan, A. (2009). The ethical claim of partiality: Practical reasoning, the disciplines, and teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(1), 93-115.
- Plato. (1960). *The Republic*. (H. D. P. Lee, Trans). Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
- Posner, G. (2004). *Analyzing the curriculum*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Raths, J. (2007). Experiences with dispositions in teacher education. In M. Diez & J. Raths (Eds.), *Dispositions in teacher education*. (pp. 153-159). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Rest, J. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Richart, A. (2007). Deliberating over dispositions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 412-421.
- Rike, C., & Sharp, L. (2008). Assessing preservice teachers' dispositions: A critical dimension of professional preparation. *Childhood Education*, 84(3). 150-153.
- Rocky Mountain College. (2011). Education Department Handbook. <http://www.rocky.edu/academics/academic-programs/undergraduate-majors/education/pdf/EducationDepartmentHandbook2011.pdf>
Accessed 8 February 2012.
- Rorty, A. (2009). On being rational. *Ratio*, 22(3). 350-358.

- Rousseau, J. (1762/1961). *Emile*. (B. Foxley, Trans). London: J.M. Dent & Sons. (Original work published 1762)
- Sanger, M. (2001). Talking to teachers and looking at practice in understanding the moral dimensions of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 33(6), 683-704.
- Sanger, M., and Osguthorpe, R. (2005). Making Sense of Approaches to Moral Education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(1). 57-71.
- Sanger, M. (2008). What we need to prepare teachers for the moral nature of their work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40(2), 169-185.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schulte, L., Edick, N., Edwards, S., & Mackiel, D. (2008). *The development and validation of the teacher dispositions index*. The University of Nebraska-Omaha. <http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol122004/schulte.pdf> Accessed 20 August 2010.
- Schussler, D. (2006). Defining dispositions: wading through murky waters. *The Teacher Educator*, 41(4), 251-268.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. (2011). Teachers' critical incidents: ethical dilemmas in teaching practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 648-656.
- Shiveley, J., & Misco, T. (2010). "But how do I know about their attitudes and beliefs?": A four step process for integrating and assessing dispositions in teacher education. *The Clearing House*, 83(1), 9-14.
- Singh, D., and Stoloff, D. (2008). Assessment of teacher dispositions. *College Student Journal*, 42(4), 1169-1180.

- Sockett, H. & LePage, P. (2002). The missing language of the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(2), 159-171.
- Sockett, H. (2006). *Teacher dispositions: building a teacher education framework of moral standards*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE Publications.
- Sockett, H. (2009). Dispositions as virtues: The complexity of the construct. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 291-303.
- Southern Wesleyan University. (2007). *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Institutional Report: School of Education*. November 3-7, 2007.
- Splitter, L. (2010). Dispositions in education: Nonentities worth talking about. *Educational Theory*, 60(2), 203-230.
- Stanford University (2008). *NCATE Institutional Accreditation Report. NCATE Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions*. <http://suse-step.stanford.edu/about/accreditation> Accessed 14 May 2011.
- Stanford University (2011a). *Teaching Performance Expectations*. <http://suse-step.stanford.edu> Accessed 13 Jan 2012.
- Stanford University (2011b). *Stanford Teacher Education Program Mission Statement*. <http://suse-step.stanford.edu> Accessed 13 Jan 2012.
- Stooksberry, L., Schussler, D., & Bercaw, L. (2009). Conceptualizing dispositions: intellectual, cultural, and moral domains of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 15(6), 719-736.
- Strike, K., and Soltis, J. (2004). *The ethics of teaching* (4th ed.). New York: New York College Press.
- Teachers College, Columbia University. (2005). *Institutional Report: Prepared for NCATE Board of Examiners Visit. April 2-6, 2005*. http://www.tc.edu/administration/oaa/PDF_DOC/NCATE_Institutional_Report.pdf Accessed 13 May 2011.

- Teachers College, Columbia University. (2010). *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness*.
http://www.tc.edu/i/a/document/22980_TC_Assessment_Plan_FINAL.pdf Accessed 3 Sept 2012.
- Teachers College, Columbia University. (2011). *Student Teaching Handbook*.
<http://www.tc.columbia.edu/studentteaching/> Accessed 10 June 2011.
- The Ohio State University (2008). *2008 NCATE Accreditation Focused Visit-Institutional Report, Educator Preparation Unit*.
<https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/> Accessed 1 April 2012.
- The Ohio State University (2012a). *Professional Dispositions Assessment*.
<http://ehe.osu.edu/admin/assessment/ncate/preparation-assessment/>
Accessed 1 April 2012.
- The Ohio State University (2012b). *Conceptual framework of The Ohio State University Initial Teacher Preparation*.
<http://ehe.osu.edu/admin/assessment/ncate/conceptual-framework/>
Accessed 1 April 2012.
- The University of Memphis. (2008a). *College of Education Institutional Report*.
<http://www.memphis.edu/ncate/IR.pdf> Accessed 11 April, 2011.
- The University of Memphis. (2008b). *Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis*.
<https://www.memphis.edu/tep/pdfs/dispositions-and-retention.pdf>
Accessed 19 February 2012.
- The University of Memphis. (2011). *Clinical Student Teaching Handbook 2011-2012*. <http://www.memphis.edu/tep/pdfs/ST-Handbook.pdf> Accessed 28 February 2012.
- The University of Minnesota (2005). *Institutional Report: University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. Unit approval and accreditation visit, October 15-19, 2005*.

- The University of Minnesota (2012a). *Clinical experiences and dispositions*. College of Education and Human Development. <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/CI/advising/experience/html> Accessed 3 April 2012.
- The University of Minnesota (2012b). *Clinical experiences handbook*. <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/ppg/coopteachers/Clinical/Performance> Accessed 3 April 2012.
- Thornberg, R. (2008). The lack of professional knowledge in values education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1791-1798.
- U.S. News and World Report. (2011). *U.S. news college compass: best colleges 2011*. <http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings> Accessed 11Apr 2011.
- Villegas, A. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: a look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 370-380.
- Wasicsko, M. (2007). The perceptual approach to teacher dispositions: The effective teacher as an effective person. In M. Diez & J. Raths (Eds.), *Dispositions in teacher education*. (pp. 53-90). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Wasicsko, M., Wirtz, P., & Resor, C. (2009). Using dispositions in the teacher admission process. *S.R.A.T.E. Journal*, 18(2), 19-26.
- Wayda, V., & Lund, J. (2005). Assessing dispositions: an unresolved challenge in teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 76(1), 34-41.
- Welch, F., Pitts, R., Tenini, K., Kuenlen, M., & Wood, S. (2010). Significant issues in defining and assessing teacher dispositions. *The Teacher Educator*, 45, 179-201.
- White, P. (1996). *Civic virtues and public schooling: educating citizens for a democratic society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Wilkerson, J. (2006). Measuring teacher dispositions: Standards-based or morality based? *Teachers College Record*. April 20, 2006.
- Wilkerson, J., & Lang, W. (2007). *Assessing teacher dispositions: five standards-based steps to valid measurement using the DAATS model*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Willemse, M., Lunenberg, M., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Values in education: A challenge for teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 205-217.
- Willemse, M., Lunenberg, M., & Korthagen, F. (2008). The moral aspects of teacher educators' practices. *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(4). 445-466.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. 2nd. Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX 1: List of InTASC Critical Dispositions

Standard #1: Learner Development – The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

(h) The teacher respects learners' differing strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to further each learner's development.

(i) The teacher is committed to using learners' strengths as a basis for growth, and their misconceptions as opportunities for learning.

(j) The teacher takes responsibility for promoting learners' growth and development.

(k) The teacher values the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in understanding and supporting each learner's development.

Standard #2: Learning Differences – The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

(l) The teacher believes that all learners can achieve at high levels and persists in helping each learner reach his/her full potential.

(m) The teacher respects learners as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents, and interests.

(n) The teacher makes learners feel valued and helps them learn to value each other.

(o) The teacher values diverse languages and dialects and seeks to integrate them into his/her instructional practice to engage students in learning.

Standard #3: Learning Environments – The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

(n) The teacher is committed to working with learners, colleagues, families, and communities to establish positive and supportive learning environments.

(o) The teacher values the role of learners in promoting each other's learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.

(p) The teacher is committed to supporting learners as they participate in decision making, engage in exploration and invention, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning.

(q) The teacher seeks to foster respectful communication among all members of the learning community.

(r) The teacher is a thoughtful and responsive listener and observer.

Standard #4: Content Knowledge – The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches

and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

(o) The teacher realizes that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts but is complex, culturally situated, and ever evolving. S/he keeps abreast of new ideas and understandings in the field.

(p) The teacher appreciates multiple perspectives within the discipline and facilitates learners' critical analysis of these perspectives.

(q) The teacher recognizes the potential of bias in his/her representation of the discipline and seeks to appropriately address problems of bias.

(r) the teacher is committed to work toward each learner's mastery of disciplinary content and skills.

Standard #5: Application of Content – The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

(q) The teacher is constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues.

(r) The teacher values knowledge outside his/her own content area and how such knowledge enhances student learning.

(s) The teacher values flexible learning environments that encourage learner exploration, discovery, and expression across content areas.

Standard #6: Assessment – The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

(q) The teacher is committed to engaging learners actively in assessment processes and to developing each learner's capacity to review and communicate about their own progress and learning.

(r) The teacher takes responsibility for aligning instruction and assessment with learning goals.

(s) The teacher is committed to providing timely and effective descriptive feedback to learners on their progress.

(t) The teacher is committed to using multiple types of assessment processes to support, verify, and document learning.

(u) The teacher is committed to making accommodations in assessments and testing conditions, especially for learners with disabilities and language learning needs.

(v) The teacher is committed to the ethical use of various assessments and assessment data to identify learner strengths and needs to promote learner growth.

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction – The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

(n) The teacher respects learners' diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction.

(o) The teacher values planning as a collegial activity that takes into consideration the input of learners, colleagues, families, and the larger community.

(p) The teacher takes professional responsibility to use short- and long-term planning as a means of assuring student learning.

(q) The teacher believes that plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on learner needs and changing circumstances.

Standard #8: Instructional Strategies – The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

(p) The teacher is committed to deepening awareness and understanding the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction.

(q) The teacher values the variety of ways people communicate and encourages learners to develop and use multiple forms of communication.

(r) The teacher is committed to exploring how the use of new and emerging technologies can support and promote student learning.

(s) The teacher values flexibility and reciprocity in the teaching process as necessary for adapting instruction to learner responses, ideas, and needs.

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice – The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

(l) The teacher takes responsibility for student learning and uses ongoing analysis and reflection to improve planning and practice.

(m) The teacher is committed to deepening understanding of his/her own frames of reference (e.g., culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing), the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families.

(n) The teacher sees him/herself as a learner, continuously seeking opportunities to draw upon current education policy and research as sources of analysis and reflection to improve practice.

(o) The teacher understand the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration – The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

(p) The teacher actively shares responsibility for shaping and supporting the mission of his/her school as one of advocacy for learners and accountability for their success.

(q) The teacher respects families' beliefs, norms, and expectations and seeks to work collaboratively with learners and families in setting and meeting challenging goals.

- (r) The teacher takes initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and support student learning.
- (s) The teacher takes responsibility for contributing to and advancing the profession.
- (t) The teacher embraces the challenge of continuous improvement and change.

APPENDIX 2: Huntington University - 9 goals of program

The goal of the Education Department is to develop teachers who are Effective Stewards. Stewardship is a biblical concept that fits well not only with the mission of the institution but also with our mandate from the state of Indiana to prepare candidates for the teaching profession. The biblical parable of the talents (Matthew 25) portrays stewards as individuals who are assigned responsibility for the growth and development of someone else's assets. The state of Indiana will give graduates of our teacher preparation programs responsibility for the growth and development of one of its most precious assets—its students. Based on this goal of developing Effective Stewards for our schools, the Education Department has developed nine goals for teacher candidates who complete our programs.

Teacher education graduates of Huntington University will:

1. Understand the concept of biblical stewardship.
2. Acquire a broad liberal arts education as a foundation for their development as professionals.
3. Be thoroughly grounded in the content of the curriculum that they will be responsible for as educators.
4. Realize the importance of professional training for educators.
5. Understand the developmental context in which students learn, addressing various forms of developmental stages, including physical, cognitive, and psychosocial.
6. View the diverse population of students in our schools as a positive factor, which requires special training and sensitivity.
7. *Approach management of the classroom environment with confidence, skill and professional dispositions.*
8. Be able to deal effectively with constituencies outside the classroom, e.g., parents, administrators, bargaining units, legal constraints, etc.
9. Apply instructional skills in a manner that best facilitates the learning of all students.

These nine goals for graduates of our teacher education programs are the basis of our Conceptual Frameworks, "Teachers as Effective Steward". We see teachers acting as stewards in four areas: Stewards of Knowledge, Stewards of Learner Development, Stewards of Learning Environments, and Stewards of Instruction.

(Huntington University, 2011; p. 2)

APPENDIX 3: Huntington University - Dispositions survey (EXCERPT)

Under ED295 SP10 Dispositional Survey 3 of 3 Exit this survey

1. Quick Dispositional Assessment

1. Contact Information:

Cooperative

Teacher Name:

Candidates Name:

2. University Support and Communication:
Using the scale provided, please rate the following items.

	1 - Always	2 - Most of the Time	3 - Needs Improvement	4 - Not Applicable
RESPONSIBILITY: The candidate arrives on time for scheduled observations and appointments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Schedule changes are mutually agreed upon ahead of time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COMMUNICATION: The candidate maintains ongoing communication that is productive and timely.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RESPONSIVENESS: The candidate is responsive to requests for classroom help and other duties appropriate to the experience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FAIRNESS: The candidate works with all students in a positive and productive manner. There is no evidence of favoritism or bias.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=0LJHcVcUXxvGKZRIno_2fLdA_3d_3d 2/14/2012

APPENDIX 4: Huntington University – Mission of the Institution

As a Christian university, Huntington is committed to developing the whole person, assisting students to understand all areas of human knowledge from the perspective of a Christian worldview, and preparing them to impact their world for Christ. While the programs of the University are designed especially for students who desire to study in such an environment, the University welcomes students of all faiths who understand the objectives of the University and are willing to abide by its regulations. The University is committed to a strong liberal arts emphasis for all students, regardless of the vocation or profession for which they are preparing. In developing the whole person, the University emphasizes intellectual, physical, social, emotional and religious objectives:

- The University encourages the development of thorough scholarship.
- The University encourages the student to value physical wellbeing.
- The University encourages students to develop their faith.
- The University recognizes that, as a Christian University, it must make itself not a refuge from the contemporary world but an arena for encounter with that world and creative response to it.
- The University must emphasize the necessity for its students to make a critical and personal response to the issues encountered in the various fields of study.
- The University must accept disagreement and controversy as a normal and healthy part of its life as a University.
- The University recognizes that it is unsuccessful if students learn information but are not challenged to rethink their values; students become familiar with a major field of study but are not ready to do independent and critical thinking in those fields; students learn about current problems, issues and controversies but feel no need to make personal responses to them; students maintain Christian beliefs and practices but insulate their Christian faith from other aspects of their experience and do not think through, broaden, and deepen their faith in response to the challenges presented both by their academic and career pursuits and by their awareness of current problems and issues.

(Huntington University, 2007; p. 2)

TEACHING PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

A. MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS

1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
 - *Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Multiple Subject Teaching Assignments*
 - *Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Single Subject Teaching Assignments*

B. ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING

2. Monitoring Student Learning During Learning
3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments

C. ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING

4. Making Content Accessible
5. Student Engagement
6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
 - *Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades K-3*
 - *Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 4-8*
 - *Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 9-12*
7. Teaching English Learners

D. PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS

8. Learning About Students
9. Instructional Planning

E. CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING

10. Instructional Time
11. Social Environment

F. DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
13. Professional Growth

APPENDIX 6: Stanford University – California Standards for the Teaching Profession

California Standards for the Teaching Profession

Teachers in California have a professional responsibility to provide students with safe and caring learning environments, where students' differences are celebrated and supported, and they acquire the knowledge, skills, strategies, and concepts they will need for successful participation in an increasingly technological and global society. The CSTP provide a set of interrelated guideposts for teachers across the professional continuum (pre-service, induction, and beyond) to examine their practice, seek support and resources for continuous improvement, and affirm their talents and accomplishments in support of California's children and our nation's future.

Engage and support all students in learning.

Teachers need to:

- use knowledge of students to engage them in learning;
- connect learning to students' prior knowledge, backgrounds, life experiences, and interests;
- connect subject matter to meaningful, real-life contexts;
- use a variety of instructional strategies, resources, and technologies to meet students' diverse learning needs;
- promote critical thinking through inquiry, problem solving, and reflection;
- monitor student learning and adjust instruction while teaching.

Create and maintain effective environments for student learning.

Teachers need to:

- promote social development and responsibility within a caring community where each student is treated fairly and respectfully;
- create physical or virtual learning environments that promote student learning, reflect diversity, and encourage constructive and productive interactions among students;
- establish and maintain learning environments that are physically, intellectually, and emotionally safe;
- create a rigorous learning environment with high expectations and appropriate support for all students;
- develop, communicate, and maintain high standards for individual and group behavior;
- employ classroom routines, procedures, norms, and supports for positive behavior to ensure a climate in which all students can learn;
- use instructional time to optimize learning.

Understand and organize subject matter for student learning.

Teachers need to:

- demonstrate knowledge of subject matter, academic content standards, and curriculum frameworks;
- apply knowledge of student development and proficiencies to ensure student understanding of subject matter;
- organize curriculum to facilitate student understanding of the subject matter;
- utilize instructional strategies that are appropriate to the subject matter;
- use and adapt resources, technologies, and standards-aligned instructional materials, including adopted materials, to make subject matter accessible to all students;
- address the needs of English learners and students with special needs to provide equitable access to the content.

Plan instruction and design learning experiences for all students.

Teachers need to:

- use knowledge of students' academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development to plan instruction;
- establish and articulate goals for student learning;
- develop and sequence long-term and short-term instructional plans to support student learning;
- plan instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies to meet the learning needs of all students;
- adapt instructional plans and curricular materials to meet the assessed learning needs of all students.

Assess students for learning.

Teachers need to:

- apply knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and uses of different types of assessments;
- collect and analyze assessment data from a variety of sources to inform instruction;
- review data, both individually and with colleagues, to monitor student learning;
- use assessment data to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction;
- involve all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitor progress;
- use available technologies to assist in assessment, analysis, and communication of student learning;
- use assessment information to share timely and comprehensible feedback with students and their families.

Develop as a professional educator.

Teachers need to:

- reflect on teaching practice in support of student learning;
- establish professional goals and engage in continuous and purposeful professional growth and development;
- collaborate with colleagues and the broader professional community to support teacher and student learning;
- work with families to support student learning;
- engage local communities in support of the instructional program;
- manage professional responsibilities to maintain motivation and commitment to all students;
- demonstrate professional responsibility, integrity, and ethical conduct.

APPENDIX 7: Alverno College - Teacher Candidate's Disposition Commitment

Teacher Candidate's Disposition Commitment

The School of Education at Alverno College is committed to preparing candidates who have the required knowledge, skills, and *dispositions* necessary to become effective classroom teachers in a professional environment. Based on standards set forth by NCATE and WDPI, the candidate and faculty will evaluate each candidate's demonstration of beginning teacher dispositions in a series of required education courses. The progress of a candidate will be dependent on her/his successful demonstration of these characteristics.

Dispositions are defined as the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behavior toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice (NCATE, 2006). The dispositions listed below are expected of Alverno College teacher education candidates in the college classroom and in field placements and student teaching for teaching. The following indicators reflect the disposition categories for teaching of *respect, reflection, responsibility, collaboration and communication*.

Respect

- *Ethics* is demonstrated by maintaining confidentiality, disclosing any unlawful activity that might adversely affect ability to obtain a teaching license, displaying honesty and integrity in all situations. (Conceptualization)
- *Demonstrates flexibility* in modifying ideas, plans, being open to new attitudes, ideas and opinions; able to adapt to the situation (Coordination)
- *Uses language* which is clear, correct, and appropriate, both written and oral (Communication)
- *Values diversity* through choosing and creating inclusive, engaging materials, lessons, assessments, and planning for classroom environments that are inviting for diverse students' participation and learning; and that provide equitable access to instruction (Integrative Interaction, Conceptualization)
- *Demonstrates commitment* to address the needs of all learners in one's field or student teaching class

Responsibility

- *Timeliness* refers to arrival to class, clinical/field experiences, group work, appointments, submission/completion of assignments (Coordination)
- *Attendance* pertains to class, group meetings, appointments, field and clinical experiences (Coordination, Conceptualization)
- *Poise/attitude* reflects a positive, courteous demeanor and a proactive attitude in planning, preparation, and engagement in classes and in the schools (Communication)
- *Demonstrates organization* through planning, preparation of materials, study skills, time management (Coordination)

Reflection

- *Responds appropriately to feedback* from instructors, classroom instructors, peers, mentors (Communication)
- *Practices ongoing self assessment* that provides insights to personal performance and professional development and reflects comparable perceptions by other stakeholders (Diagnosis)

Collaboration

- *Initiative* is demonstrated by offering ideas and suggestions to others, setting goals for self-improvement, seeking advice and feedback, and independently searching for, creating, or modifying plans and materials (Diagnosis)
- *Provides leadership* to peers, instructors, school personnel, and students; initiates, suggests, contributes ideas (Integrative Interaction)
- *Collaborates* with peers, instructors, school personnel and teachers; shares responsibilities, ideas, materials (Coordination, Communication)
- *Cooperates* with instructors, peers, and school personnel; resolves differences or misunderstandings respectfully and reflectively (Integrative Interaction, Communication)
- *Establishes rapport* with classmates, instructors, school personnel and students (Integrative Interaction, Communication)

Communication

- *Professional Image* is demonstrated by effectively speaking, writing and listening; utilizing appropriate verbal and nonverbal messages; dressing in an appropriate manner and speaking with clear and grammatically correct language (Communication, Integrative Interaction)

I have read the dispositions and indicators above. I agree that dispositions are important to being an effective professional teacher. I am committed to both growth and excellence in demonstrating these dispositions. I understand that my progress in the teacher education program depends upon successful demonstration of these dispositions.

Signature

Date

Major

Advisor

APPENDIX 8: Alverno College -Professional Behaviors of Undergraduate Teacher Candidates Checklist

Alverno College Professional Behaviors of Undergraduate Teacher Candidates

Name: _____ Mid Semester F Sp 20____
 Instructor: _____ End of Semester F Sp 20____
 Course: ED 116 , ED 201 , ED 215/215R , ED 216 ,
 ED 225/325 , ED 315 , ED 321/338 , Other

Ratings are based upon class meetings, assignments, appointments, group work and clinical experiences.

		E = Emerging P = Proficient		D = Distinctive				NA= Not Applicable		Comments/Evidence
		Proficient	Distinctive	I	E	P	D	NA		
Respect	Ethics	Speaks appropriately with others, maintains confidentiality.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Flexibility	Shows the ability to adapt to the situation	Consistently adapts lesson to meet time and content concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Sensitive to Diversity	Displays sensitivity to and acceptance of diverse backgrounds, ages and abilities of students, peers, and/or staff	Establishes a warmth and caring for all; listens and learns others' interests; plans to include differences	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Commitment to Needs	Shows an ability to plan to meet needs of all learners	Consistently attends to and seeks materials for full range of learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Responsibility	Timeliness	Arrives on time and remains as expected		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Attendance	Attends as regularly as scheduled	Remains as needed and/or accommodates revised plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Poise/Attitude	Generally self confident, courteous; displays attitude that is positive and agreeable	Self-assured; always displays appropriate behavior; willing attitude at all times	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Organization	Uses time effectively; prepares materials in advance	Anticipates organizational needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Reflection	Feedback	Provides constructive and supportive feedback; Accepts constructive feedback and responds appropriately	Relates feedback to criteria or other frameworks. Solicits feedback and consistently refines practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Self Assessment	Sees learning as a process; Identifies strengths and areas of improvement	Uses criteria for developing her self assessment and growth plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

		I = Inadequate	E = Emerging	P = Proficient	D = Distinctive				NA = Not Applicable	
		Proficient	Distinctive	I	E	P	D	NA	Comments/Evidence	
Collaboration	Initiative	Demonstrates enthusiasm for students, curriculum, and teaching; volunteers, asks questions	Takes responsibility to move an idea forward and engage others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Leadership	Shows ability to take charge	Initiates, suggests, contributes ideas and engages others in the task at hand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Cooperates	Shares ideas, materials and responsibilities	Consistently works cooperatively with others to create an optimal learning environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Rapport	Shows an ability to communicate and interact effectively and professionally with all	Consistently communicates and interacts effectively and professionally with all; exhibits caring and respect	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Communication	Professional Image	Demonstrates an ability to effectively write, speak and listen	Responds with a refined use of oral and written language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Utilizes appropriate verbal and nonverbal messages		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Dresses in a professional manner		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Speaks in clear and grammatically correct language	Enriches lesson with expressive language and vocabulary; demonstrates superior understanding and practice of grammar and syntax	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Comments:										

Instructor Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX 9: Duke University - Institutional Mission

The vision of Duke University has been most recently described in its 2006 Strategic Plan, *Making a Difference*. This plan highlights five of Duke's "enduring themes" that serve as the defining tenets of the University. Perhaps most relevant to the Unit's vision and function is the idea of "knowledge in the service of society," whereby civic engagement and public service combine with inquiry and discovery to address community problems and inform theoretical knowledge. The Unit's conceptual framework flows naturally from this concept, and we strive to constantly view our theory, practice, and reflection through this lens.

The Mission of Duke University reflects and expands this vision. Duke's mission includes seven intertwined components that outline Duke's commitment to:

- Provide a superior liberal education that attends to students':
 - Intellectual growth.
 - Development of ethical standards.
 - Commitment to community leadership.
- Prepare students for lives in skilled and ethical service
- Advance the frontiers of knowledge and contribute to the international community of scholarship
- Promote an intellectual environment built on a commitment to free and open inquiry
- Support sophisticated medical research and thoughtful patient care
- Provide wide-ranging educational opportunities through the use of information technologies
- *Promote three key dispositions among students:*
 - Deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential.*
 - Sense of obligation and rewards of citizenship.*
 - Commitment to learning, freedom, and truth.*

While the Unit does not address all of these goals, the University's mission provides a context for us to develop and refine our own vision and goals, as articulated in the remainder of this document.

(Duke University, 2011b; p. 3-4)

APPENDIX 10: North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards

I STANDARD I: TEACHERS DEMONSTRATE LEADERSHIP

Teachers lead in their classrooms.

Teachers demonstrate leadership by taking responsibility for the progress of all students to ensure that they graduate from high school, are globally competitive for work and postsecondary education, and are prepared for life in the 21st Century. Teachers communicate this vision to their students. Using a variety of data sources, they organize, plan, and set goals that meet the needs of the individual student and the class. Teachers use various types of assessment data during the school year to evaluate student progress and to make adjustments to the teaching and learning process. They establish a safe, orderly environment, and create a culture that empowers students to collaborate and become lifelong learners.

- Take responsibility for all students' learning
- Communicate vision to students
- Use data to organize, plan, and set goals
- Use a variety of assessment data throughout the year to evaluate progress
- Establish a safe and orderly environment
- Empower students

Teachers demonstrate leadership in the school.

Teachers work collaboratively with school personnel to create a professional learning community. They analyze and use local, state, and national data to develop goals and strategies in the school improvement plan that enhances student learning and teacher working conditions. Teachers provide input in determining the school budget and in the selection of professional development that meets the needs of students and their own professional growth. They participate in the hiring process and collaborate with their colleagues to mentor and support teachers to improve the effectiveness of their departments or grade levels.

- Work collaboratively with all school personnel to create a professional learning community
- Analyze data
- Develop goals and strategies through the school improvement plan
- Assist in determining school budget and professional development
- Participate in hiring process
- Collaborate with colleagues to mentor and support teachers to improve effectiveness

Teachers lead the teaching profession.

Teachers strive to improve the teaching profession. They contribute to the establishment of positive working conditions in their school. They actively participate in and advocate for decision-making structures in education and government that take advantage of the expertise of teachers. Teachers promote professional growth for all educators and collaborate with their colleagues to improve the profession.

- Strive to improve the profession
- Contribute to the establishment of positive working conditions
- Participate in decision-making structures
- Promote professional growth

Teachers advocate for schools and students.

Teachers advocate for positive change in policies and practices affecting student learning. They participate in the implementation of initiatives to improve the education of students.

- Advocate for positive change in policies and practices affecting student learning
- Participate in the implementation of initiatives to improve education

Teachers demonstrate high ethical standards.

Teachers demonstrate ethical principles including honesty, integrity, fair treatment, and respect for others. Teachers uphold the Code of Ethics for North Carolina Educators (effective June 1, 1997) and the Standards for Professional Conduct adopted April 1, 1998. (www.ncptse.org)

- Demonstrate ethical principles
- Uphold the Code of Ethics and Standards for the Professional Conduct

II STANDARD II: TEACHERS ESTABLISH A RESPECTFUL ENVIRONMENT FOR A DIVERSE POPULATION OF STUDENTS

Teachers provide an environment in which each child has a positive, nurturing relationship with caring adults.

Teachers encourage an environment that is inviting, respectful, supportive, inclusive, and flexible.

- Encourage an environment that is inviting, respectful, supportive, inclusive, and flexible

Teachers embrace diversity in the school community and in the world.

Teachers demonstrate their knowledge of the history of diverse cultures and their role in shaping global issues. They actively select materials and develop lessons that counteract stereotypes and incorporate histories and contributions of all cultures.

Teachers recognize the influence of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and other aspects of culture on a student's development and personality.

Teachers strive to understand how a student's culture and background may influence his or her school performance. Teachers consider and incorporate different points of view in their instruction.

- Demonstrate knowledge of diverse cultures
- Select materials and develop lessons that counteract stereotypes and incorporate contributions
- Recognize the influences on a child's development, personality, and performance
- Consider and incorporate different points of view

Teachers treat students as individuals.

Teachers maintain high expectations, including graduation from high school, for students of all backgrounds. Teachers appreciate the differences and value the contributions of each student in the learning environment by building positive, appropriate relationships.

- Maintain high expectations for all students
- Appreciate differences and value contributions by building positive, appropriate relationships

Teachers adapt their teaching for the benefit of students with special needs.

Teachers collaborate with the range of support specialists to help meet the special needs of all students. Through inclusion and other models of effective practice, teachers engage students to ensure that their needs are met.

- Collaborate with specialists
- Engage students and ensure they meet the needs of their students through inclusion and other models of effective practice

Teachers work collaboratively with the families and significant adults in the lives of their students.

Teachers recognize that educating children is a shared responsibility involving the school, parents or guardians, and the community. Teachers improve communication and collaboration between the school and the home and community in order to promote trust and understanding and build partnerships with all segments of the school community. Teachers seek solutions to overcome cultural and economic obstacles that may stand in the way of effective family and community involvement in the education of their students.

- Improve communication and collaboration between the school and the home and community
- Promote trust and understanding and build partnerships with school community
- Seek solutions to overcome obstacles that prevent family and community involvement

III STANDARD III: TEACHERS KNOW THE CONTENT THEY TEACH

Teachers align their instruction with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

In order to enhance the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*, teachers investigate the content standards developed by professional organizations in their specialty area. They develop and apply strategies to make the curriculum rigorous and relevant for all students and provide a balanced curriculum that enhances literacy skills.

Elementary teachers have explicit and thorough preparation in literacy instruction. Middle and high school teachers incorporate literacy instruction within the content area or discipline.

- Teach the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*
- Develop and apply strategies to make the curriculum rigorous and relevant
- Develop literacy skills appropriate to specialty area

Teachers know the content appropriate to their teaching specialty.

Teachers bring a richness and depth of understanding to their classrooms by knowing their subjects beyond the content they are expected to teach and by directing students' natural curiosity into an interest in learning. Elementary teachers have broad knowledge across disciplines. Middle school and high school teachers have depth in one or more specific content areas or disciplines.

- Know subject beyond the content they teach
- Direct students' curiosity into an interest in learning

Teachers recognize the interconnectedness of content areas/disciplines.

Teachers know the links and vertical alignment of the grade or subject they teach and the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*. Teachers understand how the content they teach relates to other disciplines in order to deepen understanding and connect learning for students. Teachers promote global awareness and its relevance to the subjects they teach.

- Know links between grade/subject and the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*
- Relate content to other disciplines
- Promote global awareness and its relevance

Teachers make instruction relevant to students.

Teachers incorporate 21st Century life skills into their teaching deliberately, strategically, and broadly. These skills include leadership, ethics, accountability, adaptability, personal productivity, personal responsibility, people skills, self-direction, and social responsibility. Teachers help their students understand the relationship between the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study* and 21st Century content which includes global awareness; financial, economic, business and entrepreneurial literacy; civic literacy; and health awareness.

- Incorporate life skills which include leadership, ethics, accountability, adaptability, personal productivity, personal responsibility, people skills, self-direction, and social responsibility
- Demonstrate the relationship between the core content and 21st Century content that includes global awareness; financial, economic, business and entrepreneurial literacy; civic literacy; and health and wellness awareness

IV STANDARD IV: TEACHERS FACILITATE LEARNING FOR THEIR STUDENTS

Teachers know the ways in which learning takes place, and they know the appropriate levels of intellectual, physical, social, and emotional development of their students.

Teachers know how students think and learn. Teachers understand the influences that affect individual student learning (development, culture, language proficiency, etc.) and differentiate their instruction accordingly. Teachers keep abreast of evolving research about student learning. They adapt resources to address the strengths and weaknesses of their students.

- Know how students think and learn
- Understand the influences on student learning and differentiate instruction
- Keep abreast of evolving research
- Adapt resources to address the strengths and weaknesses of students

Teachers plan instruction appropriate for their students.

Teachers collaborate with their colleagues and use a variety of data sources for short and long range planning based on the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*. These plans reflect an understanding of how students learn. Teachers engage students in the learning process. They understand that instructional plans must be constantly monitored and modified to enhance learning. Teachers make the curriculum responsive to cultural diversity and to individual learning needs.

- Collaborate with colleagues
- Use data for short and long range planning
- Engage students in the learning process
- Monitor and modify plans to enhance student learning
- Respond to cultural diversity and learning needs of students

Teachers use a variety of instructional methods.

Teachers choose the methods and techniques that are most effective in meeting the needs of their students as they strive to eliminate achievement gaps. Teachers employ a wide range of techniques including information and communication technology, learning styles, and differentiated instruction.

- Choose methods and materials as they strive to eliminate achievement gaps
- Employ a wide range of techniques using information and communication technology, learning styles, and differentiated instruction

Teachers integrate and utilize technology in their instruction.

Teachers know when and how to use technology to maximize student learning. Teachers help students use technology to learn content, think critically, solve problems, discern reliability, use information, communicate, innovate, and collaborate.

- Know appropriate use
- Help students use technology to learn content, think critically, solve problems, discern reliability, use information, communicate, innovate, and collaborate

Teachers help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Teachers encourage students to ask questions, think creatively, develop and test innovative ideas, synthesize knowledge and draw conclusions. They help students exercise and communicate sound reasoning; understand connections; make complex choices; and frame, analyze, and solve problems.

- Encourage students to ask questions, think creatively, develop and test innovative ideas, synthesize knowledge and draw conclusions
- Help students exercise and communicate sound reasoning; understand connections; make complex choices; and frame, analyze, and solve problems

Teachers help students work in teams and develop leadership qualities.

Teachers teach the importance of cooperation and collaboration. They organize learning teams in order to help students define roles, strengthen social ties, improve communication and collaborative skills, interact with people from different cultures and backgrounds, and develop leadership qualities.

- Teach the importance of cooperation and collaboration
- Organize learning teams in order to help students define roles, strengthen social ties, improve communication and collaborative skills, interact with people from different cultures and backgrounds, and develop leadership qualities

Teachers communicate effectively.

Teachers communicate in ways that are clearly understood by their students. They are perceptive listeners and are able to communicate with students in a variety of ways even when language is a barrier. Teachers help students articulate thoughts and ideas clearly and effectively.

- Communicate clearly with students in a variety of ways
- Assist students in articulating thoughts and ideas clearly and effectively

Teachers use a variety of methods to assess what each student has learned.

Teachers use multiple indicators, including formative and summative assessments, to evaluate student progress and growth as they strive to eliminate achievement gaps. Teachers provide opportunities, methods, feedback, and tools for students to assess themselves and each other. Teachers use 21st Century assessment systems to inform instruction and demonstrate evidence of students' 21st Century knowledge, skills, performance, and dispositions.

- Use multiple indicators, both formative and summative, to evaluate student progress
- Provide opportunities for self-assessment
- Use assessment systems to inform instruction and demonstrate evidence of students' 21st Century knowledge, skills, performance, and dispositions

STANDARD V: TEACHERS REFLECT ON THEIR PRACTICE

Teachers analyze student learning.

Teachers think systematically and critically about student learning in their classrooms and schools; why learning happens and what can be done to improve achievement. Teachers collect and analyze student performance data to improve school and classroom effectiveness. They adapt their practice based on research and data to best meet the needs of students.

- Think systematically and critically about learning in their classroom: why learning happens and what can be done to improve student achievement
- Collect and analyze student performance data to improve effectiveness

Teachers link professional growth to their professional goals.

Teachers participate in continued, high quality professional development that reflects a global view of educational practices; includes 21st Century skills and knowledge; aligns with the State Board of Education priorities; and meets the needs of students and their own professional growth.

- Participate in continued, high quality professional development

Teachers function effectively in a complex, dynamic environment.

Understanding that change is constant, teachers actively investigate and consider new ideas that improve teaching and learning. They adapt their practice based on research and data to best meet the needs of their students.

- Actively investigate and consider new ideas that improve teaching and learning
- Adapt practice based on data



**NORTH CAROLINA
PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS
COMMISSION MEMBERS, 2006-2008**

- Carolyn Williams, Commission Chair - Wake County
- David Corsetti, Commission Vice Chair - Wake County
- Dianne Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer - Chapel Hill/Carrboro City
- Brian Freeman, Member at Large - Robeson County
- Diana Beasley - Hickory City
- Sheree Covey - Dare County
- Eddie Davis III - NCAE
- Felicia Eybl - Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- Jack Hoke - Alexander County
- Sarah Holden - Moore County
- Tammy Jordan - Bladen County
- Allison Ormond - Rockingham County
- Dr. Delores Parker - NC Community Colleges
- Dr. Donna Simmons - Gardner-Webb University
- Meg Turner - Buncombe County
- Ruth Wormald - Wake County
- Carolyn McKinney - Executive Director
- Connie Barbour - Program Assistant

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Carolyn McKinney, Executive Director
6328 Mail Service Center | Raleigh, NC 27699-6328
Phone: 919.807.3423 | Fax: 919.807.3426 | www.ncptsc.org

APPENDIX 11: Duke University - Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions – Observable Indicators

Exhibit 1.2 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS	OBSERVABLE INDICATORS
<p>KSD 1 Candidates exhibit the characteristics of professional teachers and emerging leaders.</p>	<p>Candidates...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) participate as part of a professional learning community; 2) collaborate with colleagues, students, parents, and community partners; 3) identify the ethical, legal, research, and policy issues that influence current education debates; 4) advocate on behalf of students and schools; and 5) act in consideration of fairness.
<p>KSD 2 Candidates understand the needs of diverse learners and model the behaviors of culturally responsive teachers.</p>	<p>Candidates...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) acknowledge and appreciate diversity, 2) adapt instruction in consideration of individual differences among students, 3) create caring classroom environments that model the ideals of fairness for all, 4) develop positive relationships with students, and 5) involve families in the education of students.
<p>KSD 3 Candidates demonstrate core content knowledge in the academic areas for which they seek licensure.</p>	<p>Candidates...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) align instruction with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study, 2) recognize connections within and between content areas/disciplines, and 3) present content to students in meaningful and relevant ways.
<p>KSD 4 Candidates believe all students can learn and use a variety of effective instructional methods to positively impact student learning.</p>	<p>Candidates...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) utilize the basic principles of child and adolescent psychology to nurture both the cognitive and affective domains; 2) communicate content, concepts, goals, and standards effectively; 3) competently integrate 21st Century skills (i.e., critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration and leadership skills) and technologies into their teaching; 4) design a fair and equitable assessment system; 5) consistently monitor student growth, and 6) establish a community of learning.
<p>KSD 5 Candidates practice regular reflection to increase their effectiveness in the classroom and to grow and thrive in their profession.</p>	<p>Candidates...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) set professional goals and monitor progress in meeting them, 2) engage in systematic reflection to analyze the impact their instruction has on student learning; 3) are committed to fairness; and 4) modify their practice accordingly to ensure all students exhibit growth.

APPENDIX 12: Rocky Mountain College Teacher Candidates' Dispositions

Rocky Mountain College Teacher Candidates' Dispositions

Standard 1, Subject Matter

_____ The teacher candidate realizes that subject matter knowledge is not a fixed body of facts but is complex and ever-evolving. He or she seeks to keep abreast of new ideas and understandings in the field.

_____ The teacher candidate appreciates multiple perspectives and conveys to learners how knowledge is developed from the vantage point of the knower.

_____ The teacher candidate has enthusiasm for the discipline(s) he or she teaches and sees connections to everyday life.

_____ The teacher candidate is committed to continuous learning and engages in professional discourse about subject matter.

Standard 2, Student Learning

_____ The teacher candidate appreciates individual variation within each area of development, shows respect for the diverse talents of all learners, and is committed to help them develop self-confidence and competence.

_____ The teacher candidate uses students' strengths, as well as his or her own strengths, as a basis for growth, and errors as an opportunity for learning.

Standard 3, Diverse Learners

_____ The teacher candidate believes all students can learn at high levels and persists in the idea of helping all students achieve success.

_____ The teacher candidate appreciates and values human diversity, shows respect for students' and colleagues' varied talents and perspectives, and is committed to the pursuit of "individually configured excellence."

_____ The teacher candidate respects students and colleagues as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests.

_____ The teacher candidate is sensitive to community and cultural norms.

_____ The teacher candidate makes students and colleagues feel valued for their potential as people, and helps them value each other.

Standard 4, Instructional Strategies

_____ The teacher candidate values the development of students', and his or her own, critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities.

_____ The teacher candidate values flexibility and reciprocity as necessary for adapting instruction to his or her future students' responses, ideas, and needs.

_____ The teacher candidate values the use of educational technology in the teaching and learning process.

Standard 5, Learning Environment

_____ The teacher candidate takes responsibility for establishing a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate.

_____ The teacher candidate understands how participation supports commitment, and is committed to the expression and use of democratic values.

_____ The teacher candidate values the role of students, as well as his or her own role, in promoting learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.

_____ The teacher candidate recognizes the values of intrinsic motivation to life-long growth and learning.

_____ The teacher candidate is committed to the continuous development of individual students' abilities, as well as his or her own, and considers how different motivational strategies are likely to encourage this development.

Standard 6, Communication

_____ The teacher candidate recognizes the power of language for fostering self-expression, identity development, and learning.

_____ The teacher candidate values many ways in which people seek to communicate and encourages many modes of communication.

_____ The teacher candidate appreciates the cultural dimensions of communication, responds appropriately, and seeks to foster culturally sensitive communication.

_____ The teacher candidate possesses acceptable writing skills and appears capable of fostering acceptable writing skills in students.

_____ The teacher candidate possesses acceptable reading skills and appears capable of fostering acceptable reading skills in students.

_____ The teacher candidate possesses acceptable speaking skills and appears capable of fostering acceptable speaking skills in students.

_____ The teacher candidate possesses acceptable listening skills and appears capable of fostering acceptable listening skills in students.

Standard 7, Planning Instruction

_____ The teacher candidate values both long-term and short-term planning.

_____ The teacher candidate believes that plans must always be open to adjustment and revision.

_____ The teacher candidate values planning as a collegial activity.

Standard 8, Assessment

_____ The teacher candidate sees ongoing assessment as essential to instruction and recognizes that many different assessment strategies, accurately used, are necessary for monitoring/promoting learning.

_____ The teacher candidate is committed to using assessment to identify learning strengths and promote intellectual growth.

Standard 9, Reflection and Professional Development

_____ The teacher candidate values critical thinking and self-directed learning as habits of mind.

_____ The teacher candidate is committed to reflection, assessment, and learning as an ongoing process.

_____ The teacher candidate is willing to give and receive help.

_____ The teacher candidate is committed to seeking out, developing, and continually refining practices that address the individual needs of his or her future students.

_____ The teacher candidate recognizes his or her professional responsibility for engaging in and supporting appropriate professional practices for self and colleagues.

Standard 10, Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships

_____ The teacher candidate appears capable of appreciating the importance of all aspects of a student's experience.

_____ The teacher candidate is concerned about all aspects of a student's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical), and is alert to signs of difficulties.

_____ The teacher candidate appears capable of respecting the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.

_____ The teacher candidate appears capable of consulting with others regarding the education/well-being of students.

_____ The teacher candidate appears capable of working with other professionals.

Rocky Mountain College Standard 11: "Withitness"/Intrapersonal Skills

_____ The teacher candidate stays alert and on-task during class and monitors his or her own pace and rhythm throughout the duration of classroom events.

_____ The teacher candidate anticipates his or her own off-task behavior and prevents it.

_____ The teacher candidate is not an "amiable non-entity"—a student who has learned to hide behind apparent attentive and cooperative behavior to escape engagement or to mask skill or knowledge problems.

Rocky Mountain College Standard 12: Work Ethic

_____ The teacher candidate spends an appropriate amount of time outside of school to prepare for class; does not come unprepared; does not make excuses for missing or flawed work; does his or her own original work; and does not miss class unless absolutely necessary.

_____ The teacher candidate acts independently and demonstrates accountability, reliability, and sound judgment.

APPENDIX 13: Rocky Mountain College – Dispositions Letter

Dispositions Letter

In the event that any member of the teacher education committee becomes concerned about a teacher candidate's suitability for the teaching profession—or conversely, wishes to indicate the strengths of a particular teacher candidate—the following letter, with various modifications, may be sent to that candidate.

(Course(s) if pertinent, and semester)

Dear _____,

Please find under cover a copy of the 12 Teacher Candidates' Dispositions which are also listed in **your copy** of the education department handbook. Individual items have been marked with either an "S" indicating strength(s) or a "W" indicating weakness(es) in a particular category or categories.

The education faculty wish to inform you...*(information pertinent to the individual case will follow. A clear indication of an upcoming course of action on the part of the student and/or the faculty involved will be described.)*

We, the faculty of Rocky Mountain College's education department, are dedicated to turning out the best teachers we possibly can. We believe it is important to apprise you periodically about both your areas of strength and your weaker areas. At every stage of your education, faculty members are ready to offer assistance if you need it. Do not hesitate to follow up on this letter by asking clarifying questions or requesting help. All of your professors stand ready to support you in your quest to teach.

Cordially,

(Name(s) of the member(s) of the teacher education committee)

APPENDIX 14: The University of Memphis - College of Education Norms

College of Education Norms

I take 100% responsibility.

I neither make excuses nor cast blame.

I seek equity of voice.

I participate, I support, I listen and I perform and contribute in a manner that encourages others to do the same.

I am willing to talk about sensitive issues.

I encourage dialogue and am prepared to discuss sensitive issues.

I listen for understanding.

I neither interrupt nor participate in secondary conversations. I will go directly to the source for information and problem resolution.

I appreciate the strengths and contributions of others.

I need, I want and I value the strengths and contributions of others.

I bring positive energy and encouragement to the team.

I contribute positively; I have high expectations of others and I contribute synergy to the team.

I implement the mission of the college.

I commit, I support and I actively encourage others to implement the mission.

College of Education Mission



The first mission of the College of Education is to prepare teachers, other licensed personnel, and education-related professionals who are qualified and competent in both practice and theory to become effective educational leaders.

The second mission of the College of Education is to conduct educational and educationally-related research and to engage in the dissemination of its outcomes.

The final mission of the College of Education, tightly interwoven with the preceding mission statements, is to provide teaching, research, and service that extends beyond the confines of the campus to our urban setting and to other outreach locations.

The essence of our mission can be captured by the phrase noted above as: Preparing Educational Leaders. This is a major theme or focus for College activity. In a very general way it captures the hoped for outcome of our programs. An educational leader is what we hope you will be when you graduate.

APPENDIX 15: The University of Memphis – Behavioral Examples by Category of Professional Dispositions

Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis

Teacher candidates at the University of Memphis are expected to demonstrate content knowledge and teaching skills necessary for all students to learn. However, content knowledge and teaching skills are not the only requirements of the Teacher Education Program at the University of Memphis.

As published in both The University of Memphis *Under Graduate Bulletin*, and *Graduate Catalog*: *In programs where candidates are specializing in a professional area, awarding a degree or recommending for a professional license does not merely attest to the accumulation of the specified number of hours in the classroom or other professional setting but also to the demonstration of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The faculty has the responsibility to both the public and the profession to award a degree or license only when the candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory level of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions as judged by the program faculty. Further, candidates must exhibit integrity and character consistent with the standards of ethical principles set forth by appropriate professional associations and Tennessee law.*

As noted in both the College's Conceptual Framework and the Pillars of Practice, teacher candidates at the University of Memphis must demonstrate the dispositions (attitudes, values and professional ethics and behaviors) required of professional educators. The National Council for the Accreditation of College of Education define dispositions as: *Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development.* The College of Education has adopted the following as key dispositions and behaviors¹ essential for all candidates to demonstrate across their programs of study.

Behavioral Examples by Category of Professional Dispositions

Teachers and other school professional candidates at the University of Memphis are expected to demonstrate behaviors that are indicative of the following dispositions characteristic of effective educators. Examples of behaviors demonstrating each disposition are provided following each disposition statement.

The candidate shows a disposition toward and commitment to each of the following:

Social Justice

1. Promoting social justice

- Holds high expectations for all students with no signs of bias or prejudice within those expectations.

¹ Permission has been granted by the University of Tennessee-Knoxville for the use of the disposition outcomes and behavioral indicators included in this list.

Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis

- Employs a variety of instructional practices that assure academic success for diverse groups of students, particularly those marginalized in US educational settings.
- Links academically challenging curriculum to the cultural, intellectual, contextual, interest, and emotional assets and needs of students.
- Develops personal bonds with students to avoid viewing students as separate or the other.
- Constructs lessons that include the perspectives of different groups.
- Explicitly teaches students about society's injustices and the dynamics of privilege.
- Advocates for, gives significant voice to, and collaborates with parents and the community in educational decisions and processes.
- Seeks opportunities to strengthen social justice understanding and practice as integral to everyday practice.

2. Providing equitable learning opportunities for all students

- Adapts instruction to meet varying needs and abilities, for example, fulfills instruction as detailed on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for a student
- Holds high expectations for all students
- Demonstrates no sign of overt bias, prejudice, or lack of fairness toward certain students or groups of people
- Creates a learning environment that enables all students to reach their full potential.

3. Promoting achievement of students at all levels

- Demonstrates persistence in helping all children achieve success
- Holds positive expectations for all students to learn
- Reinforces student achievement for all students
- Does not negatively compare current students to other students with whom they have worked
- Conveys high expectations for student achievement
- Advocates for all learners

4. Recognizing students' unique prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests as part of the context for student learning

- Demonstrates the belief that diversity in the classroom, in the school, and in society enhances learning
- Develops lessons that encourage students to value and draw upon their unique life circumstances
- Selects materials, develops lessons, and promotes classroom environments that counteract negative stereotypes and bigotry
- Fosters student appreciation for diversity in the classroom
- Demonstrates sensitivity to the legitimate needs and concerns of others.
- Demonstrates positive attitudes toward diverse cultures and learners
- Provides students with access to varying points of view

Integrity

5. Maintaining his/her position as a positive role model for students and others

- Arrives for class/field experiences/clinical experiences on time

**Policies and Procedures for
Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis**

- Attends class except when excused in advance
- Exhibits positive attitude toward the discipline and/or teaching profession
- Acts and dresses according to the standards of the school where the candidate is placed
- Maintains composure in the classroom
- Demonstrates situationally appropriate behavior and professional demeanor.
- Uses language free of profanity and malicious statements toward any individual or groups
- Models behavior expected of both teachers and learners in an educational setting
- Uses appropriate tone of voice
- Maintains emotional control
- Uses self-disclosure appropriately
- Uses appropriate non-verbal expressions
- Responds appropriately to actions and reactions of others
- Demonstrates good personal hygiene and grooming.
- Recognizes the need for, and seeks help in, one of the areas above (self-monitoring)

6. Demonstrating positive work habits and interpersonal skills, demonstrating a positive attitude, dependability, honesty and respect for others

- Completes assignments, duties, or tasks on time
- Demonstrates willingness to adapt instruction to “best practices”
- Interacts in a positive and professional manner with students, peers, teachers, university personnel, and others
- Communicates without intent to deceive
- Considers opinions of others with an open mind
- Listens attentively to others in a variety of contexts
- Interacts in a polite and respectful manner
- Respects the property of others
- Demonstrates empathy and concern for others
- Displays equitable treatment of others
- Acknowledges perspectives of individuals from diverse cultural and experiential backgrounds
- Interacts appropriately in relation to cultural norms
- Acts from a positive frame of reference, including when changes occur
- Returns borrowed materials in a timely manner
- Respects the intellectual property of others by giving credit to others when using their work and avoiding plagiarism
- Adheres to the accepted standards of truthfulness, honesty, and ethical behavior as stated in U of M’s Student Handbook, student teaching guidelines, and course syllabi.
- Provides students access to varying points of view
- Shows due courtesy and consideration for people and ideas
- Maintains positive working relationships with peers

7. Maintaining the standards of confidentiality regarding student information and communications

- Maintains confidentiality of student records, parent communications, and private professional communications.
- Uses language that meets professional standards and is not demeaning or harmful to any individual or group.

**Policies and Procedures for
Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis**

Excellence

8. Understanding and involving a wide variety of resources in the school, family, culture, and community to facilitate student learning

- Appreciates unique community culture
- Provides materials for students of different cultures (bulletin boards, library books)
- Welcomes involvement of family and community members
- Recognizes, values, and utilizes assets in the community

9. Seeking out, developing, and implementing the most appropriate methods to meet the diverse learning needs of the students

- Adapts teaching to changing classroom circumstances (Flexibility)
- Adapts instruction and assessment to fit various learning styles
- Adapts instruction and assessment for students with special needs
- Aware of the process for making referrals
- Seeks and supports student services when appropriate

10. Developing students' skills as problem-solvers as they progress toward becoming independent, self-directed learners

- Models problem-solving skills
- Provides opportunities for students to learn conflict resolution skills
- Utilizes peer tutors in the classroom
- Provides opportunities for students to learn to function in cooperative learning groups
- Provides opportunities for student decision making
- Shared decision making with students

11. Using effective planning and classroom organization as tools in maximizing the time available for instruction and learning

- Prepares for classes, meetings, and group work
- Submits lesson plans within agreed-upon timelines
- Plans daily instruction in light of long range goals and objectives
- Manages time effectively
- Establishes routines and procedures to maximize instructional time (how to submit homework, taking attendance, etc.)
- Organizes seating and resources for efficiency
- Completes assigned tasks from group activities within an acceptable time frame
- Prioritizes work based upon established goals

Respect

12. Collaborating with other professionals to improve the overall learning of students

- Works together with others to achieve a common goal.
- Responds positively to requests from other professionals for collaboration.
- Makes a contribution to group effort
- Shares information and materials with others

Policies and Procedures for Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis

- Assists peers
- Supports decisions of group willingly, even if different from own
- Supports work of others
- Establishes professional goals that are aligned with those of the organization.
- Plans and sets goals and priorities with others
- Maximizes individuals' talents
- Distributes responsibilities evenly
- Keeps groups on task

Accountability

13. Accepting responsibility for what occurs in his/her classroom and for other school-wide responsibilities that contribute to student learning and a safe, orderly environment

- Consciously avoids acting in a dangerous or irresponsible manner that might put students at risk
- Identifies personal responsibility in conflict/problem situations
- Initiates communication to resolve conflict
- Adapts to new or unexpected situation
- Accepts consequences for personal actions or decisions
- Submits assignments/reports on time or follows procedures for extensions
- Takes action to solve problems within the authority granted to the candidate
- Takes initiative to get materials and notes when absent from meetings or classes
- Seeks/locates needed resources
- Maintains order
- Follows school procedures for discipline referrals
- Ensures accuracy of information for which he/she is responsible
- Supports assignments outside the classroom, such as bus duty or bathroom duty
- Supports school system policies regarding health and safety issues
- Knows and is prepared to implement plans for disasters and emergencies as required by the school system

14. Using sound judgment and thoughtful decision making with consideration of the consequences

- Uses credible and data-based sources
- Generates effective/productive options to situations
- Analyzes situations, comments, and interactions and makes appropriate adjustments that promote a positive learning environment
- Makes reasoned decisions with supporting evidence
- Uses appropriate strategies to respond to emotional and emergency situations
- Supports and follows school, system, and university directives
- Avoids engaging in illegal or unethical conduct involving minor children or other behavior which would be grounds for dismissal from a teaching position

Continuous Learning

**Policies and Procedures for
Assessing Teacher Candidates Dispositions at the University of Memphis**

15. Demonstrating life-long learning and personal growth through reflection, seeking constructive feedback, and being willing to learn from others and past experience

- Values and participates in opportunities to improve instructional practices and teaching activities
- Seeks opportunities to learn new skills
- Views reflection as a component of the instructional process
- Responds constructively to professional feedback from supervisors and others, making changes to address legitimate concerns.
- Seeks clarification and/or assistance as needed
- Exhibits curiosity about new and seemingly old concepts
- Displays creative ideas about and applications to education concepts
- Models flexibility regarding course content, process and tasks
- Makes connections to previous readings/experiences/courses, etc.

16. Participating in professional growth activities within and outside the school

- Attends school and school system inservice/staff development sessions
- Pursues opportunities in professional educational organizations and associations.
- Is open to opportunities to attend/present at meetings of professional organizations

Candidate Understanding of Dispositional Expectations

Candidates applying for admission to the Teacher Education Program will sign a dispositions verification form indicating they understand the dispositions they are to demonstrate in all course work, field/clinical experiences and other activities associated with them becoming a licensed teacher or other support personnel. This form will be turned in to the Office of Teacher Education and Student Support Services (TESS) and become part of their professional education file. For candidates in Other School Personnel Programs, program coordinators will forward copies of the dispositions verification forms to the Office of Teacher Education and Support Services.

Faculty Reporting of Dispositional Deficiencies

Faculty will submit to both the chair of their department and Director of Teacher Education documentation of any candidate's lack of proficiency in regard to the targeted dispositions. Prior to submitting the documentation, the faculty member must meet with the candidate, discuss the candidate's deficiency(s) and obtain a signature from the candidate. The signature does not mean the student agrees with the decision of the faculty member, rather it is just an indicator the candidate was informed. Before forwarding to the chair and Director of Teacher Education, the faculty member will summarize the conference with the candidate. Please note if the deficiency is at a field/clinical site, then both the mentor teacher and university faculty mentor should meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's deficiency(s) and follow the same procedure outlined above.

APPENDIX 16: Brigham Young University – Key Components of the Conceptual Framework (Excerpted)

Brigham Young University Aims

- Intellectual Capacity
- Moral Character
- Spiritual Strength
- Lifelong Learning

Educator Preparation Aims

- Collaboration
- Academic Excellence
- Social Competence
- Moral Dimensions of Teaching (from Goodlad)
 - Stewardship
 - Access to Knowledge
 - Nurturing Pedagogy
 - Enculturation for Democracy

Collaboration: Effective education professionals work openly with and welcome the support, collaboration, and assistance provided by an array of talented professional colleagues in serving, instructing, and relating to students and their families. The effectiveness of education professionals depends on their ability to collaborate with others. Candidates learn about collaboration processes as they learn in cohorts; engage in co-teaching; participate on teams; work with paraeducators, faculty and staff; and partner with parents and other community members. Collaboration extends to educational policy as principals in training in our Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations learn how to form and maximize learning communities, and practicing principals in the schools learn theory, skills, and wisdom of practice through collaborative participation in the Principals Academy.

Academic Excellence: ...We define academic excellence as fully understanding the content that one teachers and practices...It is our disposition that academic excellence goes beyond content knowledge. Highly qualified educators must have well trained minds: have the ability to research and process information; be able to apply theory in thinking critically, reasoning productively, and solving problems; possess and synthesize broad knowledge of classic literature, the arts, and the sciences; and use knowledge productively in terms of a spiritual foundation for thinking and behavior.

Inquiry and reflection are included in all licensure programs but receive particular emphasis on the graduate level...Additionally, teachers, counsellors, and administrators must be committed to ongoing professional development, deepening their knowledge and their capacity for serving, helping, and teaching others as they gradually develop in the wisdom of practice.

Social Competence: Central to all teaching, helping, counselling, and administrating is social competence. Education professionals must be committed to communicating effectively. They must interpret and respond to social contexts and individuals accurately so that conflicts can be thoughtfully resolved. Their disposition must be to accept responsibility for their personal actions, providing models which students can emulate. Of special importance is their disposition and commitment to teach students from diverse backgrounds and students with disabilities with sensitivity and awareness.

Stewardship: BYU believes that education professionals have a moral obligation to be responsible stewards for the well-being of students, their families, and communities (Goodlad, 1990, 1994; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990). During their preparatory coursework, future education professionals share this stewardship with peers, mentors, and other education personnel. As they interact with children and adults in diverse school settings, they become increasingly aware of the impact of their behaviors on students and colleagues. As they come to realize they are stewards for the well-being of their students and others, they learn to assume responsibility for the organization and instructional climate of the settings in which they serve and teach. As these realizations deepen, our education professionals become renewal agent in their schools, continually striving to improve service within their stewardships to students, families, and communities. As they progress, they act with greater integrity, and care in responding to school and community challenges, developing and communicating high expectations, and acting in ways that fundamentally and consistently benefit those in their care.

Access to Knowledge: BYU believes that education professionals have a moral obligation to *provide all students with access to high quality learning* by providing conditions and environments that enable them to learn and progress to their highest potential. If there are methodologies or practice that interfere with access for some of the students, educators are responsible to replace them with more equitable and appropriate arrangements (Goodlad & Keating, 1994).

Nurturing Pedagogy: BYU believes that education professionals have a moral obligation to *practice nurturing pedagogy* (Goodlad, 1990, 1994; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990). This is evident in their service as they commit themselves to the intellectual, social, and emotional growth of all students. This commitment includes understanding and sensitively responding to students' needs, as well as implementing pedagogies and creating learning environments that genuinely support and cultivate their growth and development. Nurturing pedagogies are designed to assist all students in fully realizing their potential.

Enculturation for Democracy: BYU believes that education professionals have a moral obligation to prepare young people for participation in our social and political democracy (Goodlad, 1990, 1994; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990). The skills and knowledge gained through public education should serve one primary purpose: the development of democratic character. Those who have democratic character understand and embrace the responsibilities of citizenship, deploy their learning and knowledge in the service of others, possess critical thinking

skills, model civility, and know how to problem solve and communicate respectfully with others. They thoroughly understand their roles in living and growing together, serving families, communities, and nations throughout the world. BYU believes that all who work personally and professionally with young people must provide the conditions and contexts for developing skills which are necessary for functional citizenship (Goodlad, 1990, 1994; Goodlad & McMannon, 1997; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003) (ER.CF.A.) and should live as examples worthy of emulation.

(Brigham Young University, 2012c)

APPENDIX 17: Brigham Young University – Candidate Dispositional Scales

CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONAL SCALES

Course: _____ Semester _____ BYU ID _____

SECTION I:

Decide to what extent you agree or disagree with the idea expressed in each of the statements listed below. If you are not currently employed as a teacher, choose the answer that best describes how you believe you would most likely perform as a teacher. Do not exaggerate. Be as honest as you can. Respond to every item; do not leave any blank.

1. I accept the responsibility to help all students in my class to learn.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
2. If my classroom is going to have a positive learning environment, it has to start with me.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
3. Part of my job is to help every student meet the academic standards of our school.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
4. It is my responsibility as a teacher to ensure that all students achieve to their potential.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
5. It is my job to take the initiative to contact the parent(s) of any child who is struggling in my class.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
6. I regularly participate in teacher improvement workshops and programs.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
7. I have the responsibility to create a positive learning climate for my class.
 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree

-
8. I have the responsibility to create lesson plans that are effective and that meet the needs of my students.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
9. Part of my job is to make myself available when my students need my help.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
10. When one of my students has a learning problem that I don't know how to solve, I take responsibility to get help from other professionals (e.g., another teacher, a counselor, a social worker, a principal).
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
11. When I make lesson plans, I consciously try to meet the needs of every individual student.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
12. I accept the responsibility to keep up to date with new developments that will help me become a more effective teacher.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
13. When I don't know the answer to a students' question, I take the responsibility to help students find an answer.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree
14. I have a responsibility to work with school administrators, parent groups, and other teachers to create a positive learning environment throughout our school.
- 4 Strongly Agree 3 Agree 2 Disagree 1 Strongly Disagree

SECTION II:

In your work as a teacher, how frequently do you personally engage in or perform each of the activities listed below? If you are not currently employed as a teacher, choose the answer that best describes how you believe you would most likely perform. Do not exaggerate. Be as honest as you can. Select the answer which best describes you. Respond to every item; do not leave any blank.

1. I actively seek opportunities to learn more about the subjects I will teach.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
2. I integrate new insights from research into the classes and subjects that I teach.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
3. I strive to be responsive to the needs and interests of each student.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
4. I seek input from my principal and fellow teachers to help me better understand my weaknesses and blind spots as a teacher.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
5. I try to be open to suggestions and constructive feedback that will help me become a more effective teacher.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
6. I work at learning how to better assess my students' progress so that I can become a better teacher.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
7. I willingly try new teaching methods even if it means that I have to step out of my comfort zone.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never
8. I try to encourage all students to make the most of their opportunities to learn.
 4 Always 3 Usually 2 Sometimes 1 Never

9. I write out my goals for how I can improve my teaching.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
10. I try to learn how students' needs differ so that I can adapt my teaching to meet those needs.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
11. I talk with my peers about how I can be a better teacher.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
12. I work to improve the overall learning environment in my classroom by collaborating with other professionals.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
13. I talk with other educators about my hopes for students in my class.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
14. I take the time needed to stay current on new developments in the subject matter I will teach.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
15. I read more than is required in my teacher preparation classes.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |
16. I welcome feedback about my teaching and try to use it to help me improve my skills as a teacher.
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never |

8. When working with others, I clearly communicate objectives that are relevant to their context and potential.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
9. When working with others, I assist them to succeed by providing adequate support/resources (e.g., technology collaboration with other professionals, family members, community organizations).
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
10. I recognize the backgrounds and worldviews of others and attempt to strengthen our relationship when meaningful differences occur.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
11. I know enough about second language learning, acculturation, and developmental processes to adjust my own behavior to effectively meet the needs of the people I serve.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
12. I communicate in ways that others can easily understand, providing examples relevant to *their experience and world views*.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
13. When attempting to help others, I utilize a variety of intervention and assessment techniques appropriate for their background and abilities.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
14. When making decisions that concern others, I include stakeholders in the decision process and seek equitable solutions.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
15. I assess the outcomes of those I have attempted to help/instruct and work to reduce any gaps in achievement across different groups (e.g., race, socioeconomic status).
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent
16. I evaluate my own performance to better meet the needs of individuals with different backgrounds and abilities.
- 5 4 3 2 1
- Very Competent Not Competent

A Conceptual Framework for Professional Education at Teachers College

Consistent with the College's long tradition of serving the needs of urban and suburban schools in the United States and around the world, the vision and purpose of professional education at Teachers College is to establish and maintain programs of study, service, and research that prepare competent, caring, and qualified professional educators (teachers, counselors, psychologists, administrators, and others). This vision is based on three shared philosophical stances that underlie and infuse the work we do:

Inquiry stance: We are an inquiry-based and practice-oriented community. We and our students & graduates challenge assumptions and complacency and embrace a stance of inquiry toward the inter-related roles of learner, teacher, and leader in P-12 schools.

Curricular stance: Negotiating among multiple perspectives on culture, content, and context, our graduates strive to meet the needs of diverse learners, both students and other adults, in their school communities.

Social justice stance: Our graduates choose to collaborate across differences in and beyond their school communities. They demonstrate a commitment to social justice and to serving the world while imagining its possibilities.

The three philosophical stances provide the context for developing and assessing candidates' proficiencies based on professional, state, and institutional standards. There are five TC standards:

Standard 1: Inquirers and Reflective Practitioners: Our candidates are inquirers/ researchers who have breadth of knowledge and a variety of tools to ask questions about educational environments. They reflect on and continually evaluate the effects of their choices on others (children, families, and other professionals in the learning community).

Standard 2: Lifelong Learners: Our candidates are continually engaged in learning and research. They take responsibility for their professional growth and seek/create learning opportunities for themselves and others.

Standard 3: Learner-Centered Educators/Professionals: Our candidates understand their subject matter/disciplines, learners and learning, and curriculum and teaching. They create learning experiences that foster development and achievement in all students.

Standard 4: Effective Collaborators: Our candidates actively participate in the community or communities of whom they are a part to support students' learning and well-being.

Standard 5: Advocates of Social Justice and Diversity: Our candidates are familiar with legal, ethical, and policy issues. They provide leadership in advocating for children, families, and themselves in a variety of professional, political, and policy-making contexts.

APPENDIX 19: Teachers College– Expectations of Teacher Preparation Program

Expectations of Teacher Preparation Programs at Teachers College – Learning Outcomes for Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Table B: Master Domain of Learning Outcomes

<p><u>Stance:</u> INQUIRY</p>	<p><u>TC Standard 1.</u> Inquirers and Reflective Practitioners</p>	<p><u>Knowledge</u> K1.1 Research and Inquiry Methods K1.2 Relationship between Research and Practice</p> <p><u>Skills</u> S1.1 Self-critique and Reflection S1.2 Application of Research to Practice S1.3 Use of Research and Inquiry Methods in Practice</p> <p><u>Dispositions</u> D1.1 Open-mindedness and Commitment to Inquiry and Reflection</p>
<p><u>Stance:</u> INQUIRY</p>	<p><u>TC Standard 2.</u> Responsible and Lifelong Learners</p>	<p><u>Knowledge</u> K2.1 Continuum of Lifelong Learning K2.2 Issues of Professional Concern</p> <p><u>Skills</u> S2.1 Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of Professional Growth</p> <p><u>Dispositions</u> D2.1 Commitment to the Profession, Ethics, and Lifelong Learning D2.2 Commitment to Leadership</p>
<p><u>Stance:</u> CURRICULUM</p>	<p><u>TC Standard 3.</u> Learner-Centered Educators/Professionals</p>	<p><u>Knowledge</u> K3.1 Subject-Matter or Disciplinary Knowledge K3.2 Knowledge about Learners and Learning K3.3 Knowledge about Curriculum and Teaching</p> <p><u>Skills</u> S3.1 Planning of Curriculum and/or Services S3.2 Implementation of Instruction and/or Services S3.3 Social Behavior Management/Classroom Management S3.4 Assessment and Evaluation</p> <p><u>Dispositions</u> D3.1 Commitment to the Fullest Possible Growth and Development of All Students</p>
<p><u>Stance:</u> SOCIAL JUSTICE</p>	<p><u>TC Standard 4.</u> Effective Collaborators</p>	<p><u>Knowledge</u> K4.1 Processes and Strategies of Effective Cooperation and Collaboration</p> <p><u>Skills</u> S4.1 Interaction and Collaboration</p> <p><u>Dispositions</u> D4.1 Willingness to Collaborate</p>
<p><u>Stance:</u> SOCIAL JUSTICE</p>	<p><u>TC Standard 5.</u> Advocates of Social Justice and Diversity</p>	<p><u>Knowledge</u> K5.1 Democracy, Equity, and Schooling</p> <p><u>Skills</u> S5.1 Use of Strategies to Address Inequalities in the Classroom, School, and Society</p> <p><u>Dispositions</u> D5.1 Respect for Diversity and Commitment to Social Justice</p>

APPENDIX 20: Teachers College – Attributes of a Social Justice Stance as Chosen By Faculty

Purposes	Attitudes	Approaches
Develop critical perspectives in teachers about schools, schooling, teaching, learning, curriculum.	Value and understand diverse learners.	Use culturally responsive pedagogy.
Prepare teachers to work toward equity in society.	Engage in reflective practice.	Integrate life experiences of students and teaching into curriculum.
Prepare teachers for teaching in a democratic society.	View teaching as a moral and political act.	Create a community of learning.
Prepare teachers who will facilitate social change.	Take an inquiry stance toward teaching.	Adopt inclusive practices.
Prepare teachers to engage in social action.	Understand role of power and oppression in society.	Run a democratic classroom.

(Teachers College, 2005; p. 60-61)

APPENDIX 21: The Ohio State University – Philosophy of Unit: Initial Teacher Preparation.

Knowledge

- Possess a solid general education foundation, including a breadth of knowledge and a commitment to lifelong learning.
- Possess a strong grounding in the subject-matter knowledge they plan to teach.
- Possess a firm understanding of professional, pedagogical content and pedagogical knowledge and the development and use of theory, research, the wisdom of practice and education policies to inform and enhance their own professional practices and the learning and practices of others.

Skills

- Are independent, creative and critical thinkers and problem solvers.
- Are reflective practitioners who are self-critical, flexible, and adaptive.
- Are effective communicators with a wide variety of audiences.
- Are collaborative members of a community of learners.
- Are active participants in partnerships with the broader community in terms of economical development, democratic citizenship and ethical practices.

Dispositions

- Honor diversity and worth of individuals, cultures, backgrounds, ideas and philosophies, across all ethnicities, genders, disabilities, socioeconomic levels and other characteristics.
- Are passionate about their beliefs that all students can advance their affective and cognitive growth and development through lifelong learning, ensuring depth of knowledge in the subject-matter they plan to teach, providing differentiated instruction and using multiple data sources to inform instruction.
- Value effort and hard work, quality, the persistence to achieve and the skills of others.
- Have a sense of efficacy by attributing students' success in meeting learning goals to factors within the classroom and school, and value, encourage, and provide opportunities for all students to meet reasonable standards and expectations.

(The Ohio State University, 2012b; p. 3-4)

APPENDIX 22: The Ohio State University – Proficiencies Expected of All Candidates – Dispositions (Knowledge and Skills removed)

PROFICIENCIES EXPECTED OF ALL CANDIDATES ACROSS THE UNIT

In keeping with the mission, philosophy and goals described earlier, the following serve as the proficiencies expected of all candidates across the Unit engaged in initial teacher preparation. These candidate proficiencies provide direction for developing and aligning the curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices and assessments of candidates.

C. Professional Dispositions

Candidates shall demonstrate:

- 1.1 An appreciation for the subject matter they plan to teach.
- 1.2 An appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter they plan to teach has on current society and culture.
- 1.3 An appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change.
- 1.4 An appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities, and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels.
- 1.5 A belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations.
- 1.6 A willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups.
- 1.7 A willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning.

(The Ohio State University, 2012b; p. 68)

APPENDIX 23: The Ohio State University – Professional Dispositions Assessment I, II.

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 01 AC
Professional Dispositions Assessment I**
(to be completed by Admissions Committee)

*Decision pt 1
Admission*

DIRECTIONS: Based on evidence gathered from transcript reviews, letters of reference, a personal statement of intent and/or a personal interview with the admissions committee, use the rubric for each statement below to indicate the applicant's potential for developing the respective expectation.

- 1.1 The applicant has an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she plans to teach**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation
- 1.2 The applicant has an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he plans to teach has on current society and culture**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation
- 1.3 The applicant has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 01 AC
Professional Dispositions Assessment I
(to be completed by Admissions Committee)**

- 1.4 **The applicant has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation
- 1.5 **The applicant has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation
- 1.6 **The applicant has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 01 AC
Professional Dispositions Assessment I
(to be completed by Admissions Committee)**

- 1.7 **The applicant has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning**
- 0 Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
 - 1 There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 2 There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 3 There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
 - 4 There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

ACTION TAKEN BY ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

- applicant granted admission
- applicant needs to demonstrate further performances prior to admission
- applicant should be removed from consideration for admission

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 02 US
Professional Dispositions Assessment II**
(to be completed by university supervisor)

Dec. Pt 2:3
Completion of
Unit Assessment
field experience.

DIRECTIONS: Using the rubric for the candidate proficiencies below, which are derived from the unit's conceptual framework for initial teacher preparation, assess the candidate's current level of demonstration of each respective disposition.

- 1.1 **The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she plans to teach**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation
- 1.2 **The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he plans to teach has on current society and culture**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation
- 1.3 **The candidate demonstrates an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 02 US
Professional Dispositions Assessment II
(to be completed by university supervisor)**

- 1.4 **The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation
- 1.5 **The candidate demonstrates a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation
- 1.6 **The candidate demonstrates a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation
-

**Initial Teacher Preparation
Assessment: ITP PD 02 US
Professional Dispositions Assessment II**
(to be completed by university supervisor)

- 1.7 **The candidate demonstrates a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning**
- 0 The candidate *never* demonstrates the expectation
 - 1 Above level 0, but below level 2
 - 2 The candidate *sometimes* demonstrates the expectation
 - 3 Above level 2, but below level 4
 - 4 The candidate *always* demonstrates the expectation

APPENDIX 24: The University of Minnesota – List of Undergraduate Disposition Expectations.

The College of Education and Human Development has identified the following as dispositions that students must demonstrate in order to be recommended for teacher licensure. Although the undergraduate major does not result in licensure, it is important for students to develop these dispositions during their time in the elementary education foundations major as they prepare for the initial licensure program. Your performance on these professional competencies will be evaluated during your clinical experiences as well as in your university classes.

Professional Conduct

- Accepts Responsibility
- Completes assignments on time
- Carries out assignments independently when needed
- Arrives on time
- Presents self in a manner appropriate to the setting

Professional Qualities

- Adapts easily to changing circumstances
- Seeks and accepts the suggestions of others
- Demonstrates ability and willingness to self-assess
- Shows appreciation for diversity
- Responds appropriately to issues of bias and discrimination as they arise
- Takes initiative in making a contribution to the learning community
- Demonstrates enthusiasm about the subject matter
- Demonstrates a commitment to the individual student
- Expresses responsibility for helping all students achieve

Communication and Collaboration

- Collaborates effectively with others
- Uses good judgement in interactions with others
- Displays sensitivity in interacting with others
- Behaves ethically in dealings with others
- Respects and responds appropriately to differences in point of view
- Demonstrates effective written communication skills
- Demonstrates effective oral communication skills
- Demonstrates a commitment to working with families

(The University of Minnesota, 2012a)

APPENDIX 25: The University of Minnesota – Clinical Experiences Handbook: Responsibilities and Dispositions Expected of Student Teachers.

The responsibilities and dispositions listed here are expected of student teachers in all initial licensure programs across the College of Education and Human Development. Student teachers will find that careful observance of these responsibilities and dispositions will contribute to the successful culmination of their clinical teaching experiences. Additional responsibilities and activities will be determined by each program area.

- Maintain a student-centered approach. Make instructional decisions based on the well-being of the students.
- Demonstrate respect for the individual differences and cultures of students. Maintain confidentiality of students' personal, social emotional, intellectual, and academic status.
- Become familiar with the school and community of the student teaching placement.
- Maintain the hours required of regular teachers. Be punctual and arrive prepared to teach.
- Communicate with the cooperating teacher and other school personnel immediately if an absence must occur. Communicate the absence to the University supervisor, particularly when a supervisory visit has been scheduled for that particular day or time.
- Assume primary responsibility for all teaching assignments as they have been planned with the cooperating teacher and University supervisor.
- Prepare instructional units in advance and review lesson plans with the cooperating teacher prior to instruction. Be creative and take risks in planning some new activities.
- Accept responsibilities assigned by the cooperating teacher. Participate in the same school activities and extra duties required of the cooperating teacher.
- Demonstrate initiative by finding ways to contribute to the classroom and the school.
- Actively participate in three-way conferences with the cooperating teacher and the University supervisor. Receive feedback in a constructive, open manner. Clearly communicate questions and concerns to both the cooperating teacher and the University supervisor.
- Actively seek regular feedback on student teaching performance and reflect on its impact on students.
- Collect and organize teaching materials for portfolio development.
- Attend the regularly scheduled student teaching seminars at the University.

(The University of Minnesota, 2012b)

APPENDIX 26: The University of Minnesota – Dispositions Assessment

TEDS Disposition

Page 1 of 3

[Return to: TEDS Home](#)

[Logout](#)

TEACHER EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM

Dispositions Assessment - Evaluation form

Student Name: [Learner, Ed](#)

Student ID: 1234567

Address: 123 Pleasant St, Somewhere Nice, MN, 12345

Email: learner@umn.edu

Phone:

FERPA:  [Print address and phone # in the directory](#) [More information](#)

Indicate whether you have concerns or confidence about the student's performance on the following dispositions. Please mark N, "No opportunity to observe," if you haven't had the chance to develop an opinion on the student's performance in a particular area.

- 1 = The student **falls below expectations**. (I have **concerns** about the student's performance in this area.)
2 = The student **meets expectations**. (I have **confidence** in the student's performance in this area.)

N = No opportunity to observe

REMINDER: Data submitted into the Teacher Education Data System is part of the student's educational record to which the student may request access. In addition, data may be viewed by TEDS users.

Mark all dispositions **2, meets expectations**

Professional Conduct

1 2 N

Accepts responsibilities

Comments:

[view all](#)

Completes assignments on time

Comments:

[view all](#)

Carries out assignments independently when needed

Comments:

Arrives on time

Comments:

[view all](#)

Presents self in a manner appropriate to the setting

Comments:

Professional Qualities

1 2 N

Adapts easily to changing circumstances

Comments:

Seeks and accepts suggestions of others

Comments:

[view all](#)

<https://intranet.education.umn.edu/sps/teds/Disposition.asp>

7/28/2005

Demonstrates ability and willingness to self-assess

Comments:

Shows appreciation for diversity

Comments:

Responds appropriately to issues of bias and discrimination as they arise

Comments:
[view all](#)

Takes initiative in making a contribution to the learning community

Comments:
[view all](#)

Demonstrates enthusiasm about the subject matter

Comments:

Demonstrates a commitment to the individual student

Comments:

Expresses responsibility for helping all students achieve

Comments:

Communication and Collaboration

1 2 N

Collaborates effectively with others

Comments:
[view all](#)

Uses good judgment in interactions with others

Comments:
[view all](#)

Displays sensitivity in interacting with others

Comments:
[view all](#)

Behaves ethically in dealings with others

Comments:

Respects and responds appropriately to differences in point of view

Comments:

Demonstrates effective written communication skills

Comments:

Demonstrates effective oral communication skills



Comments:

Demonstrates a commitment to working with families



Comments:

©2005 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.
The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

[Provide feedback](#) | [Trouble seeing the text?](#)
Last modified on January 06, 2005

TEACHER EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM

Dispositions Assessment - Comment form

Student Name: [Learner, Ed](#)

Student ID: 1234567

Address: 123 Pleasant St, Somewhere Nice, MN, 12345

Email: learner@umn.edu

Phone:

FERPA:  [Print address and phone # in the directory](#) [More information](#)

REMINDER: Data submitted into the Teacher Education Data System is part of the student's educational record to which the student may request access. In addition, data may be viewed by TEDS users.

Comment

This comment applies to: (Mark all that apply)

Professional Conduct

- Accepts responsibilities
- Completes assignments on time
- Carries out assignments independently when needed
- Arrives on time
- Presents self in a manner appropriate to the setting

Professional Qualities

- Adapts easily to changing circumstances
- Seeks and accepts suggestions of others
- Demonstrates ability and willingness to self-assess
- Shows appreciation for diversity
- Responds appropriately to issues of bias and discrimination as they arise
- Takes initiative in making a contribution to the learning community
- Demonstrates enthusiasm about the subject matter
- Demonstrates a commitment to the individual student
- Expresses responsibility for helping all students achieve

Communication and Collaboration

- Collaborates effectively with others
- Uses good judgment in interactions with others
- Displays sensitivity in interacting with others
- Behaves ethically in dealings with others
- Respects and responds appropriately to differences in point of view

TEDS Disposition Comment

Page 2 of 2

Demonstrates effective written communication skills

Demonstrates effective oral communication skills

Demonstrates a commitment to working with families

submit

©2005 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.
The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

[Provide feedback](#) | [Trouble seeing the text?](#)
Last modified on January 06, 2005