

TNE Year End Report  
**STICC Study Group**  
2006-07 (Year 5)

**What was proposed?**

Two complementary studies were proposed:

- 1) A study focused on program improvement – What are the attributes of CSUN’s partnership schools that support candidate preparation?
  
- 2) A research study focused on program improvement and candidate learning – What are the effects of increased collaboration/coordination for effective clinical practice at partnership school sites? Do student teachers implement the pedagogy they have been taught in methods courses?

**What was accomplished?**

Instruments were developed for both studies:

- 1) Partnership Conversation Protocol – to ascertain the attributes of clinical practice currently in place at partnership school sites and TNE clinical sites.
  
- 2) Student Teacher Pre- and Post-Survey – to ascertain student teachers’ perceptions about the effectiveness of clinical practice experiences at their respective school sites.

Master Teacher Pre- and Post-Survey – to ascertain master/cooperating teachers’ perceptions about the effectiveness of clinical practice experiences at their respective school sites.

Both studies were conducted and data were collected. For this to happen, each of the three teacher education departments – Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education – identified a faculty member to serve as a University Liaison and selected six partnership schools. The Associate Dean in the College of Education wrote a letter to the principals of the 18 schools inviting them to engage in a new project, the CSUN/LAUSD Teacher Education Partnership. All 18 principals responded favorably. Their schools are:

*Elementary*  
Arminta  
Canterbury  
Fernangeles  
Liggett  
Noble  
Ranchito

*Secondary*  
CHIME MS  
Granada Hills HS  
Poly HS  
Sutter MS  
Vaughn MS  
Vista MS

*Special Education*  
CHIME Elementary  
Colfax Elementary  
Marlton (P-12)  
Monroe HS  
Mt. Gleason MS  
Northridge Academy HS

Additionally, Langdon Elementary School and Sepulveda Middle School, two TNE sites, participated in the study. In Spring 2008, some students in the TNE cohort were placed at Gledhill and Lassen Elementary Schools to fulfill their final student teaching assignment. As a result, ultimately 22 schools were involved in the project.

As a member of the CSUN/LAUSD Teacher Education Partnership, the principal agreed to the following: 1) participate in a Partnership Conversation with CSUN representatives; 2) select a P-12 Site Coordinator (receiving a stipend from CSUN) to collaborate with a University Liaison (receiving reassigned time or stipend from CSUN) to plan and conduct a series of activities tailored for the school site that supports the work of student teachers, master/cooperating teachers, and university supervisors; and to identify ways to improve connections and communication between the school and CSUN; and 3) allow CSUN to administer to both master/cooperating teachers and student teachers a pre- and post-survey for the purpose of gathering evidence to inform us as we strengthen our collaboration.

During December 2006 and January 2007, the Partnership Conversations took place. For each conversation, a team of two CSUN faculty – the University Liaison and a STICC member – traveled to the school site to visit with the principal and the individual the principal selected to serve as the P-12 Site Coordinator for the project and/or another master/cooperating teacher. All teams posed the nine questions from the Partnership Conversation Protocol that had been sent to the principal prior to the meeting. Each conversation lasted approximately one hour and team members took notes.

At the end of Fall 2006, student teachers at the 18 partnerships schools and Langdon and Sepulveda completed the Student Teacher Pre-Survey. Also, at the end of Fall 2006 and the early part of Spring 2007 (prior to student teachers being placed for the spring term), master/cooperating teachers at these same schools completed the Master Teacher Pre-Survey.

Throughout the spring semester, each of the three University Liaison traveled to their respective six school sites to meet individually with the P-12 Site Coordinators. At each site the Liaison and Coordinator planned activities for student teachers and master/cooperating teachers (the intervention). The University Liaisons logged their activities at each site. At Langdon and Sepulveda the coordination activities that had been in place for two and a half years continued; they were also extended to Gledhill and Lassen.

At the conclusion of the spring semester, student teachers at the 22 school sites completed the Student Teacher Post-Survey, while the master/cooperating teachers at these same schools completed the Master Teacher Post-Survey.

In Fall 2006, all student teachers fulfilling their first student teaching assignment at the above named schools, minus Gledhill and Lassen, were evaluated via online student teaching evaluation forms. Student teachers completing their second student teaching assignment were evaluated via both online student teaching evaluation forms and

portfolio rubrics. In Spring 2007, all student teachers fulfilling their first student teaching assignment at all 22 schools were evaluated via online student teaching evaluation forms, while those completing their second student teaching assignment were evaluated via both online student teaching evaluation forms and portfolio rubrics.

Currently, all data sets (Partnership Conversations, University Liaison Logs, Student Teacher Pre- and Post-Surveys, Master Teacher Pre- and Post-Surveys, Student Teaching Evaluations, and Portfolios) are being analyzed. With no unforeseen circumstances, the STICC Study Group anticipates completion of its work by the end of September or the early part of October.

### **Who was involved and what was the nature of their involvement?**

The Student Teaching and Internship Coordination Committee (STICC) is a large committee whose membership includes chairs and faculty serving as student teaching/intern coordinators from three departments (Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education) as well as representatives from the Credential Office and the Associate Dean. Early on, it was recognized that a committee of 13 could not conduct a study. Therefore, a subset of STICC was formed. This group included:

- Nancy Burstein, Chair, Special Education
- Arlinda Eaton, Associate Dean, College of Education
- Bonnie Ericson, Chair, Secondary Education
- David Kretschmer, Chair, Elementary Education
- Nancy Prosenjak, Professor, Elementary Education and TNE Cohort Coordinator
- Sally Spencer, Lecturer, Special Education and Student Teaching Coordinator

All members of the subset of STICC, known as the STICC Study Group, were involved in multiple meetings in order to:

- select partnership schools,
- develop the pre- and post-surveys for both student teachers and master/cooperating teachers,
- monitor the progress of the study, and
- analyze the multiple data sets (minus Sally Spencer).

The three University Liaisons (Julie Gainsburg, FT SED faculty; Greg Messigian, PT SPED faculty; Robin Tallas, PT EED faculty) joined the STICC Study Group for several meetings in order to:

- develop guidelines for the University Liaisons,
- develop guidelines for the P-12 Site Coordinators,
- develop the Partnership Conversation Protocol, and
- analyze the multiple data sets (minus Greg Messigian and Robin Tallas).

Arlinda Eaton assisted the project by:

- writing and disseminating a letter of invitation to the principals of the partnership schools.

The University Liaisons fulfilled the following responsibilities:

- conducted Partnership Conversations in conjunction with STICC Study Group members and three other STICC members (Elaine Adelman, Steve Holle, Pam Sierra-Scherban),
- worked with 18 P-12 Site Coordinators to increase collaboration/coordination efforts throughout Spring 2007, and
- assisted with the administration of the pre- and post-surveys.

Sally Spencer assisted the project by:

- placing online (SurveyMonkey) both the Student Teacher and Master Teacher Pre- and Post-Surveys.

Beverly Cabello assisted the project by:

- cleaning data extracted from the data warehouse,
- generating student teaching and portfolio analyses using data extracted from the data warehouse, and
- meeting with the STICC Study Group on several occasions to accomplish the above.

Nancy Burstein, Arlinda Eaton, Bonnie Ericson, and David Kretschmer are currently in the process of analyzing and writing up the findings, both quantitative and qualitative.

### **What challenges did you face?**

The late approval process for conducting research studies in AY 2006-07 presented a real challenge. Department chairs needed to identify University Liaisons and provide them with reassigned time to participate in the project long before the studies were officially approved. Similarly, the selection of partnership schools, the dissemination of the letter of invitation to participate in the CSUN/LAUSD Teacher Education Partnership, the development of the Partnership Conversation Protocol, and the development of the pre- and post-surveys for student teachers and master/cooperating teachers needed to happen prior to the studies being granted approval. The STICC Study Group was uncomfortable moving forward without knowing the final disposition of our proposals; however, time was of the essence. If the group had waited until official approval was granted, we would not have been able to accomplish the studies.

A standing committee, such as STICC, cannot assume the responsibility of conducting research studies. This we discovered quickly as we found ourselves not getting to the regular business of the committee. It became necessary to schedule a separate series of meetings in order to conduct the TNE studies. With a committee of 13, it was impossible to find times that would allow everyone to participate. Therefore, a subset of STICC, the STICC Study Group, was formed.

Four of the six STICC Study Group members serve as administrators (three department chairs and the Associate Dean). There was no reassigned time for them, nor were there stipends available to compensate them for the significant amount of work that went into

the studies during the academic year. These individuals simply added the workload created by the studies to their already full agendas.

Stipends for the three department chairs and other faculty who continued the work of the studies during the summer months helped tremendously. However, it is not advisable to analyze data about a particular department when representation from that department is not present. The summer vacations scheduled by the individuals involved in analyzing the various data sets and writing up the findings did not conjoin, thereby making it extremely difficult to advance the research agenda throughout the summer.

The amount of time and the number of meetings required to clean the data extracted from the data warehouse were unanticipated. If what we experienced is typical, then extended periods of time will need to be built into the time lines of future research studies. Additional cleaning resulted from our efforts to reconcile the data extracted from the data warehouse and the data extracted from SurveyMonkey.

Conducting a study that involves three different programs presents an interesting challenge. Although the programs are similar in many ways, there are unique features that need to be considered (e.g., specializations and subject areas) and suggest that clinical practice in one program may need to differ from that in another program.

More challenges are forthcoming once the STICC Study Group completes its analyses.

**What did you learn?**

Forthcoming

**What changes will be made as a result of this work?**

Forthcoming

9/3/07  
Arlinda Eaton, MDE College of Education