

Revisiting clinical supervision:

**“Focused observation”
of
teacher candidates
in the
practicum setting**

by

**Nancy Foster, Peel District School Board
Akane Nishimoto, Toronto District School Board
Celia Haig-Brown, Faculty of Education, York University**

Paper prepared for the conference

Totems and Taboos: Risk and Relevance in Research on Teachers and Teaching

Annual Meeting of the
International Study Association for Teachers and Teaching

Brock University, July 5-9, 2007

INTRODUCTION:

The supervisor's first commitment is to the dignity and human worth of the teachers s/he serves and his/her function is the improvement of teaching. (Morris Cogan, 1973, p.24)

Following the work of Russell Bishop, Mere Berryman and Rangiwhakaehu Walker,¹ we seek to work with teacher candidates in a way that leads them to become self-determining professionals who are fully aware that they work in schools, school boards and communities within a context of interdependence. Over the course of the 2005-06 academic year, we began to systematically explore supervision practices and assess those that teacher candidates perceive to be most useful in helping them to become technically skilled and more independent and reflective. We conducted a series of interviews with teacher candidates and course directors² surrounding supervision practices and experiences in the practicum setting. The results were rich and fascinating. Taking us in unanticipated directions, we see them as an important source for our next steps in thinking through questions related to supervision of student teachers.

What did we find and what questions were stimulated through our conversations? Although it was not the original focus of the study, underlying

¹ These concepts come up in a number of works out of the Te Kotahitanga project in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In this case they are drawn from the paper given by the three mentioned and Tom Cavanagh at the American Educational Research Association meetings in San Francisco in 2006. See list of references for other sources related to this project. See also website <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=index&indexID=5875&indexparentid=5871> or simply type Te Kotahitanga into a search engine.

² The terms teacher candidates and student teachers and course director and faculty advisors, respectively, are used interchangeably in this paper. Course directors are university-based and host teachers are classroom-based educators.

all of what was said by teacher candidates is a concern with the quality of their relationships with the host teacher and course director, with the former being perceived as having by far the greatest significance. The development of a trusting relationship in which authentic feedback is provided by a credible individual on an ongoing basis and is explored through respectful discourse was the most pervasive theme that the interviews revealed. Teacher candidates remained conscious of the power differentials inherent in the various roles and found this awareness could foster a positive or negative dimension, depending upon the relationship with the supervisor³; in all cases it was something that had to be carefully navigated. Finally, teacher candidates identified a variety of factors that supported or mitigated against self-reflecting and developing confidence in the classroom. The findings raise important questions about the selection and support of host teachers, the role of faculty advisors, and the structure of teacher education programs with embedded practicum experiences.⁴

THE CONTEXT

York University's Faculty of Education offers both concurrent and consecutive Bachelor of Education Programs. In the former, students pursue their undergraduate B.A./B.Sc./BFA/BES and B.Ed. degrees concurrently over a

³ Supervisor may refer to either host teacher or faculty advisor.

⁴ Our thanks to Britzman, Dipbo, Searle, and Pitt in the "*Report of the Academic Framework Committee*" (1995) for making the distinction between **teacher training** which fosters dependency (p.10) and the "over-reliance on acquiring and delivering preordained technique(s)" (p.5) and advocated a program of **teacher education** for York's Faculty of Education.

four or five year period, three years of which include community/school practicum placements. Alternatively, students may enter the nine month intensive consecutive program following the completion of a minimum of one undergraduate degree. Here they focus full-time on teacher education with the goal of achieving their B.Ed. Acceptance into the consecutive education program is highly competitive and Teacher Candidates generally bring to the program a breadth of life and community experiences, many involving previous teaching and/or other career-related experiences as well as additional degrees at the graduate level.

York University's I/S⁵ consecutive education program is delivered predominantly at three satellite campuses that are located in public schools in the Greater Toronto Area: Ajax High School in Durham Region, Parkdale Collegiate Institute in Toronto and T.L. Kennedy Secondary School in Mississauga. MST⁶, a fourth I/S site, is located on the main campus in York Region and has a slightly different delivery model than the other sites. Regardless of site, Teacher Candidates begin the year in August with an orientation week, followed by an Observation Week in their Host Schools which coincides with the first week of school for grades K - 12. Thereafter, Teacher Candidates devote 1-2 days/week observing/assisting/teaching in their Host

⁵ I/S refers to the Intermediate/Senior teaching division which qualifies teachers to teach from grades 7 – 12 in Ontario. Teacher Candidates in the I/S division must complete two teachable subjects (herein referred to as *Teachables*). Teachables are taught on the main campus while Teacher Candidates complete the remaining 18.0 credits at the satellite campus to which they are admitted.

⁶ MST refers to Math, Science, Technology, a theme-based rather than geographically-defined site.

Schools and complete three practicum blocks, ranging from 2.5-5 weeks in length. The three satellite campuses maintain the same practicum schedule: the first teaching block of approximately 4 weeks in November/December focuses on one of the I/S candidate's teachable subjects, a second brief teaching block of approximately 2.5 weeks at the Intermediate level⁷ takes place in February, and a final block of 4-5 weeks in the remaining teachable subject at the secondary level takes place in April/May. There is some variation from site to site and even within sites as to the number of schools a teacher candidate is placed at; some remain at one school for both secondary placements while others are placed in two different schools. The MST program is similar to the three satellite campuses, the major difference being that Teacher Candidates complete their Intermediate⁸ requirement at the secondary level rather than having a separate elementary placement.

Supervision Model

The consecutive program evolved out of the concurrent education program and was adapted as necessary to fit the condensed timeframe of a one year program. It allows for site-based decisions that make sense within the context of the school boards in which Teacher Candidates are placed at each

⁷ This is referred to as the *Elementary Block*. Teacher Candidates are generally immersed in a K- 8, or 5/6 - 8 school in order to gain insight into the early adolescent learner and gain firsthand knowledge of what it means to teach as a generalist rather than subject specialist. For most, this is a very different experience than their first and final teaching blocks which take place at the secondary level in their subject areas.

⁸ Intermediate includes grades 9 and 10.

satellite campus. Seconded faculty⁹ are replaced at each site on a three year basis and specific supervision practices are passed down through a strong oral tradition with local variations. The supervision structure, however, remains consistent from site-to-site and includes host teachers who provide day-to-day or week-to-week guidance, site coordinators or adjunct professors who liaise between teacher candidates/host teachers and the university, and course directors who are ultimately responsible for the teacher candidate's evaluation of the practicum.

By 2004-05, course directors were utilizing a variety of assessment and evaluation tools to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities for the practicum as they interpreted from the *"Practicum Partners"* handbook. During the 2004-05 academic year it was decided that although I/S teacher candidates were dispersed across a fairly large geographic area and their identities appeared to be more firmly connected with their consecutive sites rather than the Faculty as a whole, it might be beneficial to take a consistent approach to assessment and evaluation from site to site. This focus stimulated some fundamental questions such as: *What is the purpose of supervision? How can supervision be used to promote the self-determination of Teacher Candidates?* Thus, the primary researchers decided to delve into questions of supervision.

METHODOLOGY & LIMITATIONS

The primary researchers met in May of 2005 in preparation for the 2005-06 academic year and decided to begin implementing a variation of clinical

⁹ Seconded faculty refers to faculty who are *on loan* from their school boards to the university usually for a period of three years.

supervision, a useful model for observing teachers at work in their classrooms, first defined by Robert Goldhammer (1969) and further developed by Morris Cogan (1973). Clinical supervision, as defined by Goldhammer and Cogan, involves the cooperative relationship between the learning teacher and the supervising teacher, where planning of lessons takes place along with inquiry-based discussions on student learning. The initial model consisted of five steps (pre-observation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference, post-conference analysis), and these steps have been further modified and adapted by later researchers and practitioners. In our version of the model, teacher candidates were asked by their course directors to pre-define specific areas of their teaching practice that they wanted to have observed and discussed. Furthermore, we hoped to use the model to guide teacher candidates into developing their own ideas and solutions to problems, instead of having course directors be the purveyor of the truth of the students' practices. We also anticipated enhancing the independence of teacher candidates in their abilities to self-reflect, self-monitor and develop confidence as a self-determining professionals.

Upon receiving extensive feedback from course directors and faculty members in the initial workshop where we presented our model, we renamed our approach "focused observation."¹⁰ We agreed that the term "clinical

¹⁰ We are grateful to Nancy Foster for coining the term and Michael Charles, practicum coordinator for the preservice program at York University's Faculty of Education for adopting this name for use at York.

supervision” could provide a misleading signal related to the perception of a mechanistic approach too often associated with a clinical model and supposed objective observations. Although the term clinical supervision was first adopted from the medical field where the use of direct observation continues to be valued, its use in the area of teacher training explicitly takes on complex methods and meanings related to social interaction between students and teachers.

As Cogan himself has suggested, we felt free to adapt the approach so that it would speak to our specific context of teacher candidates, their course directors and host teachers. Our initial goal in conducting research was to assess responses of both course directors and teacher candidates to “focused observation;” however, there were varying levels of understanding of clinical supervision from site to site and most course directors were closer to the familiarization than the implementation stage of this model. Thus, broader questions of supervision were put forward in a series of open-ended interviews ranging from half an hour to over two hours. In total, eight interviews were conducted with J/I and I/S consecutive teacher candidates and six with course directors. Of the latter group, all satellite campuses were represented and one concurrent course director was interviewed.

The teacher candidate interviews drew respondents from three of the four sites. The primary researchers visited each of the three sites, explained the project’s rationale and addressed questions in a group session with teacher

candidates. The list of interested teacher candidates was forwarded to our research assistant, a graduate student, who contacted each person and arranged for interviews. In the case of the T.L. Kennedy site where both primary researchers taught and/or supervised, Celia Haig Brown provided the orientation to the project. One teacher candidate confidentially collected the names of interested participants and forwarded them directly to the research assistant who interviewed these respondents in order to prevent any conflict or perceived conflict of interest. As well, TL Kennedy participants were assured that interview transcripts would not be made available to the primary researchers until the conclusion of the final submission of course marks. All others were assured that audiotapes and transcripts would be made available only to the researchers and every effort would be made to protect their confidentiality; under no circumstances would their participation be made known to their course directors or host teachers. No effort was promised nor made to keep the course directors' interviews anonymous but confidentiality in the final paper was assured within the parameters of the study.

Semi-structured interviews were selected as the desired research methodology using purposeful sampling.¹¹ Teacher candidates and course directors were provided with a copy of interview questions¹² in advance but interviews intentionally deviated in sequence and wording and spontaneously followed new directions participants chose in order to help us achieve greater

¹¹ This term is adapted from the work of Michael Agar (1996), p. 168.

¹² See Appendix B for Interview Questions

insight into the meaning that teacher candidates and course directors ascribed to aspects of supervision. In keeping with the constructivist paradigm, interviews were both exploratory and inductive in nature, providing rich descriptive detail and allowing us to achieve a deep understanding of the complex and sensitive issues surrounding supervision.¹³ Purposeful sampling in some cases appeared to elicit responses from extreme cases which served to exemplify characteristics of a strong/weak host teacher or course director-teacher candidate relationship, thereby providing a wealth of information from a relatively small sample.

Teacher candidate interviews were conducted by Akane Nishimoto, the research assistant and course directors were interviewed by either the primary researchers or research assistant. Each interviewer used her unique style of interviewing. As so eloquently expressed by Greenhalgh and Taylor in *"Papers that go beyond numbers"*:

there is no way of abolishing, or fully controlling for, observer bias in qualitative research... the data generated by techniques such as focus groups or semistructured interviews are likely to be heavily influenced by what the interviewer believes about (the) subject ... it is inconceivable that the interviews could have been conducted by someone with no views at all and no ideological or cultural perspective...¹⁴

Thus, it is critical for the reader to understand the perspectives of the interviewers. All three come from a background in education, but with slightly different perspectives. Celia Haig Brown is an ethnographer who established the tone of the study - one in which we sought to truly hear the voices of the

¹³ HS411g Critical Appraisal of Qualitative Research 2006 lecture notes. York University, Toronto, Ontario.

¹⁴ "Papers that go beyond numbers (qualitative research) Trisha Greenhalgh; Rod Taylor *British Medical Journal*: Sep 20, 1997; 315, 7110; Research Library pg.740

participants, allowing sufficient time for participants to speak and encouraging the other two interviewers to allow the interviews to flow in a conversational and meaningful way to the participants. Nancy Foster is a course director who has supervised teacher candidates in their practicum for the past three years and brought to the study a host of personal experiences and beliefs that influenced and enriched her interviews with other course directors. Akane Nishimoto, a graduate student in the Faculty of Education, is closer in age and experience to the teacher candidates and could perhaps empathize with them in a very authentic way. It may have also allowed her to establish trust with the teacher candidates, as suggested by a number of the transcripts. Were the investigator effects a strength or limitation of the study? Certainly the interviewers' scholarly backgrounds and personal/professional beliefs influenced their interviewing skills so the answer is both. It should be noted that the primary researchers' views of supervision shifted dramatically as a result of this study thereby suggesting an openness to hearing the participants' stories and a re-shaping of the study's outcomes based in what was said. This research design responsiveness, which became a central aspect of the study, will be discussed in detail later in the paper.

All interviews but one were tape-recorded allowing for verbatim transcription: in the case of one teacher candidate approximately half of the interview was lost due to technical difficulties. Some teacher candidates did register concern about confidentiality during portions of the tape-recorded interviews. Generally the interviewer was able to re-establish trust and the

interviews continued as planned. In a few cases, respondents waited until the recorder was stopped and then relayed additional details to our research assistant. In these cases, the exchange was seen to be off the record with no field notes taken and no details relayed orally to other researchers. In the case of the portion of the interview that was lost, the researcher recalled missing portions of the interview to the best of her ability to create field notes immediately following the conclusion of the interview. For the purpose of this paper, the primary researchers have listened to all audiotapes and read and carefully coded transcripts of all teacher candidate interviews. The paper focuses on teacher candidate perspectives of supervision while course directors' interviews have provided part of the context. Not all transcripts were available for course director interviews which will be the substance of a second paper with a slightly different focus.

DATA ANALYSIS & PARADIGM SHIFT

When this research project was first discussed in May of 2005, it was to be an exploration of a variation of clinical supervision. York's supervision model had included a minimum of three visits per teacher candidate/year by course directors. Course directors observed lessons, made observations and then debriefed with teacher candidates following lessons; however, since there was no formalized format for classroom visits, practices for the recording of observations and sharing of feedback varied significantly. While we believed that faculty advisors played an extremely important role in the classrooms of

teacher candidates, we wondered if clinical supervision¹⁵ would help them to become less dependent upon external validation and more self-directive in their capacity to develop as new teachers.

As previously described, the project was broadened and moved from hypothesis-testing to a more explicitly emergent research methodology¹⁶ that suspended the researchers' initial intents to move really listen to and come to understand the participants' experiences surrounding the phenomenon of supervision. Simply put, the goal became to find the theory implicit in the data. The initial step taken by the researchers was to independently examine the first completed transcript of a course director with the following open-ended questions in mind: *What is going on here? What categories are appearing?* Notes were made in defining categories and the researchers then discussed similarities/differences in what they were seeing. The same process was completed for teacher candidate interviews by one of the primary researchers while remaining open to new or different categories becoming relevant. It became clear almost immediately that the categories for teacher candidates and course directors were significantly different from one another

¹⁵ Cogan outlines four steps in the clinical supervision process:

- Establishing the Relationship & planning for supervision and teaching (pre-conference)
- Classroom observation (note: may utilize a narrative/data collection approach)
- Post-conference/Debriefing to review the observations and the relation of the plan to the experience
- Planning for the next teaching and observation

¹⁶ See Glaser, Barney G. (1978, 1992, 1994, 1995 volumes 1 and 2, 1998) for a more detailed discussion of Grounded Theory.

to warrant a shift in focus to teacher candidate interviews exclusively. Once an initial list of categories was developed from teacher candidate transcripts, all coding notes and transcripts were reviewed. Categories that linked to a particular theme were placed together and all interviews were recoded until the new categories were saturated. Rich descriptive quotations were selected and this data was sent to the other primary researcher for comparison with her findings. A final comparison was made, central themes delineated and outline for the paper developed.

Most fascinating was that we had entered into the research project with the belief that course directors played a significant role in the development of teacher candidates through classroom observation and feedback. What we heard was that the role of the course director in the host classroom for the purpose of observation is almost inconsequential. What is of utmost importance to the teacher candidates is the quality of their relationship with the host teacher and how the course director and other faculty support it. Our research findings below provide some rich detail on this development in the work.

FINDINGS

Three central themes became evident as we worked with the data. Without exception, the most important theme in teacher candidate interviews was the quality of the relationship with their host teachers. Trust, mutual respect and the opportunity for professional dialogue between host teacher and teacher candidate surrounding ongoing and authentic assessment formed

the basis for the evolving relationship and associated teacher candidate self-confidence. Secondly, teacher candidates identified trust and respect for course directors as the precursors for the development of an on-going positive relationship. They saw the role of the course director as almost inconsequential in providing specific feedback on their teaching but of much greater significance when the need arose for support and/or conflict resolution in the placement. Specifically, course directors played a significant role in assisting teacher candidates to navigate the power differential between themselves and their host teachers in the absence, suspension or waning of a positive, trusting relationship. Not unexpectedly, teacher candidates sometimes experienced tensions between what they had brought from their own experiences and their university courses and what they were seeing and being told while in schools. A third theme indicated in the data surrounded programmatic factors that supported or inhibited the self-determination of teacher candidates. This raises questions about the role of the faculty advisor in supporting teacher candidates.

Quality of Relationship with the Host Teacher

I had so much to learn that it was just incredible. And you know, I'm not the kind of person that's used to getting up in front of people, so I had to learn that, I had to learn how to do lesson plans, and all those little details, and I had so much to learn about all of the students, just getting to know their situation, their personalities, and trying to figure out whether it was something I was doing in the classroom, or if it was them, you know, the behaviour I was seeing, figuring out how much I could expect of them, trying to deconstruct the concepts I was trying to teach to them, try to figure out where the host teacher was coming from. (George, p.6)

All who enter the consecutive education program have experienced a high degree of academic success so it is quite likely that a greater source of

anxiety arises from the practicum than the course work as suggested above by George¹⁷. Thus, it may not be surprising that teacher candidates identify the quality of the relationship with their host teacher as the single most significant factor in relation to supervision.

I think the host teacher can make or break how you feel about yourself. I had two very different host teachers and two very different experiences. One where I built up so much confidence as a teacher, and another one where I really began to doubt myself, and I hadn't changed, I was doing everything in the same way. (Maria, p.7-8)

Teacher candidates needed to feel welcome - to be placed with a host teacher who was physically and emotionally present - one who was perceived as having taken on the mentoring role with the goal of helping the teacher candidate to evolve into the best teacher s/he could be with his/her own unique style. Teacher candidates made a clear distinction between those whom they thought *should* be host teachers and those they thought *should not*. This began with their perceptions of the host teacher's motivation for taking on a teacher candidate:

I had an amazing host teacher for elementary. Was like, this isn't about me, it's about you and you finding yourself as a teacher. I know that sounds corny, but my host teacher said that to me and, so it was an amazing experience. I got to try things and see how they worked with students instead of following someone else's. (Emily, p.2)

S/he¹⁸ said, "Go ahead and do whatever you want to do as far as the teaching goes and we'll talk about it afterwards." So, it gave me a lot of freedom to try new things, but then we discussed what worked or what didn't work and why it worked or why it didn't work. It was excellent; it was just an excellent experience. S/he's a fantastic host teacher. (Roger, p.7).

¹⁷ All respondents have been given pseudonyms for the purposes of confidentiality. Gender should not be assumed from the pseudonyms.

¹⁸ Quotations have been modified where necessary to make them gender-unspecific and to protect the anonymity of the host teacher.

Teacher candidates who spoke most enthusiastically of their relationships with their host teachers spoke of having the freedom to experiment without feeling unduly judged and being made to feel comfortable as they emerged into their own style with feedback from host teachers whom they respected. Respect was tied to the host teacher's credibility as an effective classroom teacher - one with experience, knowledge of the subject and curriculum, and respect for and of the students.

What makes you a good host teacher? Obviously experience, they have to be very well versed in terms of what they do. They have to be able to provide effective feedback. (Bob, p.3)

I had one host teacher who, she is a brilliant woman, she was special Ed, and she knew her work. She's very, very gifted at understanding not only human psychology, but also understanding how to translate the learning needs of students into a pedagogy that works effectively in the classroom in terms of class management. I actually just went to talk with her recently about how do I deal with the gifted class, and of course, she gave me excellent advice, this particular host teacher was good at the pedagogy. She's very, very good at instruction. (Scarlett, p.23)

Teacher candidates cited the need to feel that their life experiences and opinions were valued and that they could make a positive contribution to the deconstruction of classroom experiences in consultations with their supervisors in order to feel that they were taking control of the practicum experience. The dialogue surrounding formative assessment was perceived to be of much greater significance than the summative evaluation. In fact, the quality of the ongoing dialogue between teacher candidate and host teacher epitomized the relationship.

I have two host teachers right now. One still sees me as a pre-service teacher and she does give me feedback and that's fine. The other one sees me as a colleague who has been teaching for six years and she introduces me as a teacher. We team-teach the class or I teach it and then I talk to her about what her direction is. (Scarlett, p.14)

I've had good experiences too. Like I said at my last practicum where there was open communication, where there was feedback, respect, he actually treated me like an

adult instead of talking to me like I've had no life experience whatsoever, like I know absolutely nothing about anything. (Emily, p.7)

Teacher candidates articulated the importance they ascribed to their host teacher's skill at assessing their current skill levels, guiding and supporting them in a variety of ways:

S/he was open to new ideas, s/he gave me feedback, let me do writing portfolios with the students, which s/he's continued to do after I left. And supported me, gave me resources, showed me how to phrase certain things, how to ask certain kinds of questions, would be so helpful. We did, in my history [class], different ways to address different levels of learning. We were given the documents for IEP, but it might have been good to show us, to get us to even do one. S/he showed me those kinds of things, modifications, how to help certain students, how to get students if you've recognized that they have a learning disability, how to get them the support that they need. Yeah, things that were really valuable.

If I was to start from the beginning of the year I would build those frames of reference with my students but when you dropped in you don't have it. So when you're explaining things to them, you have to communicate with your host teacher to have that kind of common language and I, and s/he gave that to me. (Emily, p.19-20)

I followed him/her around everywhere, or I-s/he, went to staff meetings and department meetings and the whole department too at that school was really a great place to be. It was really nice. I mean, I feel like I learned more every lunch hour, like just eating lunch in with them than I did in most of my classes at York. There [were] also really heavy discussions about pedagogy, and about the particular texts or subjects they were teaching and they just really cared about what they were doing. (John, p.7)

In contrast, a less than positive relationship was developed with host teachers who were perceived as wanting free labour or as being unable to make the emotional or time commitment to mentoring:

There's no way to talk about your host teachers and they're not accountable in any way. You don't evaluate your host teacher and maybe you should. Like, why are we placed with people just, it seems, anyone who will take us, I mean, is that really good enough? Is that okay? Is that, and I understand that a lot of people aren't open to having student teachers because it makes more work for them, but it's not, I don't think it's effective to place them with people who really don't care. And just want someone to do their work for them. (Emily, p.4)

I think it was the first day that I was at my practicum, I spent in the office with my host teacher and the principal stapling -- literally the entire day stapling forms for the literacy test. Now, I understand at this point too, it's like I understand administrative work is an aspect of teaching. I know what photocopying entails, I know what stapling entails, I know all of these things and I kind of feel like that's not why I am there and maybe my host teacher should have said "Why don't you go and observe other classes

instead of staying here". But instead of like it being about why I was there, it was really about what s/he needed, and s/he needed someone to staple, to help him/her prepare, you know and extra set of hands to prepare literacy tests. (Emily, p.1-2)

He was less engaged and a bit more jaded and a bit more detached. Often I would do stuff that he had never seen like I wouldn't run things by him before hand and he wouldn't even really pay attention to what I was doing. (John, p.8)

Teacher candidates spoke repeatedly and emphatically about their desire for reassurance that their work is leading them to be strong professionals, best accomplished by the individual they worked most closely with: the host teacher. Host teachers needed to be present and attentive in the classroom to contribute to their development:

I would have liked to have more time where s/he was observing me, as opposed to running around trying to get things done. I-I really liked him/her. I think s/he was doing his/her best, but I got the sense that I was there to give him/her a break. Or, that's how it ended up, whether or not that was the intention. I would have liked someone to pay attention to my professional development, and I don't think that really happened.

...I was still not very sure how I'm doing. (George, p.10)

Trust and respect on the part of the teacher candidate for the host teacher were difficult, if not impossible to attain when the host teacher's credibility was in question for any one of a variety of factors.

I didn't think that [having a first year teacher as a Host Teacher] should be allowed because what can you really learn from someone like that? I actually saw the difference between a 30 year teacher and a 1 year teacher. One of them was very comfortable with the class, and one wasn't. So, yeah, you can learn things from a first year teacher, but it's kind of learning things you don't want to do. (Roger, p.14)

I got a book on teaching strategies and I was making photocopies. So [my host teacher] said, well, I could bring you a book while you're making these copies. That was really kind of her/him so I tell her/him the book's in my bag. It's *Approaches to Teaching Hamlet*. S/he's gone for a really long time. S/he comes back with the book like half an hour or 40 minutes later, so I start reading it and I come back to the classroom and s/he's like, "You know what? I have a really great idea for how to teach Hamlet? We can do it through the lens of family." So then I'm looking through my book. What s/he said to me was word for word in the book. So s/he basically must have sat there and looked at my book and s/he didn't even say to me, "You know what? I looked through your book and I found this really great idea." S/he just claimed it for her/his own. (Emily p.18)

It was impossible for trusting and mutually positive relationships to develop with host teachers who failed to accurately assess or respond to the teacher candidate's skill level in what the student perceived as a respectful way.

S/he tells me the night before you're going to teach the Holocaust tomorrow. Things like that, I mean, to prepare to teach something like the Holocaust to teach it properly with sensitivity, it would have been nice to have some warning, but that kind of thing. Like not providing me sources, not providing any feedback. And when [there] is, it was always critical without suggestions on how to change. Well, can you recommend resources, can you tell me what strategies I might use? And s/he never did that, never did that. And I was always in the way. I was there with other teacher candidates and it was like an office off to the side and I would hear the teachers say horrible things about the other teacher candidates. So it makes me also wonder what they would say about me. (Emily, p.4)

Lack of frequent and constructive feedback and opportunities for meaningful dialogue further inhibited the development of the critical teacher candidate-host teacher relationship:

Well, I tried and I got some feedback. The person was exhausted, overwhelmed, burnt out. I'd go in there and say I've got all my lovely lesson plans for today and s/he'd say, I gotta go do this, I gotta go talk to someone, I've gotta get this. I did get that kind of feedback from my second host teacher. My third one, s/he was just not interested. (George, p.19)

I didn't get a lot of specific feedback from her/him, and s/he's the kind of person who doesn't want to say anything negative. (George, p.14)

As so simply and profoundly stated by Maria, the host teacher can "make or break" the teacher candidate's practicum experience, contributing or detracting from the faculty's goal to promote self-determination. The teacher candidates do not come as empty vessels but with ideas of their own that they are pondering and working through within their classrooms. Gesturing clearly to the idea of the pre-conference, one teacher candidate had this to say:

And if they took the time to listen, or even interview us, and say "Where are you coming from, what are you hoping to get out of this". And maybe if there was a more formal process for them to have to follow to listen to us or work with us or interview us, it could help us instead of us just going in and then being "Ok, this is what I expect

you to do. Now you've taught your lesson, here's what I have to say to you. Go off, take that, and prepare this for tomorrow." And I think the listening would be equally important there, so that they can tailor their guidance as host teacher to where we're coming from.

Going back to why are the host teacher taking on student teachers. Who are these people? What is their goal? Are they there to help us? Are they doing it because they're getting an honorarium for it? Are they doing it to lessen their load? So looking into the real truth of why a host teacher is taking on a student teacher. If they're taking us on for the wrong reasons, it does affect our learning. (Maria, p. 9)

It is of utmost importance that the faculty carefully identifies host teachers who are at the appropriate stage in their careers and lives and possess the interpersonal skills that enable them to be mentors to their teacher candidates. A trusting and mutually respectful relationship could then be nurtured by faculty advisors who are versed in supporting host teachers to assess teacher candidates on a frequent and ongoing basis and work with them to develop constructive feedback based in observations and in a manner that invites dialogue.

Quality of Relationship with the Course Director

The relationship with course directors also proved to be an important theme but differently than the researchers assumed as they went into the study. As with their relationship with host teachers, the basis for a strong foundation was trust and credibility. The teacher candidates, however, generally saw the course directors as being peripheral in terms of their value in classroom visits given the infrequency of visits, lack of understanding of specific classroom context, hectic schedules for pre-visit planning and post-visit debriefing, and, in many cases, lack of subject specialty. The relationship with the course director proved vital in arranging strong placements, helping teacher candidates to self-advocate, and problem-solve or provide mediation

or conflict-resolution in the practicum as well as work through what some saw as conflicting or shifting allegiances.

Course directors and teacher candidates saw the role of the former in classroom supervision very differently. All course directors made detailed reference to the substantial time commitment they made to classroom observation and the provision of feedback to teacher candidates and, perhaps by virtue of this investment, saw it as an important part of their responsibility in the faculty. Ironically, some also viewed it as something that took them away from devoting more time to establishing excellent placements and supporting host teachers in their mentoring roles -- the former, a factor that teacher candidates identified as being most significant, and the latter, a factor that three course directors spoke of, attributing great import. Frequent references were made to the difficulty of scheduling all teacher candidates during their three practicum blocks:

“You have thirty students (to see) in two weeks; that’s tough.” (Eleanor, 23:40)

One course director spoke in great detail about seeing his/her role as that of mentor: one whom “some teacher candidates identify as someone they think would be a good listener” and explained further, “One of the things I see myself doing is helping them to see the broader framework in their practice” (Joanne, 38:41). This individual also noted that s/he was in the unique position of being an anchor person at the faculty and in the practicum:

Teaching the practicum seminar and doing the placements had its pitfalls but it allows a relationship with these teacher candidates because it means that the conversations that you have about their practice are not limited to that hour after their class. (Joanne, 40:14)

Another spoke to the complexity of the course director's role and alluded to a broader definition of *supervision* beyond classroom observation.

Julie: [I asked myself, "What] did I really accomplish in the block?" It was in some ways, it was horrendous rushing from school to school, and but I think there was a lot that was accomplished being in the schools, and working with the teacher candidates, with the host teachers, with the site coordinators.

Interviewer: So what you're saying really I think, is that supervision doesn't occur, just in the classroom. You're beginning your supervisory role the minute you walk through the door

Julie: Before you walk through the door I think. (Julie, March 9 interview, p.1-2)

In spite of this, supervision continued to be defined largely in terms of issues surrounding classroom observation. It may have surprised course directors then, that there was a general lack of clarity around the course director's role from the teacher candidate's perspective. All understood that the course director had a role in assessment and/or evaluation but concurred that the host teacher was a much more significant figure.

[My course director] just came and evaluated just to see that everything was going fine, but it's really your host teacher that evaluates you. (Scarlett, p.8)

As well, the teacher candidates generally agreed that course directors lacked the specific context that host teachers had and the infrequency of visits prevented the feedback from being particularly meaningful.

They have a lot of questions that sometimes aren't necessarily helpful for me as a student teaching for my growth and development, but the debriefing involves a lot of clarification of what I was doing because the supervisor is not quite sure how the room is being run. If the supervisors did come in once before the formal evaluation it might be helpful. (Maria, p. 4)

Not unlike the course directors' comments, teacher candidates referred to the course directors' busy schedules also mitigating against a dialogue that would help them to reflect upon their practices.

[The debriefing] was very quick and rushed and it was because of the time constraints, it was mostly feedback from the course director to me, and I didn't really feel like I

had a chance to voice my concerns. It would have been nice if [my host teacher] was able to be there to sort of give a different perspective on how I was developing, because I'm sure that I've been better or worse on different days. (George, p.7-8)

Teacher candidates needed the time and opportunity to engage in a meaningful conversation, one in which they felt listened to, in which they had ample opportunity to explain the context for their actions and work through difficult situations with another trusted and respected educator. Supervising course directors are generally, but not exclusively, seconded faculty from neighbouring school boards who might be considered "*expert teachers*" based on the extensive experience required in order to be seconded to York. Nevertheless, teacher candidates clearly identified that trust and respect had to be established independent of their course director's reputation. It was insufficient to simply be provided with evaluative feedback. Again presaging the importance of hearing the teacher candidate's self-reflection before the supervisor's observations comes through in Kristin's comments:

Kristin: It's very linear, s/he'll read it to you, and if there's anything that you don't understand s/he'll expand on that. S/he does the talking, we do the listening.

Interviewer: Does s/he make specific suggestions? Or guide you in any way to come up with your own suggestions?

Kristin: Specific suggestions, s/he's pretty good at that. I think there's got to be room for making our own because we're the ones who've got to implement it. But, s/he'll say something like don't try and yell at them, use the lights. That was for the first block. The second block, s/he booked me in for the short period after recess during snack, and ended up being late for that as well, so s/he was there for about 20 minutes. His/her debriefing from that was, "You're fine". I know I'm fine, but I know I'm not perfect either. And what I want to do now is get somebody to tell me what I can improve on. And, 'fine' doesn't tell me anything. So, I was upset about that. (Kristin, p.8)

The basis for a strong and useful relationship came from knowing the course director although, in one case, the supervising course director was a

faculty member assigned to supervise a group of teacher candidates who were unknown to him/her. Of this, one teacher candidate said:

Well, the person who came to observe me actually didn't even know me. The problem with that was there's no context. It was split behavioural and LD. And there was tons of class management issues. I did a lesson and it went—for that class, because twenty minutes are just spent on getting people to settle down and to listen—I thought it went really well. And s/he was like, "Well class management." So to kind of judge me based on that without understanding the context was unfair. And s/he did listen. I actually got more feedback from him/her in his/her one visit than I had in the entire four plus weeks of my first practicum. (Emily)

What this does demonstrate, however, is that while it may be ideal for the teacher candidate and faculty advisor to have established a trusting relationship prior to classroom visits, one may begin to establish trust through active listening at any point in time. It should be noted as well that a number of teacher candidates described the benefits of receiving more than one point of view regarding their teaching; they simply felt that the host teacher's feedback played a more significant role than the course director's when it was frequent, ongoing and allowed for meaningful dialogue.

The role of the course director was perceived as vital when teacher candidates found themselves in a particularly problematic placement. Teacher candidates spoke of course directors changing placements in extreme situations and providing reassurance when they were in placements where feedback was sporadic and/or focused on the negative:

There was a big discrepancy between the feedback I was getting from my host teacher and my supervisor, and I felt like a tug-of-war. What do I do? So when my supervisor said, "You're doing a fantastic job, and I said "I am?!" I was not expecting to hear that, "Tell me what it is that I'm doing that's correct, because at this point I've lost track of that, because of the feedback I was getting." (Maria, p. 6)

Course directors were also perceived as serving an important role in helping teacher candidates to deal with conflict and this theme presented itself in course director interviews as well.

S/he's very insightful about dealing with students. S/he gets over the fact that we're going to have conflict. It's the quality of how you resolve the conflict. Does the person you are in conflict with, do they walk about still feeling like their integrity is intact, you've left their self-esteem intact. S/he also said something at the beginning of the year, s/he said, when it comes to your host teachers, you have to ask yourself, is this a situation that I can resolve, or that I have to manage? (Scarlett, p.25)

Another area where the relationship with the course director was seen as potentially beneficial was in helping teacher candidates work through the shifting allegiances some experienced as they were immersed into a placement where the host teacher's personal-professional values differed from their own and/or as they were exposed to new information at the university.

We read this book about ESL students, how best to treat them in a regular classroom. The theory's that they should keep their first language at home and try their second language at school, so that they can develop both at the same time and that that would benefit them in the long run. But, I was at my host school, and the VP had given advice to one of the parents that they should try and teach them English at home as well. I had this discussion with the course director, and his/her suggestion was to give a copy of the textbook to the VP to read, which I did. And he/she was very open to the idea of reading new research, and then we'd have a discussion about it. And we're still in the process of discussing what would actually be better for the students. S/he has first hand knowledge of where the students have gone after this research. It was good to be able to discuss it with the conflicting parties and say, this is what I'm hearing, this is what I'm seeing, so, how can I relate these two? (Roger, p.10)

Teacher candidates also noted programmatic factors that supported or mitigated against self-reflection and self-determination. It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore all of them, but two comments most directly related to supervision are note-worthy: a perceived emphasis on quantity of teaching and the "lack of accountability" for host teachers who do not follow university guidelines. On a positive note, teacher candidates revealed how focused reflective writing required by the supervisors aided the metacognitive process:

Interviewer: That reflection that you mentioned that was particularly interesting. What was different about that reflection as opposed to the other ones that you were writing?

John: The other ones were much more general. Like, tell us about this week, and I had to fill out five days worth of journal entries. In the one that I guess was most useful, I was asked to isolate just something of interest of me, and we were given a list of themes that we could try to slot it under. And I think that helped too. I had this experience that had stayed with me and I kept thinking about it and it kept coming up in conversation, and here was an opportunity to really focus on it. I've got to explain this to everyone else who's going to read it and I've got to try to look for solutions. (John, p.20)

A variety of topics in *theory courses* were also identified as helping teacher candidates to better understand their classroom practices:

There was a couple of really good ones. They had to do with gender politics, race relations, things like that that I thought were really interesting. I learned some things about that, self-identity too. How your self-perception affects the way your students perceive you. (Scarlett, p.22)

I remember specifically getting on the bus with some of my fellow students and talking about this book that they were reading, and saying why do we give homework? That was one of our chapters of assumptions or un-questioned assumptions, things people just do because everyone else does them. And, my fellow students were saying, I never even thought about that, but sure I give it all the time for no reason. That's crazy. And so I think that book really worked. (John, p.18)

Creating opportunities for dialogue within the university classroom was also viewed as being highly useful to teacher candidates:

You're constantly having to have a discussion and talk and talk and talk about your opinions and that was really great. That's really useful for constantly thinking, constantly being on your toes and having to you know what is your rationale. We talked about gender politics, we talked about race politics. It's a particular focus that you hadn't had the time or the opportunity to really look at before, and so now I'm given the time, because I'm in a full-time program, and the opportunity is the class. (Scarlett, p 19-20)

The first thing s/he [the non-supervising course director] said was, what is your identity? She said, you better believe a black person, a woman, a person who is non-white, they know who their identity is. And I was like, "Wow, you know, that's true. I never thought of it that way!" The course is built on awareness of people, and awareness of who you are bringing into the classroom. The course is very successful in that way. (Scarlett, p.21)

Other programmatic factors worked against the goal of promoting self-determination and these related most directly to time constraints: overlap or busy work at the faculty, juggling course work and planning for the practicum,

the infantilization of teacher candidates through attendance policies or lack of recognition/respect for individual circumstances, lack of focus and/or tight timelines in reflective writing assignments and an emphasis on quantity over quality. These can all be related back to the role of the course director, either the supervising course director or other teaching faculty member, in helping the teacher candidate to become a self-determining individual.

IMPLICATIONS

I think that students work better when there is a constructive environment where they feel they have a say in their own development and that everybody who is listening is taking them seriously. Students do better when their host teachers are treating them as knowledgeable, able contributors to their own learning as much as their host teachers act and speak in a way that makes the students teacher feel that they come from a position of experience and that they also come from the position of having been educated as a teacher. I act in a similar role. It's a conversation between the three of us ultimately. Not just on the basis of that one lesson. (Eleanor, 36:15)

Given that the quality of the relationship between teacher candidate and host teacher has emerged as the single most important factor in this study, Faculties of Education may wish to place their greatest emphasis on identifying and supporting host teachers who exemplify the characteristics upon which a mutually respectful and trusting relationship may be built. The use of focused observation in this work incorporates many of the constructive dimensions that the interviewed teacher candidates are seeking. At York, course directors are assigned supervision as a significant part of their teaching load. Perhaps that time can be better spent nurturing host teachers than doing what can only ever be superficial observations of teacher candidates whom good host teachers are already assessing on a day-to-day basis. Workshops with the express purpose of taking up contextually modified versions of Cogan and Goldhammer's original

model of clinical supervision could prove most useful. This study also demonstrates that consecutive programs should take seriously the continual re-examination of programmatic factors reducing and eliminating where possible those that work against the goal of self-determination. Using the collective wisdom of the faculty, it is incumbent upon us to further develop pedagogies that support professional independence in teacher candidates as they begin their work within a school context of interdependence. Finally, the wonderful irony of this study, with its deliberately responsive research design, one which promises to shape and re-shape itself according to what those involved have to say, has taken the researchers places they never anticipated and which they indeed have resisted in the past. It is only when we bring openness and curiosity that such shifts are made possible. It has been a rewarding study.

APPENDIX A: LITERATURE INFORMING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT AND
RESULTANT STUDY by Akane Nishimoto.

Reflective Practice and Clinical Supervision: the current state of affairs

Reflective practice in the area of teacher training and teacher education has become a commonly used and widely acknowledged method of helping to improve the quality of teaching and learning that takes place in the classrooms. At the preservice level, student teachers are often required to reflect on what they've done in the classroom, and how it has affected student learning. Student teachers may often reflect privately and with their supervising teacher, either orally or in writing. Although the mental process of reflection is a very natural process that teachers and non-teachers alike engage in, the practice and theory behind it have become formalized in different ways, especially in the field of education.

In the tradition of theorists such as Plato and Aristotle, John Dewey (1859-1952) drew upon the idea of reflection as a thought process. He focused on the process of seeking solutions to problems through experiences, and recognized reflection as an active and deliberate process of linking knowledge and experiences. Schön further developed this idea to form two types of reflections. **Reflection-in-action** is the natural process of 'thinking on your feet' that most people do in order to quickly make sense of a situation by linking prior knowledge. This process is characterized by its short period of time and its limited scope of reflection. **Reflection-on-action** is the more in-depth retrospective thinking that some people do when they recall events after

they occur to explore why they acted as they did. This helps to cumulatively build one's repertoire of ideas and responses each time. Practitioners may actively engage in reflection-on-action through writing reports and discussing events with colleagues and supervisors.

In the practicum situations, reflection-on-action often occurs between the student teacher and the supervising teacher as a required part of the practice teaching process. Goldhammer and Cogan developed a formalized model for this reflective process between the practicing teacher and the supervisor, called clinical supervision. Clinical supervision in the area of teacher professional development was adopted first from the medical field where the use of direct observation is valued. These 'objective' and 'scientific' elements of observation were blended into the humanistically elusive classroom setting. The practice involved a cooperative relationship between the learning teacher and the supervising teacher, where rational planning of lessons would take place along with inquiry-based discussions on student learning. The process involves three basic steps:

1. Pre-observation conference between teacher and supervisor about objectives of lesson and teacher observation.
2. Supervisor observes class.
3. Post-observation conference between teacher and supervisor to discuss how to build on strengths while eliminating counterproductive approaches.

Different modifications are often made to this model, such as a space for independent analysis to be made by the teacher and/or supervisor at pre-conference to prepare, or at post-conference to reflect. There may also be a

joint effort conference at the planning stage, while new objectives and areas of inquiries may naturally arise at each stage of the process. In any case, Cogan emphasized the importance of a collegial relationship between the teacher and the supervisor that focuses on the teacher's interest in student learning, instead of a hierarchical relationship that limits teachers through judgemental criticism.

Yet reflective practice is not without its limitations, and the effect of power structures can be uncovered despite Cogan's vision of the collegial relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. McNay examined the power structure in practicum situations and discovered that although "student teachers acknowledged that issues of power pervade the practicum... cooperating teachers were reluctant to talk about power at all" (McNay, 2003). She suggests that it is of no use for us to deny or try to get rid of power systems in the practicum relationship as they clearly exist and will in all likelihood persist.

Educators, including female educators, must come to terms with the fact that they live and work in systems and relationships that put them in positions of power, and that this is *good*; teaching *requires* a grounding in authority.... The concepts of power and authority must become part of the curriculum in teacher education, part of the conversation between and among student teachers, cooperating teachers and faculty members and part of the research agenda in teacher education. (McNay, 2003)

Power structures inevitably affect the honesty and effectiveness of reflections which are written or spoken for a particular audience. Seifert explains how this power structure can compromise the scope and depth of reflections.

No matter how hard pre-service students work at their assignments and classroom teaching responsibilities, they experience a variety of important discourses *outside* their programs, beliefs and attitudes that circulate in family and society, or that students carry forward from their pasts. While some of these fit comfortably with beliefs and attitudes promoted publicly with teacher education, it is likely that others do not, and teacher educators' knowledge of them is correspondingly obscured. ... What all of the discourses share is a tendency to cause some experiences or feelings to remain hidden, from both peers and instructors. (Seifert, 2004)

Thus, Seifert claims that "there is no such thing, ... as a haven for reflection that is reliably and fully authentic, real, or 'objective'" (Seifert, 2004). He suggests alternative administrative arrangements for teacher education programs that allow teacher candidates to truly reflect with each other in a cohort. These circumstances may provide a safer environment for teacher candidates to give and receive support from each other while developing their personal and professional identities. He also acknowledges that if such a system is not done cautiously and with guidance about the best way to proceed with the process, it may merely lead to the recreation of shallow, stereotypical self-identities.

In accordance with the idea of creating a safe reflective environment for student teachers, Ralph proposes the contextual supervision model where cooperating teachers are trained to adjust their supervisory style according to the student teacher's development level. He claims that "the only factor over which the supervisory participants *do* have direct control is their own behaviours in the relationship" (2003), and therefore the model aims to assist supervisory personnel in identifying and resolving mismatch problems to improve mentorship effectiveness and in turn promote successful preservice

teacher development. Chaliès et al. also advocates the importance of training cooperating teachers to optimize the practicum situation. They found that “the interactions between the preservice teachers and their cooperating teachers could be characterized as superficial most of the time” (Chaliès et al., 2004). Cooperating teachers should be trained in interview techniques, so that specific pedagogical goals can be set and pursued for productive post-lesson reflective dialogue.

Not only should the teacher education institutions and the supervising teacher be involved in the effort of improving the effectiveness of teacher education and reflective practice, but the student teachers themselves should participate in the self-monitoring of their own reflective processes as well. Ward and McCotter found that many of the reflections conducted by training teachers were self-focused and not transformative. His analysis of reflective writings showed that they often either failed to focus on problems, or the problems were often blamed on external causes. Some reflections failed to undertake deeper questioning by concentrating on self-concerns that did not include consideration of student perspectives. Thus although, student teachers are asked to reflect, the qualities of a good reflection are rarely discussed.

Reflection is in danger of becoming nothing more than a tool toward greater student achievement. Taken to an extreme, this narrow view of the purpose of reflection redefines reflection as a means of documenting student outcomes. As teacher educators, we must be able to make a clear case for reflection as an outcome above and beyond its short-term instrumental value. (Ward and McCotter, 2004)

Ward and McCotter designed a Reflection Rubric that can be used as a tool for preservice teachers to open up the practice of reflection and monitor the development of their own reflections.

Although reflective practice is not without its limits, challenges and complications, all parties involved in the development of teachers (student teachers, supervising participants, and administrative personnel) continue to approach and engage in reflection in a variety of critical ways with the belief that it offers positive experiences and progress in the area of teacher training. Reflective practice continues to be applied successfully in a variety of practicum situations, and it becomes particularly useful when new and unfamiliar ideas or strategies are being introduced to student teachers.

Fallon et al. examined teachers who were learning about Performance Based Assessment (PBA) tasks, and found that integrating reflection improved the teachers' understanding and performance. They concluded that "in understanding such complex issues as PBA, teachers must make meanings of ideas, rather than just using explanations from others in a non-reflective, technical manner" (Fallon et al., 2003). Similarly, Gwyn-Paquette and Tochon observed how reflective conversations can help preservice teachers in learning to implement Cooperative Learning activities in their lessons. They found that "the support received during feedback conversations helped them to reflect upon their actions, to see the effects of what went on, and to find alternative ways of doing." (Gwyn-Paquette and Tochon, 2002)

Ovens used a patchwork text approach to reflection where many short reflective pieces were written throughout the preservice training course for science teachers, and the pieces were patched together at the end to obtain a holistic view of their teaching practice. By the end of the course, he found that “almost all patchwork texts written by the students ... are successful in critically reconsidering *scientism*: an assumed superiority of scientific knowledge over all other kinds that tends to pervade our society” (Ovens, 2003). Thus, his reflective approach values the process of critical thinking, and encourages beginning teachers to challenge their own beliefs and assumptions embedded in the teaching practice.

Reflective practice, when done effectively not only provides a way to connect theory and practice by developing knowledge through experiences, but it can also lead to understanding theory in ways that finally begin to challenge them. “Reflection on experience enhances learning through experience such that divergent rather than convergent learning outcomes are encouraged” (Loughran, 2002).

References:

- Bishop, R. and Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture Speaks: Cultural Relationships and classroom learning*. Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers.
- Bishop, R. and Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand.

- Chalies, S., Ria, L., Bertone, S., Trohel, J., Durand, M. (2004). Interactions between Preservice and Cooperating Teachers and Knowledge Construction during Post-Lesson Interviews. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 765-781.
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical Supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fallon, A. M., Brown, C. S., & Ackley, C. B. (2003). Reflection as a strategy for teaching performance-based assessment. *Brock Education*, 13(1), 40-49.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Hold, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gwyn-Paquette, C., & Tochon, F. V. (2003). The role of reflective conversations and feedback in helping preservice teachers learn to use cooperative activities in their second language classrooms. *The Modern language Journal*, 86(2), 503-545.
- Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: in search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 33-43.
- McNay, M. (2003). Power and Authority in Teacher Education. *The Educational forum*, 68, 72-81.
- Ovens, P. (2003). A Patchwork Text Approach to Assessment in Teacher Education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(4), 545-562.
- Ralph, E. G. (2003). Enhancing mentorship in the practicum: Improving contextual supervision. *McGill Journal of Education*, 38(1), 28-48.
- Seifert, K. (2004). Learning to feel like a teacher. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, (32), n/a.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shields, C., Bishop, R. and Mazawi, A.E. (2005). *Pathologizing Practices: The Impact of Deficit Theorizing on Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ward, J. R., & McCotter, S. (2004). Reflection as a Visible Outcome for Preservice Teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 243-257.

APPENDIX B: Interview questions: The following questions served as the basis for the open-ended interviews conducted as the focus of this research

For Supervisors:

- 1) What is the current supervision model used in the preservice program?
- 2) What was the supervision model you used on first coming to York?
- 3) How have you approached supervision to date?
- 4) How do you arrange observations? Do you meet with the teacher candidate before and/or after the observation? If so, what is the focus of these meetings?
- 5) How often do you observe a teacher candidate per term?
- 6) What role do formative and summative assessment play in supervision? What is the relationship between the two in your supervision? Give specific examples.
- 7) What is the role of the teacher candidate in supervision?
- 8) What communication occurs between you and any other supervisors before/during/after teaching?
- 9) What does mentoring mean to you?
- 10) Is mentoring an aspect of your role? What do you do as a mentor?
- 11) What forms are used in supervision? What other structures influence your approach (e.g rubric, checklist, other experiences, etc.)?
- 12) Is the rubric useful to your supervision? How do you use it?
- 13) What role do you play in focusing the observation?

For Teacher Candidates:

- 1) How are you being assessed? Evaluated?
- 2) Are there opportunities for you to introduce specific concerns or issues about your own teaching into supervision of your teaching?
- 3) How does your supervisor/host teacher guide your teaching practice?
- 4) What are your supervisor's/host teacher's major contributions to your teaching practice?
- 5) In what forum or format do you receive feedback from your supervisor/host teacher? In what ways is it useful? Give examples.
- 6) In your teaching how do you assess and reflect on areas of strength or those that need improvement? Do you have a regular approach for doing so?
- 7) Is there a place in the assessment process that allows you to address these areas?
- 8) What does the rubric mean to you? Is it useful? In what ways, if any?