

PREPARING TEACHERS FOR DIVERSITY: AN ANALYSIS OF ACCREDITATION
STANDARDS

by

Paula Cristina Rocha Azevedo
A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
Education

Committee:

Gary R. Galluzzo Chair
Christopher P. Samaras
Rebecca H. Fox

James H. Kibben Program Director

Mark A. L. Dean, College of Education and Human
Development

Date: April 10, 2015 Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Preparing Teachers for Diversity: An Analysis of Accreditation Standards

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at George Mason University

by

Paula Cristina Rocha Azevedo
Master of Arts
University of San Francisco, 2010
Master of Arts
University of San Francisco, 2006
Bachelor of Arts
San José State University, 2004

Director: Gary R. Galluzzo, Professor
College of Education and Human Development

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA



This work is licensed under a [creative commons attribution-noncommercial 3.0 unported license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/).

DEDICATION

To my parents, John and Luisa Azevedo, who have been my greatest cheerleaders and whose love and support made this achievement a reality for me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have completed this journey without the support of so many people. I am grateful for my husband, Gerardo Peñaloza, whose love and encouragement gave me the strength I needed to complete this dissertation. My brother, Valdemar Azevedo, also supported me with his sense of humor and ability to make me laugh. I am also thankful for my critical friend, Syd Merz, who was reliable and provided excellent feedback while we coded and analyzed data.

I would also like to thank my three committee members for their support and guidance. First, to Dr. Rebecca Fox whose insights always gave me a clearer vision of my research. I would also like to thank Dr. Anastasia Samaras who encouraged me to ask the tough questions. Finally, to Dr. Gary Galluzzo who stuck with me from the beginning of this journey. I could not have completed this dissertation without his guidance, encouragement, and patience. More importantly, he always knew what questions to ask to get me thinking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	vi
Abstract	vii
Chapter One	1
Chapter Two.....	16
Chapter Three.....	101
Chapter Four	122
Chapter Five.....	185
Appendix A	220
Appendix B	225
Appendix C	246
Appendix D	251
Appendix E	254
References.....	255

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1: Cochran-Smith's Teacher Multicultural Education Questions	109
Table 2: Data Analysis Matrix	112
Table 3: Number and Percentages of Intercoder Agreement across All Reports	120
Table 4: Gallifrey University Accreditation Report Word Count	129
Table 5: Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Gallifrey University (GU) accreditation report	130
Table 6: Asgar University (AU) accreditation report word count	139
Table 7: Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Asgar University (AU) accreditation report	141
Table 8: Krypton University (KU) accreditation report word count	147
Table 9: Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Krypton University (KU) accreditation report	149
Table 10: Hogwarts University (HU) accreditation report word count	156
Table 11: Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Hogwarts University (HU) accreditation report	158
Table 12: Composite of Response to Overview and Framework	164
Table 13: Composite of Responses to Standard 1	166
Table 14: Composite of Responses to Standard 2	168
Table 15: Composite of Responses to Standard 3	169
Table 16: Composite of Responses to Standard 4	170
Table 17: Composite of Responses to Standard 5	171
Table 18: Composite of Responses to Standard 6	173
Table 19: Composite of Responses in Addendum	174
Table 20: Composite of total a priori codes across institutional reports.....	176

ABSTRACT

PREPARING TEACHERS FOR DIVERSITY: AN ANALYSIS OF ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Paula Cristina Rocha Azevedo, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2015

Dissertation Director: Dr. Gary R. Galluzzo

Teachers across the United States face realities in their classrooms that many were not prepared to handle by their teacher education programs. For instance, teachers meet students who are from cultures other than their own, who speak languages other than English, who are slipping further below the poverty line, or who have different learning needs. There is growing consensus that the disconnection between schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) curricula on teaching diverse learners and the realities new teachers face are disconcerting; they have also reached a point of stagnation. It is further complicated by the policies of federal, state, and nongovernment agencies such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The purpose of this study was to understand how SCDEs interpret and implement NCATE standards by using Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework of multicultural teacher education. This study examined SCDEs rated as "target" by NCATE in the preparation of preservice

teachers for diverse learners. Few studies have demonstrated how NCATE standards impacted the discourse and efforts by SCDEs to prepare preservice teachers for diversity. The findings reveal that teacher educators' reporting on diversity was limited to Standard 4 (diversity) and lack the coherence that Cochran-Smith defined in her multicultural teacher education framework. Understanding the limits of what teacher educators describe in regards to diversity in accrediting institutional reports has implications for teacher educators, researcher, SCDEs, accrediting organizations, and educational policy.

CHAPTER ONE

I was born into a Portuguese immigrant family and lived predominately in immigrant communities in the Bay Area. My family's stories, the community's collective experiences, and my own insights have given me a unique perspective on education. My grandparents and their four children left their island home, Terceira, for a country that not only looked so different, but smelled, tasted, and sounded unique from their cultural references back home. My mother and her siblings attended the local high school and elementary school in Modesto, California without knowing a single word of English. My mother recalls her experience of attending school and described moments of hardship and loneliness, especially in the first year. She explained to me that programs or curricula for English language learners (ELLs) did not exist. However, she does not lament on the fact that there were not any programs to support her learning a new language. She is very proud that she learned English without a safety net. My mother was, of course, determined to learn English. However, she also acknowledged her luck in having a supportive art teacher and school counselor who provided her safe space and guidance to learn English and maneuver through the American education system. Her art teacher and counselor suspended any judgments about her family, culture, language, and even her gender, and supported her.

Forty years later, immigrant families continue to make the challenging journey to the United States with hopes of a better future for themselves, their children, and their grandchildren. They lay their faith in American schools and education to propel their families to participate in American ideals. I am a product of immigrant hopes and dreams. My family and the community supported my thirst for knowledge, passion in the field of education, love of travel, and my farfetched dream to one day obtain a doctoral degree. However, not all immigrant children or children of immigrants are able to achieve their highest potential. Their talents, knowledge, and skills are laid to waste because, unlike my mother, they did not have that one teacher who supported and challenged them. I worked with high school students who faced challenges similar to those of my mother, but whose life experiences and struggles were unique to their cultures, genders, religious beliefs, and new economic challenges of the twenty-first century. Schoolteachers, counselors, and administrators who lack the intercultural competence necessary to work with a diverse population of children and families neglect children who need additional support, resources, or access to course material. Yet, the challenge of diversity does not simply fall on P-12 educators, but also teacher educators who prepare future teachers for the classroom.

Teachers across the United States face realities in their classrooms that many were not prepared to handle by their teacher education programs. For instance, teachers meet students who are from cultures other than their own, who speak languages other than English, who are slipping further below the poverty line, or who have different learning needs. The fact is that the population of learners is growing more diverse, while the

teaching workforce is composed primarily of white, monolingual, middle-class females (National Center for Education Information (NCEI), 2005; NCEI, 2011; National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). The differences between teacher and student populations can appear superficial, but it can cause a cultural mismatch, resulting in misunderstandings of cultures that perpetuate the social inequities and academic gaps in schools (Avery & Walker, 1993; Smith-Maddox, 1998).

In a MetLife report on the state of teachers in the United States (2010, 2012), both principals and teachers rated addressing individual needs of diverse learners the most challenging issue facing teachers and school leaders. Even though 61% of the teachers reported that they believe they are differentiating instruction, a majority of students in a separate MetLife study (2010) did not believe their teachers were differentiating instruction, especially low-income students, students with exceptional needs, and those who have considered dropping out of school. To exacerbate this challenge, in a National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ, 2008) study, 61% of new teachers reported that their teacher education program did not properly prepare them for the diversity in their classroom. Seventy-six percent of the new teachers in the MetLife study reported that they did have instruction on topics related to diversity, but that the coursework did not prepare them for the realities of the actual classroom. As a result, there is a disconnection between the realities of P-12 schools and teacher education, especially with regard to diversity.

The disconnect between schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) curricula on diverse learners and the realities new teachers face is disconcerting,

especially when this is compounded by the fact that teachers' beliefs influence how they respond to students (Good & Brophy, 1987). These beliefs are shaped by personal experiences, school experiences, and formal knowledge (Richardson, 1996). Other research has also found that teachers' identities and beliefs can be a mismatch to students' cultural experiences, resulting in a lack of teacher-student relationships and lower expectations of students (Ferguson, 2007; Smith-Maddox, 1998). Some scholars argue that white teachers lack the awareness of biased institutional practices in public schools that are tailored to reflect the cultural values and norms of the dominant culture (Darder, 1991; Nieto, 2000). As a result, since the majority of teachers are white, middle-class females, they have had little challenge in maneuvering through the dominant cultural hurdles in public education due to their racial, linguistic, and class privilege (McIntosh, 1989; Noguera & Wing, 2006). Teachers' privileges and lack of knowledge about other cultural experiences result in a lack of awareness of how public schools are perceived by other cultures and cause misunderstanding between teachers, students, and students' parents (Avery & Walker, 1993; Cooper, 2003; Smith-Maddox, 1998). For instance, Smith-Maddox (1998), using the National Education Longitudinal Survey (NELS) of 1988, found that teacher-student relationships and interactions were valuable and had lasting effects on students' lives, which was supported by Hattie's (2009) meta-analysis on the power of teacher-student relationships. Smith-Maddox argued that the more "cultural congruence" there was in the classroom, the more comfortable students felt in the academic environment (p. 312). Even a teacher's expectations could change the

personal and academic development of a child either positively or negatively depending on the teacher's beliefs and goal setting for a particular child (Ferguson, 2007).

To further complicate the issue, Lynn, Bacon, Totten, Bridges, and Jennings (2010) found that African American teachers were not always culturally aware and even used "racist hate speech" that stereotyped and condemned African American students and their families for the achievement gap. This phenomenon may relate to socioeconomic status as well (Ferguson, 2008). Ferguson found that Black teachers of high socioeconomic status held higher expectations for their white students, and as a result worked more closely with them. On the other hand, Black teachers of lower socioeconomic status and white teachers of high socioeconomic status had better academic results with Black students, especially in mathematics. This suggests that the interplay between race and socioeconomic status may be another complicating factor in how teachers work and build relationships with students.

Teachers' attitudes and beliefs are also influential in how teachers engage with diverse learners (Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning, 1997; Cooper, 2003; Good & Brophy, 1987; Ferguson, 2008; Korthagen, 2002; Lynn et al., 2010; Smith-Maddox, 1998). Some researchers have argued that preservice teachers enter teacher education programs with cultural deficit beliefs, in which they only identify what the child lacks academically and does not learn more about the child to discover his/her strengths (Choi, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Moule, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Many times, additional stereotypes may arise in teachers' minds, such as low-income families, poor parenting, and families who lack awareness of the value of education (Choi, 2008).

Such beliefs have the potential to intrude into the classroom and weaken the teachers' efforts at developing student skill and potential. The cultural deficit model is not often overcome in teacher education programs. As a result, teachers may hold negative values about different races, cultures, and languages without critically reflecting on and analyzing the potential harm they are doing to their students. Multicultural education courses and field experiences, therefore, are necessary in the professional growth of preservice teachers. When novice teachers enter the classroom, they must be prepared to teach students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

As described above, the lack of confident and well-prepared preservice teachers entering diverse classrooms remains a programmatic and education research challenge. Teachers have the ability to become agents of change in schools and close achievement gaps (Oakes, Lipton, Anderson, & Stillman, 2012; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). However, with teachers who are poorly prepared for diverse learners, the chance of closing the gaps is minimized.

Multicultural Teacher Education

Some leading experts of culturally responsive education have argued that universities' attempts to prepare preservice teachers were slow and superficial (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Fox & Gay, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas, 2002, Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Zeichner et al., 1998). For instance, multiculturalism was not a major focus in programs of education, only one or two courses were offered in a given program, little or no related field experiences were provided for preservice teachers, and there was no connection between theory and practice. The

strategies teacher educators used to prepare preservice teachers for diversity were: (a) stand-alone multicultural education course; (b) multicultural coursework with a field experience(s); (c) cross cultural immersion experiences; or (d) cross-course multicultural integration at the program level. Based on literature reviews on multicultural teacher education by Sleeter (2001), Cochran-Smith, Davis, and Fries (2004), and Trent, Kea, and Oh (2008), they agreed that multicultural teacher education has progressed, but it has also reached a point of stagnation. In each literature review, the authors concluded that the studies on multicultural education for preservice teachers were small, scattered, and lacking in rigor. Additionally, they argued that there is a need for more rigorous research on the impact of multicultural education on preservice teachers; in particular, longitudinal studies that follow preservice teachers into their internships and even into their first years of teaching would help teacher educators understand the long-term impacts of multicultural teacher education.

There are no universal methods for educating preservice teachers on working with diverse learners. This is further complicated by federal, state, and nongovernment agency policies. Gollnick (1995) and Akiba, Cockrell, Simmons, Han, and Agarwal (2010) examined government and nongovernment policies that impacted SCDEs multicultural teacher education. For instance, in Gollnick's review of federal and state education legislation in regards to diverse learners, she found that federal legislation did not develop or promote multicultural education. Based on Sleeter and Grant's (1988) multicultural education typology, the legislation was based on a deficit model approach to multicultural education. Education legislation for marginalized groups was created to

“fix” a particular group’s problem. The federal government’s approach to gender issues in education was based on the single-group studies approach. However, the use of single-group studies was not helpful in integrating services and funding, especially since race, socioeconomic status, gender, and disabilities all interact in a complex manner.

States, on the other hand, have more constitutional authority over education policy and the development of curriculum, and have greater impact on marginalized populations. Gollnick’s (1995) analysis of 47 state policies and standards indicated that few states addressed multicultural education. Using Sleeter and Grant’s (1988) typology, Gollnick identified that all states maintained federal mandates and based state legislation on teaching the exceptional and culturally different. Additionally, a number of states use nongovernment initiatives, such as NCATE, the National Board for Professional Teaching, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and Interstates New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) to create and implement teacher licensure standards, which does not necessarily encourage states to promote more rigorous multicultural standards that lead to social reconstructive curriculum or instruction.

Similar to Gollnick’s (1995) study, Akiba and her colleagues (2010) conducted a content analysis of the standards of all 50 states and Washington, D.C. on teacher certification and teacher education programs. Using Sleeter and Grant’s (1988) typology, their focus in this study was on the integration of multicultural theory and principles in teacher education programs. The study uncovered that states mostly used standards characterized by Sleeter and Grant’s framework as human relations, as well as

exceptional and culturally different approaches. The researchers explained that such approaches to multicultural education do not develop preservice teachers' understanding of the inequality in education and society, but instead perpetuate the belief that cultural differences are problems that need to be accommodated rather than a resource in education. Nevertheless, since Gollnick's study, there have been improvements in addressing diversity standards, but based on these studies, states need to critically reevaluate them in order to meet the needs of diverse learners.

As Gollnick (1995) discussed, nongovernment organizations, such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) have a role in developing multicultural standards. Recently, Delgado (2011) examined NCATE's diversity standard (Standard 4) and how eleven SCDEs that were rated as "target" assessed preservice teachers' proficiencies related to the standard and how the assessment data helped to improve the units' abilities to work with preservice teachers on working with diverse learners. What distinguished the units that received "target" ratings were the regular review by candidates and faculty of the candidates' abilities to work with diverse learners and to develop plans for improvement. However, only some of the units who received "target" ratings provided detailed documents on the assessment tools; others only provided the title of the assessment to merit a "target" rating. Delgado reported that nine of the 11 units briefly reported to NCATE how assessments were reviewed and how they improved practice by using general statements about their review process. The assessment tools used by the units measured candidates' dispositions, but they did not use the data from the assessment to study the long-term impacts of the program. Another

concern Delgado discussed was the nature of reports written by the Board of Examiners, which read like summaries of the units' reports rather than explanations of how the Board reached its conclusions.

As Cochran-Smith et al., (2004), Gollnick (1995), Akiba et al. (2010) and Delgado's (2011) studies demonstrated, there is a need to further understand how accreditation standards influence SCDE faculty members, especially when teaching about diversity and systemic inequality. Gollnick (1995) and Akiba et al. (2010) found that a majority of states used professional standards when developing teacher licensure standards and evaluating SCDEs and teacher candidate proficiency in teaching diverse learners. Gollnick explained that the federal and state governments do not coordinate resources in order to better serve K-12 schools and SCDEs. Additionally, Akiba et al. and Delgado (2011) found that the standards were not always clear or explicit in identifying effective units that are complying with the professional standards. This is especially clear in Delgado's (2011) study, in which she found great variation between units' assessments and reporting of results on Standard 4. It is necessary for the field to better understand the role and impact of accreditation standards, in general, and specifically in the case of preparing preservice for diverse classrooms.

Conceptual Framework

Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework is rich with detail about the various stakeholders involved in teacher education while also allowing diverse perspectives around multicultural education and equity. Though the conceptual framework was published in 2003, it remains relevant to teacher education programs. It

was especially relevant to this study since it integrated the reality of policy agendas, the communities SCDEs are situated in, the policies and standards that impact teacher education, the institutional resources available to SCDEs, and multiple meanings of multicultural education. Cochran-Smith explained that the framework would be useful in examining the diverse policies on multicultural education and how such policies impact SCDEs and teacher educators' preparation of preservice teachers for diverse learners. Her framework has four major areas that interact with one another. First is the definition of multicultural teacher education that the SCDE has developed. Secondly, Cochran-Smith identified eight essential questions about multicultural teacher education programs. The questions revolve around these topics: (a) diversity; (b) ideology or social justice; (c) knowledge; (d) teacher learning; (e) practice; (f) outcomes; (g) recruitment or selection; and (h) coherence. The responses to these questions reflect how holistic the program is in teaching about diversity. The third element of Cochran-Smith's framework incorporated external forces, such as the institutional capacity, relationship with local communities and schools, and governmental and non-governmental regulations. The final piece to the framework is the larger social and political context, such as the public's views on teacher education and federal and state policies in which SCDEs participate. Within this framework, the social and political contexts impact teacher education and the multiple meanings of multiculturalism. Cochran-Smith's framework was used in this study. It was helpful in analyzing SCDEs' reports and determining if NCATE's diversity standard and accreditation process are effective in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of SCDEs in teacher multicultural education.

Research Question

The purpose of this study was to understand how SCDEs interpret and implement accrediting organization's standards by using Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework of multicultural teacher education. In 2013, NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) joined to become the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Due to the lack of data from CAEP at the time of this study, the researcher examined SCDEs rated as "target" by NCATE in the preparation of preservice teachers for diverse learners. Though this study focused on NCATE standards and accreditation processes, NCATE standards are similar to those of CAEP.

The research question was:

Which dimensions of Cochran-Smith's framework for addressing multicultural education are evident in what SCDEs report they do to prepare teachers for diverse environments?

Defining Terms

There are key terms used throughout this dissertation. The following are definitions for the purpose of this research.

Traditionally, diversity in multicultural education has focused on race and ethnicity. However, based on National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2011, 2013) reports, the definition of student diversity goes beyond race and ethnicity and encompasses language, socioeconomic status, and exceptionality. It also includes gender

identity, sexual orientation, religious diversity, and citizenship status. Therefore, my working definition of diversity is inclusive of historically marginalized students.

Multicultural education or multicultural teacher education, in this research, refers to the preparation of teachers for diverse learners. Multicultural teacher education should provide preservice teachers the skills to be culturally aware and competent to educate in a pluralistic and democratic society (Gay, 2002; Sleeter, 1992).

Institutions seeking or maintaining accreditation by NCATE must abide by the standards established by the organization. The standards are developed by NCATE's Standards Committee and ratified by the Executive Board. According to NCATE (2008), "standards measure an institution's effectiveness according to the profession's expectations for high quality teacher preparation. The education profession has reached a general consensus about the knowledge and skills educators need to help P-12 students learn" (p. 9). Every seven years, the standards are revised to reflect recent research and practice in the profession. Additionally, the revisions help clarify standards and streamline the process of accreditation. The following are NCATE (2008) standards: (a) candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; (b) assessment system and unit evaluation; (c) field experiences and clinical practice; (d) diversity; (e) faculty qualifications, performance, and developments; (f) unit governance and resources.

For this study the focus was on the diversity standard, which states:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that

candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity.

Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools (p. 34).

There are four elements to the diversity standard: (a) design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences; (b) experiences working with diverse faculty; (c) experiences working with diverse candidates; (d) experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools. Each element of Standard 4 also has a rubric that describes the expectations of the unit (see Appendix A).

Significance of the Problem

For decades teacher educators have created courses, frameworks, standards, and studies to develop and understand diversity in P-12 education and the impact it has on how teacher educators address it with preservice teachers. However, there is no universal way of preparing preservice teachers for educating diverse learners. NCATE has developed and continuously revised standards on the multicultural education of preservice teachers since 1979. Yet, based on reports and research on teacher preparedness to work with diverse learners, diversity continues to challenge SCDEs. Few studies have demonstrated how accrediting organizations' diversity standard has impacted the discourse and efforts by SCDEs to prepare preservice teachers for diversity.

There are individual teacher educators and researchers interested in and dedicated to teaching and studying multicultural education, but the lack of a single research agenda and reliable funding streams create further challenges. Currently, the literature is scarce

in studies that focus on multiple SCDEs or on accreditation diversity standard. In this study, the researcher looked at a diverse sample of SCDEs that received a score of “target” on NCATE’s diversity standard. In contrast with Delgado’s study, this study provided insight into what SCDEs that receive a score of “target” do in terms of their diversity and multicultural education.

CHAPTER TWO

One of the important contributions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was the disaggregation of student achievement data based on six factors: (a) race/ethnicity; (b) socioeconomic status; (c) gender; (d) exceptionality; (e) English language proficiency; and (f) status as the child of migrant workers. Based on the achievement gaps the law intended to affect, educators and policymakers are questioning whether the efforts of teacher education programs have been effective in preparing preservice teachers to work with diverse student populations in an inclusive school environment (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

In the research reviewed below, it is clear that there is no universal way of preparing preservice teachers for teaching in diverse classrooms and schools. To alleviate some of the confusion around teaching diverse P-12 students, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the national professional accreditation agency for education programs prior to 2013, developed standards concerning the multicultural education of preservice teachers (NCATE, 1979). However, based on the scholarship and limited research since that time, preparing teachers for student diversity remains a challenge for schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs). To understand better how SCDEs are preparing teachers, it would be important to study the

impact of NCATE's diversity standard (Standard 4) on purposefully selected SCDEs discourse and efforts in multicultural education for preservice teachers.

In the next section explores the literature on teacher multicultural education and the development of NCATE's diversity standard. The review begins with a description of the rapidly changing demographics of P-12 students in comparison to the predominantly White teacher workforce, and how racial, cultural, and class differences can influence teachers' interaction with students. Additionally, practicing and preservice teachers' beliefs on diversity and multicultural education will be discussed in order to understand how teachers approach diversity and multicultural education.

Changing Student Demographics

Traditionally, diversity in multicultural education has focused on race and ethnicity. However, diversity extends beyond such limiting definitions and includes language, socioeconomic status, exceptionality, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious diversity, and citizenship status. In the following section provides further description about early 21st century student demographics.

Race and ethnicity. Schools across the United States have witnessed an increase in the number of students who meet this working definition of diversity. As NCES (2011) reported, "between 1989 and 2009, the percentage of public school students who were White decreased from 68 to 55 percent" (p. 30). The percentage of Hispanic public school enrollment increased from 16% to 23% from 2000 to 2010 (NCES, 2013). Asian/Pacific Islander student enrollment increased from 4% to 5% (NCES, 2010, 2013), and African American student enrollment decreased from 17% to 16% between 2000 and

2010 (NCES, 2013). As mentioned above and noted below, diversity not only includes race, but also English language proficiency, socioeconomic status and student ability.

Language proficiency. In the past decade, the population of immigrant children increased, creating diverse linguistic learning communities in public schools. The Center for Education Policy (2006) reported that about one in five students speak a language other than English at home. The increase of English language learners (ELLs), which refers to students who are receiving “appropriate programs of language assistance” in public schools (NCES, 2013, p. 54), especially increased in the West. For example, in the 2009-2010 academic year, 29% of California’s public school enrollment was composed of ELLs. Additionally, the District of Columbia and 13 other states (Oklahoma, Arkansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, North Carolina, Virginia, Arizona, Utah, New York, Kansas, Illinois, Washington, and Florida) that traditionally had less than 3% enrollment of ELLs, witnessed an increase to 5.9% between 2010-2011 (NCES, 2013).

Socioeconomic status. All regions of the United States experienced an increase in child poverty due to the 2008 economic downturn. Between 2008 and 2009, there was an increase in poverty among K-12 students from 17% to 19% (NCES, 2010). The Great Recession of the early 21st century impacted minorities who historically struggled with social mobility, causing a continued overrepresentation of African American and Hispanic students in high-poverty schools and among students receiving free or reduced meals. According to NCES (2010), in 2007-2008, 42% of Hispanic elementary students, 40% of African American elementary students, and 28% of American Indian elementary students were enrolled in high-poverty schools, in comparison to 5% of White and 15%

of Asian American elementary students. Similarly, in secondary schools, 44% of Hispanic students, 38% of African American students, 11% of White students, and 4% of Asian American students attended high-poverty schools. This is a trend, and the implications for teacher education are to prepare teachers to reach all children regardless of socioeconomic status.

Exceptional needs students. Lastly, children with disabilities are also a significant population of students in public schools. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates that public schools provide services to students with disabilities that are appropriate and least restrictive. As a result, more students with disabilities are in general education classrooms. Currently, 13% of students in public schools are receiving special education services (NCES, 2013). As a result, preservice and inservice teachers need to be prepared to work with students who have various learning abilities and exceptional needs.

Teacher Demographics

As the statistics indicate, P-12 student populations in schools are changing and are increasingly diverse. Meanwhile, the teacher workforce remains comparatively homogeneous. For instance, the National Center for Education Information (2011) reports that 84% of public school teachers are White, middle-class, monolingual, Christian females. Even with a slight decrease in the proportion of White teachers in the past decade, White teachers still comprise the vast majority of the public school teacher workforce. Enrollment in the nation's SCDEs also lacks the diversity that can be found in P-12 public schools. A 2010 report from the American Association of Colleges for

Teacher Education (AACTE) indicated that a majority of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in education degree program were White (78%), while 8% were African American, 6% Hispanic, 2% Asian American, and 1% American Indian. Part-time undergraduate students enrolled in an education degree program included 61% White, 12% African American, 6% Hispanic, 3% Asian American, and 1% American Indian. Additionally, there were 53% White, 9% Black, 5% Hispanic, 2% Asian American, and 1% American Indian full-time graduate students (AACTE, pp. 16-17). As described in the previous section, K-12 students are diverse and have varying experiences, while the preservice teacher population remains predominately White.

Teachers and Students' Cultural Mismatch

Yet, why do the differences between teacher and student demographics matter? Concerns about the differences between student and teacher demographic profiles stem from the belief that a diverse workforce is good for all children (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Zumwalt and Craig explained that the center of knowledge should not be held and distributed by the dominant group. A diverse teacher workforce would allow for students to learn diverse perspectives and forms of knowledge, which can only benefit and strengthen a democratic and multicultural society (Zumwalt & Craig).

According to some scholars, White teachers have little awareness that public schools' institutional practices reflect the cultural values and norms of the dominant culture, of which they are members (Darder, 1991; Nieto, 2000). The majority of teachers have had little challenge in maneuvering through the dominant cultural hurdles in public education due to their racial, linguistic, and class privilege (McIntosh, 1989; Noguera &

Wing, 2006). Teachers' privileges result in a lack of awareness of how public schools are perceived by other cultures, and even lead to misunderstanding between teachers and students (Avery & Walker, 1993; Smith-Maddox, 1998).

The differences between teacher and student populations can appear superficial, but can also cause cultural mismatches, resulting in misunderstandings of cultural norms or socioeconomic situations leading to the perpetuation of academic opportunity to learn gaps in schools, which can then lead to social inequities (Avery & Walker, 1993; Smith-Maddox, 1998). As some scholars have argued, for generations, schools have reinforced the White American cultural orientation and forcefully assimilated minority children into it (Nieto, 2000; Oakes, Lipton, Anderson, & Stillman, 2012). According to Fordham and Ogbu (1986), traditionally marginalized communities perceived the schooling their children received as a "subtractive process" (p. 182). In other words, by learning how to be successful in school, minority children were acculturating into the White culture "at the expense of the minorities' cultural frame of reference and collective welfare" (Fordham and Ogbu, 1986, p.183). Pressure from peer groups discouraged members of these minority cultures to succeed academically as it was seen as "acting white" (Fordham and Ogbu, p.183). "Acting white" was synonymous with "acting better" than other community members. The perception of "acting white" led to ostracization and even physical attack. Smith-Maddox (1998) continued to research how the different perceptions and beliefs about education between students and teachers influenced students' academic success.

Smith-Maddox (1998) studied the influence of culture on students' academic achievement by analyzing data from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey of 1988. The dependent variable was standardized test scores in mathematics, and the independent variables were constructed into four domains: student, family, school, and teacher. She found that parents' discussions with teachers were strong predictors of academic success for Asian American, African American, and European American students. Additionally, she found the teacher-student relationships and interactions were valuable and had lasting effects on students' lives. She argued that the more "cultural congruence" there was in the classroom, the more comfortable students felt in the academic environment (Smith-Maddox, p. 312). These findings support the idea that teachers' interactions and relationships with both students and parents are imperative to student success. It also suggests that curriculum and strategies taught on diversity in SCDEs need to be reexamined. Though the findings "present a resounding argument for the importance of culture in teaching and learning," there is a need for more studies that better measure academic success and operationalize variables such as cultural content and cultural capital (p. 313).

Cooper (2003) took a unique approach to understanding the impact of teacher bias by focusing on African American mothers' beliefs about the influence teachers' biases had on their child's academic success. The data were collected from 14 African American mothers from working or low-income class who had children attending various types of local schools, such as traditional public schools, charter schools, an Afrocentric private academy, and Catholic schools. She conducted two rounds of in-depth, open-ended

interviews with each mother. She found that all the mothers believed that education was important for their children and were adamant that their children get the best, academically rigorous, well-rounded, and caring education. She characterized a majority of the women as engaged in their children's schooling. Yet, they also faced challenges, such as the complexity of district choice policies, lack of transportation, lack of concise information, and little interaction with district officials who were gatekeepers into schools. All the mothers were well aware of the "pervasive inequities they found within their local, urban school district" (p.108), such as inadequate school facilities, lack of learning and teaching resources, and overcrowding, which they believed diminished the quality of the education. They also "expressed disbelief" that district and school officials exhibited tolerance of such inequities between urban and suburban schools.

Additionally, the mothers discussed that the teachers in their children's classrooms carried deficit beliefs about poor and minority children and their families. Even though the mothers were engaged in the education of their children, they felt the teachers did not value the resources African American mothers used because they were not the cultural capital used by White, middle-class, married parents. This misunderstanding between teachers and mothers further entrenched teacher bias, according to the mothers. Twelve of the 14 mothers offered that the public school teachers discriminated against inner-city school children due to their beliefs about inner city populations. Almost all of the mothers emphasized that teachers have so much power over children's self-esteem. They can either uplift or degrade children, and nine of the 14

women discussed incidences in which a teacher emotionally or physically harmed their children, and how such behavior by teachers affected their children.

Smith-Maddox's (1998) results indicated that the most important cultural predictors of academic success were parent involvement, parental socioeconomic status, and the parental expectations of their children. However, as Cooper (2003) indicated, even with mothers who were involved in their children's education, who held high expectations of their children, and who interacted with teachers, there were still perceived misunderstandings and even negative attitudes from teachers toward African American mothers and their children. The subtle messages transmitted by teachers and other adult authority figures in schools suggested to minority students and their families in lower socioeconomic classes that they would not be able to escape the oppressive conditions of poverty due to the structural inequalities in schools. As a result, children become self-fulfilling prophecies (Ferguson, 2007; Smith-Maddox, 1998). Even a teacher's expectations could radically change the personal and academic development of a child either positively or negatively depending on the teacher's beliefs and goal setting (Ferguson, 2007). These results support Bourdieu's (1986) discussion on the dominant culture's ability to maintain power in society. The idea of "cultural capital" maintains that institutions, like schools, sustain the dominant class's values and, as a result, increase the importance of one form of knowledge over other forms.

Yosso (2005) argued that other capital should also be included in order to minimize the deficit model, which maintains that minorities "lack" the social and cultural capital for social mobility. Using a critical race theory lens, Yosso explained,

“Communities of Color nurture cultural wealth through at least 6 forms of capital such as aspiration, navigational, social, linguistic, familial, and resistant capital” (p. 77). These six forms of cultural wealth are not static or exclusive, but “are dynamic processes that build on one another as part of a community cultural wealth” (p. 77). However, such community based wealth is not as valued by a majority of White, middle-class Americans who value individualism and meritocracy rather than collectivism, which are valued in Asian, African, and Latino cultures (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, & Garcia, 2009).

Culture and the way it is perceived by teachers of historically marginalized students is significant in how teachers interact with their students. As Good and Brophy (1987) noted, teachers’ beliefs influence how teachers respond to students. These beliefs are shaped by personal experiences, school experiences, and formal knowledge, and are well-established as students enter college (Richardson, 1996). In the next section, there will be further discussion about practicing and preservice teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards diversity and multicultural education. It is essential, first, to recognize teachers’ beliefs in order to best understand how to prepare aspiring teachers for the diversity in schools and to provide the knowledge and skills to effectively incorporate multicultural education into their professional practice.

Practicing Teachers’ Beliefs on Diversity and Multicultural Education

Some researchers have suggested that teachers of color are more likely to engage with and express positive beliefs about culturally diverse students; in particular, African American teachers working with African American students exhibit “cultural connectedness” (Foster, 1994; Foster & Peele, 1999). Additionally, as Ladson-Billings

(1992, 1994) argued, teachers of color can promote positive attitudes about school and education that is culturally relevant. As a result, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has called for the systematic increase of teachers of color (CAEP, 2013). The 2013 CAEP standards denote,

While recruitment of talented minority candidates is a time- and labor- intensive process, “teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported.” Recruitment can both increase the quality of selected candidates and offset potentially deleterious effects on diversity from more selective criteria- either at admissions or throughout a program. (p.10)

However, Lynn and colleagues (2010) found that African American teachers were not always culturally aware and even used “racist hate speech” that stereotyped and condemned African American students and their families for perpetuating the achievement gap. This result may relate to socioeconomic status as well (Ferguson, 2008). Ferguson found that Black teachers of high socioeconomic status had higher expectations of their White students and, as a result, worked closer and harder with their White students. Black teachers of low socioeconomic status and White teachers of high socioeconomic status were found to have better results with Black students, especially in mathematics. This suggests that the interplay between race and socioeconomic status may be a factor in how White and Black teachers work with students.

Using critical race ethnography, Lynn et al. (2010) studied teacher beliefs about why Black students failed or succeeded in school, the efforts to improve learning for Black males, and the ideas teachers had about the improving conditions for Black male

students. The researchers collected data by interviewing teachers and observing various places throughout one low-performing high school in an urban community. Ninety-nine percent of the students in the school were African American, 40% qualified for free or reduced lunch and had a high mobility rate. The researchers estimated about 50% of the school's Black males dropped out, transferred to another school, or graduated at or near the bottom of their class. The faculty and staff were also mostly made up of African Americans including the school principal. At the time of the study, the school was in the first year of "school improvement."

In total, the researchers interviewed 50 school personnel in focus groups, a majority of whom were African American. From the focus group responses, the researchers chose six teachers to interview individually and observe in the classroom. When the researchers asked the focus groups why they believed African American students in school were failing state standards, the teachers responded that it was due to: (a) students' behavior and attitudes about school; (b) barriers within the community; and (c) a lack of parental commitment to their children's academic success.

The researchers were surprised by the results of their study because African American teachers were using "racist hate speech" (p. 313) to describe the achievement gap and students' disengagement with school. Essentially, they were blaming students, parents, and the community for the students' failure in school. For instance, many teachers expressed their disappointment in the African American community's lack of interest in education, as well as the lack of support and structure within homes and neighborhoods. The authors concluded that this was due to the internalization of racist

messages from society. Additionally, the majority of the teachers were middle-class, which provided another explanation for their attitudes.

On the other hand, the six teachers that the researchers focused on individually did not blame the achievement gap on students or parents, but rather on systemic issues such as poverty and the lack of funding and resources. Based on the six teachers' conversations with the researchers, they did not have high efficacy on their ability to teach, yet the researchers noticed that they used real-life application to the content, engaging students in activities and discussion. Teachers were genuinely interested in students' ideas and questions; they were able to connect to their students and as a result, the students were engaged and never left the classroom to wander the halls. This finding is similar to Hattie's (2009) findings in his meta-analysis of teacher-student relationships. He found that students who had good relationship with teachers not only enjoyed attending school, but also had higher achievement scores.

However, none of the teachers in either the focus or individual interviews ever blamed teachers for the failure of student engagement and success in school. The authors concluded that the discussion around teacher quality should be reframed in order to incorporate non-traditional indicators of highly qualified teachers, such as teachers' ability to understand their "students' cultural standpoints" (p. 323). It must also be noted that teacher educators need to be aware that, though teachers of color may have different cultural experiences than their White peers, they may also carry deficit beliefs about culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1997) investigated general education teachers' beliefs about language minority students. Their study attempted to focus on "new" linguistic-minority students since many of the previous studies focused on non-standard English and Spanish speakers. Using the Language Attitudes of Teachers Scale, the researchers surveyed 191 teachers in teacher education courses in Arizona, Utah, and Virginia. By sampling from different states, the researchers hoped to capture the language diversity and a variety of teacher experiences. They examined the data using analysis of variance techniques and found that respondents with more experiences with ELLs were more likely to have positive attitudes. Additionally, formal training about English language learners was also associated with positive attitudes towards ELLs. It was not surprising that teachers from Arizona, who have a high percentage of Spanish speaking students in their classes and have more formal training opportunities on linguistic diversity, were the most positive, followed by Utah, and Virginia. The authors concluded that teacher education programs should incorporate courses that empower teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to work with ELLs. In addition, districts need to support teachers with the necessary resources. The study was important in understanding what factors were associated with teachers' attitudes towards language and reinforcing the need to prepare preservice teachers with the knowledge and resources to work with ELLs.

To support the conclusion of Byrnes et al. (1997) on education programs, Pohan and Aguilar's (2001) exploratory study on measuring teachers' beliefs about diversity in both their personal and professional situations found that multicultural and diversity education courses were "more strongly associated with professional beliefs than with

personal beliefs about diversity,” but this was not true for practicing teachers (p.174). Participants of the field testing stage of the measures included preservice teachers ($n = 411$) and inservice teachers ($n = 209$). The researchers explained that preservice teachers had more exposure to topics of diversity throughout their program of study. On the other hand, they added that the reality and complexities of the classroom caused inservice teachers to be more firm in their beliefs and hesitant to change their practice. One explanation is that teacher education programs do not properly prepare teachers for the realities of the classroom while discussing topics around diversity.

The research above indicates that that teachers’ influences on students’ self-esteem, academic success and engagement is great. Negative beliefs about culturally and linguistically diverse students can have an impact on students’ success. Many of the authors called for education programs to take a more active role in facilitating dialogue with preservice teachers about their beliefs about marginalized students. In the next section will discuss beliefs and attitudes on diversity and multicultural education, but this time focusing on preservice teachers.

Preservice Teachers’ Beliefs About Diversity and Multicultural Education

Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes have powerful impacts in the classroom (Korthagen, 2002). All teachers were once students and have a developed their own vision of what teaching and learning looks like, but many times, these beliefs about teaching can be oppositional to what is being taught in a teacher education course. Yet, old beliefs tend to prevail over new information being taught in teacher education course work (Wubbels, 1992). Teacher education emphasizes “becoming conscious of one’s

own ‘personal practical knowledge’” (Clandinin, 1986). During this time, the value of teachers’ stories has increased and has been recognized in teacher education. The narratives teachers tell themselves and others are influential in how they view themselves as professionals and how their professional identity develops (Carter, 1993). This is not necessarily a negative aspect of teaching if the teacher knows her own biases and acts on eliminating these negative beliefs and attitudes. As Hamacheck (1999) noted, “The more that teachers know about themselves – the private curriculum within – the more their personal decisions are apt to be about how to pave the way for better teaching” (p. 209). Yet, a teacher’s beliefs and attitudes can be detrimental for children, especially those who do not follow the teacher’s mental model of what constitutes a “good” student.

Similarly, Avery and Walker (1993) found that preservice teachers’ expectations of students’ academic and social behavior were complex and appeared to affect student achievement. Their study focused on preservice teachers’ ($n = 152$) perceptions of gender and ethnic differences in academic achievement. They were given two open-ended items to respond on gender and race. The written responses were analyzed for the causal factors the preservice teachers cited and how well they described and related to social factors.

The researchers found that preservice teachers were most likely to attribute gender differences in academic achievement to society, such as discrimination and societal expectations. On the other hand, ethnic differences were attributed to the students’ culture, such as a group’s values and socioeconomic status. In addition, their explanations for the disparities were simplistic in nature. They concluded that the

exploration of issues of diversity with preservice teachers may need to begin with a deeper understanding of origins of their beliefs.

Kumar and Hamer (2012) conducted a similar study, but they focused on the impact teacher education had on white preservice teachers' beliefs toward traditionally marginalized students in relation to instructional practices they would endorse. Additionally, the researchers examined whether preservice teachers' experiences in a teacher education program improved their disposition towards minorities and less affluent students.

The participants were white preservice teachers ($n = 868$). Preservice teachers of color were not included in the study because the available sample size was too small to conduct any meaningful analysis. The data collection process was a sequential design, which included cross-sectional and longitudinal data. They developed their own scale to measure preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity, which included ethnic minority students, low socioeconomic status students, assimilations into mainstream culture, and their comfort level interacting with diverse students and faculty. They created another instrument to measure preservice teachers' willingness to adapt instruction to meet the needs of diverse students and preservice teachers' self-efficacy.

The ANOVA indicated that teachers were less biased at the end of the program than the first year they started the program. On the other hand, the paired t -test based on the longitudinal data illustrated that though preservice teachers increased the desire to promote democratic multiculturalism in their classroom instruction, they were less inclined to be critical and self-reflective about diversity when they entered their field

experiences. The researchers suggested that multicultural course work should be included toward the end of the program in order to reinforce multicultural topics discussed earlier in the program. Nevertheless, even with the coursework, more than 25% of these preservice teachers held stereotypical beliefs about minority and poor children. Preservice teachers who held negative beliefs towards minority and poor students also indicated that working with diverse students would be a challenge, and building rapport with children of different cultures would be difficult. However, the analysis must be interpreted with caution due to the self-reported data. As a result, the positive change towards multiculturalism from preservice teachers may be a response to better awareness, but not necessarily a better understanding or willingness to change beliefs and action in the classroom.

Nevertheless, Kumar and Hamer (2012) suggested that coursework in teacher credentialing programs needs to be consistent in teaching about diverse student populations; coursework should employ consistent terminology and build connections between coursework and field experiences. This, of course, means that faculty must buy into the need to integrate courses better by developing common course syllabi, goals, objectives, and assessments.

Goodwin (1994) wanted to identify how preservice teachers defined and conceptualized multicultural education. Participants included 120 preservice teachers completing their teacher education program. A questionnaire was administered asking preservice teachers to describe the goals of multicultural education, identify practices they saw in their field experience, and describe barriers to multicultural practices. Data

were analyzed using an inductive process. In addition, Sleeter and Grant's (1994) typology was used to analyze the range of definitions and concepts of multicultural education.

These preservice teachers identified four goals of multicultural education to: (a) deepen children's knowledge about others; (b) change the way people view differences; (c) cultivate pride in individual children's culture; and (d) evoke social change beyond the classroom. When the data were disaggregated by race, Goodwin (1994) found that participants of color were more likely than White peers to describe the goals of multicultural education to focus on the individual child and on social change. In addition, preservice teachers of color were more likely to suggest that multicultural education should explore non-White cultures. Goodwin also found that when these preservice teachers were asked about what they observed or implemented during their field experiences, a majority of what was seen or practiced by the participants was driven by content, such as social studies, literature, and math. Multicultural practices were secondary and described as an add-on to the curriculum. For instance, 17% of the multicultural interaction encouraged students to share their perspectives and family stories. Twelve percent of the multicultural practices were linked to special events such as Black History Month, religious holidays, and festivals. Other responses included the use of languages other than English in a book and teacher initiative to create a positive classroom environment. Only 4% of the responses described activities engaging students in critical analysis of the status quo. Finally, the rest of the responses described cooking ethnic

foods, utilizing multicultural materials in the classroom, or emphasizing marginalized people's history rather than the American history canon.

Goodwin argued that the majority of participants' viewed multicultural education as a secondary activity that was triggered by a particular holiday or event, which resulted in a superficial investigation of another culture. However, 25% of the respondents did not indicate that they saw or practiced multiculturalism, and 50% did not implement any multicultural practices. In the final question about barriers to multicultural education, these preservice teachers were concerned about the instruction, themselves, and the context. Many were concerned about the amount of material needed to cover in addition to multicultural material. Other students wanted clarification, models, and evidence that multicultural education benefited students. Others discussed being fearful of making mistakes, as well as uncertainty about their preparedness to deal with controversial issues. In addition, the participants referred to multicultural education as predominately for students of color.

These results indicated that there was a range of understanding of what multicultural education was, and the preservice teachers did not get clarification from their program because they were about to graduate. In addition, their field experiences also failed preservice teachers' opportunity to engage in multicultural education. Goodwin argued that teacher educators needed to be more explicit and proactive in engaging with preservice teachers in their beliefs about diversity and multicultural education. However, it is not enough to have some content labeled multicultural education. Teacher educators need to "be fully aware of their students' perceptions, have

powerful activities and experiences to offer students, and be willing and able to dialogue with students on an in-depth level over a sustained period in an effort to affect their perceptions” (p. 129). This means that SCDE faculty members need to work closely with cooperating teachers and collaborate with P-12 schools. Lastly, Goodwin recommended that programs consider integrating racial identity theory into teacher preparation, which helps to identify how preservice teachers view themselves as cultural beings (Carter & Goodwin, 1994). She argues this will facilitate the conversation on race and situate preservice teachers and faculty within multicultural education as a practice that leads to equity. As a result, teacher education can have a greater impact on teachers.

Siwatu’s (2007) study examined preservice teachers’ culturally responsive self-efficacy and the relationship between their efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs, or the likely consequences of engaging in the behavior, using the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale and the Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Scale. The author created the scales after an extensive review of culturally responsive teaching competencies. The instruments were pilot tested and refined, and a final draft was administered to a sample of preservice teachers. In this study, Siwatu wanted to understand how efficacious preservice teachers were in practicing culturally responsive teaching and whether they believed in the positive outcomes of culturally responsive teaching. The researcher surveyed 275 participants who were mostly White ($n = 255$). The participants were at varying points of their education programs. Participants responded to all the questionnaires during a regular class session. The results indicated that there was a positive relationship between the two scores ($r = .70, p < .001$). Therefore,

if teachers are efficacious in their abilities to execute culturally relevant practices, then they also believe that positive outcomes are associated with the pedagogy.

Siwatu's (2007) findings suggest that preservice teachers are efficacious in their ability to teach and help students feel like important members of the classroom and develop positive relationships with students. However, they do not feel comfortable communicating with English language learners, and they do not believe in the positive outcomes of encouraging students to use their native language. These findings are similar to the beliefs that Byrnes et al. (1997) found practicing teachers had, which suggests that SCDEs are not appropriately preparing teachers to work with ELLs; more needs to be done to insure that prospective teachers are introduced to theory and practice on teaching linguistically diverse students by exposing them to models of success.

Siwatu (2011) also studied the influence school context has on preservice teachers' preparedness to teach. Thirty-four preservice teachers were drawn from a population of students enrolled in a teacher education program in the Southwest. The sample included 21 White students, five African Americans, and four Hispanics. A counterbalanced repeated measure quasi-experimental design was implemented. Ideally, students would have been exposed to both urban and suburban contexts, but this was not possible. As a result, the researcher wrote an essay on the suburban context and a separate one on the urban context.

In Phase 1 of the study, the participants were given one of the essays to read, and after reading the description of either school context they responded to a 31-item self-efficacy scale and to five questions pertaining to their sense of preparedness to teach

either in an urban or suburban school. After four days, the participants returned to complete Phase 2, which was the same as Phase 1, but participants read about a different school context. A series of paired-samples *t*-test were conducted on the self-efficacy scale to evaluate whether there were significant differences between the participants' preparedness to teach in either urban or suburban schools, and whether there were significant differences between preservice teachers' self-efficacy for teaching scores by either context.

The results revealed that preservice teachers were scored as better prepared to teach in suburban schools and felt confident teaching diverse learners in a suburban school rather than in an urban school. However, regardless of the context, teachers felt most prepared to teach White students, while feeling the least prepared to teach ELLs. These findings again support the results of Byrnes et al. (1997) on practicing teachers and Siwatu's (2007) study on preservice teachers. Additionally, their self-efficacy scores were significantly lower in the urban context compared to the suburban context, suggesting that context does matter. One explanation is that teacher education programs are not doing an adequate enough job of preparing teachers for a variety of contexts or for diverse student populations, especially ELLs. The participants' self-reported lack of confidence about teaching in urban settings may also be due to the contextual factors of urban schools, such as class size, student socioeconomic status, community support, and test scores. Additionally, Siwatu explained that these preservice teachers may have been influenced by the media's negative stereotypes of urban communities. Some limitations, such as the researcher's description of each school context and the small sample size,

may limit the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, they support other studies' findings that preservice teachers do not feel prepared to work with ELLs, students of color, or in an urban context.

Finally, Van Hook (2002) looked at preservice teachers' perceived barriers to teaching a multicultural and anti-bias curriculum. The participants were sophomore undergraduate students ($n = 68$) enrolled in a teacher education program. They were asked to write a reflective paper on the barriers to implementing a diversity curriculum and the barriers to creating a diverse classroom community. The majority of students identified teaching in a racially diverse classroom as a barrier. Sixteen percent of the students responded that they would have a difficult time discussing sensitive topics and religion, and controversial topics were specifically discussed in their reflections. Some expressed fear of crossing the strict line between state and church, while others were nervous of offending someone's religious beliefs in class. They preferred to remain neutral and implement a curriculum that avoided topics that could be viewed as controversial. They identified federal, state, and school policies and geography as barriers to diversity. They explained that the level of acceptance and support for diversity in schools was different and could limit a teacher's ability to implement curriculum or practice that was inclusive. This also led to a discussion on communities strictly made up of one race. The evidence suggested that these preservice teachers assumed that homogenous communities might carry attitudes that do not allow for teachers to facilitate discussions around diversity. They also mentioned the difficulty of implementing a diversity-inclusive curriculum because they feared leaving a student out or having

incorrect information about a child. Two students also identified time as a constraint to multicultural education, arguing that there were particular standards that needed to be covered and diversity may not always fit the standard. Lastly, these preservice teachers identified other people's inabilities to accept diversity as another barrier, in particular the perception of parents' inabilities to accept diversity.

Van Hook (2002) argued that these "perceived beliefs may be interpreted as inherent barriers to obstructing the implementation of a diverse curriculum" (p. 262). By understanding these perceived barriers, teacher educators can facilitate discussions and reflections around what teachers view as barriers to multicultural education and break down those barriers in order for new teachers to integrate multicultural education in the classroom.

These studies suggest that teacher education toward multicultural education is not adequately challenging preservice teachers' self-efficacy in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students or in different school contexts. Many (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2007) have argued that teacher education programs' disjointed attempts at multicultural education and outdated coursework and techniques have allowed preservice teachers to enter into suburban and urban classrooms unfit to teach in diverse and multicultural classroom environments.

The lack of confident and well-prepared preservice teachers entering diverse classrooms remains a programmatic challenge and a research challenge because teachers have the ability to become agents of change in schools and close the opportunity to learn and achievement gaps (Oakes, Lipton, Anderson, & Stillman, 2012; Sleeter & Grant,

2009). However, failing to find ways to prepare teachers for diverse classrooms, the chance of closing these gaps remains narrow. Many times, knowingly or unknowingly, teachers enter the classroom with their own biases and stereotypes that can quickly affect how children in their classrooms will be treated and their own expectations of the children (Moule, 2009; Sleeter, 2001). Additionally, some preservice teachers believe in the cultural deficit ideology, in which the teacher only sees the child for what he/she lacks academically and does not learn more about the child to discover the child's strengths (Choi, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Moule; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). As a result, the value of that child is diminished. Not only are academic skills viewed as a deficit, but other stereotypes creep in, such as low-income status, poor parenting, and families who lack the value of education (Choi, 2008). Choi further explained that these social deficits can tarnish a teacher's view of a child, and she may not spend time to develop the student's skills and potential (Cooper, 2003; Gay, 2010).

Given the changed demography, multicultural courses and experiences are essential in the professional growth of the traditional teacher workforce. When novice teachers enter the classroom they must be prepared to teach students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and continue their professional growth in multicultural issues. Cooper (2003) argued that there is a need for "social justice educators who are dedicated to opposing the structural inequality found in schools" (p.113). Accomplishing this goal requires teacher education programs to encourage preservice teachers to become critically reflective practitioners, through integrated coursework and fieldwork that facilitate

preservice teachers becoming aware of their own culture and also becoming culturally sensitive, such as instituting mentoring programs between preservice and practicing teachers who use culturally relevant pedagogy. The next section is a review of the different interpretations of teacher multicultural education. Some SCDEs use the single course approach with or without field experience; others include immersion into communities; while others develop programs that address diversity throughout the curriculum.

Multicultural Teacher Education

In 1979, NCATE created new multicultural education accreditation standards. The standards were established as a result of AACTE's Bicentennial Commission on Education report, which expressed the imperative of multicultural education. As a result, SCDE faculty members had to take a more active role in integrating multicultural education into teacher education.

Below is a review of the literature on teacher multicultural education. The literature is divided into five sections. The first section looks at the single course model, on which there is a large number of studies. Due to the implementation of the NCATE standards, SCDEs quickly developed courses that fulfilled the accreditation standards. Additionally, teacher educators can easily study their practice, but, as will be discussed, there are methodological concerns that need to be addressed. After the section on the single course model are sections on the following: (a) courses with field experience; (b) immersion into a community; (c) programmatic interventions; and (d) recommendations by experts in the field of multicultural teacher education.

Single course model. The single course model is usually one course in the teacher education program sequence that discusses diversity and multiculturalism. Teacher educators who have studied them typically conduct the studies on their own courses. Some researchers use Likert-type scales, while others use student work as the sole source of data. The strengths and weaknesses of each study are discussed, followed by a summary of the single course approach.

Cho and DeCastro-Ambrosetti (2005) explored the impact a multicultural education course had on preservice teachers' attitudes. Participants included 18 secondary education preservice teachers who completed the pre- and post-assessments. The survey asked questions about students' attitudes related to culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students and multicultural education. The survey included a 5-point Likert-type scale and open-ended questions. The data were analyzed using frequencies and t-tests and the open-ended questions were coded and categorized.

The findings indicated that a majority of preservice teachers' attitudes toward working with CLD students were positively influenced by the course on multicultural education. Though students claimed to learn a great deal from the course, they did not feel prepared to work with CLD students. They feared being viewed as an outsider by parents and students due to their limited knowledge and experience with different cultures. The evidence also showed contradictory views and even negative attitudinal shifts about the benefits of multicultural education for all students, especially minority and low social class parents' support of education. The researchers wondered if the increased awareness about diversity caused preservice teachers to question their ability to

work with students. The data sources were too limiting for Cho and DeCastro-Ambrosetti (2005) to understand why preservice teachers in their post-tests believed they were not prepared to teach CLD students.

The authors concluded that these contradictory views by preservice teachers needed to be further investigated in future research. In addition, they provided little information on the course and how it was developed. Such information is important for other teacher educators and researchers who are interested in replicating the study or build on it. There was also limited information on the educators and participants in the study. In such studies, context is essential in understanding how the intervention influenced participants' thinking. Based on the results, the researchers questioned the ability of one stand-alone multicultural education course's ability to shift preservice teachers' attitudes and build the knowledge and skill necessary to work with CLD students.

Frye, Button, Kelly and Button (2010) wanted to understand the impact of a methods course that included strategies on culturally responsive teaching (CRT). The authors claimed that the teacher educators involved in this study were dedicated to CRT; however, no evidence was provided to support such a claim. The researchers used Siwatu's (2006) survey on culturally responsive teaching competencies, which also included a self-analysis in which preservice teachers reviewed their responses and assessed what they gained the most during the semester course. Preservice teachers took the survey prior to and after the course in order to determine on which competencies they gained the most.

The course began with a culturally responsive teaching lesson that the researcher developed. The lesson incorporated two children's books about the African American experiences in gaining rights from pre-Civil War era to the mid-20th century. The preservice teachers discussed the books in detail in class. The researchers also co-taught an art and literacy project. The lesson began by describing how symbols and designs are used to express cultures. In addition, one of the researchers, who was also an arts specialist, demonstrated the use of different art mediums and color to emphasize the importance that art can have in expressing different cultures. The preservice teachers then engaged in creating individual paper quilts that incorporated four symbols that represented their own identity. The students put the quilt together and discussed the quilt and what it symbolized. After the researchers demonstrated this CRT lesson, preservice teachers were encouraged to practice CRT in their own teaching and keep a journal on their practices.

Based on the pre- and post- surveys, the preservice teachers showed an improvement in their beliefs in the benefits of CRT and their ability to use CRT in their classroom. Interestingly, though undergraduates rated themselves as having less CRT skill on the pretest than graduates, the posttest indicated that graduates were less confident than undergraduates due to their experience in the classroom and more accurate understanding of their skills. In their written responses, the preservice teachers expressed that they valued CRT, but also understood that using CRT was a lifelong practice.

There were limitations to the study. The preservice teachers in the course may have felt compelled to indicate greater improvement than they actually believed. Even

though their results would not impact their grade, the students may have provided socially desirable responses in order to receive a good grade. In addition, the study relied heavily on the students' self-reported data. The researchers concluded that modeling CRT in a methods course can improve students' understanding and confidence in using the practice in their own teaching.

Artiles and McClafferty (1998) focused on human diversity beyond race, and included topics around gender, socioeconomic status, and language. The course's objective was to promote reflection. Artiles taught the required course for five weeks to 17 students. A variety of teaching methods were implemented, but what was unique about this particular study was the use of both concept maps and surveys as measures of preservice teachers' change and development in attitudes. Using an inductive approach to examine participants' conceptions of teaching culturally diverse students, the researchers first analyzed the concept maps to see how individual participants' changed their conceptualization. They did not score the concept map against a standard concept map, but rather looked for high density of concepts, such as the number of main ideas and the different levels of categories. Finally, they conducted a content analysis of the concept maps and created a category system, which included curriculum issues, instructional issues, and social context issues. The surveys were distributed in the first and last weeks of the course. However, not all participants completed the survey the last week and as a result, the results are based on a small sample size and must be interpreted with caution. They found that preservice teachers emphasized social context and attitudes or qualities

teachers should possess in order to teach diverse students successfully, such as respecting students and tailoring instruction for individual students.

Reflection has also been viewed as an important element in courses focusing on diversity. Howard (2003) discussed the ways in which teacher educators can best equip preservice teachers with the skills and knowledge to reflect critically on their own racial and cultural experiences and identities. Reflection is an active component of challenging, and ultimately changing, beliefs and behavior. This is especially important in culturally relevant teaching in which teachers reflect on deficit beliefs about diverse students they may carry. By shedding negative beliefs, teachers can authentically positively engage with diverse students to think critically. As Howard argues:

Effective reflection of race within a diverse cultural context requires teachers to engage in one of the more difficult processes for all individuals – honest self-reflection and critique of their own thoughts and behaviors. Critical reflection requires one to seek deeper levels of self-knowledge, and to acknowledge how one's own worldview can shape students' conceptions of self. (p. 198)

This, of course, is a difficult activity for even experienced teachers. Critical reflection requires people to ask themselves difficult questions and to be honest with themselves. As a result, it is critical for teacher educators to create a space that is safe for preservice teachers to express themselves freely, and then guide them in reflective practice, in particular thinking about the influence of race on learning. In the following study, Garmon (1998) described how he used dialogue journals to create such a space.

Garmon focused on dialogue journals, in which students reflected on the course materials and discussions and the instructor responded and asked questions for students to engage in future journal entries. The journals were intended for students to think critically about issues around race in education. The primary data sources were journal entries from 21 students. The researcher analyzed the data by identifying the sections in the journals that related to race. Then he read and reread the segments, coded, and developed categories.

He found that the dialogue journals promoted student learning. For example, in many instances, the journal writing provoked students to gain new insights, without the instructor's input. The journals were also a platform for the instructor to respond to students' questions, and the interaction became a way to individualize instruction for each student. In addition, the instructor would directly challenge students' beliefs that could be viewed as problematic. With the researcher's support through non-confrontational dialogue in students' journals, preservice teachers were able to develop new understandings around race, racism, and discrimination.

The researcher concluded that by engaging the students in dialogue journals, the instructor was able to observe how students were processing information from the course readings, lectures, and discussions, especially from students who did not speak in class. It also helped the instructor plan lessons and to ask certain students to share previous experiences with the class. However, he did describe two limitations to using dialogue journals: (a) they are time consuming for instructors; and (b) the effectiveness of dialogue

journals is not the same for every student. Some students were not willing to engage in dialogue, others were not willing to deeply reflect, while others found it difficult to write.

Another approach to reflective practice is the narrative. Lee's (2012) study focused on developing preservice teachers' cultural narrative. Many white preservice teachers believe that they do not have culture. This misconception of their own culture can lead to further misunderstandings of other people's culture. Lee argued that becoming culturally aware begins with understanding one's own culture. As a result, he assigned preservice teachers a cultural autobiography in which students explored their own experiences with their own culture and other cultures in their personal and school lives. He chose to focus on five students. The data were their autobiographies and one-on-one interviews with each student. The researcher analyzed the data using constant comparative analysis. Lee found that all five preservice teachers became more sensitive and aware of learners' cultures and prior knowledge, but also gained a deeper understanding about themselves as cultural beings. The author argued that the autobiography helped preservice teachers confirm that they had limited experiences with other cultures and were able to reconstruct their beliefs. Additionally, the students concluded that understanding students' cultures and home life were important in order to bridge the students' culture and the culture of the school. However, the researcher did not collect data on what students' previous assumptions were on different cultures. As a result, it is difficult to know whether the students were dramatically different in their beliefs, and more importantly what the long-term impact of such a course assignment had on preservice teachers.

Reflective practice and narrative pieces may also be important in developing preservice teachers' cultural awareness, but Hinton (2006) argued that in order to increase student learning, the learning environment has to be open and welcoming. Hinton's course was about multicultural literature. In her previous experiences, she found students, especially White students, resistant and even resentful of multicultural education. She described that she first asked students to explain what they know and want to learn about multicultural education. The author begins the course this way in order to signal to students that she finds their knowledge and experiences important, and it opens the class to understand the debate within the field and the multiple ways multiculturalism can be defined. She then provided the class her definition of multicultural literature. The students read and wrote poetry that encouraged them to view themselves as cultural beings. They read critical essays with works of fiction about certain cultural groups. They discussed myths to be aware of and to avoid, and were welcomed to pose questions in class and also in their weekly written assignments. The researcher believed that by creating a welcoming, open and intellectually rigorous environment, the students were more willing to engage in discussions revolving around multicultural education. Though she believed her technique helped to transform her students, she cannot definitively state that because she did not measure students' beliefs and attitudes; she explained that measuring transformative beliefs is difficult. However, the students' final assignment suggested to her that they were more critical and more knowledgeable about underrepresented cultures in literature.

As previously mentioned, one of the shortcomings of this body of literature is that many of the single course studies did not explore the impact of the course had on preservice teachers' practice. However, Jennings and Smith (2002) do describe how a multicultural education course continued to transform one preservice teacher's beliefs and practice even after taking the course. They combined two case studies to fill the gap in the literature about the process in which teachers continued to learn and practice multicultural education after a course on multicultural education. The first case study investigated the impact of a five-week course on the foundations of multicultural education. Data were collected and analyzed using ethnographic methods, which included field notes recorded by a graduate assistant, participants' work, and the instructor's reflection. The course included examining knowledge and beliefs about diversity and multicultural education. The preservice teachers had the opportunity to gain knowledge from various perspectives, to critically analyze multicultural approaches, to develop action plans that integrate multicultural education in their practices, and to reflect constantly on course readings and discussions. The researchers' analysis of the students' writing during the course indicated that teachers' transformed their understanding of multicultural education. Additionally, their action plans also showed a shift in students' "repertoires for multicultural education" (p. 463). However, even though their language indicated transformation, Jennings and Smith reported that the students' plans indicated limitations in their understanding of multicultural practices. These preservice teachers did not provide specific details on how they were going to achieve their goals.

In the second case study, Jennings and Smith (2002) followed one former preservice teacher's experience implementing multicultural practices after taking the course. Cynthia, the second researcher, entered the course with personal experiences with diversity, but the course did allow Cynthia to continue to challenge and expand her views. With the new knowledge and an action plan from the course, Cynthia developed a culturally relevant, inquiry-based history unit. In the unit, she incorporated perspectives about Native Americans and African Americans during the 1840s to make sure her students had multiple perspectives. The unit Cynthia developed was a unit that was implemented by all third grade teachers in the district. She provided teachers in the district opportunities to observe her teaching the unit, and a space for teachers to discuss their ideas, beliefs, and practices. Cynthia wanted to know whether the unit she developed would increase diverse students' interest and knowledge in this area.

Cynthia found that her students, who were typically not interested or engaged in history lessons, were more engaged in the unit she developed. Additionally, even after a month, students were able to provide detailed information about life in the 1840s. The authors report that Cynthia gained insight on the importance of reflection of her practice in order to continue to revise and improve the unit and potentially improve students' understanding of multiple perspectives. She also found the collaboration between the researcher, teachers, and students gave everyone ownership of their learning and allowed all involved opportunities to gain insights that they would never have had if it were not for the collaborative environment. For example, teachers collaborating with Cynthia began to shift their understanding of pedagogy and developed an appreciation for CRP

and inquiry-based instructional practices. This process changed the way Cynthia viewed learning and teaching. She no longer took anything at face value, but critically analyzed the socio-political impact it had on her, her students, and her school. Additionally, her new stance began to have an impact at the district level since she had been invited to discuss her unit with other teachers.

The combination of the two case studies identified some key elements to teaching multicultural education and how a teacher can continue to develop and transform as a multicultural educator. The first case study demonstrated that a critical inquiry stance could help preservice teachers develop their multicultural practices. The second case study highlighted how one preservice teacher used the knowledge gained in a teacher education course to transform her practice, while also impacting her colleagues thinking on CRP and inquiry based learning and her students learning experiences.

The impact of the single course model on preservice teachers is difficult to establish. There are many studies by teacher educators researching on their own practice, but these studies have many flaws, small sample sizes, and the concern of researcher bias. The researchers typically do not describe the course in enough detail necessary to promote replication. Researchers in this area have a difficult task in understanding how preservice teachers change their deficit beliefs and develop multicultural attitudes and pedagogy. This becomes even more difficult since the studies last one semester and do not follow preservice teachers throughout the program, field experience, and/or their first year of teaching. Additionally, research bias could be reduced if researchers conducted research on other instructors' courses.

Course and field experience. Similar to the single course model is the single course with a field experience model. The field experiences are typically held in diverse settings where the preservice teachers can experience what was discussed in their course. For instance, Barnes (2006) studied how 24 preservice teachers in an elementary education program taught using culturally responsive teaching. The purpose of the study was to scaffold course and field experiences in order to better integrate learning and teaching experiences that would improve working with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Preservice teachers met three times a week for their reading methods class, but two of the days were for the structured field experience. The university transported all preservice teachers to the elementary school located in an urban center serving predominately African American students. Each preservice teacher was assigned two students. Each had to prepare a lesson integrating CRT practices and the literacy strategies discussed in the methods class. After each session, the preservice teachers met with the instructor and research assistant for fifteen minutes to debrief their sessions and discuss what occurred in class. Barnes, the researcher, claimed that the debriefing sessions allowed these preservice teachers “to connect, on the spot, theory to practice, thus integrating the classroom and field experience for better reflections and appropriate use of teaching practices” (p. 91). Though the researcher described the assignments and shared excerpts from some of the students’ reflections, she did not describe the research method. For instance, the data collection process and the analysis were not described in the article. The lack of transparency was concerning. As a result, the conclusions did not correspond with the findings. Barnes concluded that the teachers learned to focus on their

own attitudes and beliefs about diversity, use CRT practices to teach reading, learn more about their students' backgrounds, use various strategies, and explore how their teaching can impact students' learning. Though these may have been the objective of the course, it is not clear that the evidence suggested that preservice teachers were able to accomplish all objectives.

Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006) studied 92 White, middle- and upper-class preservice teachers majoring in Elementary Education to understand the impact of a course on multiculturalism that was followed by a 30-hour practicum in a diverse school setting. In their practicum, the preservice teachers had to prepare to teach two lessons, observe students, and assist the classroom teacher as needed. The preservice teachers, while conducting their practicum, were enrolled in a seminar in which they read about diversity in education. The researchers used the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (Henry, 1985), which focused on cultural awareness, family matters, communication, assessments, and multicultural practices. The participants responded to the survey after taking the two multicultural courses but prior to their field experiences, and again to the same survey after completing their practicum.

The results indicated that the practicum had a positive impact on preservice teachers': (a) views on students' ethnic identity; (b) knowledge and experience working with minority families; (c) views on families with students with special needs; (d) ability to identify students with cultural differences and language barriers to special education; and (e) acceptance of ethnic jokes. The results suggest the practicum had a positive impact, and the seminar supported preservice teachers' positive beliefs around diversity

and multicultural education. Though there may have been an impact on preservice teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards diversity, this does not necessarily mean the preservice teachers are practicing multiculturalism in the classroom. This study was limited by the fact that the researchers did not observe preservice teachers' practicum, but it does demonstrate that a combination of multicultural courses and field experiences in diverse school settings is needed. For instance, preservice teachers recognized that students are different and that individual students' cultures are important in learning. Additionally, interacting with students and parents increased preservice teachers' positive attitude toward parents' knowledge. Such positive results indicate that preservice teachers can become culturally aware in a course and supportive field experience setting.

Akiba (2011) also studied the changes in preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity after taking a course on diversity that included a 20-hour field experience element. She wanted to know which characteristics of teacher preparation for diversity preservice teachers associated with positive changes to their beliefs. Participants included 243 preservice teachers enrolled in diversity courses in a Midwest Research I university who agreed to participate in the study. Data were collected during the 2006-2007 academic year at the beginning and one at the end of the semester using the "Diversity Beliefs in Personal and Professional Contexts" scales created by Pohan and Aguilar (2001). The scale was chosen because it was specifically developed for preservice teachers and it addressed societal and educational values on diversity. The data were analyzed using ANOVA for the difference in preservice teachers' characteristics, and another ANOVA was conducted for the difference in pre- and post-mean change for each

characteristic. Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between preservice teachers' prior experience with diversity and also the pre-post changes in their diversity scores. Finally, multiple regression analyses were executed to understand the relationship between teacher preparation elements, such as course work and field experiences and preservice teachers' belief scores at the post-survey.

Akiba found no significant change in mean diversity belief scores in the participants' personal context or their social context. Yet, the change in their beliefs about diversity in a professional context showed a statistically significant improvement after taking the diversity course and field experiences. Of note, female preservice teachers and graduate students had higher diversity belief scores than their male counterparts and undergraduate students at the beginning of the course. Based on the results, the following course characteristics were identified as improving preservice teachers' diversity belief scores: (a) classroom as a learning community, (b) an instructor modeling constructivist and culturally-responsive teaching, and (c) field experience for understanding diverse students. These results indicated that it may be easier to change beliefs about diversity within the context of a profession rather than personal context with the use of course work and field experience. Akiba suggested that future studies should go beyond preservice teachers' self-reported data and include observations of preservice teachers as they do their student teaching. Additionally, preservice teachers should be evaluated for their knowledge and skill in diversity in order to understand the overall outcomes of course and field experiences. This link between coursework and behavior remains lightly studied.

Bell, Horn, and Roxas (2007) wanted to understand how teacher learning might vary across service-learning experiences. Three sections of a course on diversity were included in the study. Researchers asked students if they would like to participate in the study, 86% volunteered. The course required a 15-hour field experience, which the authors described as service-learning. Two sections focused on urban challenges where the participants mentored one student in an elementary school, while the third section focused on tutoring students from the same urban school district. Data sources included course assignments, which included analytical and autobiographical essays, journal entries, and pre- and post-course written surveys. Data were coded using Paine's (1989) framework and analyzed using a qualitative analysis program, N6. Bell et al. found that the preservice teachers who were mentors worked in inside and outside school settings and interacted with a variety of adults in the student's life, while the preservice teachers who tutored limited themselves to traditional learning activities inside the school.

The results between the two forms of service-learning experiences indicate interesting differences between mentoring and tutoring students. For instance, preservice teachers who mentored were able to interact with students within their family and neighborhood context. They were able to learn more about the child and his/her interests, while preservice teachers who tutored remained in school and maintained academic discussions. Tutors had to maintain their role as expert, while mentors' roles were at times reversed when they asked the child about their interests. Mentors were also able to make the connection between learning and teaching. They also were able to discuss with classroom teachers about teaching pedagogies and question philosophies and strategies.

On the other hand, tutors were not able to make the same connections between their teaching practices and students' learning. When they had a problem, they often sought out support from more experienced teachers. These results indicate that service-learning experiences do shape preservice teachers' learning opportunities. Though both groups started with similar views on diversity, by the end of their experiences, the mentors could better articulate and elaborate their understanding than could the tutors. Nevertheless, the pedagogical understandings of diversity were weak for both groups.

The small number of preservice teachers who moved toward more complex pedagogical understanding was concerning for the researchers. Additionally, the researchers were also concerned that there were too few rich learning environments for preservice teachers to work in; as a result, these opportunities may not be available to all preservice teachers. Like Akiba (2011), the researchers found that diversity is complex and preservice teachers may hold conflicting views. Though the service-learning provided teachers with unique learning opportunities, Bell et al. cautioned teacher educators to evaluate what and how service-learning teaches preservice teachers. For example, they found instances in which a preservice teacher's stereotype of urban parents was challenged, but the preservice teacher did not systematically examine the stereotype. Lastly, Bell et al. explained that the service-learning takes great support from leadership and teachers in K-12 schools and even the university instructor.

Tellez (2008) took a different approach in understanding the impact of field experiences in multicultural education. The purpose of his study was to understand the role cooperating teachers (CTs) play in providing preservice teachers with the knowledge

and skill to engage in multicultural instructional practices. The researcher sought to understand the experiences of both cooperating teachers and preservice teachers. This study, however, was not able to quantify the effectiveness of the cooperating teachers' implementation of multicultural education. The CTs were selected from the professional development school associated with the university. The school made multicultural education a high priority. Five CTs were chosen with advice from the curriculum coordinator and principal. Each CT was interviewed twice using a skeletal interview protocol. The purpose of the interview was to understand the CT's view of equity pedagogy and his/her ability to share vision with student teachers. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed. The school served a predominately Hispanic community. When describing their conceptualization of multicultural education, the CTs discussed using students' language and knowledge as the foundation of their instruction and then building lessons on equity. All but one CT viewed their practice as a work in progress and never fully complete. CTs explained that most preservice teachers were challenged by the balance between caring and having high academic and behavioral standards for all students. Additionally, they reported that many preservice teachers believed that all students needed was more love, but in fact just because many of the students were poor did not mean they needed love. This was viewed by CTs as a form of lowering academic expectations for poor, marginalized students. Preservice teachers also assumed that direct instruction and skills practices were inappropriate since universities focused on other forms of learning. CTs also exposed preservice teachers to the important

role parents should have. More importantly CTs believed that learning about other students' cultures was not only a "professional undertaking but a moral one" (p. 53).

Tellez (2008) explains that some of the limitations of the study include the shortcoming of not talking to student teachers in order to get their perspective on what they were learning from CTs. However, the choice not to interview student teachers was to maintain trust with the CTs and to provide the space for CTs to speak candidly with the researcher. Additionally, the researcher discussed the lack of generalizability because the CTs in this study were not typical in that they focused on multicultural instruction, as did the school. Tellez found that the CTs in this study strongly believed in equity pedagogy and only enhanced the general information that was being discussed in the university-based course. The CTs provided a genuine learning environment for student teachers and provided local knowledge about specific methods and strategies that the school and teachers supported. Such local knowledge is invaluable and cannot be provided by a teacher educator.

The studies on course and field experiences identify the strengths of course work and field experiences. Field experiences have a positive impact on preservice teachers' views of diversity, especially when the coursework supports preservice teachers' changing views. However, as Akiba (2011) found, diversity is complex. Though preservice teachers showed signs of changing their professional beliefs, they did not always change their personal beliefs. Additionally, as Bell et al. (2007) found, the preservice teachers did not always develop a deep understanding of their beliefs. Yet by pairing student teachers with cooperating teachers who use multicultural instruction in

their classrooms, student teachers gained local knowledge and better understood the nuances of equity pedagogy. However, the studies cited above did not follow the preservice teachers into the school to observe their instructional practices, but instead depended on the work, e.g. reflections, journals, interviews, etc., as their data sources. This overreliance of student work and self-reporting is problematic, because they were being graded and may have overstated their change and development during the field experience to satisfy the instructors/researchers. If we are to know more about the effects of teacher education on students' multicultural perspectives and practices, then more studies are needed that follow preservice teachers into the classroom and observe their multicultural practices.

Community-based learning experience. Some SCDEs have developed community-based learning experiences that place preservice teachers into communities where they had no previous experience living or working. Typically, such experiences include preservice teachers interacting with students and/or people in urban communities. Some of the community-based experiences were within a university, while others were just outside of the university, or in a different country. These learning experiences were in conjunction with a course or assignments that supported preservice teachers during their experience. The coursework typically required preservice teachers to evaluate not only the school environments, but also the community surrounding the school, student culture and language, and the impact on student learning and their own teaching. The idea of immersing preservice teachers in a community was to get preservice teachers out of their comfort zones, and to encourage them to use their understanding of the students'

culture, language, and home experiences in order to bridge the gap between home and school life.

In Keengwe's (2010) study, the course was a typical stand-alone multicultural course, but in this instance the students were assigned to work with an English language learner from the university's English Language Learning Center. The students in the Center were all immigrants from countries in Asia and the Middle East and had varying levels of English proficiency. The preservice teachers were not provided any training prior to meeting their ELL partners. The students spent one hour with their partner during the semester engaging in social and academic activities. The intention of the project was to provide cross-cultural experiences for preservice teachers who predominately had experiences in homogenous communities. While the preservice teachers worked with the ELLs, they kept journals that they used to relate the challenges they faced in the project at the end of the semester. They also used them to evaluate whether the project was useful in preparing them to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students. In their final reflection of the project, preservice teachers described their limited exposure to diversity and discussed that they were fearful of saying or doing something that would be considered offensive. They also viewed the language and cultural barriers as challenging. Additionally, the meetings with ELL partners shed light on some assumptions that the preservice teachers carried with them about certain cultures. They also realized that their ELL partners do not have the same cultural references and knowledge that they do as White Americans.

All of these preservice teachers indicated that the project was beneficial and made them feel better prepared to teach CLD students. The project taught preservice teachers to go beyond themselves in understanding other cultures. The preservice teachers identified that they were initially fearful of meeting students from diverse cultures, but were relieved to realize that they had more in common with them than not. It also exposed them to other cultures. The research indicated that the project provided an important opportunity for teachers to engage with different cultures.

Cooper (2007) studied 37 preservice teachers who were enrolled in a yearlong seminar with a community-immersion experience. The first three assignments, a written autobiography, a bio-poem, and a privilege walk, were completed during the fall semester in preparation for the final activities in an urban and underserved community. The assignments and activities engaged the preservice teachers in understanding their identities, experiences, and societal privileges, respectively. The final three assignments were a part of a cultural-immersion experience. First, they were required to complete a camera safari, in which preservice teachers walked in the community and took pictures of what they saw. They also wrote a reflection based on prompts provided by the professor. Second, these preservice teachers completed a “walking a mile in another’s shoes” assignment. Each preservice teacher was given a different scenario that people in the community typically experienced, such as applying for food stamps, legal immigration status, or public housing. The last assignment was called debunking the community, in which these preservice teachers had to engage with members of the community by meeting the parent of a child who was at risk of failing or attending a church service, for

example. The assignments the preservice teachers submitted to their professor were used as the data sources. The data were inductively analyzed in three phases. The researcher coded the data, generated categories, and selected quotes to demonstrate the resultant themes.

Cooper (2007) found that these preservice teachers were extremely reluctant to complete the immersion assignments. Many felt uncomfortable and even fearful of delving deeper into the urban community. However, once they began to complete each assignment, they understood the hardship their students' families were experiencing. In addition, Cooper reports that these preservice teachers were surprised that the community embraced them as if they were members of the community. Cooper reported that they were excited and realized they were impacting their students, because they made an effort to learn more about them. Cooper further indicated that the preservice teachers were transformed by the activities and immersion experiences. The cultural-immersion experiences challenged their prior fears and beliefs. The preservice teachers were more sensitive to their students' environments and experiences and how they influenced their eventual academic work. However, like previous studies, there are limitations, such as the heavy reliance on self-reported data. Preservice teachers may have been compelled to overestimate the impact of the immersion experience since they were being graded. It would have also been useful to observe preservice teachers as they taught lessons in a classroom setting.

In a similar research project, Zygmunt-Fillwalk (2005) studied 22 preservice elementary education teachers who participated in an urban education immersion

experience for one semester. These aspiring teachers self-selected to participate in the immersion in one of the two urban elementary schools near their university. The immersion program was established to dispel myths about urban schools, communities, and youth. Included in the program were courses on classroom management, math methods, science methods, social studies methods, and special education, which were taught at the elementary school. The researcher was the observer and investigator and was given access to participants' weekly reflections. She also conducted two focus groups as well as individual interviews after the immersion experience. She used a constant comparative approach to analyze the data.

By comparing the preservice teachers' pre- and post-experience attitudes toward working with a diverse population of students, Zygmunt-Fillwalk found that preservice teachers initially had a negative orientation toward working in urban schools. She reported that they believed working with urban youth was going to be challenging due to the chaos in school and even in students' home life. Zygmunt-Fillwalk found that these preservice teachers pitied the children and did not believe that their parents were dedicated to their children's education. However, their experience working and engaging with urban youth and families challenged these beliefs. They were surprised by their students' eagerness to learn, and that the parents were engaged in their children's education. These preservice teachers were in the process of unlearning stereotypes through these challenging experiences. The immersion appeared to humanize diverse populations and urban communities for these aspiring teachers. As a result, they gained a new understanding and appreciation for diversity and multiculturalism. Though these

findings support similar research and indicate that community immersion experiences with reflections and support from faculty are effective ways to shift beliefs about diversity, there is a need to further study how such community-based experiences impact preservice teachers when they conduct their student teaching and their first years as a teacher. Therefore, longitudinal studies are needed to follow preservice teachers and study the long-term impact of community-based experiences in teacher education courses.

Zeichner and Melnick (1996) argued that community-based teacher education has been ignored by the field as a viable form of student teacher field experience. In their chapter, they discuss the American Indian Reservation Project, which involved student teachers living and working on a Native American reservation in the Southwest for one semester. While these student teachers were immersed in the community, they also had to read, analyze, and write about the literature and how their experiences connected to it. While living in the community, the student teachers forged relationships and began to learn more about their coworkers, their students, and the families. By visiting the homes of students and engaging in weekend activities with their students and colleagues, these student teachers developed richer understandings of their students. As a result, many of these student teachers began to use their new knowledge about their students and incorporated culturally relevant pedagogy to ensure that their students were engaging in the material in a culturally appropriate manner. Many of them reported that their cooperating teachers, who were White, discouraged them from using alternative

curriculum or practices. Nevertheless, many of these student teachers continued to advocate for their students and for multicultural education.

There is little evidence whether the project had a lasting impact on teachers as they entered the field, but some reported being one of the few teachers in their school who always mentioned multicultural curriculum, culturally relevant teaching, and worked at learning more about their students outside of the classroom. However, the project did not have a positive impact on all student teachers. Some did not make any effort to engage in the Native American community and activities. Many would superficially write or discuss multiculturalism and one of them never attempted to incorporate culturally relevant pedagogy in her lessons. Nevertheless, the majority of the student teachers found the experience beneficial not only for their teaching, but also in their personal lives, as they were more willing to meet people and experience activities that were outside their comfort zones and had a better capacity to understand others, suggesting that immersion experiences can have a powerful impact on some student teachers.

Lenski, Crumpler, Stallworth, and Crawford (2005) taught 34 preservice teachers in a year-long program on ethnographic research methods. These preservice teachers immersed themselves in the community and conducted ethnographic observations for seven months to learn about a culture within an urban professional development school and its community, and wrote an ethnographic paper for the final. The main goal was to encourage preservice teachers to view themselves as researchers in hopes that they would take these methods and apply them in their own classes to understand their students individually. The researchers' data sources included: (a) the preservice teachers'

responses to a questionnaire about diversity; (b) the preservice teachers' observational field notes of the community; (c) the participants' final ethnographic paper; (d) videotapes of participants' discussions of their participation in the program; and (e) exit conversations with eight preservice teachers. The researchers used open-coding to analyze the written documents from which categories were established. The videotapes were transcribed and analyzed using a sociolinguistic approach, which allowed the researchers to focus on both the context and structure of the interactions.

Lenski et al. (2005) found that at the beginning of the process, these preservice teachers were uncomfortable with ethnographic research and did not see its connection to teaching, but by the end they began to appreciate the project and its greater purpose. The researchers concluded that the ethnography experience provided these preservice teachers a valuable tool for learning about their students. It not only gave them a better awareness of perspectives beyond their own, but preservice teachers learned how to question their beliefs and become critical of situations they observed. As a result, preservice teachers could effectively teach students, even those that had traditionally been marginalized.

Marx and Moss (2011) conducted a unique case study of one preservice teacher, Ana, who completed her teacher education program in a study abroad program in London. Even though the study abroad program was in an English-speaking country, Ana still found many differences in the education system; she was also teaching in a school that served predominantly immigrant populations. Participant observation and five in-depth interviews with Ana were the two primary sources used. Data were collected in

three phases during the academic year. A constant comparative approach was used to analyze the data with the support of the computer program NVivo 7.

Ana was initially critical of how British teachers interacted with their students, arguing that they were too harsh and even rude. However, once she understood the culture, she stopped being ethnocentric in her comments about the differences between England and the United States, and became more ethnorelative, realizing that the two countries' school systems were just different. The researchers concluded that including study abroad experiences in teacher education program can be transformative experience for some preservice teachers. For Ana, her experiences changed her worldview by helping her become a more critically reflective practitioner. However, in one of the in-depth interviews, Ana explained that she was always interested in learning more about culture and how it affects education, which indicated that she was willing and open to learn about other cultures. Would such a program have the same impact on preservice teachers who may not be as willing or ever considered the importance of culture in education, as was seen in the Zeichner and Melnick (1996) study above? To better understand study abroad teacher education programs, a larger sample size with participants of varying backgrounds will be necessary.

Immersion projects seem promising; however, too many unanswered questions still loom. Do immersion experiences best respond to the NCATE diversity standard? For instance, do immersion experiences have an impact on students for the long-term? How do they affect preservice teachers' beliefs on diversity? Do preservice teachers teach CLD students better after an immersion project rather than after a traditional field

experience? Like previous studies in this genre, the reliance on self-reported data remains problematic, therefore limiting what we know about how to help preservice teachers understand the influences of culture on teaching and learning. Researchers need to observe preservice teachers in action in order to understand the impact of the intervention, especially the long-term impacts, as they become practicing teachers.

Research on multicultural program interventions. There are few studies on programmatic interventions that have focus on diversity throughout preservice teacher education. This may be due to the fact that it is difficult to study an entire program's impact on preservice teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards diversity and multicultural education. The lack of studies may also reflect that units interpret and respond to NCATE's diversity standard differently and therefore, some SCDEs may not be compelled to change their entire teacher education program.

The purpose of Capella-Santana's (2003) study was to understand the development of preservice teachers' attitudes and knowledge on multicultural issues in education. The researcher studied 52 participants completing a teacher education program. The researcher administered two questionnaires and interviewed nine of these preservice teachers. The first questionnaire, developed and piloted by the researcher, was administered in a repeated measures design. The questionnaire collected data about preservice teachers' knowledge and beliefs on multiculturalism during the first week of the teacher education program to establish a baseline. The second and third administrations of the questionnaire were at the beginning and end of students' second semester. The final time the participants completed the questionnaire was at the end of

the third semester in which preservice teachers were completing their methods courses and field experience. The second questionnaire, also designed by the researcher, was administered at the end. The questionnaire focused on the participants' perception of change in their attitudes and knowledge. The semi-structured interview allowed the researcher to further investigate how participants identified the factors that influenced change.

Results indicated a statistically significant change in students' attitudes toward and knowledge of multicultural issues, specifically their beliefs about bilingual education, building minority students' self-esteem, culturally related behavior, and assimilation. The results showed a positive linear trend. The participants identified courses in bilingual education, students and families with whom the preservice teachers worked, a multicultural education course, field experience, and classmates as the most influencing factors on the changes in perspective they experienced. The interviews supported the findings especially on the importance of bilingual education courses in providing information about bilingual education, which helped the preservice teachers question their previous misconceptions about bilingual education. Similarly, the multicultural education course gave students a forum to openly discuss diversity and their concerns about teaching diverse learners. Finally, the interaction with diverse learners during the field experience also impacted the interviewees. These findings suggest that positive changes in preservice teachers' attitudes and knowledge can occur in a teacher education program with multicultural and bilingual education course work, field experiences, and

collaboration and discussion among students. However, further research is needed to understand the long-term impact of multicultural education on a teacher.

According to Groulx (2001), the Professional Development School (PDS) model may more effectively address race, poverty, and white privilege by clearly linking teacher education coursework and elementary schools. The college of education undertook the PDS model and formed partnerships with three local elementary schools, whose student populations reflected ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity. The researchers hypothesized that preservice teachers' attitudes would become more favorable toward teaching in urban, minority-majority schools by being assigned to learn to teach in one of these three PDSs. The participants included 112 preservice teachers, a majority of whom were White, who either participated in a traditional student teaching experience or were involved in the PDS program. They responded to a two-part questionnaire designed for the study. The first section asked students to rate the level of comfort and interest in teaching at different types of schools, such as a suburban school, a diverse private school, an urban Hispanic majority school, or an urban African American majority school. The second part asked students to rate a list of 14 characteristics regarding ethnic and social class diversity, school safety, parental involvement, and student motivation and achievement as either (a) does not matter; (b) somewhat desirable; (c) highly desirable but not essential; or (d) absolutely essential.

When the preservice teachers from the original sample completed their student teaching experience, they answered the same survey again. Results from a Wilcoxon ranked-sum test indicated that there were no statistically significant changes between first

and second time the preservice teachers took the survey. One noteworthy difference is that ethnic and socioeconomic diversity tended to increase in importance ($Z = 1.68$, $p = .08$) after their student teaching experiences. Based on the factor analysis, preservice teachers rated the following variables as important factors in choosing a school to teach in: (a) similarity between student and teacher; (b) student diversity; (c) ideal student; and (d) safety. Low to moderate correlations were found with several variables. For instance, the preservice teachers' preference for similarity between students and teachers correlated with lower interest in working in minority schools, but greater interest working in suburban or private schools. While the preservice teachers who indicated their interest for diversity were more likely willing to work in a predominately African American or Hispanic school and less interested in working in suburban or private schools. Lastly, preferences for working with ideal students and for safety were negatively correlated with wanting to work in African American schools.

The survey was designed to give participants opportunities to respond and clarify their choices. Based on the candid responses in the qualitative data, these preservice teachers were not being politically correct in their responses. The most frequent concerns mentioned were language barriers between themselves and English Language Learners and their families. Some preservice teachers had assumptions and stereotypes about urban schools, while others believed working in urban schools would provide them personal and professional opportunities to learn and grow. Most were simply not able to envision what working in a predominately African American or Hispanic school would be like. Many had never encountered or experienced such schools either as students or as

preservice teachers; as a result, they felt most comfortable working in schools similar to the ones they experienced growing up. Several students mentioned the quality and wealth of resources in suburban schools, including parental support. Though there was not a dramatic shift in preservice teachers' beliefs about minority students and urban schools after their course-work and student teaching experience, it showed that even PDS models cannot change all students' beliefs. However, students who participated in the PDS model were more likely to have a modest change, compared to students who had a traditional student teaching experience. Though the model shows promise, the evidence does not strongly suggest that student teachers were better prepared to work with CLD students.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992) argued that teacher education should be conducted in the context of inquiry, where preservice teachers should not only read and discuss the literature, but “construct the local meanings of cultural diversity and to create courses of actions appropriate to particular contexts” (p. 105). They state that preservice and inservice teachers should learn from teaching, which means that every classroom should be viewed as a “site for inquiry and a source of knowledge” (p. 105). They argue that providing the space for teachers to conduct their own research is a powerful way to understand learning and teaching and can identify their strengths and areas of growth. However, teacher-based research should not be limited to the classrooms or practice, but should include conceptual research. For instance, Project Student Teacher As Researching Teacher (START) and The Philadelphia Writing Project (PhilWP) were projects that formed partnerships among teacher educators, preservice, and inservice teachers to conduct research about practice and school reform. Project START targeted

student teachers specifically and encouraged them to critically think about diversity, and to ask critical questions rather than jump into conclusions. More importantly, these student teachers developed an understanding that the answers about how to respond to diversity lie within them and their own beliefs, biases, experiences, about teaching and learning. In the PhilWP, experienced teachers working in urban schools also had opportunities to evaluate their own personal histories and experiences that informed their pedagogical decisions and also questioned school policies that impacted culturally and linguistically diverse students. Cross-visitation was also another major component of each of the projects. Student teachers and practicing teachers visited and worked in school sites different from the ones in which they usually worked. As a result, these teachers were aware of the differences between schools. This awareness often provided space for the teachers to raise difficult questions, but it also reinforced stereotypes about communities, families, students, and cultures. Nevertheless, after START, student teachers and teacher educators reported that the cross-visitation was essential in facilitating inquiry-based discussions. The writing also provided the student teachers with the space to unravel and question their beliefs.

It seems logical that developing programmatic interventions that lead to collaboration with communities, schools, and other programs would improve the preparation of teachers for diversity. However, there are too few studies and too little data to draw any conclusions about the effects of programmatic interventions. It would be important to know how individual teacher educators' courses and field experience assignments changed to reflect the program's shift. Such information is important to

understand the influence a program has on multicultural teacher education. Many experts in the field of teacher education have written about the lack of multicultural education in SCDEs and the need for more rigorous research (Cochran-Smith, Davis & Fries, 2004; Sleeter, 2001; Trent, Kea & Oh, 2008). The following section discusses experts' recommendations for teacher educators and researchers.

Recommendations on Multicultural Teacher Education

Sleeter (2001) argued that SCDEs have responded slowly to the growing cultural gap between inservice and preservice teachers and K-12 students. In order to understand the state of SCDEs in preparing preservice teachers to work in historically underserved schools with culturally and linguistically diverse students, she conducted a literature review of 80 peer-reviewed articles.

She recommended that SCDEs place increased effort on recruiting and selecting more students of color and students who are culturally competent and have experience with diversity. The most prevalent research was the single multicultural course. However, based on the research, she reported that it was difficult to state the impact of multicultural education courses had on preservice teachers. For instance, studies using Likert-type scales did not describe the course or participants very well, while case studies described the course, materials used, and students, well. Additionally, due to researcher bias, some researchers may have overstated the success and impact of their course. She suggested that researchers study other instructors' courses. Sleeter also questioned whether preservice teachers could maintain and continue to develop multicultural practices in their own classes after graduating. However, of the studies she included in her review,

none of the researchers followed the preservice teachers after they graduated from their teacher education programs. She also found that studies that examined both coursework and field experience were difficult to evaluate because they did not clarify which of the two variables had the most impact or whether it was the combination of the two. She reported that community-based immersion experiences also appeared to have powerful effects on preservice teachers, but that the number of participants in these studies is small, and therefore need to be treated with caution. Other questions about the length of the immersion project, the setting, and the long-term impact need to be fully answered to better understand the effectiveness of such experiences on preservice teachers. Lastly, there were too few programmatic interventions to know the impact of program changes. However, she explains that “the quality and nature of the experience in partner schools is as important to examine as is the nature of the teacher education program....partnerships between schools and university with predominately White staff doing business as usual would probably produce more business as usual” (p. 101). Overall, she concluded that research on multicultural teacher education was too scattered and small-scale to understand the impact multicultural education had on preservice teachers. She stated that “research in teacher education needs to follow graduates into the classroom, and our work needs to extend beyond preservice education, linking preservice education with community-based learning and with ongoing professional development and school reform” (p. 102-103).

In another review on multicultural teacher education, Cochran-Smith, Davis and Fries (2004) synthesized 14 reviews published between 1980 and 2001. The reviews were

chosen because they focused on the recruitment and/or preparation “of teachers for multicultural society” (p. 937). In this review, they explained the progress SCDEs have accomplished in integrating multicultural education into teacher education programs since the last decade of the twentieth century and into the first few years of the twenty-first century. For instance, influential professional organizations, such as AACTE and NCATE included recommendations or standards that reflected the importance of teachers being culturally aware and competent. On the other hand, there was still much work to be done based on their synthesis of empirical research. They recommended that researchers learn more about how teacher educators theorize about the practice of multicultural teacher education. They noted that more information is needed on the effectiveness and long-term impact of multicultural teacher education. They suggested additional research was needed on what an effective teacher looks like. One could then work backward from that question to understand how to build and implement effective teacher education. Lastly, more empirical studies are needed on the impact of accreditation systems on SCDEs implementation on standards and if such accrediting standards are consistent with multicultural and social justice teacher education, which the present study proposes to examine.

Trent, Kea, and Oh (2008) conducted a literature review on teacher education preparation for diversity in both general and special education. The purpose of the literature review was to determine the quantity, quality, and topics in recent scholarship. They also wanted to examine the progress the field has had in preparing teachers for CLD students with or without disabilities. Lastly, the authors provided recommendations for

future researchers and teacher educators to take into consideration. The researchers selected articles published from 2001 through 2006 for general education programs and 1997 through 2006 for special education. The dates were determined based on the last literature review conducted on the topics by other researchers. The authors searched by hand and used databases and resulted in a total of 46 studies, 39 from general education and 7 from special education. To organize the data, they created a coding sheet and coded each study, entered the coded data into Excel, and imported it to the Statistical Package for Social Science software, which was used to compile descriptive statistics.

The researchers found that the majority of the studies had small sample sizes, as noted throughout this literature review. Unsurprisingly, the characteristics of the participants were similar; the majority of participants were White females, which is representative of the demography of the current and future teaching force. Sampling methods varied from one study to the next, but a majority of them used convenience sampling and qualitative methods were frequently used, while there were some quantitative and mixed methods research studies. Three categories emerged from their analysis: (a) preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about self, program efficacy, and teaching in diverse settings; (b) curriculum/instruction used to prepared preservice teachers for diversity; and (c) the effects of teacher education experiences and programs on teacher candidates and teacher educators. Based on Case and Hemmings (2005) study on preservice teachers' beliefs on racial inequities in schools, they found that preservice teachers believed racism no longer existed in modern society, affirmative action created reverse racism and believed in meritocracy. Case and Hemmings (2005) recommended

that teacher educators encourage open and honest discourse about race. In regards to curriculum and instruction used for preservice teachers, Trent et al. summarized Ambrosio, Sequin, and Hogan's (2001) study. They studied the impact of lesson plan evaluation approach on preservice teachers' capacity to include culturally responsive instruction into their lesson plans. About half of the preservice teachers were able to demonstrate minimal skill in creating a culturally responsive lesson plan. Ambrosio et al. concluded that the state licensure and national guidelines limited the number of multicultural courses preservice teachers were required to complete. Another explanation could be the demanding requirements during student teaching, which may have impacted preservice teachers' attention on the lesson plan. They concluded that performance-based assessments could be effective tools for teacher educators in clarifying vague program objectives, while effectively evaluating program effectiveness. Finally, Trent et al. focused on the Hyland and Noffke (2005) study examining the impact courses have on teacher candidates and teacher educators. Hyland and Noffke's study was a longitudinal action research, which focused on their own thinking and practice while teaching preservice teachers. They found that preservice teachers were positively impacted by the course and better understood marginalization and its impact on the education system. However, they also found that state licensure and national guidelines made it difficult to provide preservice teachers additional experiences working with diverse learners and using culturally relevant instruction. Based on the review, Trent et al. (2008) recommended: (a) more emphasis on multicultural education at the programmatic level; (b) increased multicultural coursework; (c) more longitudinal studies of programs and

stand-alone courses; (d) increased use of theoretical frameworks that address privilege, oppression and social justice; and (e) more research to determine the impact of teacher education programs on culturally and linguistically diverse P-12 learners.

Though the authors agree that the research and such recommendations are important and necessary, they argued that the stagnant recommendations indicate that multicultural teacher education and research have not progressed. They explained that the linear model researchers use to study multicultural education is not appropriate and that cultural-historical activity theory can be used to address the cultural-historical issues. The authors also suggest researchers include reliability and validity of instruments to improve the quality and rigor of research. There are few studies on program-wide multicultural interventions. Therefore, more studies need to be conducted on such programs to identify the policies, procedures, and activities that expand or hinder multicultural curriculum in teacher education.

The authors also questioned the role journals play in publishing work on multicultural education and the definition of “sound research.” Discussion and tensions about multicultural frameworks are relevant and important to have in research, but such debates should be transparent. Like previous recommendations, the authors also recommend that more culturally and linguistically diverse preservice teachers be recruited and retained in programs. Other topics and themes need to be explored in research such as access, equity, social justice, and critical race theory. They suggested that more researchers needed to look into the pedagogical practices of teachers in culturally diverse schools, which can provide more insight on other research areas.

Finally, the gap between general and special education on multicultural education is disconcerting for the authors. More visibility is necessary in both general and special education teacher programs that effectively address the issues and improved teaching and learning for CLD students.

Cochran-Smith et al. (2004) were the only researchers to question the role accrediting bodies have in multicultural teacher education. Researchers in the field of education for too long have not explored the impact of the accreditation process and standards on multicultural education. Have standards been too narrow or too broad for SCDEs to address multiculturalism appropriately? How have institutions described how they prepare preservice teachers for diversity? How have accrediting bodies, like the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, described multiculturalism and diversity? What constitutes effectiveness in addressing diversity? These questions and many more surrounding accreditation have not been properly addressed in the literature on teacher education. Accrediting bodies are influential players in developing standards for teacher educators. In Cochran-Smith's (2003) framework, which is further described in the next section, she included accrediting bodies as an important force in teacher education.

Cochran-Smith's multicultural teacher education framework. Due to the importance of multicultural education in teacher education programs and the multiple meanings that have been created to describe notions around equity it is important to develop a rich conceptual framework that clarifies differing assumptions, sorts out different theories and practices and analyzes ways political agendas are entangled in the

process. Cochran-Smith (2003) argued that the framework was not a model for teacher education programs to follow or a set of desirable policies and practices:

Rather the elements of the framework are intended to provide conceptual structure for interrogating the *multiple* meanings of multicultural teacher education- first simply to reveal them and suggest their complexities, but then also to chart their origins and implications as they both shape and are shaped by local and larger political, economic, and social contexts....the framework is intended to be useful in examinations of all sorts of research, practices, and policies that in some way are related to or have an impact on the preparation of teachers for a diverse society, regardless of epistemological or methodological paradigms and regardless of whether these policies and practices themselves would be considered “liberal,” “conservative,” or otherwise. (p. 8-9) As a result, the conceptual framework was relevant to this study since the framework include multiple external stakeholders and diverging agendas that impact preservice teacher education programs.

Her framework has four major areas that interact with one another. First is the definition the SCDE or organization defines as multicultural teacher education. In the framework Cochran-Smith identified eight key questions about multicultural teacher education programs and whether the responses to the questions reflect a holistic program. The questions include the following: “the diversity question, the ideology or social justice question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice question, the outcomes question, the recruitment/selection question, and the coherence question” (p.

10). The third element of the framework incorporated external forces, such as institutional capacity, relationships with local communities and schools, and governmental and non-governmental regulations. Finally, the larger contexts and reform agendas, such as the public's views on teacher education and policies like No Child Left Behind affect not only external forces but also teacher education and the multiple meanings of multiculturalism. In this dissertation, Cochran-Smith's framework was helpful in analyzing SCDE reports and identifying whether NCATE's standards and accreditation process are effective in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of SCDEs in their teacher multicultural education.

A Brief History of NCATE's Diversity Standards

In 1979, NCATE implemented new accreditation standards. There were noticeable changes such as in the governance and curricula of education programs. With the new changes came debates about the intentions of the accreditation process and the ability of evaluators to be objective and quantify all standards (Fritschel, 1978). Though accreditation is about quality control, others feared that the accreditation process lacked definition, reliability, and validity, especially with only one agency in control of creating and implementing the standards (Gallegos, 1978; Gollnick & Kunkel, 1986; Gubser, 1978; Krathwohl, 1978; Tom, 1980). Nevertheless, many welcomed the addition of multicultural education standards. The preamble to NCATE's (1979) standard stated:

Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions.

This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluation, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus multicultural education is viewed as an international and an on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society. (as cited by James, 1978)

Like the other standards, scholars were concerned that the multicultural standard was ambiguous and did not provide a clear meaning. However, James (1978) pointed out that there were certain conclusions and assumptions based on NCATE's standards, such as: (a) learning experiences in schools do not meet the needs of diverse student population; (b) cultural, racial, and ethnic factors do contribute to the inability of schools to meet students' needs; (c) teachers play a central role; and (d) teacher education programs do not provide opportunities for preservice teachers to become interculturally competent.

Kaplan (1978) also supported the new multicultural education standards adopted by NCATE because he believed that integrating multicultural education into teacher education programs will improve education for all children. The idea of the standards was to stimulate conversations on how to become more culturally responsive. However, he argued that it was important for teacher education programs to do more than just acknowledge multicultural education, "but to insure their infusion into the mainstream of ongoing programs" (p. 46). His argument was that when teacher candidates graduate, they should be knowledgeable, critical, and have developed curriculum and strategies that

concern multicultural education. Tom (1980), a critic of NCATE and its standards, argued that the newly adopted multicultural education standard not only lacked a definition but was inconsistent; he suggested that a comprehensive review with critical analyses of the standards and accreditation process was needed by not assuming that standards are necessarily a good mechanism for the profession. He believed that more emphasis was needed on more meaningful standards that establish high quality programs.

Even with the early criticisms of NCATE's process and standards, the addition of multicultural standards "says to the education community that multicultural education is a national goal of education and that professionals in this field will work toward the establishment of this goal in the same dedicated selfless way they would on the other goals of American education" (Kaplan, 1978, p. 46). Yet, there were unresolved issues revolving around multicultural education. McCormick (1984) explained that there were public schools proclaiming humanistic ideals and approaches, but in their actions they did not come close to multicultural education, and instead created policies that prevented children from speaking a language other than English.

NCATE continuously revised its standards to incorporate new knowledge and practice. For instance, in the mid-1990s, NCATE changed the multicultural standard to the diversity standard or Standard 4 (Wise & Leibbrand, 1996). However, in 2005, the diversity and social justice elements in NCATE's standards quickly came under fire from the press and U.S. Department of Education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2011). Standard 1 of NCATE's (2002) standards stated that teacher candidates should "know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge skills and dispositions

necessary to help all students learn.” The term “disposition” was defined: “The values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities...Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice” (as cited in Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2011, p.192).

Teacher educator programs began to implement the standard by measuring preservice teachers’ dispositions. The controversy, as Cochran-Smith and Fries (2011) argued,

...has much deeper roots in the larger and ongoing culture wars in the U.S. and, more particularly, in the curriculum wars...These are connected to sharply contested ideas about the purposes of schooling in society, the politics of knowledge, and the current backlash against universities, which are characterized by some conservatives as hotbeds of radical thought and revolution. (p. 193)

Under pressure, NCATE rescinded the language of social justice in its standards and maintained an apolitical stance in teacher education.

The controversy around teachers’ dispositions reminds teacher educators that society demands an apolitical education system. However, as scholars have pointed out, this is neither feasible, nor desirable for a democratic society (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2011; Giroux, 1992). The controversy also relates to society’s value in teaching as a profession and the belief that anyone can teach and should be able to teach if she/he wants to. Like any profession, education must have standards, but standards that reflect research. Unfortunately, much of the research on multicultural

teacher education is not generalizable and inconclusive on best practices. Additionally, there has been little research on the impact of NCATE's standard in SCDEs, especially the impact of the standard on diversity (Standard 4). The next section describes the latest studies on NCATE standards.

Research on NCATE

There are few studies related to NCATE's standards that have demonstrated impact on teacher education programs and students, and there are even fewer concerning multicultural education. Gollnick (1995) examined federal and state policies regarding multicultural education by looking at multicultural guidelines in teacher education standards. In this review of policies and standards, she used Sleeter and Grant's (1988) typology, which included five approaches of multicultural education: (a) teaching the exceptional and culturally different; (b) human relations; (c) single-group studies; (d) multicultural education; and (e) education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. As Gollnick explained, after the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965, the federal government wrote legislation to protect and extend basic education to historically marginalized groups. In addition, legislation such as the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 and the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 were created with the main purpose to improve students' opportunities to compete in the dominant culture. However, Gollnick explained that the legislation was developed on the basis of the deficit model and with low expectations of students from minority groups due to the de-emphasis of culture.

Additionally, Title I of the ESEA, which was created to promote the educational opportunities of low-income children, has done little to encourage equitable education since the learning gap between low- and high-socioeconomic statuses has not decreased. Similar to the federal government legislation on racial minority groups, legislation on low-income students tends to focus on the deficit of students and their families and trying to change these subgroups. Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, Women's Education Equity Act, and Title IV in the Civil Rights Act were created with the purpose of preventing discrimination based on gender. Unlike the legislation on minorities and low-income students, legislation on gender not only focused on teaching the exceptional and culturally different approach identified by Sleeter and Grant, but also the single-group studies approach, since materials were developed on women in education. The federal government also voted in the Bilingual Education Act in 1968, which was intended to create equal opportunities for children learning English as a second language. However, by the 1990s, the legislation was weakened and defunded reflecting the belief that language diversity was a deficit and bilingual students were not capable of becoming proficient in English. Based on this review, federal legislation did not develop or promote multicultural education, but rather based legislation on a deficit model approach to multicultural education. Additionally, the single-group studies approach was not helpful in integrating services and funding, especially since race, socioeconomic status, gender, and disabilities all interact in a complex manner. As Gollnick explained, "Society is not served well if policies support the elimination of discrimination against one group (e.g.,

women) and continue to allow discrimination against another group (e.g., Haitians)” (p. 48).

States, on the other hand, have more constitutional authority over education issues and can mandate curriculum and textbooks. Additionally, states use federal funds to enforce federal legislation; however, Gollnick’s (1995) analysis of 47 state policies and standards indicated that few states addressed multicultural education. For instance, 35 states referred to ethnicity, race, and/or culture in their education policies. Twenty states referred to socioeconomic status, 22 states mentioned language, and 11 states included religion as cultural characteristics. There was a pattern among regions in the United States. Western and Midwestern states included language about marginalized groups in their policies, while the South and Northeast had fewer initiatives. There were 22 states that had specific policies about multicultural education in K-12; 21 states mentioned multicultural education in program standards for teacher education; and 14 states addressed a multicultural requirement for teacher licensure. Additionally, six states addressed multicultural content in approved textbooks and referred to eliminating cultural and linguistic biases in teachers and students.

Using Sleeter and Grant’s (1988) typology, Gollnick (1995) reported that all states followed the federal mandate by creating legislation based on teaching the exceptional and the culturally different. For example, 15 states had bilingual education, but students identified for such programs were placed in remedial classes, tracked, and never integrated into classrooms. Six states used single-group studies in K-12 education. For example, Montana, North Dakota, and Wisconsin required Native American studies.

In 12 states, programs preparing teachers required competencies in human relations. In other words, teachers had to know the contributions of certain racial, cultural, and economic groups. Thirty-three states referred to the inclusion of cultural diversity in education, but only 19 specifically used the term “multicultural education.” Additionally, there were great differences in states’ requirements for multicultural curriculum. Seven states did not have a specific multicultural curriculum, and only four states made schools accountable through regular reporting on the implementation of the curriculum. A number of states have also been using nongovernment initiatives, such as NCATE, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Council of Chief State School Officers’ (CCSSO) Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) to develop teacher licensure standards. Overall, the focus at the state level was on teaching the exceptional and culturally different, human relations, and single-group studies, as identified in Sleeter and Grant’s (1989) typology.

Similar to Gollnick’s (1995) study, Akiba and her colleagues (2010) conducted a content analysis of the standards of all 50 states and Washington, DC on teacher certification and teacher education programs focusing on the integration of multicultural theory and principles into teacher education programs. The study uncovered the types of diversity requirements and the characteristics of diversity requirements teacher education programs were being held accountable for. Though the standards do not guarantee implementation, they do reveal the guidelines that have been established and can advance the field’s knowledge on teacher multicultural education in order to improve standards. The authors used Sleeter and Grant’s (1988) typology, because it reflected the different

perspectives of multicultural education. As previously mentioned, Gollnick used the same framework in her study on federal and state initiatives on multicultural education.

Therefore, not only did the framework lend itself to the study, but helped the researchers compare the state policies from Gollnick's work and theirs.

The Akiba et al. (2011) data were collected between 2005 and 2006 by conducting Internet searches and a survey of state officials with follow-up questions. The survey, which included questions about state diversity standards, was sent to selected state officials with a request for pertinent state documents. Missing documents were acquired by calling state officials and personally requesting the documents. The data were analyzed using open and axial coding procedures.

The researchers found that all states either had their own standards or used national standards for teacher licensure. As would be expected, the types of diversity requirements varied from state to state. Twenty-eight states (55%) required that diversity-related performance be addressed. Twenty-four states (47%) followed with program or curriculum design that was related to diversity. Field experience and internship with a diversity component was addressed in 21 states (41%). The following were the least required by states: "diverse candidates (16 states, 31%); diverse faculty (13 states, 25%); assessment on diversity-related knowledge and skills of teacher candidates (9 states, 18%); and faculty knowledge of diversity (8 states, 16%); and courses on diversity topics (6 states, 12%)" (p. 453). Additionally, most states could be explained by using multiple approaches to Sleeter and Grant's five approaches; however, few states (5 states, 10%) used a social reconstructionist approach in teacher certification and program

accreditation. The authors explained that there is variation in the phrasing of standards and many statements are ambiguous, which impacts how standards are interpreted and then implemented by each teacher education program in the state.

This ambiguous phrasing leaves too much room for interpretation by teacher education programs. Though all states and Washington, D.C. have diversity standards, they alone do not guarantee that programs will appropriately prepare preservice teachers for teaching in diverse classrooms and schools. The standards most used by states were characterized by Sleeter and Grant's (1988) framework as human relations, and exceptional and culturally different approaches, which do not promote understanding of the inequality in education and society, but instead see cultural differences as a problem that needs to be accommodated.

Since Gollnick's (1995) study, there have been improvements in addressing diversity standards, but the states need to evaluate them critically in order to meet the needs of diverse learners. Akiba et al. (2010) argued that programs had to go beyond a human relations approach since it does not help preservice teachers understand institutional injustices. They further explained that the standards should have specific requirements and require programs to identify specific examples of increasing preservice teachers' understanding. Yet, further studies are needed to address the link between standards and implementation of multicultural teacher education, and more studies are needed to identify if multicultural standards improve preservice teachers skills in working with diverse learners.

Recently, Delgado (2011) examined 11 SCDEs that were rated as "target" by

NCATE between Fall 2008 and Fall 2009 in how they assessed preservice teachers' proficiencies related to the diversity standard and how the assessment data helped to improve the units' abilities to work with preservice teachers on Standard 4. Data were collected using pre-existing data from NCATE. Four documents were analyzed for each of the 11 sites: (a) the Institutional Report; (b) supplemental documents; (c) Board of Examiners reports; and (d) Unit Accreditation Board report. The documents were analyzed using a grounded theory approach. The limitations to the design of the study were the reliance on self-reported data, non-random sampling, and limited contextual information about the units. In her findings, Delgado explained that there was a range of expectations and assessments on teacher candidates' proficiencies on the diversity standard at the program level and also at the individual course level. What distinguished the units that received "target" ratings were the regular review by candidates and faculty of the candidates' abilities to work with diverse learners and to develop plans for improvement. However, Delgado reported that nine of the eleven units reported how assessments were reviewed and how they improved practice, but the statements were general and had little specific detail, suggesting that Standard 4 was not always clear to SCDE faculty members, especially in regards to the assessment tools. Often times, the researcher had to refer to Standard 2, which also addressed assessments. The researcher questioned whether the Board of Examiners was able to understand the assessment of diversity proficiencies, especially during a quick, usually 48-hour review process. Delgado did not have access to supplemental data such as assessments since it was uploaded to NCATE's AIMS data management system, which raised questions about

NCATE's data collection and researchers' ability to access these data. The author also questioned the consistency of documentation by units. Some units provided detailed documents on the assessments tools, while others only provided the title of the assessment, and yet received a score of "target." Another concern Delgado mentioned was the fact that reports written by the Board of Examiners read more like summaries of unit reports rather than explanations of its conclusions. The assessment tools also measured candidate disposition, but did not look at long-term impacts of the program. Such data would help units improve the program and strengthen their ability to engage candidates in multicultural practices.

The Gollnick (1995), Akiba et al. (2010) and Delgado (2011) studies demonstrate that there is a need to further understand how accreditation standards influence SCDE faculty members, especially when teaching about diversity and preparing preservice teachers for diverse classrooms. Gollnick and Akiba et al. found that a majority of states use professional standards when evaluating SCDEs and teacher candidates' proficiencies in teaching diverse learners. Gollnick explained that the federal and state governments do not always coordinate resources and support in order to better serve K-12 schools and SCDEs. Additionally, Akiba et al. found that the standards are not always clear or explicit in identifying effective units who are complying with the professional standards. This is especially clear in Delgado's study in which she found great variation between units' assessments and reporting of results. The need to better understand the role and impact of accreditation standards is necessary, especially with the creation of a new accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

In 2013, NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) joined to create the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Though there are great expectations for CAEP, there are still questions being raised about the inconsistencies of the accrediting board. For instance, in CAEP's new accreditation standards, the terms "social justice," "multiculturalism," or "intercultural" are never mentioned. The word "diversity" appears in the document five times, but only in describing two standards (Standards 2.3 and 3.2). Standard 2.3, for example, states:

The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, as declined in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students. (CAEP, 2013, p.6)

Despite the standard, how do students get to the point of teaching diverse learners if they never openly discussed matters of diversity, intercultural competence, and social justice throughout their coursework? Additionally, how will schools guarantee programs that they will pair teacher candidates with culturally responsive teachers? How will schools and teacher educators identify such teachers? As Hayes and Juárez (2012)

explained, “Taking their [preservice teachers’] bodies into spaces of the Other and coming back to tell about it does not make them experts on diversity or culture- it makes them people who love to visit the margins of Whiteness and then return to talk about exotic-ness” (p. 9). It appears that CAEP’s response is Standard 1.9, which states, “Candidates reflect on their personal biases and access resources that deepen their own understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, language, and learning differences to build stronger relationships and to adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner” (CAEP, p. 16). Therefore, does this mean one course that imbeds reflections on and a spattering of readings about diverse learners satisfies Standard 1.9, in hopes that preservice teachers will make the connection between a course and their clinical practice as stated in Standard 2.3?

Like previous accreditation standards, CAEP standards appear to lack consistency, substance, and rigor when it comes to issues surrounding diversity. Jacobowitz and Michelli (2008) expressed concern that the NCATE standard on diversity was not being taken seriously by either SCDEs or the accrediting board. Based on the weak language on diversity and social justice in CAEP standards, there may continue to be a lack of attention on issues surrounding learning and achievement gaps. Therefore, this proposed study is relevant in understanding how SCDEs interpret and implement accreditation standards, especially the diversity standard. Such research can help accreditation bodies such as CAEP to create standards that are professionally relevant, clear, explicit, and rigorous.

Summary of Research

Beliefs and attitudes can influence how teachers interact with students (Good & Brophy, 1987). Teachers' beliefs are shaped by personal experiences, school experiences, and informal and formal knowledge (Richardson, 1996). Additionally, it is well known that teachers' attitudes and beliefs can influence how they interact with diverse learners (Byrnes et al., 1997; Cooper, 2003; Good & Brophy; Ferguson, 2008; Korthagen, 2002; Lynn et al., 2010; Smith-Maddox, 1998). Studies have shown that some preservice teachers enter teacher education programs with cultural deficit beliefs (Choi, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Moule, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). As a result, multicultural education courses and field experiences are increasingly necessary in the professional growth of preservice teachers. When novice teachers enter the classroom, they must be prepared to teach students from diverse backgrounds. However, some in the field have argued that universities' attempts to prepare preservice teachers have been slow and ineffective (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Fox & Gay, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas, 2002, Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Zeichner et al., 1998).

There are no universal methods for educating preservice teachers, which creates further difficulty in understanding effective interventions in teacher multicultural education. Teacher education programs typically design programs to include diversity in: (a) stand-alone multicultural course; (b) multicultural coursework with field experience; (c) cross-cultural immersion experiences; or (d) multicultural integration at the program level. Based on the literature review, it is clear that there is not a single multicultural teacher education research agenda. Instead, the majority of studies are small and

conducted by individual teacher educators who are interested in multicultural education. More rigorous and longitudinal research on the impact of multicultural education on preservice teachers is necessary. However, SCDEs' multicultural education programs are further complicated by federal, state, and nongovernment agency policies. NCATE had the important role of developing diversity standards that are based on the latest research, but the accreditation agency was also influenced by state policies. Few studies have investigated how accreditation standards impact SCDEs' multicultural education, further indicating the need to understand how SCDEs interpret and impellent the diversity standard.

CHAPTER THREE

The purpose of this study was to understand how SCDEs interpret and implement NCATE standards by using Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework of multicultural teacher education. Multicultural teacher education continues to struggle to impact teachers' beliefs and practices in the classroom. Federal and state policies, such as the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 and the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 have recognized the need to improve education conditions for historically marginalized groups. However, Gollnick (1995) and Akiba et al. (2010) found that government policies do not always encourage multicultural education, but rather maintained deficit approaches in education by viewing minorities as people who need external help in order to participate in the majority culture. Further, Gollnick also reported that professional organizations, such as NCATE, also influence state teacher licensure policies, but states continue to have limited views on multicultural education rather than more rigorous standards that lead to social reconstructive curriculum and teaching. Such limited perspectives on teacher multicultural education also influence NCATE's ability to create standards that reflect the need to educate teachers for diversity (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2011). Using qualitative content analysis research procedures, the following question was addressed:

Which dimensions of Cochran-Smith's framework for addressing multicultural education are evident in what SCDEs report they do to prepare teachers for diverse environments?

As discussed in Chapter Two, many of the multicultural teacher education studies failed to reveal a clear understanding of how SCDEs tackle the challenge of teaching about diversity to a homogenous group of preservice teachers and the impact accrediting bodies are having on SCDEs' multicultural teacher education curriculum. To address this gap in the literature, this study used Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework to identify whether NCATE's diversity standard (Standard 4) has influenced teacher educators to improve multicultural teacher education, and whether SCDEs are preparing preservice teachers for diversity based on Cochran-Smith's conceptual framework. Her multicultural teacher education framework integrates federal and state political agendas and teacher education programs. Cochran-Smith explained that the framework is appropriate in examining the diverse policies on multicultural education and the impact of such policies in SCDEs preparation of preservice teachers for diverse learners. This study used a qualitative content analysis of selected institutions' responses to NCATE standards using data collected by NCATE. As mentioned, this study used a priori codes generated from Cochran-Smith's multicultural teacher education framework. This chapter explains the research methods, data collection, data analysis, and limitations of the study.

Sample Selection

The sample consisted of SCDEs that were seeking reaccreditation and received a rating of “target” on NCATE’s Standard 4 between September 2012 and December 2013. Only SCDEs that were seeking reaccreditation were used because such units have experience with NCATE and its accreditation standards and processes. Like Delgado’s (2011) dissertation, the rating of “target” was used in the selection process. This criterion was used in order to evaluate units who have, according to NCATE, successfully met the diversity standard. Using the NCATE rubric, these units may be viewed as exemplars of NCATE’s Standard 4, and have perhaps prioritized diversity in their programs. Therefore, by focusing on SCDEs that received a score of “target” on Standard 4, I evaluated how the units interpreted and implemented a multicultural teacher education and to what degree the units fulfilled Cochran-Smith’s (2003) framework. There were no limitations on where the units were located or the diversity of the SCDEs. Lastly, the accreditation cycles between September 2012 and December 2013 were used because these were the latest sample of accreditation documents when this research was conducted.

Data

The data were collected from institutional report documents, which exist independent from this study. The data were found in the selected units’ accreditation reports to NCATE. Unit accreditation reports were written and submitted to NCATE in order to gain reaccreditation. Each report, prepared by unit faculty, explained how the unit implemented and assessed each accreditation standard. It also included the unit’s vision and mission in teacher education.

Bowen (2009) explained, “[D]ocuments may be the most effective means of gathering data when events can no longer be observed or when informants have forgotten the details” (p. 31). Documents explain information in greater detail than an interview or observation can (Bowen, 2009; Caulley, 1983). In addition, documents are convenient to use, often available, and nonreactive (Bowen, 2009; Caulley, 1983). It is also important to realize that documents are context-specific and do not exist in isolation, but rather in a “systemic relationship” with other relevant documents (Atkinson & Coffey, 1997, p. 55; Bowen, 2009). In this study, the documents used were interrelated. For instance, NCATE standards influenced the coursework and the assessments units used in order to abide by the standards. Therefore, the documents in this study are interrelated and do not exist in isolation. The researcher recognized these relationships while analyzing the documents.

Data Collection

The data preexisted with individual academic units and was accessed with the support of the academic units and CAEP. After reviewing the research proposal, CAEP agreed to provide the researcher with a list of nine members that fit the predetermined criteria. The researcher was provided with the name and contact information of each institution’s dean. In addition, CAEP leadership wrote a letter of support, which described to its members the legitimacy and importance of the research. This letter of support was important in gaining trust and access to the units’ institutional reports.

A letter was written to each institution describing the purpose of the research, its significance, and a request for the institution’s NCATE institutional report. Out of the nine units, four agreed to participate in the research and immediately sent the requested

documents. Three of four are in the southern region of the United States, and one is in the Midwest. Two of the universities are located in major cities, and the other two are located in small college towns. All of the universities are public institutions, but they vary in enrollment. The largest university has about 48,000 students enrolled, one university has an enrollment of about 11,000, and two universities have just over 4,000 students enrolled.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using qualitative content analysis, which is “the analysis of documents in order to gather facts” (Caulley, 1983, p. 20). Qualitative content analysis was appropriate for this study because it is retrospective in nature, and specific details about the institution’s mission, policies, and practices in coursework and fieldwork were essential in understanding how each SCDE interpreted accreditation standards. Additionally, as Atkinson and Coffey (1997) noted, document analysis can provide worthwhile data about the organization and its cultural characteristics.

Document analysis is typically used in conjunction with other qualitative or quantitative methods for triangulation (Silverman, 2000). According to Patton (2002), triangulation can help a researcher corroborate findings and protect her/him from being accused of researcher bias. Documents have been used as a stand-alone research data source, such as in Wild, McMahon, Darlington, Culley, and Liu’s (2010) document analysis or “diary study” of engineering documents and engineers’ documentation needs. The purpose of Wild et al.’s study was to understand when users need documents, the use of documents, the characteristics of documents, and the impact the information had on

the engineers. A diary study was used, because it was less intrusive than surveys or interviews, and it immediately captured instances of document use. The diary study required participants to self-log their activity with engineering documents. For 12 months, the 18 participants logged their need to search documents, the type of documents they accessed, and how the documents were accessed and used. The engineers' diaries were analyzed by coding and quantifying types of documents, the number of uses, and time spent on each document. The researchers found that the engineers spent from a few hours to days with a single document, and the same documents were revisited on a regular basis. Other times, the document was used as a quick reference. Documents were used in preparation for or during meetings, especially since design practice was a collaborative process. The documents used were often in physical form rather than digital, and were located in the engineers' personal archives. They found that the engineers used documents in a much more complex manner than previous researchers believed. The participants went beyond the consumer-producer characteristics of using documents. Though the research produced interesting findings, the researchers argued that the validity of the study was threatened by the sole use of diaries. Nevertheless, the diaries provided rich data about engineers' use of documents.

Since documents are typically not used as the sole data source, Wild et al. (2010) and Bowen (2009) explained that it is important to have a detailed explanation of systematic and objective research procedures. Caulley (1983) identified the following three controls to make the document analysis systematic and objective:

1. Categories of analysis must be clearly explained.

2. All relevant materials in samples must be systemically classified.
3. Quantitative procedures should be used in order to measure the importance of various ideas in the documents.

The process of document analysis is the organizing of information into categories. This was done through an interactive process combining elements of content analysis and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009). Similarly, Schreier (2012) described qualitative content analysis as systematic and involving a specific sequence of steps (p. 5). Schreier explained that the steps involve: (a) deciding on the research question; (b) selecting the material; (c) creating a coding frame; (d) trying out the coding frame; (e) evaluating the coding frame and modifying it; (f) the main analysis of documents; and (g) interpreting and presenting the findings (p. 5-6).

As Bowen (2009) wrote, “content analysis is the process of organizing information into categories related to the central questions of the research” (p. 32). There are two approaches to content analysis: inductive content analysis and deductive content analysis. Inductive analysis includes open coding, creating categories from the codes, and finally abreacting or creating subcategories (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). On the other hand, deductive analysis is used when the researcher wants to test existing data in a new context (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Both approaches include three important elements: (a) preparation; (b) organizing; and (c) reporting (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). The preparation phase includes selecting the unit of analysis, which in this research is the institutional report. Secondly, the data are organized using either inductive or deductive analysis. This

research lends itself to deductive analysis, because Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework was used to determine the coherence of SCDEs in their multicultural teacher education. The questions used in the framework are being used as categories for this study. The questions include the following: "the diversity question, the ideology or social justice question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice questions, the outcomes question, the recruitment/selection question, and the coherence question" (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p 10) (see Table 1). In deductive content analysis, structured matrixes are used in the analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). The data for each institution is organized in the matrix and only aspects of the data that fit the matrix are chosen. However, there is room to add categories when data that do not fit the matrix emerge (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

Though deduction analysis is the primary analysis, there was also an element of thematic analysis, which guided the process of recognizing additional patterns within the data. The process involved searching the text for recurring words and themes by first reading the documents and making comments in the margin (Patton, 2002). The first round of coding was also the beginning of organizing data into topics based on Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework. This involved reading the unit's accreditation report to identify whether the unit answered the eight questions Cochran-Smith proposes SCDEs should answer based on their multicultural education practices (see Table 1). Since an element of this study involved document analysis, it was important to count the number of times codes appeared, but frequency is but one element

of the analysis. A color-coded system was used in order to begin to identify patterns in the documents (Patton, 2002).

Bowen does not recommend quantification in his definition of content analysis, and as Saldaña (2013) warned “frequency of occurrence is not necessarily an indicator of significance” (p. 39). Nevertheless, Caulley (1983) suggested that quantification could provide the researcher an objective view of the data. In this study it was appropriate to quantify the data. Quantification was important to maintain an objective view; also, it provided answers to the research questions. For instance, in order to understand whether the sample of units was practicing the multicultural teacher education conceptual framework, it was necessary to quantify the data.

Table 1

Cochran-Smith’s Teacher Multicultural Education Questions

Theme	Question
Diversity	How should the increasingly diverse student population in American schools be understood as a challenge or ‘problem’ for teaching and teacher education?
	What are the desirable ‘solutions’ to this problem?
Ideology	What is the purpose of schooling?
	What is the role of public education in a democratic society?
	What historically has been the role of schooling in maintaining or changing the economic and social structure of society?
Knowledge	What knowledge, interpretive frameworks, beliefs, and attitudes are necessary to teach diverse populations effectively, particularly knowledge and beliefs about culture and its role in schooling?

	What do teachers need to know about the knowledge base?
	What else do they need to know, including attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs needed to teach diverse groups?
Teacher learning	How do teachers learn to teach diverse populations and what, in particular, are the pedagogies of teacher preparation (e.g., coursework assignments, readings, field experiences) that make this learning possible?
Practice	What are the competencies and pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse populations effectively?
Outcomes	What should the consequences or outcomes of teacher preparation be and how, by whom, and for what purposes should these outcomes be assessed?
Recruitment and selection	What candidates should be recruited and selected for America's teaching force?
Coherence	To what degree are the answers to the first seven questions connect to and coherent with one another in particular policies or programs?
	How are diversity issues positioned in relation to other issues?

The second round of coding involved rereading the documents and formally coding the substance of the accreditation documents and clarifying the system of coding (Patton, 2002), which yielded a closer look at how units answer Cochran-Smith's questions. An emic analysis was important in this process since the researcher evaluated how the units use terms such as multicultural education, diversity, and social justice. In other words, the second round of coding of the institutional reports provided further context and examples of how the SCDE responded to Cochran-Smith's questions. During the coding process, the researcher wrote analytic memos. Stake (1995) explained, "Good

research is not about good methods as much as it is about good thinking” (p. 19). Writing the analytic memos while coding was helpful in making sense of the data.

Lastly, creating cross-classification matrices provided further analysis of the data and “generate[d] new insights about how the data can be organized. Matrices will be useful in looking for patterns that were not immediately obvious” in the initial analysis (Patton, 2002, p. 468) (see Table 2). The matrices also helped determine substantive significance of the data (Patton, 2002; Schreier, 2012). The matrices assisted in the analysis of the coherence of the unit’s commitment to diversity in teacher education (see Appendix B).

Table 2

Data Analysis Matrix

Theme	Question	Number of times question answered by Unit A	Percentage of times question answered by Unit A	Number of times question answered by Unit B	Percentage of times question answered by Unit B
Diversity	How should the increasingly diverse student population in American schools be understood as a challenge or 'problem' for teaching and teacher education? What are the desirable 'solutions' to this problem?				
Ideology	What is the purpose of schooling? What is the role of public education in a democratic				

society?

What historically
has been the role
of schooling in
maintaining or
changing the
economic and
social structure of
society?

Knowledge

What knowledge,
interpretive
frameworks,
beliefs, and
attitudes are
necessary to teach
diverse
populations
effectively,
particularly
knowledge and
beliefs about
culture and its role
in schooling?

What do teachers
need to know
about the
knowledge base?

What else do they need to know, including attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs needed to teach diverse groups?

Teacher learning

How do teachers learn to teach diverse populations and what, in particular, are the pedagogies of teacher preparation (e.g., coursework assignments, readings, field experiences) that make this learning possible?

Practice

What are the competencies and pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse populations effectively?

Outcomes	What should the consequences or outcomes of teacher preparation be and how, by whom, and for what purposes should these outcomes be assessed?
Recruitment and selection	What candidates should be recruited and selected for America's teaching force?
Coherence	<p>To what degree are the answers to the first seven questions connect to and coherent with one another in particular policies or programs?</p> <p>How are diversity issues positioned in relation to other issues?</p>

Validity

In qualitative research, the researcher is the instrument (Patton, 2002). As a result, the validity or credibility of qualitative research depends on the rigor, experience, and transparency of the researcher. Though perfection and “objective truth” in research is impossible to achieve, it is worth setting a goal to achieve plausible explanations in order for the research to be useful (Maxwell, 2005). As a result, the researcher must “identify the specific threat in question and to develop ways to attempt to rule out that particular threat” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 107). The following paragraphs are descriptions of the threats to the research and ways to improve the validity of the study.

Qualitative content analysis has its limitations, especially when documents are the sole source of data. Academic institutions may write reaccreditation reports to the accrediting body that paint the institution and its programs in a better light than they might actually be, which may misdirect the interpretation of the documents (Caulley, 1983). As Atkinson and Coffey (1997) explained, “They [documents] are ‘social facts,’ in that they are produced, shared and used in socially organised ways. They are not, however, transparent representations of organizational routines, decision-making processes, or professional diagnoses. They construct particular kinds of representation with their own conventions.” (p. 47) Furthermore, reading is not a passive activity. Readers bring in their own knowledge, biases, and ignorance about the topic and organizations. This can be both a strength and a limitation. Documents, such as accreditation documents have specific vocabulary that relates to teacher education and accreditation policies. Therefore, having a deep knowledge about education and

accreditation is an asset. On the other hand, misinterpretation may occur due to not knowing the specific details about a unit that would be valuable in the interpretation of the documents. There is an expectation that the researcher is objective and sensitive to the subtle cues about the context in the documents (Bowen, 2009).

In addition to the limitations of using documents, the non-random sample may be a threat to the validity of this study. Selecting units based on their Standard 4 rating of “target” limits the validity of the findings with regard to units that did not receive a “target” score. For example, if the researcher selected units that received ratings of “acceptable” and “unacceptable,” that choice may uncover other patterns that would not appear with the decision rule used. Additionally, the specific multicultural theory and practice each unit uses would be unique to its context. Yet, the use of units that received the score of “target” provided information about how these specific units interpreted and implemented diversity throughout the institutional report and if it aligned with current theories on multicultural teacher education.

Lastly, researcher subjectivity was another validity threat that needed attention. As described earlier, the researcher is the product of an immigrant community that strived to achieve the American dream, but also witnessed the injustices of the education system and the impact that it had on students and families that did not understand how the American education system worked and the hidden doors available for well-informed, English-speaking, middle- and upper-class families. As a result, the researcher is a passionate advocate for multicultural education, especially in teacher education, because it not only informs preservice teachers about diverse students, but also engages them in

conversations and practice that improves student learning. This particular lens is important, but it can also shade the coding and interpretation processes.

In order to ensure the credibility of the research, a second coder and critical friend coded the all four institutional reports using the same coding procedure described above. The second coder was trained on the coding process during the summer of 2014 and participated in a pilot study to determine if the codebook was well developed and the process was clear. Based on the pilot study, the codebook was modified to better describe the following categories: ideology, knowledge, teacher learning, and practice. In addition, the subcategories of ideology and knowledge were combined because there was a lack of differences between the subcategories. This streamlined the codebook and more accurately represented Cochran-Smith's (2003) framework (see Appendix C). Additionally, Schreier (2012) explained that the development of a well-defined codebook should produce similar results from both coders. The coherence question was not coded as its own category since it was difficult to establish coherence during the coding process. Therefore, coherence was determined during the final analysis of the data by the researcher.

Intercoder reliability or intercoder agreement (Tinsley & Weiss, 1975) was essential in qualitative content analysis. If the coding was not reliable then the study cannot be trusted (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, Bracken, 2002). Intercoder reliability was determined by comparing categories used and resolving coding disagreements through discussions (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004; Schreier, 2012). The codes were compared using a comparative coding sheet in which the codes from each coder were listed for each

unit (see Appendix B) (Schreier, 2012). There were various ways to interpret the data since multiple realities exist and impact interpretations. However, there was value in dialoguing with a second coder not just for the mere verification of labels, but “to determine whether or not various researchers and experts would agree with the way those data were labeled and sorted” (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 110). Additionally, as Morse (1997) explained, reliability determined by an interrater reliability score can be achieved, but “at a cost of losing all the richness and creativity inherent in analysis, ultimately producing a superficial product” (p. 446).

When there were disagreements on a code, the two coders discussed the reasoning behind the code, and one of the following situation resulted: (a) one coder made a mistake, prompting both coders to agree on one code to be entered into the final code column on the comparative coding sheet; (b) the two coders had different reasons for entering different codes, but one coder was able to convince the other of her reasoning; (c) both coders had legitimate and convincing reasons for their interpretations and code assignments, in which instance the coders could not agree on a final code (Schreier, 2012, p. 205). When there were disagreements on the final code and a consensus could not be agreed upon, the situation was handled by taking turns between the interpretations of the two coders. For example, the first time there was disagreement, the first coder’s interpretation was used as the final code. The second time, the second coder’s code was used (Schreier, 2012, p. 206). However, the researcher and second coder did not need to use turns between interpretations because consensus was consistently reached. Summary measures of coding consistency, such as percentage of agreement, were used in this

study, because the qualitative nature of this study does not lend itself to quantitative analysis (Patton, 2002). The initial percentage of agreement for all four Institutional Reports between coders was 43.3% (see Table 3). Final intercoder agreement was determined by comparing codes; coding disagreements that were resolved through ongoing discussions. The percentage of agreement after the discussions was 100%. This was done by systematically reviewing each line of every page of a report that was coded. Often the disagreement was quickly resolved by rereading the statement in the unit's NCATE accreditation report and realizing that the line or paragraph was miscoded by one of the coders due to a misreading or other human error. There were a few times that the two coders reached different conclusions due to a bias or an assumption, but by rereading the statement in the report and consistently referring back to the language used in the codebook, a code was agreed upon. The codebook was the anchor to every discussion and decision.

Table 3

Number and Percentages of Intercoder Agreement across All Reports

Standard	<i>n</i> codes agreed		<i>n</i> codes in section		Agreement %	
	Round 1	Round 2	Round 1	Round 2	Round 1	Round 2
Overview	35	58	65	58	53.8	100
Standard 1	34	59	77	59	44.2	100
Standard 2	16	39	40	39	40	100
Standard 3	29	56	53	56	54.7	100
Standard 4	90	188	247	188	36.4	100
Standard 5	10	18	20	18	50	100
Standard 6	8	12	19	12	42.1	100
Addendum	35	58	73	58	47.9	100
Total	257	488	594	488	43.3	100

The analysis of the multiple documents from each unit and the use of a second coder improved the validity of this study. The findings from this study can inform teacher educators and the literature in understanding how to improve the interpretation and implementation of NCATE standards. Additionally, the findings can help accrediting agencies improve standards and accreditation processes for teacher educators by understanding better the evidence selected institutions use to meet their standards.

CHAPTER FOUR

As presented in Chapter Two, multicultural teacher education continues to struggle to impact teachers' beliefs and practices in the classroom. The purpose of this study was to understand how SCDEs interpret and implement NCATE standards by using Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework for multicultural teacher education. The framework has four major areas that interact with one another. First is how the SCDE or education unit defined multicultural teacher education. Second, in the framework, Cochran-Smith identified eight key questions about multicultural teacher education programs and whether the responses to the questions reflected a holistic program. The questions included the following: "the diversity question, the ideology or social justice question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice question, the outcomes question, the recruitment/selection question, and the coherence question" (p. 10). The third element of the framework incorporated external forces, such as institutional capacity, the relationship with local communities and schools, and governmental and non-governmental regulations. Finally, the fourth element included larger contexts and reform agendas, such as the public's views on teacher education and policies like No Child Left Behind that affect not only the external forces but also teacher education and the multiple meanings of multiculturalism.

In the present dissertation, Cochran-Smith's framework was used to analyze selected SCDEs' reaccreditation reports to examine the extent to which they approximated Cochran-Smith's framework toward a coherent perspective on multicultural teacher education. Cochran-Smith explained that the framework is appropriate for examining the diverse policies affecting multicultural teacher education and the impact of such policies on SCDEs' preparation of preservice teachers for diverse learners. Using qualitative content analysis research procedures, the following research question was addressed:

- Which dimensions of Cochran-Smith's framework for addressing multicultural education are evident in what SCDEs report they do to prepare teachers for diverse environments?

The National Center for Education Information (2011) argued that the multicultural teacher education literature has not revealed a clear understanding of how SCDEs tackle the challenge of teaching about diversity to its preservice teachers, and the impact accrediting bodies are having on SCDEs' multicultural teacher education curriculum. To address this gap in the literature, the present study used Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework to determine the extent to which NCATE's standards have influenced teacher educators to improve the preparation of preservice teachers for diversity.

The participants were four SCDEs that sought reaccreditation from NCATE between September 2012 and December 2013 and received a rating of "target" on Standard 4. The data were the contents of each unit's institutional report to NCATE. Each

report was analyzed using qualitative content analysis and coded using a priori codes generated from Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework (see Appendix C). The codebook was designed using Cochran-Smith's multicultural teacher education questions revolved around these topics: (a) diversity; (b) ideology or social justice; (c) knowledge; (d) teacher learning; (e) practice; (f) outcomes; (g) recruitment or selection; and (h) coherence. The responses to these questions reflect how holistic the program was in teaching about diversity.

In the remainder of this chapter, the researcher presents the findings of each unit's NCATE accreditation report. First, though, is a brief review of the six NCATE standards and their expectations, followed by a detailed description of the findings based on the a priori codes for each standard of the institutional reports. Quotes from institutional reports are not being presented in the reporting of the findings, which is abnormal in the reporting of findings in qualitative research. The reason for this is that the anonymity of the institutions is a priority of the researcher; in the age of the Internet and sophisticated search engines, the anonymity of institutions would have been threatened if direct quotes from the reports were imbedded in Chapter Four. Instead, the researcher has paraphrased statements from the report in order to provide the reader with some context of the findings. A description of the findings across each unit's report of each standard will be discussed. Lastly, the units' coherence, Cochran-Smith's eighth question, will be outlined.

Overview of the NCATE Standards

The mission of NCATE was to ensure that “graduates of accredited institutions have acquired knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn” (NCATE, 2008, p. 1). NCATE’s commitment as a professional accreditation agency was to promote accountability and improvement in teacher education and to determine whether SCDEs followed standards established by the field. When units went through the accreditation or reaccreditation process, an institutional report was written and provided to NCATE’s Board of Examiners during their on-site visit. The institutional report detailed how the unit believed it fulfilled each NCATE standard. The complete list of standards and the brief descriptions by NCATE can be found in Appendix C.

Conceptual framework. Across the four reports analyzed for the present study, the first section of the typical institutional report was about the unit’s conceptual framework. The conceptual framework was the unit’s vision for the program. The writers of the institutional report articulated how the conceptual framework was created. Additionally, NCATE expected the conceptual framework to be aligned with the curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessments and outcomes of teacher candidates. The conceptual framework served as the foundation for the unit’s dedication to education, but also its “commitment to diversity and the preparation of educators who help all students learn” (NCATE, 2008, p. 14). The units’ writers then described how they fulfilled the requirements of each standard.

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The first standard was about how candidates were prepared to work as educators with

proficient knowledge of content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional disposition to work with diverse learners. In order to demonstrate that units were abiding by professional standards, the unit was required to provide assessments, rubrics, and data on candidates' outcomes.

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. The second standard required that institutions have assessment systems in place which were designed to collect data on preservice teachers' development and performance in the program for further analysis. NCATE argued that the collection and constant analysis of data were necessary not only to improve candidates' education, but also the performance of the unit and its programs. Therefore, to successfully pass Standard 2, units had to demonstrate that the assessments were aligned with its conceptual framework and that they regularly evaluated its assessment system and made changes and improvements based on data-driven decisions.

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. Standard 3 was developed to ensure that the unit and its partner schools developed candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to working with diverse learners in P-12 school settings. The units' demonstrated competence in Standard 3 by describing the collaboration between the unit and partner schools. Additionally, the report included evidence that the school partners' preparation of candidates was aligned with those of the unit and that candidates were integrating their knowledge with practice in the school setting. The unit provided documentation about the partner schools as evidence that candidates were being placed in partner schools with diverse learners.

Standard 4: Diversity. NCATE's fourth standard required that faculty design and implement curriculum that provided opportunities for preservice teachers to learn, practice and develop professional dispositions that helped all learners. In addition, units were expected to demonstrate provision of opportunities for preservice teachers to increase their experience working with diverse populations within the institution and also in P-12 settings. Units were expected to describe how the curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practices incorporate diversity and opportunities for preservice teachers to work with diverse colleagues and learners.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications. In Standard 5, NCATE required units to ensure that the faculty were qualified and modeled best practices in three areas: scholarship, service, and teaching. This was indicated by the units' description of faculty members' scholarship, teaching practices, and collaboration, as well as alignment with the units' mission. In addition, the units had to demonstrate that faculty were evaluated and sought to improve.

Standard 6: Governance and resources. Finally, Standard 6 focused on the units' leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities and resources including technological resources for candidates. In this section of the institutional report, units had to describe the structure of the leadership and budgetary allocations. In addition, the units described the recruiting and admissions processes to indicate that candidates had sufficient resources to successfully complete the program.

Units that sufficiently described and provided evidence to support the claims in the institutional report were accredited or reaccredited by NCATE. Accreditation

indicated that the unit was abiding by professional standards and was preparing teachers to teach in diverse P-12 settings. The following are descriptions and findings of institutional reports from four pseudonymous institutions: Gallifrey University, Asgar University, Krypton University, and Hogwarts University. The *a priori* codes are in italic to help the reader understand when the researcher is referring to an *a priori* code.

Gallifrey University NCATE Accreditation Report

Gallifrey University (GU) is a public institution located in a metropolitan area in the Midwest United States. The university was designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution by the U.S. Department of Education. The university reported over 11,000 students enrolled, and nearly 60% are students of color. The College of Education reported 2,416 students enrolled in its program. In 2012, there were 1,180 White students, 1,043 students of color, and 193 students that did not self-report their race. The majority of students enrolled in the College of Education were female ($n = 1,731$). There were 67 faculty members employed by the College of Education. Forty-six faculty members were White, 21 were people of color, 22 were male, and 45 were female.

The institutional report was written for the Fall 2012 NCATE reaccreditation visit. The report had a total of 86 pages. The 86-page report included the institution's history, mission, vision and values, an overview of the College of Education with its conceptual framework, a description of how the unit complied with NCATE's six standards, and an addendum. After each description of the standard, Gallifrey University's report also had a list of exhibits with active web links. The exhibits provided NCATE and the Board of Examiners evidence that supported the unit's description of

how it fulfilled each standard. Standards 1 and 2 had 10 pages each. Standard 3 had a total of eight pages, and Standard 4 had a total of seven pages. Standards 5 and 6 had the least number of pages, with six pages each. The total report had 114 coded statements.

The a priori code that had the highest percentage of coding in Gallifrey University's NCATE accreditation report was about preservice teachers' *outcomes* in the program. As can be seen in Table 4, "data" ($n = 155$) was the most commonly used term, followed by the words "diversity" ($n = 58$) and "diverse" ($n = 48$). As a result, three of the six standards had the a priori code *outcome* with the highest percentage of codes. The following sections of this chapter include a description of each standard and the findings, which are also represented in Table 5.

Table 4

Gallifrey University Accreditation Report Word Count

Word	<i>n</i>
Diversity	58
Diverse	48
Intercultural	0
International	3
Multicultural	4
Social Justice	2
Equity	3
Exceptional/lities	7
Data	155
State	46

Table 5

Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Gallifrey University (GU) accreditation report

Standards	<i>n</i> Div	Div %	<i>n</i> Ideol ogy	Ideol ogy %	<i>n</i> Knlge	Knw lge %	<i>n</i> Learn	Lear n %	<i>n</i> Pract ice	Pract ice %	<i>n</i> Outc ome	Outc ome %	<i>n</i> Rert mnt	Rert mnt %	<i>n</i> Total	Total %
Ovrw	5	45.5	6	54.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9.6
S 1	0	0	0	0	2	20	1	10	0	0	7	70	0	0	10	8.8
S 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	0	0	8	88.8	0	0	10	8.8
S 3	2	9.5	0	0	1	4.7	8	38	3	14.3	7	33.3	0	0	21	18.4
S 4	6	18.2	1	3	6	18.2	6	18.2	4	12.1	5	15.2	5	15.2	33	28.9
S 5	1	25	0	0	0	0	2	50	0	0	1	25	0	0	4	3.5
S 6	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.6	3	2.6
Addn dm	12	54.5	1	4.5	0	0	6	26.2	0	0	0	0	3	13.6	22	19.2
Total	27	23.7	8	7	9	7.9	24	21.1	7	6.1	29	25.5	10	8.8	114	100
Mean	3.4	23.3	1	7.8	1.1	5.4	3	19.2	0.9	3.3	3.6	29.6	1.3	11.9	14.3	100

Note. Div: Understandings Diversity; Kntlge: Knowledge; Learn: Teacher Learning; Rertmnt: Candidate Recruitment.

Conceptual framework. The purpose of the overview and framework section of Gallifrey's accreditation report was to introduce the Board of Examiners to the unit. This section of the report had 11 (9.6%) of the 114 statements that fit one of Cochran-Smith's a priori codes. The a priori code most present in this section of the report was *ideology*, with 6 (54.5%) codes. GU described its appreciation of the diverse neighborhoods in which it was situated and its commitment to prepare candidates that were well-rounded in the liberal arts; it provided preservice teachers opportunities for comprehensive experiences in its diverse partner schools. This was not surprising since this section of the report was about the university and the unit's mission and conceptual framework. The second most coded term in the GU's conceptual framework was *diversity* ($n = 5$, 45.5%), which indicated that the unit's mission included *diversity* as an important element to its framework in preparing preservice teachers. This is further supported by the unit's description of its evolving conceptual framework that was created through a collaborative effort by faculty members. The unit faculty characterized the conceptual framework as transformative, collaborative, and reflective and was dedicated to ensuring the preparation of candidates to work in diverse school communities.

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

NCATE's Standard 1 was about candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to educate diverse learners. As displayed in Table 5, Gallifrey University's institutional report had a total of 10 a priori codes for Standard 1, representing (8.8%) in the entire report. The highest representation of an a priori code was *outcome* ($n =$

7, 70%). There may have been a greater focus on *outcomes* in Standard 1 of GU's report since the standard specifically stated: "Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards" (NCATE, 2008). This was further indicated by GU's introduction of Standard 1. The unit report began with a description of the assessments, evaluations, and data collection that helped the unit faculty identify whether their preservice teachers and their programs were meeting professional, state, and institutional standards. Descriptions about the *knowledge* teachers were expected to know as related to diversity had two (20%) codes and descriptions about how teachers *learn* the knowledge base had one (10%) code (see Table 5). At the end of GU's description of Standard 1, the report stated that an area of weakness and need for continued attention was preparing teachers for English Language Learners. There were no discussions about the unit's *understanding of diversity*, its *ideology*, preservice teachers' *practice*, or pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse learners, nor was there discussion of candidate *recruitment and selection*.

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. Assessment systems and unit evaluation were discussed in Standard 2. The section on Standard 2 had 10 (8.8%) codes in the entire report (see Table 5). The highest percentage of codes went to *outcome* ($n = 8$, 88.8%). This was expected since this particular standard is specifically about assessments. In the introduction to Standard 2, the Gallifrey faculty described the update of its integrated assessment system, which aligned with the unit's conceptual framework. The system, according to the report, helped the unit sift through data to better support its preservice teachers and improve the program. The unit mentioned its assessment of

candidates, especially in relation to working with diverse learners. It explained protocol for working with preservice teachers who fail to the professional standards set by the unit, which included the diversity proficiencies the unit developed and sought to improve. There were also statements related to the faculties' role in analyzing data and collaborating to make improvements. Finally, there was one mention of *learning* about diversity ($n = 1$, 11.1%) in Standard 2 that referenced that all preservice teachers had experience working with diverse learners in their clinical practice, which was ensured through data collection.

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. In GU's report, the description of Standard 3 had 21 (18.4%) codes from the entire report (see Table 5). The codes about preservice teachers' *learning* and *outcomes* each represented eight (36.3%) codes in the report. For example, the unit described that candidates had to learn to examine student data and design instruction based on the student data. This was done during the candidates' clinical practice and assessed by the faculty. The report also had statements related to preservice teachers' *practice* with diverse learners ($n = 3$, 13.6%), such as opportunities to work in diverse schools and communities, but its statements did not further explain the types of pedagogical skills the candidates are practicing, especially in clinical experiences. There were two instances (9%) in which the unit demonstrated *understanding of diversity*, such as when it explained its diligent work in establishing and developing partnerships with local school districts and schools that lead to important solutions, such as revising bilingual education curricula. Finally, the unit mentioned ($n = 1$, 4.5%) the need to support preservice teachers' *knowledge* on diversity during clinical

practice. In this particular standard, there was not one code that was overly represented, and there was a balance between assessing students and engaging in preservice teachers' learning.

Standard 4: Diversity. Gallifrey University's accreditation report had the most statements coded in this section of the report ($n = 33$, 28.9%) (see Table 5). Standard 4 was the only standard in which all a priori codes were found within one standard and no a priori code had an overwhelming percentage of codes. This perhaps indicated that the unit was most coherent about its approach to diversity in Standard 4. Preservice teachers' *understanding of diversity* and *knowledge* about diversity, and what preservice teachers *learned* about diversity had six (18.2%) codes in its description of Standard 4. For instance, the unit described its definition and embrace of diversity, which included ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, physical differences, exceptionalities, languages, religion, sexual orientation, cultural, and geographical area. Additionally, in regards to *knowledge*, the unit detailed the diversity proficiencies that candidates had to abide by, such as promoting social justice and equity, recognizing various differences between people and communities, and designing and implementing instruction appropriate for diverse learners. The unit stated that the diversity proficiencies aligned with what preservice teachers *learned*. The unit explained that all preservice teachers were required to take a course on diversity and related to the diversity proficiencies, but further elaboration was not stated in the report, though there were exhibits with the course outline. Gallifrey University's institutional report also described how the faculty assessed preservice teachers' *outcomes* as related to working with diverse learners five

times in this section of the report (15.2%), using multiple evaluations of preservice teachers that also included feedback from university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty members who monitored candidate willingness to work with diverse learners. The unit report did mention that the proficiency related to candidates' promotion of social justice and equity was difficult to measure and therefore to assess candidates. In this section of the report, the authors explained that the unit's faculty actively *recruited and selected* diverse candidates five times (15.2%), by, for example, seeking grants that provided need-based tuition assistance to candidates. The unit also mentioned *practice* four (12.1%) times, in such instances as having field experiences and clinical practices in diverse partner schools. Finally, one (3%) a priori code was related to the unit's *ideology*, which was located in the introduction of the discussion on Standard 4 and reiterated the unit's commitment to diversity.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications. In this institutional report, Standard 5 had four (3.5%) of the 114 codes in the entire report, which was the second least coded standard (see Table 5). This may have to do with Cochran-Smith's (2003) framework, rather than the unit's lack of attention to diversity. Within Cochran-Smith's eight questions about multicultural teacher education, she did not mention faculty knowledge, experience, or research interest in issues around diversity. Though Standard 5 was about faculty qualifications, *knowledge* and *practice* had two (50%) codes in this section of the report; those two statements were related to preservice teachers *learning* about diversity. In each instance, the unit described methods used by the faculty to teach the material, such as modeling best practices, conducting simulations, encouraging discussions and

questions, peer teaching, lecturing, reflecting, role playing, using case studies, and providing hands-on experiences. The unit also described once (25%) the unit faculty's *understanding of diversity* by ensuring that the candidates and faculty were diverse and that such diversity lead to deeper and richer discussions and experiences. Lastly, the unit described once (25%) in Standard 5 the use of student evaluations to support and improve the individual faculty and program's *outcomes* on diversity.

Standard 6: Governance and resources. This standard had three of 114 codes (2.6%) in the entire report, which was the least coded standard (see Table 5). As mentioned, this NCATE standard was about the governance system and resources that support candidates learning (see Appendix C). The most coded a priori code was about the *recruitment and selection* of diverse preservice teachers ($n = 2$, 66.6%). For instance, the unit mentioned its recruitment efforts and institutional support of veterans. Lastly, there was one (33.3%) mention of the unit's *understanding of diversity* by providing additional funds to support technology integration and English Language Learning program.

Addendum. Gallifrey University's institutional report included an addendum. In the addendum, the faculty addressed concerns the Board of Examiners raised with the institutional report. The addendum had the second most a priori codes ($n = 22$, 19.2%) in the report (see Table 5). The addendum, based the codebook, discussed the most about the unit's *understanding of diversity* ($n = 12$, 54.5%), which included references and additional information about diversity data, diversity proficiencies, and decision-making based on the diversity of candidates and surrounding communities. The unit's faculty also

wrote about what preservice teachers *learned* in relation to diversity ($n = 6$, 26.2%) and specifically focused on candidates' practicum hours. Additionally, the unit provided further support and data about its *recruitment and selection* of diverse candidates ($n = 3$, 13.6%). Lastly, the unit's *ideology* ($n = 1$, 4.5%) was mentioned in regards to its alignment with the unit's diversity proficiencies.

Asgar University NCATE Accreditation Report

Asgar University (AU) is located in a metropolitan area in the South. It is a public university designated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the top tier of research universities and offers 180 programs. The university has approximately 35,000 students enrolled of which 41% are students of color. At the time the institutional report was written, the College of Education had 2,904 students enrolled in the program. About 56% ($n = 1623$) of the students enrolled in the College of Education programs identified as White, 21% ($n = 615$) identified as students of color and 1.5% ($n = 32$) did not identify with a race. The majority of students in the program were female ($n = 1830$, 63%), while males represented 17% ($n = 485$) of students in the program. There were 111 faculty members employed by the College of Education. Eighty-six faculty members were White, 25 were people of color, 38 were male, and 73 were female.

Asgar University's institutional report was written for the Spring 2013 NCATE reaccreditation visit. The report had a total of 47 pages. The report included the history, mission, vision, and values of the university, an overview of the College of Education with its conceptual framework, a description of how the unit complied with NCATE's six

standards, an appendix, and an addendum. The addendum included live web links to the unit's exhibits. The exhibits provided NCATE and the Board of Examiners the evidence that supported the unit's description of how it fulfilled each standard. The section about the overview of the unit had a total of three pages. Standards 1 of the report had six pages and Standard 2 had four pages each. Standards 3 and 4 each had a total of five pages. While Standards 5 and 6 each had four pages. Finally, the appendix had three pages and the addendum had a total of 11 pages.

The institutional report had a total of 103 codes (see Table 6). The a priori code that had the highest percentage of coding in this unit's report was *outcome*, with 35 codes representing 34% of the all codes. This corresponded with the word count for the word "data" in which it was found a total of 149 times (see Table 6). Though the word "diversity" was found 65 times, the word "state" was found 58 times. When the word "state" was used it was in regards to Asgar's state education policies or standards that SCDEs had to abide by. Even though data, assessments, and state standards were a major component of the accreditation report, the percentage of the codes about assessment was high in two of the six standards, which were Standards 1 and 2. This unit was asked to prepare an addendum, which had a high percentage of the a priori code *outcome* represented ($n = 18$, 81.8%). Preservice teachers' *learning* had the highest percentage of codes in four of the six standards (Standards 3, 4, 5, 6), but had 24 (23.3%) codes in the entire report. The following further describes each standard and the findings in the Asgar University accreditation report (see Table 7).

Table 6

Asgar University (AU) accreditation report word count

Word	<i>n</i>
Diversity	65
Diverse	35
Intercultural	0
International	3
Multicultural	3
Social Justice	1
Equity	1
Exceptional/lities	10
Data	149
State	58

Conceptual framework. The conceptual framework introduced the Board of Examiners to the unit. This section described the unit faculty's commitment to creating a diverse, supportive, scholarly, collaborative learning environment for its candidates. As displayed in Table 7, the a priori code most mentioned in this section of the report was *understanding of diversity* with six (40%) codes. The report included several changes and additions to the program that directly related to the faculty's understanding and view of its role in the solution with issues on diversity. For example, new programs were implemented, such as a Master's degree in Autism Spectrum Disorders, a Speech Language Hearing program, and a stand-alone English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement. Preservice teachers' *knowledge* base ($n = 4$, 26.6%) was also described in the overview of the unit. The report listed and described how the conceptual framework aligned with what the unit wanted preservice teachers to know. For instance, the unit wanted its students to know how to collaborate with partner schools, families,

and other members of the community, demonstrate their content knowledge, and to be aware and engage in issues of diversity. Finally, two (13.3%) codes in this section fell under preservice teachers' *practice* and the unit's *ideology*. In the section, the unit briefly described the importance of candidates' reflective practice and clinical practice. Also, the unit described in the beginning and reiterated at the end of the section the alignment of its *ideology* with Asgar University, especially in regards to diverse populations, advocating for social change, demonstrating democratic values, and ensuring inclusive policies.

Table 7

Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Asgar University (AU) accreditation report

Standards	<i>n</i> Div	Div %	<i>n</i> Ideol ogy	Ideol ogy %	<i>n</i> Kwn lge	Kwn lge %	<i>n</i> Lear n	Lear n %	<i>n</i> Pract ice	Pract ice %	<i>n</i> Outc ome	Outc ome %	<i>n</i> Rert mnt	Rert mnt %	<i>n</i> Total	Total %
Ovrv w	6	40	2	13.3	4	26.6	0	0	2	13.3	0	0	1	6.6	15	14.6
S 1	1	7.1	0	0	2	14.3	1	7.1	2	14.3	8	57.1	0	0	14	13.6
S 2	1	14.3	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	5	71.4	0	0	7	6.8
S 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	63.6	1	9	4	36.3	0	0	11	10.7
S 4	6	18.8	1	3.1	3	9.3	14	43.8	2	6.3	0	0	6	18.8	32	31.1
S 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Addn dm	2	9	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	18	81.8	0	0	22	21.4
Total	16	15.5	3	2.9	11	10.7	24	23.3	7	6.8	35	34	7	6.8	103	100
Mean	2	11.2	0.4	2.1	1.4	7.4	3.1	41.1	0.9	5.4	4.4	30.8	0.9	3.2	12.9	12.5

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions are discussed under Standard 1, which had a total of 14 (13.6%) of the codes in the entire report (See Table 7). In this section, the unit had eight codes (57.1%) in the area of *outcomes*. For example, the College of Education described and provided mean scores for measures related to diversity, such as internship evaluations from university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and candidates' self-assessment on diversity dispositions. *Knowledge* and *practice* both had two (14.3%) codes in Standard 1. The first code related to *knowledge* based on diversity was found at the beginning of the section on Standard 1, which related to candidates' knowledge of content. The second code at the end of the section was about Special Education programmatic revisions that the faculty believed were necessary to improve candidates' *knowledge*. The discussion of the Special Education program also led to *teacher learning* being coded once (7.1%), because it further described how the unit planned to prepare the candidates for inclusive classrooms. Finally, the unit's *understanding of diversity* had one code (7.1%), as it described the need for programs to continue to revise to 21st century standards, especially with the increase of diverse populations in P-12 schools.

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. In the section about Standard 2, Asgar University had a total of seven codes (6.8%) (see Table 7). The statements most coded were related to *outcomes*, which had five codes (71.4%). This was expected since Standard 2 is specifically about assessments. For example, the unit report explained the complexity of the assessment system due to the size and nature of the unit, but also due to

the state requirements in regards to assessments and reporting requirements. It also described the programs' surveys, e-portfolios and other projects, such as the curriculum project in which candidates analyzed student learning and addressed needs of diverse learners. However, the faculty writers also acknowledged flaws and the need to emphasize assessments on student learning, and applying theory into practice better. Teacher *learning* was coded once (14.3%) in Standard 2, because the unit described the courses in which candidates learned about student learning and analysis of student assessments. Finally, there was also one mention (14.3%) of the unit's *understanding of diversity* in Standard 2 in relation to changing technology and the need to integrate technology in courses.

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. The unit's description of the third NCATE standard, regarding field experiences, had 11 (10.7%) codes in the entire report (see Table 7). The code represented the most in Standard 3 was teacher *learning*, in which the unit described how the institution prepared preservice teachers for field experiences, with seven (63.6%) codes. For instance, they wrote of their growing partnerships with schools to ensure that candidates were placed in diverse school settings for the practicum. Additionally, with the discussion of preservice teachers learning about diversity, there were three occasions in which the collaboration between the unit and K-12 schools was mentioned. In the Standard 3 discussion, candidates' *outcomes* were represented four (36.3%) times, which related to the evaluation of teacher interns' dispositions for working with diverse learners. Finally, *practice*, in which the unit described an extensive field experience in the Special Education program that provided

candidates a link between theory and practice, had each one (9%) code in Standard 3.

There were no mentions of the unit's *understanding of diversity*, its *ideology*, *recruitment*, or *knowledge* of preservice teachers in Standard 3.

Standard 4: Diversity. The diversity standard had the most statements coded in AU's accreditation report with a total of 32 (31.1%) codes (See Table 7). *Teachers learning* was the a priori code with the most mentions in Standard 4 ($n = 14$, 43.8%), which indicated that the unit described how the institution prepared preservice teachers for diverse learners. For example, the unit report included a statement about a course that all of its undergraduates were required to take. The course was about teaching in diverse settings and preservice teachers had to conduct field observations in one of the partner schools. The a priori code *understanding of diversity* was represented six (18.8%) times in Standard 4. In a few instances, the unit described the diversity surrounding Asgar University and described itself as part of the solution as it prepared candidates for diversity. This sentiment was further articulated as the unit described its efforts to *recruit and select* ($n = 6$, 18.8%) diverse preservice teachers into its programs, such as making scholarships available to underrepresented groups. Additionally, the a priori code *knowledge* had three (9.3%) codes in this section of the report, which described the alignment between the conceptual framework (*ideology*, $n = 1$, 3.1%) and the diversity dispositions the candidates had to exhibit, such as respect for diversity. Lastly, *practice* was represented twice (6.3%) in this section, and the unit described the pedagogical skills necessary to success, e.g. workings with English language learners, engaging in reflective

practice, modifying curriculum, and learning material and strategies for diverse needs of learners.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications and Standard 6: Governance and resources. The sections on Standard 5 (faculty qualifications) and 6 (unit governance) have the fewest number of codes. Each had one (1%) code in the entire report (see Table 7). In each, the coded statement related to preservice *teachers' learning*. In the narrative for Standard 5, the unit referenced Standard 4 and mentioned the faculty's commitment to developing culturally competent candidates by infusing instruction and experiences about diverse learners throughout each course. Finally, in Standard 6, the instructional technology available for faculty and candidates to learn how to use and incorporate in courses for individuals with disabilities was described in the report.

Addendum. Asgar's report also included an addendum to the report, which had 22 (21.4%) codes in the entire report (see Table 7). The majority of the addendum was dedicated to further discussion and clarification of its *outcomes* ($n = 18$, 81.8%), which was an indication that NCATE needed further description and evidence of the unit's assessment and evaluation systems in order for the Board of Examiners to make its recommendation. For example, the unit shared disaggregated program data on the *outcomes* on assessments related to diversity and the results of employer surveys about the candidates' ability to implement a variety of strategies with diverse learners. The faculty in the report described its *understanding of diversity* ($n = 2$, 9%) by providing further information on its partner schools' student diversity profile and their teacher populations. Lastly, there were two statements about *knowledge* of preservice teachers

that included the mention of a required diversity course that all preservice teachers had to take and a field experiences in diverse settings.

Krypton University NCATE Accreditation Report

Krypton University (KU) is a small public liberal arts university located in a small town in the South. There are a little over 4,000 students enrolled in the university. The College of Education reported 706 students enrolled in the professional education program. There were 365 White students, 317 students of color, and 24 students that did not self-identify with a race. The majority of the students in the program were female ($n = 588$), while there were 118 males. There were 28 faculty members employed by the College of Education. Twenty-two faculty members were white; six were people of color, and 21 were female.

The institutional report was written for the Fall 2012 NCATE reaccreditation visit. The 60-page report included the institution's history, mission, vision, and values of the university, an overview of the College of Education with its conceptual framework, and a description of how the unit complied with each of NCATE's six standards. Throughout the report, Krypton University faculty included active web links to exhibits, which supported the institution's claims by providing the Board of Examiners further evidence. The section about the overview and institutional framework was five pages long. The descriptions of Standards 1 and 2 had a total of 10 and eight pages, respectively. Standard 3 had six pages, while Standard 4 had a total of 13 pages, which was the longest section of the report. Standard 5 had a total of seven pages and finally

Standard 6 had 11 pages. The NCATE report from Krypton University had a total of 116 codes.

The a priori code that had the highest percentage of coding in this unit's NCATE report was *outcomes* with 42 (36.2%) mentions. Additionally, four of the six standards had *outcomes* with the highest percentage of a priori codes, which were Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. The word count for the term "data" in this report was a total of 169 (see Table 8). The word "diverse" was the second most used term in the report ($n = 63$), which coincides with the total number of statements coded about the unit's understanding of diversity. *Understanding diversity* was the second most coded category with 24 codes (20.7%), followed by *knowledge* ($n = 15$, 12.9%), *teacher learning* ($n = 14$, 12.1%), *unit ideology* ($n = 9$, 7.8%) and *practice and recruitment and selection of preservice teachers* ($n = 6$, 5.2%). The following is a description of the findings in each standard (see Table 9).

Table 8

Krypton University (KU) accreditation report word count

Word	<i>n</i>
Diversity	27
Diverse	63
Intercultural	0
International	1
Multicultural	0
Social Justice	0
Equity	0
Exceptional/lities	3
Data	169
State	43

Conceptual framework. This section of the accreditation report, an introduction to the unit and its philosophy and mission statement had 6 (5.2%) codes (see Table 9). The a priori category most coded in this section of the report was the unit's *ideology* with four (66.7%) codes in this section of the report. The primary mission of the institution was to focus on serving the region that the university is located in, which was characterized as having significant areas of poverty. Its commitment to improve economic, social, and educational opportunities for the surrounding communities is demonstrated by the College of Education's conceptual framework, which focused on developing competent and caring teachers that can teach learners in impoverished areas. Additionally, in this section of the report, there was one (16.7%) code representing the unit's *understanding of diversity*. The faculty's understanding of diversity links with its mission and its conceptual framework as it recognized that poverty is an issue in the region and views the institution, the faculty, and preservice teachers as part of the solution to improving conditions for the community. Finally, the category *outcomes* was also coded once (16.7%). The statement related to the a priori code *outcomes* explained that with the development of a new conceptual framework (caring and competent teachers) that the unit also developed assessments that measured teacher candidates' development as related to the conceptual framework throughout the program.

Table 9

Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Krypton University (KU) accreditation report

Standards	<i>n</i> Div	Div %	<i>n</i> Ideol ogy	Ideol ogy %	<i>n</i> Knw lge	Knw lge %	<i>n</i> Lear n	Lear n %	<i>n</i> Pract ice	Pract ice %	<i>n</i> Outc ome	Outc ome %	<i>n</i> Rcrt mnt	Rcrt mnt %	<i>n</i> Total	Total %
Ovrw w	1	16.7	4	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	6	5.2
S 1	5	23.8	0	0	3	14.3	2	9.5	1	4.8	10	47.6	0	0	21	18.1
S 2	1	5.9	1	5.9	4	23.6	2	11.7	0	0	9	52.9	0	0	17	14.7
S 3	2	18.2	1	9	1	9	3	27.2	1	9	3	27.2	0	0	11	9.5
S 4	7	14.6	1	2	6	12.5	7	14.6	4	8.3	18	37.5	5	10.4	48	41.4
S 5	6	85.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	7	6
S 6	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	6	5.2
Total	24	20.7	9	7.8	15	12.9	14	12.1	6	5.2	42	36.2	6	5.2	116	100
Mean	3.4	28.3	1.3	16.7	2.1	10.9	2	9	0.9	3.2	6	28.4	0.9	3.5	16.6	14.3

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The standard about candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions had 21 (17.9%) of the total codes in the report (See Table 9). *Outcomes* was the most-mentioned code in this section of the report (47.6%, $n = 10$), which was focused on the analysis of data demonstrating that candidates were proficient not only with content knowledge, but that they also had the pedagogical skills needed to work with diverse learners. The report included active web links that provided evidence of such claims. The second most coded a priori code was the unit's *understanding of diversity* ($n = 5$, 23.8%). In describing Standard 1, the unit consistently referenced its surrounding communities that have diverse learners and the unit's own determination to be a part of the solution in resolving many of the socio-economic challenges the communities faced. Additionally, the unit referenced Standard 4 (diversity). The category *knowledge* had three (14.3%) codes in Standard 1 related to preservice teachers, which were references to their dispositions regarding diversity and also their knowledge on how to create lesson plans for different learners. *Teacher learning* was coded twice (9.5%) in this section. In regards to how the unit was preparing preservice teachers, the unit's faculty explained that in courses the preservice teachers were taught skills such as, data analysis, planning, assessing, and differentiation. Finally, the a priori code *practice* was represented once (4.8%) in Standard 1, which was a reference to candidates using pedagogical skills to impact student learning, but there were no descriptions on these specific skills. This indicated that the unit understood diversity and viewed itself as part of the solution to teaching and engaging preservice teachers in practice with diverse learners, while maintaining a deep

focus on assessing and collecting data on preservice teachers.

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. The standard on assessment and unit evaluation systems had a total of 17 codes or 14.7% of the codes of the entire report (see Table 9). Of the 17 codes, nine (52.9%) statements were related to the category *outcomes*. This was to be expected since this particular standard is specifically about *outcomes*. In this institutional report, the faculty described the comprehensive restructuring of the assessment system that reflected the unit's conceptual framework and dispositions. The assessments at Krypton were used throughout the program and were viewed as checkpoints in order to analyze the development of teacher candidates and provide immediate remediation if the unit's standards were not being met. Additionally, stakeholders, such as principals of partner schools, were also involved in the evaluation of candidates. These evaluations were used to gather data on the impact the program had on alumni, employers, and teachers. Another a priori code, *knowledge*, was found four times (23.6%) in this section. When describing the dispositions candidates had to know, there were references to the conceptual framework's depiction of the local conditions of poverty and diversity, which indicated a strong commitment to the conceptual framework and ensuring that the program was aligned with it. Two references to *preservice teacher learning* (11.7%) were also found at the end of this section of the report, which were about providing additional workshops for candidates that needed further development in content. Finally, there was one (5.9%) mention of the unit's *understanding of diversity and ideology* in Standard 2 at the end of the section, in which the faculty reiterated the unit's understanding of the community it served and its connection to the conceptual

framework. There were no references in Standard 2 related to *practice* or the *recruitment and selection* of candidates.

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. The field experience and clinical practice standard had 9.5% ($n = 11$) of the codes in the entire report (see Table 9). The code represented the most in Standard 3 was *outcomes* with 27.2% ($n = 3$) of the codes, which explained how candidates were evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and how the evaluations were aligned to develop preservice teachers' dispositions, skills and knowledge about diverse learners. The unit faculty members also made a point to explain how assessments aligned with state and professional standards. Preservice teachers' *learning* about diversity also had three (27.2%) codes in reference to the placement of candidates in diverse partner schools. There were two codes (18.2%) related to the category *understanding of diversity*. In these references, the faculty in the report described the partner schools diversity and restated that faculty's commitment to be a part of the solution in supporting the community. Finally, *ideology*, *practice*, and *knowledge* each had one code (9%) in Standard 3. There was no mention of the unit's *recruitment and selection* process of preservice teachers in this section.

Standard 4: Diversity. The diversity standard has the most statements coded in the report with 48 codes (41.4%) (see Table 9). In addition, it is the only standard in which all a priori codes are represented. Preservice teacher *outcomes* was the a priori code with the most mentions in Standard 4 (37.5%, $n = 18$). In the response to this standard, the faculty listed and further described its use of formative and summative

assessment, and their expectations that their preservice teachers demonstrate their knowledge of student background, school and community context, how to create a positive learning environment, and to respect all students and their families. The categories *understanding of diversity* and *learning* each had seven codes (14.5%) The faculty wrote that the candidates learned about diversity through course work, clinical and internship experiences, and professional development activities about diversity and best instructional practices. There were six (12.5%) codes related to *knowledge*, which again were about professional attitudes and dispositions required in diverse settings. There were 5 (10.4%) statements in Standard 4 that fit the category *recruitment and selection* of diverse candidates, which described programs such as the Teacher Cadet Program, which provided opportunities for high school students in the community to learn about the profession, as well as the college application process and financing. The category *practice* had 4 (8.3%) codes in this section. The faculty in the report stated that candidates demonstrated best teaching and behavioral management practices; however, no further details about these skills were provided. Finally, *ideology* had one code (2%) in Standard 4, which was at the beginning of the section and reiterated the dedication of the faculty to prepare teachers for the surrounding communities' diverse schools. The findings from this standard indicated that this unit focused its attention on assessing and collecting data on preservice teachers understanding and practice of diversity within a very local focus on community improvement through teacher education.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications. The standard on faculty qualifications had the second least number of codes in the entire report ($n = 7$, 6%) (see Table 9). The

majority of these seven codes were about the unit's *understanding of diversity* ($n = 6$, 85.7%), which described the faculty's commitment to working with diverse school settings and collaborating with a Center of Excellence that was dedicated to preparing and supporting teachers who work in impoverished communities. Finally, there was also one (14.3%) mention of the *recruitment and selection* of preservice teachers, which referenced a committee composed of faculty members that supported the Center of Excellence to recruit diverse candidates.

Standard 6: Governance and resources. Along with the Overview, Standard 6 (governance) had the least number of codes ($n = 6$, 5.2%) in the entire report (see Table 9). The a priori codes most represented were the unit's *understanding of diversity* and its *ideology* ($n = 2$, 33.3%). In this part of the report the faculty reported that the leadership in the college was committed to the conceptual framework's emphasis on diversity, and that it viewed itself as a part of the solution to the region's challenges with poverty. *Knowledge* and *outcome* were also coded in this standard ($n = 1$, 16.7%), which were found at the end of the section. The statement related to *knowledge* and *outcome* was about the faculty's work in better aligning the diversity dispositions they sought in their students to the assessment of the candidates. The unit did not describe how *teachers learn* and *practice* diversity or their *recruitment and selection* policies as described by the codebook.

Hogwarts University NCATE Accreditation Report

Hogwarts University (HU) is a small public university located in a small town in the South. The university implemented Advancement Via Individual Determination

(AVID) strategies (<http://www.avid.org/what-is-avid-for-higher-ed.ashx>). When the report was written, there were 3,800 students enrolled in the university and 50% of students self-classified as students of color. The College of Education reported 364 students enrolled in its program. There were 204 White students, 156 students of color, and 3 students that did not self-report their race. The majority of students enrolled in the College of Education are female ($n = 308$). There were 39 faculty members employed by the College of Education. Twenty-eight faculty members were White, 11 were people of color, and the majority were female faculty members ($n = 28$).

The institutional report was written for the Spring 2013 NCATE reaccreditation visit. The report had a total of 58 pages. The 58-page report included the institution's history, mission, vision, and values of the university, an overview of the College of Education with its conceptual framework, a description of how the unit complied with NCATE's six standards, and an addendum. The overview section and Standard 1 had four pages. Standards 2, 3 and 5 had five pages. Standard 4 had nine pages, which was the longest section of the report. Standard 6 had six pages. Finally, the addendum had 18 pages.

The NCATE report from Hogwarts University had a total of 154 codes. The a priori code that was most represented in the report was preservice teachers' *knowledge* ($n = 40$, 26%). The word "data" was found 195 times in this report (see Table 10), and *outcomes* was the second most coded a priori code in the report ($n = 34$, 22.1%). Additionally, Standard 1 ($n = 11$, 78.6%) had the highest percentage of a priori codes related to *outcomes*. The report also had an addendum, which also focused on preservice

teachers' *outcomes* ($n = 12$, 85.7%). The following describes further each standard and the findings (see Table 11).

Table 10

Hogwarts University (HU) accreditation report word count

Word	<i>n</i>
Diversity	25
Diverse	63
Intercultural	0
International	3
Multicultural	0
Social Justice	0
Equity	0
Exceptional/lities	21
Data	195
State	92

Conceptual framework. This section was an introduction to the unit, its mission and conceptual framework, and it had the second most coded statements in the entire report ($n = 21$, 14.2%). The a priori code most found in this section of the report was the *knowledge* preservice teachers received in the program ($n = 12$, 46.2%). The third page of the report described the knowledge candidates had to demonstrate, including the content and practice appropriate for all learners, learner-centered instruction, and understanding and respecting diversity. *Practice* had four (19%) a priori codes in this section, which explained reflective practice, collaboration with the community and families, and a focus on learner-centered pedagogy. *Ideology* was represented in this section with four (9%) codes, which included preparing teachers to be proactive in the development of all

learners. Finally, the category, preservice teachers' *learning*, was coded once (4.8%), which was a mention about candidates practicing appropriate techniques that met diverse learners' needs, but no further details were provided in this section about the strategies the faculty expected candidates to learn. Interestingly, the unit's *understanding of diversity* was never discussed in this section. Neither were *outcomes* or the *recruitment and selection* of preservice teachers.

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The standard about candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions had a total of 14 codes (9.4%) in the report (see Table 11). *Outcomes* was coded the most in this section with 11 codes (78.7%). Hogwarts University described assessments such as Candidate Work Sample, which included candidates demonstrating knowledge and skill in analyzing student data, community and school context, and best practices for all learners. The following were each coded once in this section of the report (7.1%): the unit's *understanding of diversity*, preservice *teacher learning*, and the *recruitment and selection* of diverse preservice teachers. For instance, the unit understood the need to support the surrounding community by preparing teachers to teach bilingual students. As a result, the unit had "prescriptive" instruction on best practices to support diverse learners. However, the report does not provide additional detail on what the faculty means by "prescriptive," but according to the report the instruction was successful. Lastly, *knowledge* and *practice* were not coded in Standard 1.

Table 11

Numbers and Percentages of a priori codes for Hogwarts University (HU) accreditation report

Standards	<i>n</i> Div	Div %	<i>n</i> Ideol ogy	Ideol ogy %	<i>n</i> Kwn lge	Knw lge %	<i>n</i> Lear n	Lear n %	<i>n</i> Pract ice	Pract ice %	<i>n</i> Outc ome	Outc ome %	<i>n</i> Rcrt mnt	Rcrt mnt %	<i>n</i> Total	Total %
Ovrw w	0	0	4	19	12	57.1	1	4.8	4	19	0	0	0	0	21	14.2
S 1	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	1	7.1	0	0	11	78.6	1	7.1	14	9.4
S 2	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	4	2.7
S 3	4	30.8	1	7.6	1	7.6	3	23.1	1	7.6	3	23.1	0	0	13	8.8
S 4	3	4	2	2.7	27	36	17	22.7	14	18.7	7	9.3	5	6.7	75	50.7
S 5	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4.1
S 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	2	1.3
Addn dm	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	12	92.3	0	0	13	8.8
Total	15	10.1	9	6.1	40	27	23	15.5	19	12.8	34	23	8	5.4	148	100
Mean	1.9	21.9	1.1	8.4	5	11.2	2.9	8	2.4	5.7	4.25	27.7	1	14.2	19.3	12.5

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. The standard on assessment and the unit's evaluation system had four (2.7%) codes in the entire report (see Table 11). The a priori code *outcome* was found once (25%), which was an explanation of the alignment between the conceptual framework, diversity dispositions, and assessments. Though Standard 2 is about assessments and evaluation systems, the lack of representation of *outcomes* may be due to the faculty describing the unit's transition into a new assessment system and online data management system. The unit report also mentioned state and professional standards and assessments that impacted the preservice teachers and the unit, such as the Educator Readiness Portfolio and rubrics, which was revised to meet the state's new pedagogy and professional standards for teachers. There were two (50%) codes in this standard related to the unit's *understanding of diversity*, which reflected the faculty's knowledge of diversity and the analysis of data that has direct impact on the unit such as, the creation of new courses that develop candidates' knowledge of diversity. Additionally, the unit's *ideology* ($n = 1$, 25%) was also mentioned in the second standard, because the faculty acknowledged the connection between the conceptual framework and the assessments. The following a priori codes were not represented in Standard 2: *knowledge*, *teacher learning*, *practice*, and *recruitment and selection* of diverse candidates.

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. Field experience and clinical practice were described in Standard 3 and had a total of 13 (8.8%) codes (see Table 11). The code represented the most in Standard 3 was the unit's *understanding of diversity* with four (30.8%) codes, such as the acknowledgement of the diversity of

partner schools and the collaboration between faculty and schools to provide best practices for all learners. Additionally, the section had three (23.1%) codes each related to preservice *teacher learning* and preservice teachers' *outcomes* pertained to teaching diverse learners. The faculty described the unit's opportunities for candidates to engage with diverse learners in field experiences and the feedback cooperating teachers and administrators provided the unit about candidates that helped the unit make improvements, followed by one (7.6%) code each under *knowledge*, *practice*, and *ideology*. In this instance, the faculty in the report stated that candidates had to have the appropriate attitudes, beliefs, and practices for all learners. Additionally, the report had a statement about the pedagogy the state education department established and the unit taught to its candidates. Finally, the report had a statement about the alignment between field experiences and the conceptual framework and mission of the unit. There were no mentions of the unit's *recruitment* and *selection* of preservice teachers in this section.

Standard 4: Diversity. The NCATE standard on diversity had the most statements coded in the report with 75 (50.7%) codes. In addition, it was the only standard in which all seven a priori codes were found in one standard. The majority of the statements in this section were coded with the a priori code *knowledge* ($n = 27$, 36%). The second most coded statements were about how preservice *teachers learn* about diversity ($n = 17$, 22.6%). Additionally, *practice* was coded 14 (18.7%) times in the report. The frequent coding of *knowledge*, *teacher learning*, and *practice* was due to the fact that the faculty listed and described courses and experiences in which knowledge and pedagogy about diversity were discussed. For example, courses were offered on second language

acquisition, content area literacy with a focus on diverse learners, and multilingualism. Additionally, case studies, modeling, and simulations were used to deliver the material. The category *outcomes* ($n = 7, 9.3\%$), was discussed in this section when describing preservice teachers outcomes the faculty expected in courses, such as the ability to write lesson plans for ELLs or presenting an issue of diversity. Also, the assessment, titled Candidate Work Sample, for the clinical experiences was again described (see Standard 2 above). The unit's efforts at *recruitment* and *selection* of diverse preservice teachers was mentioned in Standard 4 ($n = 5, 6.6\%$), which included seeking grants to prepare diverse candidates for the teaching profession. Lastly, the least discussed codes were the unit's *understanding of diversity* ($n = 3, 4\%$), and *ideology* ($n = 2, 2.6\%$), which were referenced to the alignment between the unit's ideology to courses, assessments and its definition of diversity. The findings indicated the unit was focused on ensuring the students had knowledge of diversity through the courses and experiences the unit offers.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications. The standard on faculty qualifications, performance and development had six (4.1%) codes in the entire Hogwarts report (see Table 11). In this section, the unit discussed how faculty collaborated and worked with neighboring school districts and communities. Therefore, it may not be surprising that the unit's *understanding of diversity* was coded the most ($n = 5, 83.3\%$) in this section of the report. The faculty described their research and collaboration with local school districts and communities around issues of diversity, such as in research on the impact of professional development on the implementation of vocabulary instruction. Additionally, the faculty and candidates collaborated with the local community library by supporting its

read aloud and literacy program. Lastly, there was one mention about the unit's *ideology* (16.7%), which referenced the faculty's dedication to the vision and mission of the unit.

Standard 6: Governance and resources. The governance of the unit was discussed in Standard 6. It had two (1.3%) codes in the entire report (see Table 11). The two statements coded were about the *recruitment and selection* of preservice teachers, in which the faculty members described their active participation in the recruitment of community college students into the program by participating in recruitment trips to local community colleges. Additionally, the faculty described their efforts to win grants that supported diverse candidates, especially those that were in high-needs subject areas, such as Mathematics, Science, Bilingual, and English as a Second Language programs.

Addendum. Finally, this report also had an addendum, which clarified or expanded on some topics. This section had 13 (8.8%) codes (see Table 11). The addendum mostly focused on preservice teachers' *outcomes* as it related to teaching diverse learners ($n = 12$, 92.3%). There were statements about specific scores on candidates' cultural understanding and the faculty members' analysis of what the data suggested. For example, the unit acknowledged that some candidates in their internship did not acknowledge multicultural issues in their content area and received low scores as a result. The faculty explained that it needed to re-emphasize and make explicit the critical thinking related to multicultural instruction. Finally, one (7.7%) code was found related to *teacher learning*, which was a clarification that candidates were exposed to diverse learners during their field experiences.

Summary of Findings of Individual Unit Reports

The findings above indicate that each institution had the same structure to the institutional report. However, there were differences in the units' *ideology* and how the faculty in each institution described *knowledge, teacher learning, practice, outcomes, and recruitment and selection*. This can be attributed to the unique context of each institution, as each teacher education program functions within its own local context and expectations as it prepares teachers to teach anywhere in the nation or the world. The preceding findings do not provide as much information about the commonalities and differences in the units' reporting of multicultural teacher education as a cross-case analysis would. Below is a cross-case analysis of the institutional reports.

Cross-case Analysis of Institutional Reports

Each of these institutions was obligated to address multicultural teacher education as part of their reaccreditation application to NCATE. Though these institutions reported in their own way, it is possible to draw them together to examine larger themes that cut across all four institutions. The following are the findings about each standard gleaned from a comparison of the four units.

Conceptual framework. All unit reports included descriptions about the faculties' dedication to preparing teachers to teach for all learners, but each had a unique perspective based on the context in which the unit was situated. For example, Gallifrey and Krypton universities were the two units that, in this section of the report, focused on *ideology* and explicitly connected it to diversity, which was indicated by the second most coded statements relating to unit *understanding of diversity* (see Table 12 below). GU's

faculty described its mission including intentionally preparing preservice teachers for diverse learning environments. KU's mission also focused on serving the high-poverty region in which it was located. The KU faculty was committed to improving socio-economic and educational opportunities for the surrounding communities by developing competent and caring teachers. Asgar University, on the other hand, focused on *understanding of diversity* ($M = 40\%$), followed by preservice *teachers' knowledge* ($M = 26.6\%$). Similar to KU, AU viewed its role as an institution as part of the solution to the local issues of diversity by preparing teachers for diverse learners. The faculty at AU believed it important to highlight new programs created to improve candidates' knowledge on diversity and described the importance of clinical experiences and reflective practice. Hogwarts University's mission was to develop proactive teachers who were prepared to work on the development of all learners. However, HU focused on preservice teachers' *knowledge* ($M = 57.1\%$), *practice* ($M = 19\%$), *ideology* ($M = 19\%$), and *teacher learning* ($M = 4.8\%$), but did not discuss the unit's *understanding of diversity*.

Table 12

Composite of Response to Overview and Framework

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	45.5	54.5	0	0	0	0	0
AU	40	13.3	26.6	0	13.3	0	6.6
KU	16.7	66.7	0	0	0	16.7	0
HU	0	19	57.1	4.8	19	0	0

Mean	25.6	38.4	20.9	1.2	8.1	4.2	1.7
------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. As can be seen in Table 13 below, all units had a high percentage of codes related to *outcomes* under Standard 1 of the report. Across all four institutions, *outcomes* was highly represented in this section of the report ($M = 63.3\%$), because the standard stated, “Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards” (NCATE, 2008). For example, HU’s and GU’s unit reports began with a description of the assessments, such as the Candidate Work Sample (HU), evaluations, and data collection that helped the faculty identify whether their preservice teachers and programs were meeting professional, state, and institutional standards. AU provided mean scores for measures related to diversity, such as internship evaluations from university supervisors, teacher cooperation, and the self-assessment of candidates on diversity dispositions. Similarly, at KU, there were active web links that provided evidence that candidates were proficient in their knowledge and skills.

Furthermore, the standard stated: “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” (NCATE, 2008). The a priori codes *knowledge*, *teachers learn*, and *practice* should have the highest percentage of codes; however, the description of what preservice teachers should *learn* had a mean of 8.4% between the units. This suggests that units did not specifically

describe what or how preservice teachers should learn in regards to diversity. The means were also low when units' described the pedagogical *practice* discussed in courses ($M = 4.8\%$). For instance, GU and AU described deficiencies and continuous improvement in certain areas of their programs, such as preparing students for English Language Learners and Special Education. Krypton's faculty, on the other hand, explained that they taught skills such as data analysis, planning, assessing, and differentiation. Lastly, though Asgar and Krypton universities were the only two units to make references to pedagogy in Standard 1 of the report, the faculty did not provide specific detail on the type of pedagogy or pedagogical skills that were being discussed and implemented in the coursework.

Table 13

Composite of Responses to Standard 1

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	0	0	20	10	0	70	0
AU	7.1	0	14.3	7.1	14.3	57.1	0
KU	23.8	0	14.3	9.5	4.8	47.6	0
HU	7.1	0	0	7.1	0	78.6	7.1
Mean	9.5	0	12.2	8.4	4.8	63.3	1.8

Standard 2: Assessment and evaluation. The second NCATE standard is about assessment systems and evaluation standards. Three of the four units (GU, AU, KU) had a high percentage of codes related to preservice teachers' *outcomes* in their responses to

this standard (see Table 14 below). The high percentage of the a priori code, *outcomes* ($M = 59.5\%$), was expected because Standard 2 is about assessment systems and preservice evaluation. The faculty in all four institutions wrote that the faculty members made improvements in their assessment systems by using electronic data management, which made collecting, analyzing, and reporting data more efficient and facilitative of data-driven decisions. The authors of the reports also mentioned that the conceptual framework was aligned with the assessment system. Faculty members in all units collaborated to review the assessments, rubrics, and data collected in order to determine the validity and reliability of the assessments. In addition, the faculty described their efforts to constantly improve assessments and rubrics, including assessments that emphasize P-12 student learning and applying theory in practice. All units also provided opportunities for stakeholders in partner schools to evaluate candidates, especially during candidates' internships. However, none of the units' faculty specifically described assessments related to diversity in Standard 2. Instead, the units described the systems in place to collect and analyze data from assessments and evaluations. Hogwarts University was also the only unit not to have a priori code *outcomes* highly represented in Standard 2 (25%). Though none of the units described specifics about assessments on diversity, they all mentioned the alignment of assessments with the diversity dispositions their candidates were expected to demonstrate. HU faculty mentioned diversity dispositions, but not as frequently as GU, AU, or KU. With further analysis of Standard 2, HU faculty frequently described the alignment of its assessments to the state Department of

Education's standards and requirements. None of the other units mentioned state standards in Standard 2.

Table 14

Composite of Responses to Standard 2

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	0	0	0	11.1	0	88.8	0
AU	14.3	0	0	14.3	0	71.4	0
KU	5.9	5.9	23.7	11.7	0	52.9	0
HU	50	25	0	0	0	25	0
Mean	17.6	7.7	5.9	9.3	0	59.5	0

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice. As the data in Table 15 (below) display, Gallifrey and Krypton universities focused most of the discussion around *outcomes* and *teacher learning*, while Asgar had a higher percentage of codes related to *teachers learn* ($M = 63.6\%$) and Hogwarts focused on its *understanding of diversity* in education ($M = 30.8$). It was notable that all four units described the importance of relationships and collaboration between the unit and partner school administrators and teachers. Additionally, all unit reports described their partner schools as having diverse populations of P-12 students, which ensured that all teacher candidates would engage with diverse learners. Lastly, all units acknowledged their commitment to supporting partner schools and the surrounding communities, which reified that the faculties viewed themselves as part of the solution to supporting P-12 schools and

improving learning for diverse students. Though the units stated similar goals, partnerships, and solutions to candidates' field experiences, the differences in the coding could be due to how the authors of the reports stated their work on diversity issues and its relationship to candidates' field experiences and internships, further exemplifying the individual nature of each institution.

Table 15

Composite of Responses to Standard 3

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	9.5	0	4.7	38	14.3	38	0
AU	0	0	0	63.6	9	36.3	0
KU	18.2	9	9	27.2	9	27.2	0
HU	30.8	7.6	7.6	23.1	7.6	23.1	0
Mean	14.6	4.2	5.3	38	10	31.2	0

Standard 4: Diversity. The units' dedications to diversity is strongest in their responses to Standard 4, which is the diversity standard. Nearly all a priori codes were found in each unit's reporting of Standard 4 (see Table 16 below). Asgar University was the only unit that did not have all a priori codes represented in Standard 4, with *outcomes* missing. Also, across all four units, there were no a priori codes that were represented with over 50% of the codes. However, the a priori code with the greatest mean was *teachers learn* ($M = 24.8\%$), which was related to how the units taught preservice teachers about diversity. For instance, GU's faculty described the alignment of the

diversity proficiencies to what preservice teachers were required to learn. Asgar and Krypton similarly described course materials and the expectations of being placed in a diverse learning partner school during field experiences. Hogwarts had a much more extensive list and description of each course's delivery of material and experiences on diversity. Additionally, the units described the *knowledge* they taught ($M = 19\%$) and candidates' *outcomes* in relation to diverse learners ($M = 15.5\%$), such as Hogwart's Candidate Work Sample. Yet, the code *practice* had a relatively low mean ($M = 11.4\%$), which indicated the units did not describe the pedagogical skills they taught preservice teachers in order to be successful teachers of diverse learners. It is also interesting to note that Hogwarts University was the only unit to describe the use of culturally responsive pedagogy in its course work, which may be the reason the unit had the highest percentage ($M = 18.7\%$) of codes related to *practice* compared to the other units.

Table 16

Composite of Responses to Standard 4

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	18.2	3	18.2	18.2	12.1	15.2	15.2
AU	18.8	3.1	9.3	43.8	6.3	0	18.8
KU	14.6	2	12.5	14.6	8.3	37.5	10.4
HU	4	2.7	36	22.7	18.7	9.3	6.7
Mean	13.9	2.7	19	24.8	11.4	15.5	12.8

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications. Across all units, Standard 5 had the fewest a priori codes, because this standard focused on faculty performance, qualifications, and development (see Table 17 below). The definitions and indicators of the a priori codes, which were based on Cochran-Smith's (2003) teacher education framework, did not fit many of the statements in Standard 5, because Cochran-Smith does not question the qualifications and development of teacher educators in the eight questions she asks SCDEs. However, all the reports had statements that described the units' understanding and dedication to being a solution to challenges around *diversity*, and their commitment to developing candidates who were prepared to work with diverse learners. Gallifrey University went so far as to describe how some faculty taught about diversity, such as modeling best practices, conducting simulations, discussing case studies, peer teaching, lecturing, reflecting, role playing, and providing hands-on-experience.

Table 17

Composite of Responses to Standard 5

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	25	0	0	50	0	25	0
AU	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
KU	85.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
HU	83.3	16.7	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	48.5	4.2	0	37.5	0	6.3	0

Standard 6: Governance and resources. The second least coded standard was Standard 6. This NCATE standard focused on the unit's governance and resources. Each

unit took a different approach to describe governance. Gallifrey University incorporated descriptions on its intent to recruit diverse preservice teachers ($M = 66.6\%$). For instance, the unit mentioned its recruitment efforts and institutional support of military veterans. Additionally, it demonstrated its *understanding of diversity* ($M = 33.3\%$) by providing additional funds to support technology integration and an English language learning program. Asgar University had one a priori code that was related to how *teachers learn* about diverse learners ($M = 100\%$), which was indicated by the authors' description of the instructional technology available for faculty and candidates to learn how to use and incorporate in courses for individuals with disabilities. This was an indication that the unit supported diverse learners by providing the necessary resources. While Krypton University had a larger spread of coded statements in which it described its *understanding of diversity* ($M = 33.3\%$), its *ideology* as it related to diversity ($M = 33.3\%$), preservice teachers' *outcomes* ($M = 16.7\%$), and *knowledge base* ($M = 16.7\%$), the wider range of a priori codes represented may indicate that KU was providing a variety of resources to support faculty work and candidates' learning with diverse learners. For instance, KU reported that the leadership in the college was committed to solving the region's challenges with poverty. Also, the faculty's work in aligning the diversity dispositions to the assessment system was reiterated in Standard 6, indicating that the unit provided resources to support the faculty's efforts. Lastly, Hogwarts' coded statements related to preservice teachers' *recruitment and selection* ($M = 100\%$), where faculty members described their active participation in the recruitment of community

college students into the program, as well as efforts to win grants in support of diverse teacher candidates.

Table 18

Composite of Responses to Standard 6

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	66.6
AU	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
KU	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	0	16.7	0
HU	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Mean	16.7	8.3	4.2	25	0	4.2	41.7

Addendum. Three universities (AU, HU, and GU) had an addendum to correct, clarify, and support claims made in the report to the visiting board (see Table 19 below). Asgar ($M = 81.8\%$) and Hogwarts ($M = 85.7\%$) universities further described the data systems and assessments, which was interesting since these two units had the lowest percentages (AU, $M = 0\%$) (HU, $M = 9.3\%$) related to preservice teachers' *outcomes* based on assessments on teaching diverse learners. For example, Asgar's faculty shared disaggregated program data on the *outcomes* related to diversity and the results of employer surveys about the candidates' ability to implement a variety of strategies with diverse learners. Additionally, Hogwarts' faculty disclosed in the report specific scores on candidates' cultural understanding and the faculty members' analysis of what the data suggested and acknowledged that some candidates were not meeting the professional

standards on diversity. On the other hand, Gallifrey focused most of its addendum clarifying its *understanding on diversity* and diverse learners ($M = 54.5\%$) and how preservice *teachers learn* about diverse learners ($M = 26.2\%$), which included references and additional information about diversity data, diversity proficiencies, and decision-making based on the diversity of candidates and surrounding communities.

Table 19

Composite of Responses in Addendum

Unit	Diversity %	Ideology %	Knowledge %	Learn %	Practice %	Outcome %	Recruitment %
GU	54.5	4.5	0	26.2	0	0	13.6
AU	9	0	9	0	0	81.8	0
KU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HU	0	0	0	7.7	0	92.3	0
Mean	21.2	1.5	3	11.3	2.4	55.8	4.5

Composite of total a priori codes across units. As seen in Table 20 (below), all a priori codes were represented in each report. The a priori code most represented in units' institutional reports was *outcomes*, which across all four units had 29.1% of all codes. The category, *outcomes* was consistently the highest code among the three units' reports (GU, AU, and KU). Hogwarts University was the only report that had *knowledge* (27%) most represented in its report. The second most represented a priori code across participants was the units' *teachers learning* with a mean of 17.7% of codes across the four institutional reports. The units' *understanding of diversity* was coded an average of

17% of the time and *knowledge* had a 15.6% average. The three lowest represented a priori codes in all four reports were *practice* (8.1%), *recruitment and selection of candidates* (6.4%), and *ideology* (6%).

Table 20

Composite of total a priori codes across institutional reports

Unit	<i>n</i> Div	Div %	<i>n</i> Ideol ogy	Ideol ogy %	<i>n</i> Knwl ge	Knwl ge %	<i>n</i> Lear n	Lear n %	<i>n</i> Pract ice	Pract ice %	<i>n</i> Outc ome	Outc ome %	<i>n</i> Rcert mnt	Rcert mnt %	<i>n</i> Total	Total %
GU	27	23.7	8	7	9	7.9	24	21.1	7	6.1	29	25.5	10	8.8	114	100
AU	16	15.5	3	2.9	11	10.7	24	23.3	7	6.8	35	34	7	6.8	103	100
KU	24	20.7	9	7.8	15	12.9	14	12.1	6	5.2	42	36.2	6	5.2	116	100
HU	15	10.1	9	6.1	40	27	23	15.5	19	12.8	34	23	8	5.4	148	100
Total	82	17	29	6	75	15.6	85	17.7	39	8.1	140	29.1	31	6.4	481	100

Cochran-Smith's Coherence Question

Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework included eight questions that should be answered by researchers, teacher educators, and/or policymakers. The questions were the following: "the diversity question, the ideology or social justice question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice questions, the outcomes question, the recruitment/selection question, and the coherence question" (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 10). The first seven questions were coded individually in each report (see codebook in Appendix C) and described above. However, the *coherence* question could not be coded separately, because the "coherence question" "encompasses the seven questions" and asked: "To what degree are the answers to the first seven questions connected to and coherent with one another in particular policies or programs and how are diversity issues positioned in relation to other issues?" (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 15). Cochran-Smith argued that, regardless of whether the SCDEs have diversity courses or infused diversity throughout their curricula, the program may not be coherent because the faculty may not agree on the importance of diversity or the methods by which preservice teachers are prepared for diverse settings. Due the framing of *coherence* by Cochran-Smith it could not be coded separately, but rather analyzed holistically by reading the institutional report for *coherence* on diversity as Cochran-Smith defined it and looking across the tables with the numbers and percentages of a priori codes for each unit's accreditation report (see Tables 5, 7, 9 and 11 above). Below is a description of how each unit addressed its *coherence*.

Gallifrey University's response to coherence. As seen in Table 5 (above) and described earlier in this chapter, at least one a priori code related to diversity was represented in each standard description in GU's institutional report. This was an indication that Gallifrey's faculty responded to at least one of Cochran-Smith's questions related to diversity in each standard. Additionally, in describing Standard 4 (diversity standard) all a priori codes were represented indicating that the faculty responded to seven of the eight Cochran-Smith diversity-related questions. Yet, the numbers and percentages of a priori codes did not provide the whole picture of the unit's *coherence* to diversity. For example, in describing the overview and framework, the faculty wrote about the programmatic revisions, which included streamlining candidate outcomes and aligning courses and assessments with the expected candidate outcomes. The faculty's description of Standard 1 connected the unit's conceptual framework, which included language about collaboration and transformation, to the unit commitment to work with the community and partner schools to revise courses and materials in preparing candidates for English language learners. Additionally, the strategic planning retreat attended by faculty, described in their response to Standard 2, further addressed the *coherence* question with the mention of aligning the conceptual framework with assessments, and how data were used in developing a plan of action related to the unit's framework and goals. Finally, faculty in Gallifrey demonstrated *coherence* by describing mini-retreats, or half-day faculty meetings, which focused on topics related to diversity and building relationships with surrounding communities and partner schools. It is important to mention that the faculty described, on seven separate occasions,

programmatic alignment with other organizations' professional standards, such as Special Professional Associations (SPAs) and state standards, but none of the descriptions of alignment between the unit and other organizations' professional standards related directly to diversity. Gallifrey University's faculty wrote an institutional report that mentioned its efforts to align its conceptual framework with candidates' outcomes and assignments, its strategic plan, and commitment to building relationships with the diverse community and partner schools.

Asgar University's response to coherence. At least one a priori code related to diversity was represented in AU's description of each standard in the institutional report (see Table 7 above), an indication that Asgar's faculty responded to at least one of Cochran-Smith's questions related to diversity in each standard. Asgar University was the only unit to have all a priori codes but one (*outcome*) represented in Standard 4. Further reading of the institutional report provided insight into faculty coherence in reporting the unit's *coherence*. For instance, the mission and vision of the unit inform the conceptual framework and the six candidate proficiencies. Additionally, the faculty reported maintaining critical friend discussions that focused on diversity knowledge and skills. Lastly, the faculty described the importance of its partnership with a local school district, which maintained programs and projects that aligned with the district, state and national standards, but there was no direct mention of *diversity* in the statement. Five statements related to cohesion or alignment had direct relation to the state or other professional organizations' standards, but no direct description of the unit's cohesion with diversity.

Krypton University's response to coherence. As seen in Table 9 (above) and described earlier in this chapter, at least one a priori code related to *diversity* was represented in each standard description in KU's institutional report. Therefore, the faculty responded to at least one of Cochran-Smith's questions related to diversity in each standard. Additionally, in describing Standard 4 (diversity) all a priori codes were represented, indicating that the faculty responded to seven of Cochran-Smith's eight diversity related questions. Yet, the numbers and percentages of a priori codes were not enough to determine *coherence*. Further reading of the institutional report provided insight into how faculty described the unit's *coherence*. For example, the restructuring of the unit's conceptual framework better reflected the university and College of Education's mission to serve the community, especially focusing its efforts on the economically disadvantaged. The unit incorporated knowledge, skill, and dispositions in candidates' programs prior to the clinical practice. Additionally, the dedication of the unit and its partner schools to prepare candidates for diverse learners was evident in the consistent description of the collaboration between partner schools and the unit. The faculty also mentioned the incorporation of the state's performance standard related to diversity in its advanced programs leading to licensure. This was further outlined in matrices detailing the incorporation of the diversity in courses, with the emphasis on children in poverty. Course assignments are also aligned with the diversity standards, which included field experiences. To ensure that the program was successfully improving candidates' knowledge and skill to work with diverse learners, the faculty utilized the assessment system to consistently analyze data and make improvements as necessary.

The *coherence* of the program extends to the multiple disciplinary approaches to learning and teaching of the unit, which further indicated the cohesion of the unit's commitment to diversity. The unit also collaborated with the Center of Excellence in order to prepare preservice and inservice teachers for diverse and high-poverty schools. The faculty's written description of the unit's *coherence* was not concentrated in its section on Standard 4, but was consistent throughout the report. The unit faculty were consistent in referencing diversity in its alignment with its mission, conceptual framework, assessments and evaluations, partnerships, course work and field experiences. There were also four mentions to the unit's alignment with state and other professional organizations' diversity standards.

Hogwarts University's response to coherence. There was at least one a priori code related to diversity represented in HU's description of each standard (see Table 11 above). This is an indication that Hogwarts' faculty responded to at least one of Cochran-Smith's questions related to diversity in each standard. Additionally, in describing Standard 4 (diversity) all a priori codes were represented, indicating that the faculty responded to the seven of Cochran-Smith's eight diversity related questions. Further reading of the institutional report provided additional insights into the unit's *coherence*. For instance, the unit elaborated on how the conceptual framework, data collection system, and knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with the unit's objectives and candidates' outcomes. The descriptions of the unit's specific *coherence* to diversity in HU's institutional report were concentrated in Standard 4. The faculty further described in Standard 4 that the diversity standard aligned with the conceptual framework and its

expectations for its candidates, which corresponded to the courses and coursework students were required to take. This was further outlined in matrices about the alignment of unit syllabi, coursework, and the diversity standard. The unit also described on ten separate occasions its commitment to aligning its courses and assessments to state and professional organizations' standards, but only two had a direct relation to diversity.

Cross-case analysis of coherence in institutional reports. Based on Cochran-Smith's definition of *coherence* in multicultural teacher education, each unit described its *coherence* differently, as would be expected, because each unit's unique context determined how it viewed and responded to diversity. This was similar to its cohesive discussion about diversity in the institutional reports. Krypton University was the only unit to thread a message about its commitments and the actions it had taken in order to not only prepare preservice teachers for diverse learners, especially learners in poverty, but to establish and maintain partnerships and collaborations within the university community and outside of the university to solve the socioeconomic inequality that plagued the region. The other units did imply *coherence* at points of the report, but the statements were brief or referred more to alignment with professional organizations and state standards, which did not directly relate to diversity. In addition, much of the descriptions about *coherence*, especially in Hogwarts University's institutional report, concentrated in Standard 4 rather than throughout the units' report.

However, Buchmann and Floden (1992), a decade prior to Cochran-Smith's framework, warned that consistency should not be confused for coherence. They maintained "while *consistency* implies logical relations and the absence of contradictions,

coherence allows for many kinds of connectedness, encompassing logic but also associations of ideas and feelings, intimations of resemblance, conflicts and tensions, previsagements and imaginative leaps” (p. 4). They argued that consistency brings regiment or prescriptive methods, which result in a program fitting “students with blinders, deceives them, and encourages complacency” (p. 4). Based on Buchmann and Floden’s argument, the institutional reports all lean more towards consistency rather than coherence as they had defined it. However, it is difficult to determine if the units are “coherent” as Buchmann and Floden have defined it due to the way the reports are written and the lack of narratives about specific examples of cohesion within the unit. Further, it is difficult to determine whether the units are coherent as Cochran-Smith has defined, too. This is not a surprise since NCATE’s Professional Standard (2008) has the word “consistent” threaded throughout the description of standards, such as in the description of units’ conceptual framework, professional dispositions for all candidates, assessment systems and unit evaluations, professional education and practice of faculty, and the units’ governance and resources.

Overview of Findings

Faculty across units used the same structure to write the institutional reports, and they all responded to the same Standards. Yet, there is almost idiosyncratic diversity among these four institutions, which may tell us something about teacher education as a more general field of practice where local contexts predict local programs. Additionally, the a priori code *outcomes* was most represented in units’ institutional reports, which may suggest that faculty are preoccupied with assessments and collecting data due to the

environment of accountability in education. Faculty wrote the reports to demonstrate the unit was cohesive in its mission, course work, and aligned with professional standards. However, there were differences in the units' *ideology* and how the faculty in each institution described *knowledge, teacher learning, practice, outcomes, and recruitment and selection*. The unique context in which each unit was situated determined how the faculty and leadership viewed and responded to diversity. In the final chapter is a discussion on the findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

This study sought to understand whether SCDEs, rated as “target” under NCATE’s Standard 4 (diversity standard), prepared preservice teachers for diversity approximated by Cochran-Smith’s (2003) conceptual framework of multicultural teacher education toward a social justice agenda for teacher education reform. The data were the contents of four selected education unit’s Institutional Report for reaccreditation from NCATE. Each report was analyzed using qualitative content analysis and coded using a priori codes generated from Cochran-Smith’s multicultural teacher education framework (see Appendix B). The following question was addressed:

- Which dimensions of Cochran-Smith’s framework for addressing multicultural education are evident in what SCDEs report they do to prepare teachers for diverse environments?

The following chapter will provide an overview of the major findings from Chapter 4. A discussion of the links between teacher education practices and Cochran-Smith’s (2003) multicultural teacher education framework will be made. Finally, the implication of this study on policymakers, accreditation organizations and teacher educators will be detailed alongside suggestions for future research on multicultural teacher education.

Overview of Findings

Faculty across units used the same organizational structure to write the institutional reports and responded to the same six standards. Each unit's report included an overview of its mission, conceptual framework, and descriptions with supporting evidence of how the faculty met each of NCATE's professional standards. Yet, there is distinctive diversity among these four institutions, which may help us understand how teacher education is more about the local rather than the global. Due to the unique contexts in which each institution was situated, including state policies, the community served, history, mission, faculty knowledge and interests, and student population, each written report had unique elements distinctive to the institution. For example, all units described faculty's dedication to preparing teachers for all learners in their descriptions of conceptual frameworks, but they had diverse perspective due to context. Gallifrey, Asgar, and Hogwarts universities' faculties described how their conceptual frameworks connected to diversity in general. The faculty at Asgar University, on the other hand, described specifically the concerns of the community (high poverty) and how the conceptual framework was developed to resolve the specific problem.

In the descriptions of Standard 1 (candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions) faculty in each unit emphasized how they measured student outcomes and the results of preservice teachers' *outcomes*. Gallifrey and Asgar described their continuous efforts to improve candidates' preparation for diverse learners, but only Krypton and Asgar made references to pedagogy; however, neither provided specific

detail on the type of pedagogy or pedagogical skills they wanted their preservice teachers to know and be able to employ.

One of the standards that had many similarities across units was Standard 2 (assessment and evaluation). All four units explained that the faculty made improvements in the assessment system by using an electronic data management system causing collecting, analyzing, and reporting of data to be more efficient. The authors of each report also mentioned that the conceptual frameworks were aligned to the assessment system. However, across unit reports, the faculty only mentioned that they assessed candidates' diversity disposition, but no other assessment on diversity was described.

In Standard 3 (field experiences and clinical practice) the four units' faculty described the importance of their relationships and collaboration with partner school administrators and teachers. Additionally, all units explained that their partner schools had diverse P-12 student populations, which ensured that all candidates would engage with diverse learners. Lastly, all units acknowledged their commitment to supporting partner schools and the surrounding communities.

The *coherence* of the units' dedication to diversity is strongest in the units' responses to Standard 4 (diversity). All but one unit, Asgar University, had all a priori codes represented in Standard 4. Also, among all four units there were no a priori codes that were represented with over 50% of the codes. The following are brief examples of what the authors of the reports wrote about in Standard 4. Gallifrey University's faculty described the alignment of the diversity proficiencies to what preservice teachers were required to learn. Asgar and Krypton similarly described course materials and the

expectation of placement in diverse partner schools during field experiences. Hogwarts had an extensive list and description of each course's delivery of material and experiences on diversity. Additionally, the units described in better detail than they did in Standard 2 (assessment and evaluation) the assessments candidates had to complete in relation to diverse learners, such as Hogwarts' Candidate Work Sample. The a priori code *practice* had a low representation across all four units, which indicated that the units did not describe the pedagogical skills they taught preservice teachers in order to be successful teachers of diverse learners.

Across all units, Standard 5 had the fewest codes, because this standard focused on faculty performance, qualifications, and development. The definitions and indicators of the a priori codes did not fit many of the statements in Standard 5, because Cochran-Smith did not describe the qualifications and development of teacher educators in her conceptual framework. However, all the reports had statements that described dedication to resolving community challenges around diversity, as well as commitment to developing candidates that were prepared to work with diverse learners.

The second least coded standard was Standard 6 (Governance and resources). Each unit took a different approach to describe governance. Gallifrey University incorporated descriptions on its intent to recruit diverse preservice teachers and specifically mentioned veterans. Gallifrey also provided additional funds to support technology integration and an English Language Learning program. Asgar University detailed the instructional technology available for faculty and candidates to learn how to use and incorporate in courses for individuals with disabilities. Krypton University

expressed the leadership's commitment to solving the region's challenges with poverty. Lastly, like Gallifrey, Hogwarts faculty members described their active participation in the recruitment of community college students into the program, and their efforts to win grants that will support diverse teacher candidates.

Finally, three universities (GU, AU, and HU) had an addendum to correct, clarify, and support claims made in the report to the visiting board. Gallifrey's faculty clarified their *understanding of diversity* and diverse learners, how preservice *teachers learn* about diverse learners, and included references and information about diversity data, diversity proficiencies, and decision-making based on the diversity of its candidates and surrounding communities. Asgar and Hogwarts universities provided further descriptions on the data systems and assessments. For example, Asgar's faculty shared disaggregated program data on the outcomes on assessments related to diversity. Similarly, Hogwarts' faculty disclosed in the addendum candidates' cultural understanding scores and the analysis and findings of the data.

Based on Cochran-Smith's definition of *coherence* in multicultural teacher education, each unit described its *coherence* differently, as would be expected, because each unit's unique context determined how it viewed and responded to diversity. Krypton University was the only unit to thread a consistent message about its commitments to prepare preservice teachers for diverse learners, especially learners in poverty. The other units did imply *coherence* at points of the report, but the statements were brief or referred more to alignment with professional organizations and state standards, which did not directly relate to diversity. In addition, many of the descriptions about coherence,

especially in Hogwarts University's institutional report, were concentrated in Standard 4 rather than throughout the units' reports.

Discussion

The discussion will be framed using Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework. The framework is composed of broad and narrow elements that interact with one another and influence the preparation of teachers for diversity. First, Cochran-Smith explained that the SCDE or education unit must define multicultural teacher education by responding to the eight key questions about multicultural teacher education programs she identified and reflecting on the holistic nature of the program. The questions included the following: "the diversity question, the ideology or social justice question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice question, the outcomes question, the recruitment/selection question, and the coherence question" (p. 10). Second, the framework included the external forces, such as the institutional capacity, the relationship with local communities and schools, and governmental and non-governmental regulations. Finally, the inclusion of the larger contexts and reform agendas, such as the public's views on teacher education and policies from the U.S. Department of Education, affect not only external forces but also teacher education and the social justice agenda.

Based on the findings, there are some indications that the four units that achieved "target" on NCATE's Standard 4 (diversity) are aligned in certain aspects to Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education conceptual framework, while at times there were disconnects between the framework and the institutional reports. The

following is a discussion of unit misalignment with Cochran-Smith's multicultural teacher education framework, which is indicative of more systemic problems in teacher education. The discussion captures the lack of definition of multicultural teacher education and the compartmentalization of diversity in institutional reports, which addresses Cochran-Smith's first and second elements of the framework. There also is a description of the external forces that Cochran-Smith described that influence multicultural teacher education, such as the need to build and expand community-based teacher education, the issue of institutional capacity, and the inconsistencies of accreditation organizations. Finally, there is a discussion on the reform agenda based on the accountability of teacher education.

Defining a coherent multicultural teacher education program. In none of the four unit reaccreditation reports did faculty provide a comprehensive and coherent definition of multicultural teacher education. This was due to the vague reporting of what and how preservice teachers learn about the complex knowledge and skills of teaching. The discussion about diversity was compartmentalized in the units' description of Standard 4, rather than being presented throughout the report, indicating a lack of direction and coherence in multicultural teacher education. The following is further discussion on these points.

Vague reporting on diversity. The institutional reports written by the four units' faculties were not specific in detailing the pedagogical knowledge or skills that they wanted their graduates to develop in order to impact diverse learners. For instance, in Standard 1 NCATE required all units to describe how candidates were prepared to work

as educators with proficient knowledge of content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional disposition to work with diverse learners. In addition, NCATE instructed that units describe the outcomes of their efforts. As described in Chapter 4, all units had little or no representation of the a priori codes *practice*, *learn*, or *knowledge* in Standard 1 (candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions); rather, there was a high representation of the a priori code *outcome* across units. It can be concluded then that the units were preoccupied with reporting that the candidates were proficient, but they did not describe in detail what and how they taught in terms of more complex professional knowledge and skills.

The vague reporting continued in the units' description of Standard 2 (assessment and evaluation) in which none of the units' faculties described in detail assessments or *outcomes* related to diversity. Instead, the units outlined the systems in place to collect and analyze data from assessments and evaluations. To be fair, there were mentions of assessments being aligned with the diversity dispositions that candidates had to demonstrate. However, units such as Gallifrey University expressed difficulty in measuring diversity proficiencies related to candidates' promotion of social justice and equity. Assessments related to diversity simply did not exist and as a result, were not reported in Standard 2.

Even in describing compliance with Standard 4 (diversity), the faculties across units reported that candidates had to demonstrate best teaching practices, but failed to provide details about the knowledge and pedagogy the candidates were expected to learn.

Some of the supporting documents, such as syllabi, rubrics, and outlines of dispositions were attached using live web links as a part of the units' exhibits. The exhibits provided the evidence the Board of Examiners needed to review the units' faculties' compliance to teaching preservice teachers the professional content and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Yet, the reporting and exhibits related to Standard 4 did not provide the narrative detail explaining how the pedagogy, knowledge, dispositions, and assessments were implemented and correspond with each other.

What was most revealing was that there were no definitions of multicultural teacher education across the four reports. Therefore, the vague reports could be a symptom of a bigger problem. Perhaps it is the units' teacher educators' lack of a definition of teacher multicultural education that led to the vague reporting on diversity in the institutional reports. The definition is the most basic element of Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework. Defining multicultural education can be viewed as the skeleton on which the unit's faculty can build the connecting tissues, muscles, and skin, or the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary to teach diverse learners effectively. By defining multicultural education, the faculty would be a more coherent unit with a common definition and rationale for multicultural teacher education, and as a result, the institutional report would also become more coherent.

Compartmentalizing diversity. Cochran-Smith (2003) included *coherence* as a part of the multicultural teacher education framework. The eighth question was the *coherence* question, which "encompasses the seven questions" and, in essence, asked whether units were cohesive. Findings indicated each unit described its *coherence*

differently since each unit's unique context determined how it viewed and responded to diversity. However, it is important to note that when describing Standard 4 (diversity) nearly all units consistently addressed all eight of Cochran-Smith's multicultural teacher education questions (except for Asgar University, which did not have the a priori code *outcome* represented in Standard 4). Therefore, the units were far more attentive to describing diversity in Standard 4 than in other standards, suggesting that units compartmentalized diversity to one standard, just like NCATE compartmentalized diversity into one standard.

The compartmentalization continued across the four units' description about diversity course requirements. Typically, units required that preservice teachers take one course on diversity in education (Kumar & Hamer, 2012), which has been viewed by some researchers as a simplistic and incoherent approach to addressing diversity (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2007), especially when beliefs and attitudes can have a powerful impact in the classroom (Cooper, 2003; Korthagen, 2002; Van Hook, 2002; Wubbels, 1992). Though the units were generally consistent in the messaging about diversity in the institutional reports, this does not necessarily demonstrate coherence. As Buchmann and Floden (1992) explained, consistency should not be mistaken for coherence. Nor should compliance with NCATE standards be confused with coherence or even consistency. Compliance with accreditation standards determined that the units' faculties were proficient in comprehending, aligning, and writing about standards in the context of the unit. Coherence in teacher education may always be elusive no matter which definition one

chooses to use, Cochran-Smith's (2003) or Buchmann and Floden's (1992), since teacher education may not be about the prescriptive vision of teaching, but about guiding teachers to their own development and expression of teaching.

External forces. There are three influential external forces identified in Cochran-Smith's (2003) framework, relationships with local communities and schools, institutional capacity, and government and non-government regulations, that impact multicultural teacher education. The following is a discussion on how each external force. First is a description on the important role local communities and school partners play in supporting multicultural teacher education, while other external forces, such as the institutional capacity and accreditation organizations did not support units' multicultural education and limited the units' coherence.

Relationships with the community. In all four units' institutional reports there were references to relationships with partner schools and the benefits partner schools brought to the preparation of teacher candidates for diverse learners. It was emphasized in the reports that the units' partner schools were demographically diverse. In some cases there were also details about the relationship between the unit and the greater community. In particular, Krypton University's mission directly aligned with the concerns of the regions high poverty rate. Frequently, the unit explained the alignment of the standards with its work on alleviating poverty in communities it served. Such narratives indicate that though there are prescriptive state and accreditation standards, units can still maintain the important relationships with their communities and school partners. In addition, unlike other community-based learning experiences that place preservice

teachers into communities where they have little or no previous experience living or working (Cooper, 2007; Marx & Moss, 2011; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996; Zygmunt-Fillwalk, 2005), Krypton's description indicated support of the communities that it served. As mentioned in Chapter Two, community-based learning experiences typically include preservice teachers interacting with students and/or people in urban communities or abroad in the hopes that they be removed from their comfort zones and gain better understanding and appreciation for other cultures, languages, and experiences that they may never had encountered growing up (Cooper, 2007; Keengwe, 2010; Lenski, et al., 2005; Marx & Moss, 2011; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996; Zygmunt-Fillwalk, 2005). Such learning experiences were created to bridge the gap between home and school life (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Moule, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2004).

Based on the narrative Krypton provided in the NCATE institutional report, the collaboration between the institution and communities was a partnership that emerged organically. The university leveraged its capacity to be a part of the solution in a community fighting against poverty. There are other examples of community-university partnerships; for instance, Holen and Yunk (2014) described Kansas State University's partnership with a local school that transformed not only the teacher education program, but also led to benefit classroom teachers in regards to professional development, opportunities to become teacher leaders, mentors, and conducting their own research for presentation at conferences. This supported Jeffery and Polleck's (2010) findings that school leaders and teachers identified professionalism as a benefit to partnering with university-based teacher education programs. For teacher educators, the partnership led to

new lines of inquiry, opportunities for grants, and a rejuvenated call-to-action to support community schools. It also led to the improvement of the College of Education's reputation in the community. Finally, candidate teachers frequently received feedback about their teaching as a result of the collaboration between cooperating teachers, clinical instructors, and university faculty. This led to better mentoring for candidates. Additionally, candidates became well known by school administration and had greater career opportunities.

Partnerships should not only occur between university-based teacher education programs and local schools, but also with community based organizations. Skinner (2010) demonstrated in her description of the partnership between the Logan Square Neighborhood Association and the Bilingual Education Program at Chicago State University that such unlikely partners can share common goals, build trust, and work together with and within community. The project, *Nueva Generación*, was created to recruit preservice teachers from the local Hispanic community with the intent to increase the number of teachers of color, an underrepresented group, and improve school conditions by preparing teachers from and for their local communities. Such partnerships take time to foster and grow, but have the potential to revolutionize not only teacher education, but education for P-12 students, and uplift entire communities that have historically been underserved. As Skinner explained:

Colleges of education have put considerable effort into attempting to prepare White outsiders to teach in historically underserved urban settings and that effort should continue. Following the example of project *Nueva Generación* and the

statewide Grow Your Own initiative in Illinois, colleges of education could adopt an alternative and contemporary strategy, one which aims to increase the number of teachers of color but also prepare them to work as change agents in urban schools. (p. 165)

Such social justice education projects within university-based teacher education programs can provide a unique solution to prepare teachers while maintaining the dignity of the community, local schools, school leaders, educators, preservice teachers, parents, P-12 students, and other stakeholders. Based on the accreditation reports, each unit made efforts to reach out to their communities and partner schools to provide professional development, opportunities for school teachers to become leaders, and recruitment efforts for teacher candidates, while the teacher candidates gained experience working with diverse learners.

Institutional capacity. In Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education conceptual framework she included external forces that impact how the eight multicultural teacher education questions are answered. One of the external forces included institutional capacity and mission, which consist of the institutional environment, policies, agendas, and mission in regards to diversity. It also includes faculty recruitment and development in diversity. While compiling and writing the demographic information about each unit in Chapter 4, the diversity among faculty members across all four units was compelling. On average, 25% of the faculty in the units were people of color. This is actually quite impressive since 36% of residents in the United States identify as non-White or multiracial (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). The

units were diverse and each unit mentioned their continued commitment to recruit faculty and preservice teachers of color.

The four units in the present study can be viewed as exemplars in their institutional capacity to recruit preservice teachers. There is an effort by policymakers, accreditation organizations, non-traditional teacher education programs, and university-based teacher education programs to recruit and select diverse preservice teachers. It has been well documented that there is a need to recruit diverse teachers from various backgrounds and with various experience to serve in P-12 schools that are growing more diverse (see Chapter Two). Additionally, faculty diversity is essential in recruiting and selecting diverse preservice teachers. As Poloman (2014) explained, diversity in SCDEs gives students of color opportunities to envision themselves within the profession. She continued that a diverse faculty can provide influential mentors to students of color, as well as diverse experiences and perspectives that are important in learning about teaching about diversity in education. The lack of diversity among faculty stems from the lack of diversity in doctoral programs. The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation (2005) reported that by 2003 only 7% of doctoral degrees were awarded to African Americans and 11% were awarded to Hispanics (http://www.woodrow.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/WW_Diversity_PhD_web.pdf). The report acknowledged that financial support by universities and the federal government for underrepresented doctoral students had decreased and caused the lack of diversity in doctoral programs. Yet, the units in the present study specifically stated that the faculty actively sought grants to support diverse preservice teachers in their programs. They were also involved

in efforts to recruit diverse teachers by, for example, working with local high school students who were interested in becoming teachers and supporting them with the application and financial aid process. Despite the vague reporting and lack of coherence on diversity, such examples of faculty dedication to recruiting diverse teacher candidates are impressive.

The problem arises from the prevailing model of faculty recognition and promotion maintained by universities (Gause, Dennison, & Perrin, 2012). The current promotion system rewards scholars for the number of publications and grants awarded, which are important and even essential to the university and scholars. Gause et al. suggested that universities should support alternative research and reward community engagement and grassroots activism. Bill Tierney, the former president of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), called members to envision a different path for AERA and its members in order to “bring about transformative social change” (Tierney, 2012). He suggested that education researchers rethink platforms to communicate knowledge and ideas, provide non-tenured track faculty new opportunities, use technology to advance professional development, and become better at broadening and reaching out. Such visionary conception of the academy can alleviate the pressures professors face with the quantification of promotions, such as number of publication, and provide teacher educators the flexibility to work alongside communities in an activist capacity.

Finally, another interesting finding related to institutional capacity was the lack of discussion about teacher educators’ professional development on diversity. As Goodwin

and her colleagues (2014) described, there is little discussion on what knowledge teacher educators should have and how they should be prepared for their roles. They explained:

...teacher educating also involves engaging in teacher education research that examines and informs the pedagogy of teacher educating (as distinct from the pedagogy of teaching), as well as being an active member of the larger scholarly community committed to the development and advancement of policies, practices, and programs focused on educating teachers.” (p. 285)

Goodwin et al. (2014) found in a mixed methods study of 293 teacher educators that the profession suggests that content knowledge and/or prior experience teaching is sufficient preparation for workforce entry. However, they found that many of these teacher educators described a more “haphazard and dysfunctional process of ‘learning through doing’” (p. 296). As a result, the authors suggest that there is a need to understand what it means to be a quality teacher educator. Additionally, mentoring programs should be incorporated to help new teacher educators understand their roles better, especially the importance of research and being able to create a research agenda that blends with teacher educators’ teaching practices. The use of self-study can support the reframing of teacher educators approach to research and teaching (Samaras, 2011). As Samaras explained, “You are the researcher and also the teacher. Your position is inside, not outside, the research” (p.12). For instance, in Zeichner’s (2005) description about becoming a teacher educator, it was clear that his research, specifically self-study, led him in his transition from a classroom teacher to a teacher educator. He explained that he saw “self-study research and thinking more consciously about one’s role in educating

teachers as a basic requirement for learning to become a teacher educator” (p. 122). Wilson (2006) and Loughran (2014) agreed with Zeichner’s premise that cultivating teacher educators’ research is what supports professional development. Finally, Goodwin and her colleagues found that tenured teacher educators self-reported having less knowledge compared to recently hired faculty, which indicates that more work is needed in academia to support teacher educators in developing culturally responsive teaching and social justice research in order to effectively prepare preservice teachers for diverse learners. In the present study, all four units described the faculties’ involvement in creating professional development opportunities for preservice and inservice teachers, but there was little discussion of the professional development of teacher educators. For instance, Gallifrey mentioned funding availability for teacher educators to seek professional development, but neither the College of Education nor the university provided opportunities for teacher educators. Such professional development requires financial support from the institution, but can also be facilitated by using internal resources. Each unit in the present study had a diverse faculty with unique experiences and expertise in multicultural education; therefore, facilitating simple brown bag discussions on diversity, forming book clubs, and establishing collaborative research groups can be simple, inexpensive and innovative ways to incorporate more on-campus opportunities for faculty to develop their culturally responsive knowledge and skills.

Government and non-government regulations. Cochran-Smith (2003) discussed the influence that government and non-government agencies have on evaluating teacher preparation programs. This was further supported in earlier work by Gollnick (1995), as

well as Akiba et al. (2010), who conducted analyses of government and nongovernment policies that impacted SCDEs' multicultural teacher education efforts. They separately found that government and non-government agencies' ideological stance, which was linked to the larger historical, socio-economic, and political context in education reform, influenced multicultural teacher education. Therefore, another possible reason for the lack of definition and vague reporting of multicultural teacher education in institutional reports may be due to the prescriptive nature of the accreditation standards and NCATE's historically vague multicultural advocacy.

Since the inception of NCATE there have been arguments that ambiguous accrediting standards would limit faculty ability to define and describe in detail the units' multicultural teacher education program. James (1978) pointed out that there were certain conclusions and assumptions based on NCATE's standards, such as: (a) learning experiences in schools do not meet the needs of diverse student population; (b) cultural, racial, and ethnic factors do contribute to the inability of schools to meet students' needs; (c) teachers play a central role; and (d) teacher education programs do not provide opportunities for preservice teachers to become interculturally competent. Kaplan (1978) also supported the new multicultural education standards adopted by NCATE, hoping that the standards would stimulate conversations on how to become more culturally responsive learning communities. However, Kaplan argued that it was important for teacher education programs to do more than merely acknowledge multicultural education, "but to insure their infusion into the mainstream of ongoing programs" (p. 46). His argument was that when teacher candidates graduate they should be knowledgeable,

critical, and have developed curriculum and strategies that concern multicultural education. However, the findings of the present study suggest that the open conversations about multicultural education that Kaplan hoped for never came to fruition. The accreditation standards, instead of propelling multicultural education into the mainstream, pushed it into the corners of a single standard (Standard 4 – Diversity). The findings of the present study support that all four units only described their efforts in multicultural education in Standard 4.

Critics of NCATE and its standards, such as Tom (1980) argued that the newly adopted multicultural education standard not only lacked a definition but also was inconsistent. He suggested that a comprehensive review with critical analyses of the standards and accreditation process was needed by not assuming that standards are necessarily a good mechanism for the profession. He believed that more emphasis was needed on more meaningful standards that establish high quality programs. Even with the early criticisms of NCATE's process and standards, the addition of multicultural standards "says to the education community that multicultural education is a national goal of education and that professionals in this field will work toward the establishment of this goal in the same dedicated selfless way they would on the other goals of American education" (Kaplan, 1978, p. 46).

Yet, the unresolved inconsistencies revolving around multicultural education in accreditation standards lingered into the 21st century. For instance, Fein (2004) explained the lack of "explicit expectations for faculty 'dispositions' is especially problematic in relationship to Standard 4 (diversity), because without explicitly setting expectations for

faculty dispositions regarding diversity, realizing the diversity standards may not be truly achievable” (p. 54). Additionally, Fein pointed out the inconsistent message from NCATE to ask faculty to prepare preservice teachers to hold certain dispositions and hold the unit accountable for the candidates’ dispositions, and yet the faculty who teach them were not themselves accountable for the same dispositions. Fein continued to describe that Standard 5 (faculty qualifications, performance, and development) implied faculty disposition by stating, “modeling best professional practices in teaching” (NCATE, 2008) and the descriptors imply faculty sensitivity to diversity. However, as Fein explained:

...integrating diversity with passion and depth is different from a passing reference or two to diversity-related topics in a semester-long course. This begs the question regarding how many college professors actually adjust their instructional strategies to accommodate culturally different learners and to what extent then do so.” (p. 54)

The findings in the present study indicate that Fein’s (2004) arguments are well founded since none of the four units reporting in Standard 5 (faculty qualifications, performance, and development) described in detail faculty understanding of diversity, their definition of multicultural teacher education, or even how they modeled best practices for diverse learners. Even in Standard 4 (diversity), there were limited details of what and how preservice teachers learned in regards to multicultural education. The vague reporting and simple association to multicultural ideals does not equate to passionate and innovative involvement in multicultural teacher education. As McCormick (1984) explained, schools’ proclamations of humanistic ideals and approaches did not produce in their

actions multicultural education, and instead created policies that denied diverse learners access to knowledge.

Reform agenda. As Cochran-Smith (2003) explained, teacher education programs reside in the larger context of reform agendas that are often competing with one another. One finding in the present study that is linked to the education reform agendas is the constant reference across the four units' institutional reports to assessment systems and data that must align perfectly with the professional and state standards. This is an indication that units sense pressure from accrediting institutions, professional organizations, and the federal and state governments to be accountable by collecting data on preservice teachers, teacher candidates, faculty, and programs. The attention on accountability as related to outputs may have resulted in a misalignment between Cochran-Smith's expectations of how teacher educators should respond to the eight multicultural teacher education questions and the institutional reports written by the faculties.

Though accountability is a necessary and an important aspect of education in order for the profession to grow and be legitimized (Cochran-Smith, 2004, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Zeichner, 2005, 2010), it should not interfere with the agency of teacher educators to prepare culturally responsive teachers. Zeichner (2010) described his and his colleagues' fulltime preparation for the state education department report:

...some aspects of this work were valuable to us in better understanding the opportunities for our students to learn and what our students actually are learning in our programs, other aspects (e.g., aligning hundreds of arts and science classes

across our campus with state content guidelines) were clearly less useful and marginally related to program quality. So while some forms of accountability for teacher education institutions are reasonable and necessary, in a growing number of states, current demands for teacher educators to rationalize their programs have gone beyond the realm of reasonableness and are beginning to interfere with teacher educators being able to accomplish their goals. (p. 1548)

Even the competing forces of federal and state governments can be dizzying for teacher educators to comply with as the federal and state governments are in a constant “tug-of-war” with each other (Bales, 2006). Due to this obsession with the collecting of data and reporting of outputs, the description of inputs are not priorities for faculty who write institutional reports. In essence, if NCATE standards focus on outcomes, then the faculty will produce a report that describes assessments and teacher candidate results rather than on the process of teaching and learning. This perhaps explains why in Standard 1 (candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions) the authors of the four institutional reports in the present study focused on the outcomes of preservice teachers rather than on the inputs.

The preoccupation with outcomes and accountability can be traced back to *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), which found that top-rated college students were not being recruited into the teaching profession. In addition, the Commission claimed that the preparation of teachers focused too much on methods and not enough on content. The Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, made similar claims, and in a 2009 speech he explained:

In far too many universities, education schools are the neglected stepchild. Too often they don't attract the best students or faculty. The programs are heavy on educational theory—and light on developing core area knowledge and clinical training under the supervision of master teachers.... So it is clear that teacher colleges need to become more rigorous and clinical, much like other graduate programs, if we are going to create that new army of great teachers. But I'd also like to see high-quality alternative pathways for aspiring teachers, like the New Teacher Project, the Troops to Teacher program, and Teach for America, expand in coming years. (Duncan, 2009)

Two weeks later in New York, Duncan stated similar sentiments:

[B]y almost any standard, many if not most of the nation's 1,450 schools, colleges, and departments of education are doing a mediocre job of preparing teachers for the realities of the 21st century classroom. America's university-based teacher preparation programs need revolutionary change—not evolutionary tinkering. But I am optimistic that, despite the obstacles to reform, the seeds of real change have been planted. (Duncan, 2009)

The “seeds of real change” to the antiquated teacher education models that Duncan discussed were, according to the U.S. Department of Education proposal (2014), to shift the rules and require “state reporting on teacher preparation programs from mostly inputs to outcomes - such as how graduates are doing in the classroom - while giving states much flexibility to determine how they will use the new measures and how program performance is measured” (<https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us->

department-education-proposes-plan-strengthen-teacher-preparation). The proposed plan to strengthen teacher preparation included:

Meaningful data at the program level, support states in developing systems that differentiate programs by performance on outcomes, provide feedback to programs about graduates' performance and satisfaction, and hold programs accountable for how well they prepare teachers to succeed in today's classrooms and throughout their careers. (U.S. Department of Education, 2014)

The focus on assessments, data, and outcomes in education policy has been created in the name of transparency in order for stakeholders to make data-driven decisions (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

What is interesting in the debates between state and federal governments about teacher education is who is missing from the conversations. Though accrediting organizations, such as NCATE and, today, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), and professional organizations, such as the American Association of College for Teacher Education (AACTE), are members and leaders consisting of university-based teacher educators and deans, it is a tragic irony that teacher educators and researchers' voices are not heard in the debate about accountability in P-12 education settings or in their own university-based programs. It is imperative to note that NCATE (and today CAEP) had to receive approval from the U.S. Department of Education's Commission on Higher Education Accreditation, which is further evidence that the larger context, as described by Cochran-Smith (2003), has implications not only on external forces (relationships with communities, institutional capacity, government and non-

government regulations), but also on how teacher educators respond to the eight multicultural teacher education questions posed by Cochran-Smith. Due to the way reform agendas impact teacher education, Sleeter (2004) warned teacher educators not to “be ignored in policy debates about teaching and teacher education” (p. 6). Additionally, Bales (2006) acknowledged, “teacher educator professionals need to examine how we might alter the accountability trajectory in the policy spectacle that surrounds us and take control of our destiny” (p. 405).

The institutional reports of the four units that achieved “target” on NCATE’s Standard 4 (diversity) were at times aligned with certain aspects of Cochran-Smith’s (2003) multicultural teacher education conceptual framework. For example, each institution described its commitment to work closely with partner schools in order to provide teacher candidates with diverse teaching experiences. The faculty members of each unit were also diverse and had research and teaching interests and experiences in diversity. On the other hand, the institutional reports revealed misalignment with Cochran-Smith’s multicultural teacher education framework. The divisions were a symptom of more systemic problems in teacher education, such as the compartmentalization of the diversity standard by NCATE and the four units, which led to a lack of coherence of the units’ multicultural teacher education. The institutional capacity also limited the faculties’ ability to support and expand the units’ multicultural teacher education. Finally, the constant reference across the four units’ institutional reports to assessment systems and data that must align perfectly with the professional and

state standards indicated that the reform agenda has an impact on teacher education.

Implications

The findings from this study suggest that the four units that received a score of “target” on Standard 4 (diversity) did not present a defined and coherent conception of multicultural teacher education, as Cochran-Smith (2003) defined in her framework, in the NCATE institutional reports, but each in its own way was implementing a commitment to diversity. This study provides a critical perspective on how SCDEs report multicultural teacher education and what is passed as “target” by accrediting organizations. The pressures from external forces have played a role in the lack of coherence in multicultural teacher education. The findings of this study can help inform policymakers, accreditation organizations, and teacher educators on the state of multicultural teacher education and there are implications for future research.

Policymakers. Though this study is about university-based teacher education programs, it is important to include and inform policymakers in the discussion about multicultural teacher education, as Cochran-Smith’s (2003) framework explained and this study supported. The narrowing view of what teacher education should look like and how accountability should be measured leads to questioning how multicultural and social justice teacher education are in conflict with the accountability policies of governments and non-government agencies. The relatively narrow view of accountability as the solution to the teacher education problem has led to the industrialization of teacher education and allowed market forces to play a role in teacher education. Policymakers have put much of their faith in resolving the teacher education problem by introducing

competition, such as in the case of Teach for America. However, the same policymakers who are constraining university-based teacher education programs and requiring that teacher education programs collect data on graduates success rates and test scores, while allowing Teach for America to place underprepared teachers into high-need, high-poverty schools on the belief that a warm-body is better than nobody in the classroom (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002). Such beliefs and policies create a false impression that preparing teachers for the 21st century is a technical job rather than a transformative process for teacher educators and preservice teachers. Zeichner (2010) summarized the major trends in teacher education programs, which included,

the commodification of the work of preparing teachers and making teacher preparation subject to market forces, excessively prescriptive accountability requirements from government bodies and accreditation agencies that seek to control the substance of the teacher education curriculum...and attacks on efforts to educate teachers to teach in socially just ways such as preparing them to engage in multicultural and anti-racist education. (p. 1544)

Today, university-based teacher education programs are valued and rewarded for their “capacity to stimulate economic growth and meet the need of knowledge societies in a climate of financial crisis” (Solbrekke & Sugrue, 2014). Teacher educators should not be responsible for economic growth, and most did not enter into the field of education with such intentions. Instead, the focus on teacher education should surround the eight multicultural teacher education questions Cochran-Smith (2003) proposed in her framework. Therefore, policymakers should collaborate with teacher educators and

researchers respected within the field in order to create policies that benefit diverse P-12 learners.

Accreditation. In 2013, NCATE and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) joined to create the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Though there are great expectations for CAEP, there are still questions being raised about the inconsistencies of the accrediting board. Even AACTE (2015) took notice and announced:

The AACTE Board also reiterates its ongoing, significant concern about the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and asserts that there is a ‘crisis of confidence’ with respect to CAEP. Specific concerns are related to the accreditation standards, process for accreditation, costs associated with accreditation, the capacity of CAEP to implement the accreditation system and the representativeness of the CAEP governance structure.

(<http://aacte.org/news-room/press-releases-statements/488-aacte-board-resolution-on-caep>)

Like NCATE’s previous accreditation standards, CAEP’s standards appear to lack consistency, substance, and rigor when it comes to issues around diversity. Jacobowitz and Michelli (2008) expressed concern that the NCATE standard on diversity was not being taken seriously by SCDEs or the accrediting board. Based on the weak language on diversity and social justice and equity in CAEP’s standards, there may continue to be a lack of attention on issues surrounding learning and achievement gaps. This may be especially true since CAEP’s new standards do not include a diversity standard, but rather

diversity is mentioned in passing in the glossary defining “All P-12 students,” Standard 2 (Clinical Partnership and Practice), Standard 3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity), and in Appendix A (Cross-cutting Themes: Diversity and Technology and Digital Learning). As a result, diversity may be washed out since it is not being emphasized in a single standard or even within all standards. For instance, CAEP’s Standard 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge), which is about the unit’s ability to provide candidates a “deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline” does not mention the importance of including multicultural, intercultural, or social justice and equity education. Standard 4 (Program Impact), which is about the impact teacher candidates have on P-12 learners learning, classroom instruction, and the overall satisfaction of candidates’ experiences and education from the unit, but there is no specific mention on the impact of the candidate on diverse learners, especially students with learning disabilities, English language learners, and students in lower socioeconomic status. Finally, Standard 5 (Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement) describes the data collection process and the use of the data to improve the unit, but again in this standard CAEP does not specifically include diversity. Therefore, this study supports the concerns of researchers and the AACTE about CAEP standards and the interpretation and implementation of NCATE accreditation standards by SCDEs. This research can help CAEP create standards that are professionally relevant, clear, explicit, and rigorous around the issues of social justice and equity that it currently lacks.

In addition to improving the intentionality of multicultural teacher education, there should also be a widening of the definition on diversity to include a more global

perspective. With the rise of immigration in the United States and the “interconnectedness of the world’s cultures, economies, technologies, ecology, and political relationships” there is a need for global education and a better understanding on how to prepare teachers on global issues (Merryfield, 1998, p. 342). Though there are connections between multicultural education and global education, such as looking at cultural diversity, human rights, and prejudice, but global education goes beyond the local by examining diversity at the global level (Lucas, 2010). Such expansion of definition and standards can better prepare teachers and P-12 students for the increasingly globalized world and how to become better global citizens (Zhao, 2010).

Based on the finding of this study the institutional reports were all written using the same format, which may be due to the restrictive nature of the accrediting standards. The prescriptive nature of the reports may limit the units’ creativity in not only its reporting, but also in the units’ process of collecting and analyzing data. For instance, self-study can be used in analyzing and describing a unit’s efforts in preparing preservice teachers for diversity (Samaras, Guðjónsdóttir, McMurrer & Dalmau, 2012), but also provide an authentic narrative of the unit’s efforts and a discussion on how the unit’s faculty intend to continuously improve. The use of self-study method to analyze the program’s approach to diversity should be used because social justice and equity based education is multi-faceted, complex and constantly changing. Therefore, social justice cannot be viewed solely as goal to be achieved, but rather social justice is both a goal and a process, which social justice teacher educators are constantly working towards (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007). CAEP should provide units multiple ways of reporting how the

institution met the accrediting standards and reward institutions for honesty describing how the unit plans to improve.

Teacher educators. Sleeter (2004) challenged teacher educators to participate in policy debates. Based on Cochran-Smith's (2003) conceptual framework, external forces and reform agendas can have an impact on how multicultural education is defined, or as found in this study, not defined. Therefore, teacher educators have the obligation to work closer together and use multiple strategies in order to capture reformers' attention, collaborate with policymakers, and redefine education reform.

Such efforts must occur at the top with policymakers, but also at the local level. Therefore, organizations such as the AACTE and deans of SCDEs need to continue to collaborate and have frank discussions about the impact of the current reform agenda on SCDEs and, in the long run, P-12 students, with state and national leaders and policymakers. Meanwhile, teacher educators need to continue to create context-based programmatic changes as Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992), Holen and Yunk (2014), and Skinner (2010) described, which will support community efforts toward social justice and equity. In addition, SCDEs and teacher educators' partnerships with local communities and partner schools can continue to flourish by supporting the grassroots efforts of administrators, school teachers, parents, and P-12 students to redefine the education reform agenda. By supporting such efforts at the grassroots level, SCDEs can legitimize P-12 schools' concerns and the demands such accountability-heavy reforms have on administrators, teachers, and students. However, such efforts cannot be conducted without the support of universities and SCDEs. Currently, university recognition and

promotion systems that SCDEs abide by are constraining the efforts of teacher educators and researchers to create “transformative social change” (Tierney, 2012) nationally and locally. A new vision of multiple pathways to promotion should be advocated within SCDEs. Teacher educators must be reminded,

[T]eacher education revolves around the ‘sun’ – the growth of children, in P-12 schools. It is my experience that we often act as if ‘we’ (in the academy) are the sun, as in ‘how could we possibly let a student out of our program without taking *my* course.’ I would argue that too often we begin the design of teacher education programs around the talent we have available in the academy, and not with a discussion of the types of learning we would like to see happening in schools and how we might collectively work toward that vision. (Galluzzo, 1999, p. 3)

Finally, teacher educators need to find ways to incorporate multicultural teaching practices and community-based teaching programs into research. LaBoskey (2009) explained that self-study and social justice are compatible with one another due to the methodology’s “strengths that reside in its personal and interpersonal nature- in its acknowledgement of the humanity of the teaching/learning endeavor- and the need for us as teachers and teacher educators to take responsibility for our actions” (p.76). Brown (2004) also highlighted that “self-study is uniquely suited to contribute to an understanding of race and social class issues in education [because]... self-study is a research paradigm that promotes educators’ identification of the problems of practice that emerge in their work and fosters an examination of the values, beliefs, and assumptions that inform their educative decisions and actions” (as cited in LaBoskey, 2009, p. 76).

Self-study provides teacher educators the iterative space needed to ask their own research questions, collaborate, improve practice, and share their experiences with the larger community. With the increase of such research, teacher educators will have a body of knowledge on what knowledge and practices impact multicultural teacher education.

Future research. This study found that a rating of “target” on Standard 4 (diversity) by accrediting bodies does not indicate that SCDEs are implementing a coherent multicultural teacher education. The vague institutional reports and compartmentalization of diversity to one standard can be linked to external forces and competing education reform agendas that impact university-based teacher education programs. However, future research can continue to support the need to improve accreditation standards and multicultural teacher education.

The current literature indicates that SCDEs have responded at a glacial pace to the growing cultural gap between inservice and preservice teachers and P-12 students. Additionally, U.S. education policies have not historically complemented the social justice reform agenda. Future studies can further investigate units’ multicultural teacher education by not only using the accreditation institutional reports, but also surveying and/or interviewing administrators, teacher educators, teacher candidates, and alumni on the effectiveness of the multicultural teacher education program by framing Cochran-Smith’s (2003) eight questions on multicultural teacher education into interview and/or survey questions. The interviews may provide a narrative that corroborates or diverges from the institutional reports. Such findings could also be telling of how SCDEs and teacher educators view accreditation standards and the processes.

As CAEP assumes its accreditation responsibilities, it will be necessary for researchers to conduct research on the organization in order for there to be transparency. Research like this study would be helpful in understanding the validity of the new accreditation standards. It will provide an understanding of how external forces, such as accreditation bodies, support research-based multicultural teacher education.

Finally, research on the longitudinal impact of innovative programmatic multicultural teacher education is necessary. Multiple longitudinal studies can provide the consistent data necessary to understand the impacts of multicultural teacher education on preservice teachers as they become classroom teachers. Such studies can also include data from P-12 students. This type of mixed-method, longitudinal study can provide the evidence necessary to change the conversation and even policies in education reform.

The researcher's hope with this study was to engage SCDEs and accrediting organizations in a more critical conversation about what is being reported and accepted as effective teacher multicultural education. In addition, by using Cochran-Smith's (2003) multicultural teacher education framework, the field learned that a rating of "target" on Standard 4 (diversity) by accrediting bodies does not necessarily equate to having a well-defined and coherent multicultural teacher education program. This study improved the field's knowledge about SCDEs' various interpretations and implementations of NCATE standards. Such research can help current and future accreditation bodies create standards that are relevant to the profession and improve education for all P-12 students.

APPENDIX A

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
The unit has not articulated candidate proficiencies related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework. The curriculum and field experiences for the preparation of educators do not prepare candidate to work effectively with diverse populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates do not understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. They are not developing skills for incorporating diversity into their teaching and are not able to establish a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Assessments of	The unit clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework that candidates are expected to develop during their professional programs. Curriculum and field experiences provide a well-grounded framework for understanding diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates connect lessons, instruction,	Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice promote candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework. They are based on well-developed knowledge bases for, and conceptualizations of, diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply them effectively in schools. Candidates learn to contextualize teaching and draw effectively on representations from the students' own experiences and cultures. They challenge students toward cognitive complexity and engage all students,

<p>candidate proficiencies do not include data on candidates' ability to incorporate multiple perspectives into their teaching or service, develop lessons or services for students with different learning styles, accommodate linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities and communicate effectively with diverse populations.</p>	<p>or service to students' experiences and cultures. They communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences. Candidates incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught or services being provides. They develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed, and the data are used to provide feedback to candidate for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.</p>	<p>including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, through instructional conversation. Candidates and faculty regularly review candidate assessment data on candidates' ability to work with all students and develop a plan for improving their practice and the institution's programs.</p>
---	--	---

4b. *Experiences working with diverse faculty*

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Candidates in conventional or distance learning programs interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty who are from one gender group or are members of only one ethnic/racial group. ¹⁸ Professional education and school faculty have limited knowledge and experiences related to diversity. The unit has not demonstrated good-faith efforts to recruit and maintain male and female faculty from diverse ethnic/racial groups.	Candidates in conventional and distance learning programs interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, both male and female, from at least two ethnic/racial groups. Faculty with whom candidates work in professional education classes and clinical practice have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity.	Candidates in conventional and distance learning programs interact with professional education faculty, faculty in other units, and school faculty from a broad range of diverse groups. Higher education and school faculty with whom candidates work throughout their preparation program are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities.

4c. *Experiences working with diverse candidates*

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Candidates engage in professional education experiences in conventional or distance learning programs with candidates who are from one gender group or from the same socioeconomic group or ethnic/racial group. ²⁰ Unit activities for candidates do not encourage or support the involvement of candidates from diverse populations. The unit has not demonstrated good-faith efforts to increase or maintain a pool of candidates, both male and female, from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups.	Candidates engage in professional education experiences in conventional and distance learning programs with male and female candidates from different socioeconomic groups, and at least two ethnic/racial groups. ²¹ They work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas. Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts the unit makes to increase or maintain a pool of candidates, both male and female, from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups.	Candidates engage in professional education experiences in conventional and distance learning programs with candidates from the broad range of diverse groups. The active participation of candidates from diverse cultures and with different experiences is solicited, valued, and promoted in classes, field experiences, and clinical practice. Candidates reflect on and analyze these experiences in ways that enhance their development and growth as professionals.

4d. *Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools*

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
In conventional or distance learning programs, not all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices with exceptional students and students from diverse ethnic/ racial, gender, language, and socioeconomic groups. The experiences do not help candidates reflect on diversity or develop skills for having a positive effect on student learning for all students.	Field experiences or clinical practice for both conventional and distance learning programs provide experiences with male and female P–12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. Candidates also work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.	Extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices for both conventional and distance learning programs are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from a broad range of diverse groups. The experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning and develop strategies for improving student learning and candidates’ effectiveness as teachers.

APPENDIX B

Matrix of coders' codes and final codes

Unit	page	Coder 1 (line)	Coder 2 (line)	Final code
Overview & Conceptual Framework				
GU	1	UndDiv (16) Ideo (18) UndDiv (27) Ideo (40)	Ideo (18) UndDiv (27) Ideo (40)	UndDiv Ideo UndDiv Ideo
GU	2	Ideo (3) UndDiv (19) UndDiv (28-32)	Ideo (5)	Ideo UndDiv UndDiv
GU	3	UndDiv (6) PracDiv (36) Ideo (40)	UndDiv(6) Ideo(21) Ideo(39)	UndDiv Ideo
GU	4	PracDiv (7) AssmntDiv (7) PracDiv (15)	KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(17) AssmntDiv(30)	Ideo Ideo
Standard 1				
GU	5	AssmntDiv (27)	AssmntDiv(36)	
GU	6		DivCand(27)	
GU	7	AssmntDiv (1) AssmntDiv (10) AssmntDiv (25) KnwDiv (38)	AssmntDiv(6) AssmntDiv(10) AssmntDiv(38)	KnwDiv
GU	8	LrnDiv (5) PracDiv (20) AssmntDiv (25) UndDiv (35)	AssmntDiv(3) AssmntDiv(25) UndDiv (37)	LrnDiv AssmntDiv
GU	9	AssmntDiv (6) AssmntDiv (16)	AssmntDiv(11) AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(40)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
GU	10	AssmntDiv (6)	UndDiv(28)	AssmntDiv

		AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(22) KnwDiv (28)	AssmntDiv(42)	KnwDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 2				
GU	11		AssmntDiv(6) AssmntDiv(8)	
GU	12	LrnDiv (35)	AssmntDiv(13)	LrnDiv
GU	13			
GU	14	AssmntDiv (4) AssmntDiv(12) AssmntDiv (18) AssmntDiv(22)	Assmnt Div (1) AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(14) AssmntDiv(21) AssmntDiv(22)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
GU	15	AssmntDiv (7)	AssmntDiv(7) AssmntDiv(29)	AssmntDiv
GU	16	AssmntDiv (8) AssmntDiv (21)		
GU	17	AssmntDiv (10) AssmntDiv(27) AssmntDiv (32) AssmntDiv(34) AssmntDiv(36) AssmntDiv(39) AssmntDiv(40) AssmntDiv(41)	AssmntDiv (25) AssmntDiv (32) AssmntDiv (34) AssmntDiv (36) AssmntDiv (39) AssmntDiv (40) AssmntDiv (41)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 3				
GU	18	KnwDiv (16) LrnDiv (19) LrnDiv(28)	LrnDiv(28) AssmntDiv(31)	KnwDiv LrnDiv
GU	19	PracDiv(7) LrnDiv(10) UndDiv(20) LrnDiv(28)	LrnDiv(6) LrnDiv (12) AssmntDiv(11) AssmntDiv(21) UndDiv(26)	PracDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv AssmntDiv UndDiv LrnDiv
GU	20	AssmntDiv (9)	AssmntDiv(5) AssmntDiv(20)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
GU	21	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv (15) LrnDiv(36)	AssmntDiv(26) AssmntDiv(36)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv

GU	22	AssmntDiv(2) LrnDiv(9) AssmntDiv(16) LrnDiv(20) LrnDiv(24) PracDiv(31) LrnDiv(36) UndDiv(41)	AssmntDiv(2) KnwDiv(10-11) PracDiv(11) AssmntDiv(14) LrnDiv(12) KnwDiv (24) KnwDiv(33) AssmntDiv(38) UndDiv(41)	AssmntDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv PracDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv
GU	23	PracDiv(11) LrnDiv (18)	DivUnd (11) DivUnd (15) AssmntDiv(31) AssmntDiv(37)	UndDiv PracDiv
Standard 4				
GU	24	Ideo(5) UndDiv(6) Ideo(7) UndDiv(13) UndDiv(26) KnwDiv(33) AssmntDiv(36) PracDiv(38) PracDiv(41)	DivCand(7) KnwDiv(19) Ideo(22) KnwDiv(22) UndDiv(27) KnwDiv(33) KnwDiv(36) PracDiv(38) PracDiv(41)	Ideo UndDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv PracDiv
GU	25	KnwDiv(3) KnwDiv(7) KnwDiv(10) UndDiv(12) PracDiv(21) AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(36) PracDiv(41)	KnwDiv (3) KnwDiv(7) LrnDiv(12-20) LrnDiv(21) AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(37)	KnwDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
GU	26	AssmntDiv(2) KnwDiv(11) UndDiv(17) AssmntDiv(25) DivCand(30) DivCand(35)	AssmntDiv(2) UndDiv(18)	AssmntDiv KnwDiv UndDiv
GU	27	DivCand(1) DivCand(16) DivCand(30) PracDiv(38)	DivCand(16) DivCand(31) DivCand(38)	DivCand DivCand
GU	28	LrnDiv(1) LrnDiv(12) LrnDiv(26)	KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(15) KnwDiv/AssmntDiv	LrnDiv LrnDiv UndDiv

		UndDiv(33) DivCand(35) DivCand(36) PracDiv(38) AssmntDiv(40) PracDiv(41)	(26)	DivCand PracDiv AssmntDiv PracDiv
GU	29	DivCand(1) PracDiv(4) UndDiv(8) UndDiv(12) UndDiv(18) Ideo(18) DivCand(20) LrnDiv(22) AssmntDiv(23) PracDiv(25)	UndDiv(12) UndDiv (19) AssmntDiv(23)	DivCand LrnDiv UndDiv UndDiv UndDiv DivCand LrnDiv PracDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 5				
GU	30	UndDiv(1)		
GU	31	UndDiv(17) LrnDiv(38)	UndDiv(34)	UndDiv LrnDiv
GU	32	LrnDiv(1) LrnDiv?(14	AssmntDiv(1)	AssmntDiv LrnDiv
GU	33			
Standard 6				
GU	34	DivCand(6)		
GU	35	KnwDiv(22)		
GU	36		UndDiv(14)	
GU	37	AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(37)		
GU	38	DivCand(1) UndDiv(22)	DivCand(1)	DivCand UndDiv
GU	39	DivCand(24)		DivCand
Addendum				
GU	1			
GU	2			
GU	3	UndDiv UndDiv DivCand	UndDiv UndDiv Ideo UndDiv	UndDiv UndDiv Ideo UndDiv
GU	4	UndDiv	UndDiv	UndDiv
GU	5			
GU	6	UndDiv	UndDiv UndDiv	UndDiv UndDiv

GU	7			
GU	8	UndDiv	UndDiv	UndDiv
GU	9			
GU	10			
GU	11	LrnDiv PracDiv PracDiv LrnDiv	LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv	LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv
GU	12	LrnDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv UndDiv	LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv DivCand UndDiv	LrnDiv LrnDiv UndDiv DivCand UndDiv
GU	13			
GU	14	DivCand	UndDiv	DivCand
GU	15	UndDiv	UndDiv	UndDiv
GU	16			
GU	17	UndDiv		
GU	18			
GU	19			
GU	20			
GU	21			
GU	22			
GU	23			
GU	24			
GU	25			
GU	26			
GU	27			
GU	28			
Overview & Conceptual Framework				
AU	1			
AU	2	Ideo (6) Ideo(23)	UndDiv (7) DivCand(11) Ideo (21)	UndDiv DivCand Ideo
AU	3	UndDiv (16) UndDiv(18) UndDiv(19) UndDiv(23) UndDiv(28) PracDiv(33)	UndDiv (16) UndDiv(18) UndDiv(19) UndDiv(23) UndDiv(28)	UndDiv UndDiv UndDiv UndDiv UndDiv PracDiv
AU	4	Ideo(6) AssmntDiv(9)	KnwDiv(5) Ideo(7)	Ideo KnwDiv

		KnwDiv(11) Ideo(27)	KnwDiv(14) KnwDiv(19) KnwDiv(21) KnwDiv(24) KnwDiv(25) KnwDiv(27) KnwDiv(30)	KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv
Standard 1				
AU	5	AssmntDiv(21)	KnwDiv(41) AssmntDiv(47)	AssmntDiv KnwDiv AssmntDiv
AU	6	AssmntDiv(1-7) AssmntDiv(9-29) AssmntDiv(33) AssmntDiv(45)	PracDiv(11) AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(39) AssmntDiv(45)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	7	AssmntDiv(4-17) AssmntDiv (19-35) AssmntDiv(37-45)	AssmntDiv (11) AssmntDiv(26-34) AssmntDiv(39)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	8	AssmntDiv(6-21) AssmntDiv(31-34) AssmntDiv(38)	AssmntDiv (7) AssmntDiv(23-29) AssmntDiv (31) AssmntDiv(38) PracDiv(47)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv PracDiv
AU	9	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(15) AssmntDiv(26)	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(15)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	10	KnwDiv(1) LrnDiv(4) PracDiv(5) UndDiv(11) PracDiv(13) UndDiv(19) <i>Tech</i> UndDiv(32) <i>Tech</i>	UndDiv(10)	KnwDiv LrnDiv PracDiv UndDiv
Standard 2				
AU	11	AssmntDiv(24) AssmntDiv(43)	AssmntDiv (12) AssmntDiv(24-32) AssmntDiv(43)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	12	AssmntDiv(11) AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(41)	AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(41)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	13	DivCand(10) AssmntDiv(25)	AssmntDiv(12) AssmntDiv(21)	LrnDiv

			AssmntDiv(25) AssmntDiv(34) AssmntDiv(39) AssmntDiv(42) AssmntDiv(46)	
AU	14	AssmntDiv(1) UndDiv(17)	AssmntDiv(1) UndDiv(17)	UndDiv
Standard 3				
AU	15	LrnDiv(13) UndDiv(31)		
AU	16	LrnDiv(21)	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv(35)	LrnDiv AssmntDiv
AU	17	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8) LrnDiv(31)	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv LrnDiv
AU	18	AssmntDiv(8) LrnDiv(29) LrnDiv(31) PracDiv(41)	AssmntDiv(8) LrnDiv(29) LrnDiv(31)	AssmntDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv
AU	19	LrnDiv(6) PracDiv(17-23) LrnDiv(24) KnwDiv(35)	LrnDiv(6) LrnDiv(17-20) PracDiv(20-23) LrnDiv(24) KnwDiv(35)	LrnDiv LrnDiv PracDiv LrnDiv
AU	20	LrnDiv(3)	LrnDiv(3)	LrnDiv
Standard 4				
AU	20	PracDiv(28) KnwDiv(30) LrnDiv(30) PracDiv(35) Ideo(37) PracDiv(41) KnwDiv(44)	LrnDiv(10) KnwDiv(28) LrnDiv(30) KnwDiv(35) KnwDiv(37) KnwDiv(41) KnwDiv(44)	LrnDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv Ideo PracDiv KnwDiv
AU	21	LrnDiv(2) LrnDiv(7) LrnDiv(9) LrnDiv(10) LrnDiv(13) PracDiv(18) LrnDiv(22) PracDiv(24) LrnDiv(27)	KnwDiv(2) KnwDiv(7) KnwDiv(9) KnwDiv(10) KnwDiv(13) LrnDiv(22) LrnDiv(27) LrnDiv(34) LrnDiv(39-42)	PracDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv DivCand

		PracDiv(30) LrnDiv(35) KwnDiv(39) LrnDiv(39) KwnDiv(40) PracDiv(40) DivCand(44)	DivCand(44)	
AU	22	LrnDiv(1) DivCand(2) DivCand(6) DivCand(8) DivCand(12) DivCand(13) LrnDiv(35)	DivCand(2) DivCand(6) LrnDiv(35)	DivCand DivCand DivCand DivCand DivCand LrnDiv
AU	23	UndDiv(8) UndDiv(11) LrnDiv(12) UndDiv/LrnDiv(19) UndDiv/LrnDiv(32) UndDiv/LrnDiv(40) LrnDiv(43)	LrnDiv(11) LrnDiv(19) LrnDiv (32) LrnDiv(41) LrnDiv(44)	UndDiv LrnDiv UndDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv
AU	24	LrnDiv(1) LrnDiv(7) UndDiv(12) UndDiv(19) KwnDiv(24) KwnDiv(31) LrnDiv(39)	LrnDiv(1) LrnDiv(7) UndDiv(12) UndDiv(19) UndDiv(31)	LrnDiv LrnDiv UndDiv UndDiv
AU	25	LrnDiv(2) AssmntDiv(7) LrnDiv(41)	UndDiv(2) UndDiv(9) AssmntDiv(42)	UndDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 5				
AU	26	LrnDiv(10)	LrnDiv(10)	LrnDiv
AU	27			
AU	28			
Standard 6				
AU	29			
AU	30			
AU	31	LrnDiv(31)		LrnDiv
AU	32			
Appendix				
AU	33			
AU	34	DivCand(3)	DivCand(3)	DivCand

AU	35	UndDiv/LrnDiv	UndDiv/LrnDiv	UndDiv
Addendum				
AU	1			
AU	2			
AU	3		AssmntDiv(9) AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(19)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	4	UndDiv(11) UndDiv(12)	KnwDiv(20)	
AU	5	AssmntDiv(11)	AssmntDiv(11)	AssmntDiv
AU	6	AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(25)	AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(20)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	7	AssmntDiv(10) AssmntDiv(20) AssmntDiv(22)	AssmntDiv(10) AssmntDiv(21) AssmntDiv(22)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	8	AssmntDiv(1) KnwDiv(6) KnwDiv(8) AssmntDiv(19) AssmntDiv(27) AssmntDiv(35)	KnwDiv(6) KnwDiv(8) UndDiv(27)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv
AU	9	UndDiv(7) AssmntDiv(12)		UndDiv AssmntDiv
AU	10	KnwDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv	KnwDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv	KnwDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	11	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
AU	12			
Overview & Conceptual Framework				
KU	1	UndDiv(41)	DivCand(42)	UndDiv
KU	2	Ideo (3)	Ideo(3)	Ideo
KU	3			
KU	4	Ideo (16) Ideo(26) AssmntDiv(34)	Ideo(14) Ideo(23) UndDiv(26)	Ideo Ideo Ideo

			Ideo(27) AssmntDiv(31)	AssmntDiv
KU	5			
Standard 1				
KU	6	AssmntDiv(25)		
KU	7	AssmntDiv(2) AssmntDiv(13) AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(31) AssmntDiv(37)	AssmntDiv(2) AssmntDiv(13) DivUnd(18) UndDiv(23) AssmntDiv(31) AssmntDiv(37)	AssmntDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv
KU	8	AssmntDiv(9) AssmntDiv(19) LrnDiv(31) AssmntDiv(37)	PracDiv(19) AssmntDiv(21) AssmntDiv(31) PracDiv(32) AssmntDiv(33) PracDiv(37) LrnDiv(41)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv LrnDiv
KU	9	AssmntDiv(1) UndDiv(7) AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(27) LrnDiv(35)	UndDiv(1) PracDiv(2) UndDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8) AssmntDiv(19) PracDiv(43)	UndDiv AssmntDiv LrnDiv PracDiv
KU	10	AssmntDiv(1) UndDiv(32)	AssmntDiv(1) LrnDiv(3) AssmntDiv(6) LrnDiv(11) AssmntDiv(18)	AssmntDiv KnwDiv AssmntDiv
KU	11	Ideo(24) UndDiv(27) KnwDiv(32)	UndDiv(21) LrnDiv(27)	UndDiv UndDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv
KU	12	AssmntDiv(24) LrnDiv(39)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv(38) AssmntDiv(41)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	13	AssmntDiv(2) KnwDiv(6) KnwDiv(23) AssmntDiv(25) UndDiv(34)	AssmntDiv(2) AssmntDiv(6) AssmntDiv(12) UndDiv(16) Ideo(18-19) AssmntDiv(23)	AssmntDiv UndDiv

			AssmntDiv(34)	
KU	14	UndDiv(1) UndDiv(16) AssmntDiv(32) AssmntDiv(40)	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv(9) AssmntDiv(26) LrnDiv(26) LrnDiv(31) AssmntDiv(34) LrnDiv(42)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	15	AssmntDiv(1)	AssmntDiv(2)	
Standard 2				
KU	16	AssmntDiv(28) AssmntDiv(37)	AssmntDiv(8) KnwDiv(15) AssmntDiv(21) KnwDiv(24) AssmntDiv(28) KnwDiv(35) AssmntDiv(37)	Ideo AssmntDiv KnwDiv AssmntDiv KnwDiv AssmntDiv
KU	17	AssmntDiv(3) KnwDiv(38) LrnDiv(39) KnwDiv(40) KnwDiv(41) LrnDiv(42) KnwDiv(43)	AssmntDiv(3) AssmntDiv(28)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	18	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv(5) AssmntDiv(8)	AssmntDiv(13) AssmntDiv(27) AssmntDiv(38)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	19	AssmntDiv(33)	AssmntDiv(5) AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(34) AssmntDiv(43)	
KU	20	AssmntDiv(2)	AssmntDiv(2) AssmntDiv(11)	
KU	21	AssmntDiv(27)	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8) AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(23) KnwDiv(23) AssmntDiv(26)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	22		UndDiv(13) KnwDiv(18)	UndDiv

			AssmntDiv(23)	
KU	23			
KU	24	Ideo(11) LrnDiv(23) Ideo(31) LrnDiv (38)	LrnDiv(8-10) LrnDiv(19) PracDiv(20) KnwDiv(30) PracDiv(30) KnwDiv(30) LrnDiv(34-38)	KnwDiv LrnDiv PracDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv
Standard 3				
KU	25			
KU	26	LrnDiv(14) AssmntDiv(28) LrnDiv(42)	LrnDiv(14-20) AssmntDiv(23) AssmntDiv(28) LrnDiv(43) UndDiv(43)	AssmntDiv LrnDiv
KU	27	LrnDiv/UndDiv(1-6) UndDiv(6-12) AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(36)	LrnDiv(1-6) UndDiv(6-12) AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(29-32) AssmntDiv(34)	LrnDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv
KU	28	UndDiv(12)		
KU	29	AssmntDiv(1)		
KU	30	Ideo(10) LrnDiv(13) KnwDiv(16) KnwDiv(22) Ideo(25) AssmntDiv(33)	Ideo(10) LrnDiv(13) KnwDiv(16) PracDiv(21) UndDiv(25) AssmntDiv(30)	Ideo LrnDiv KnwDiv PracDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 4				
KU	31	KnwDiv(8) LrnDiv(9) PracDiv(10-11) LrnDiv(12) KnwDiv(14) AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(20) AssmntDiv(22) AssmntDiv(24) KnwDiv(33) LrnDiv(39)	AssmntDiv(8) LrnDiv(12) AssmntDiv(14) AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(20) AssmntDiv(22) AssmntDiv(24) AssmntDiv(26) KnwDiv(34) AssmntDiv(36) LrnDiv(39)	PracDiv LrnDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv KnwDiv AssmntDiv LrnDiv

				KnwDiv
KU	32	LrnDiv(1) AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8) AssmntDiv(12) AssmntDiv(15) UndDiv(24) LrnDiv(30)	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(8) AssmntDiv/ AssmntDiv(17) AssmntDiv(24) PracDiv(31) LrnDiv(35) UndDiv(36) PracDiv(38) UndDiv(42)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv PracDiv UndDiv
KU	33	AssmntDiv(12) LrnDiv(13-14) KnwDiv(15) KnwDiv(22) PracDiv(30) KnwDiv(35)	LrnDiv(7) KnwDiv(13) UndDiv(20) UndDiv(26) UndDiv(37)	LrnDiv KnwDiv PracDiv LrnDiv UndDiv PracDiv UndDiv
KU	34	KnwDiv(7) KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(21) LrnDiv(28)	KnwDiv(7) KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(21)	KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv
KU	35	LrnDiv(1) DivCand(36)	UndDiv(1) DivCand(37) KnwDiv(38) UndDiv(39) DivCand(40)	UndDiv DivCand
KU	36	DivCand(4) DivCand(34)	DivCand(4) DivCand(27-34)	DivCand DivCand
KU	37	UndDiv(23-37) UndDiv(37-46)	AssmntDiv(3) AssmntDiv(24) AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(31) UndDiv(35) LrnDiv(38) LrnDiv(42)	AssmntDiv UndDiv AssmntDiv UndDiv LrnDiv
KU	38	UndDiv(1) LrnDiv(18) LrnDiv(36)	KnwDiv(24) UndDiv(25) UndDiv(27) KnwDiv(28) UndDiv(36)	UndDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv

KU	39	DivCand(26-36)	AssmntDiv(17) DivCand(25-36)	AssmntDiv DivCand
KU	40	DivCand(25)	DivCand(17) DivCand(26)	DivCand
KU	41	AssmntDiv(26)	DivCand(3) UndDiv(10) AssmntDiv(12) AssmntDiv(26) UndDiv(27) KnwDiv(28) AssmntDiv(34) KnwDiv(39) PracDiv(40)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
KU	42	AssmntDiv(3)	AssmntDiv(3)	AssmntDiv
KU	43		KnwDiv(15) Ideo (17) UndDiv(21) PracDiv(21-22)	Ideo
Standard 5				
KU	44			
KU	45			
KU	46			
KU	47	UndDiv(26) UndDiv(34) UndDiv(42)	UndDiv(26) UndDiv(31) UndDiv(36)	UndDiv UndDiv UndDiv
KU	48	UndDiv(1) UndDiv(20)	UndDiv(1) DivCand(5) LrnDiv(8) UndDiv(20)	UndDiv UndDiv DivCand UndDiv
KU	49			
Standard 6				
KU	50			
KU	51		AssmntDiv(6)	
KU	52		DivCand(9) DivCand(11) DivCand(18) DivCand(26) DivCand(29) DivCand(33)	

KU	53			
KU	54			
KU	55	Ideo(10) KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(15) Ideo(35)	AssmntDiv(6) UndDiv (10) KnwDiv(12) KnwDiv(13) Ideo(33)	UndDiv Ideo
KU	56	AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(26)	AssmntDiv(2) AssmntDiv(25)	
KU	57	UndDiv(35)	Ideo(3) AssmntDiv(19) AssmntDiv(26) UndDiv (30) Ideo(36)	UndDiv
KU	58		UndDiv(1)	
KU	59	KnwDiv(1-8) AssmntDiv(14) KnwDiv(27) AssmntDiv(38)	KnwDiv(1-8) Ideo(3) AssmntDiv(13) Ideo(24)	KnwDiv AssmntDiv Ideo
KU	60			
Overview & Conceptual Framework				
HU	1	Ideo(24) Ideo(28)	Ideo(25-27) Ideo(29-32)	Ideo Ideo
HU	2			
HU	3	Ideo(12) Ideo(16) KnwDiv(8-31) LrnDiv(32) KnwDiv(33) PracDiv(35) KnwDiv(36-38) LrnDiv(39) KnwDiv(40) KnwDiv(41-43) PracDiv(44) LrnDiv(45) KnwDiv(46) KnwDiv(47-48) PracDiv(49) KnwDiv(50)	Ideo(11-12) Ideo(15-21) KnwDiv(29) PracDiv(31) KnwDiv(33) PracDiv(34) KnwDiv(35) KnwDiv(38) PracDiv(38) KnwDiv(39) PracDiv(43) KnwDiv(44) KnwDiv(45) KnwDiv(47) PracDiv(48) KnwDiv(49)	Ideo Ideo LrnDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv

		KnwDiv(51-52)	KnwDiv(51)	
HU	4	LrnDiv(2) PracDiv(3) KnwDiv(4) KnwDiv(6) PracDiv(7) PracDiv(8) KnwDiv(9) KnwDiv(10) KnwDiv(13) LrnDiv(14) KnwDiv(15) KnwDiv(18) PracDiv(20) KnwDiv(21) KnwDiv(22) KnwDiv(23)	KnwDiv(1) PracDiv(2) KnwDiv(3) KnwDiv(5) PracDiv(6) PracDiv(7) PracDiv(13) KnwDiv(14) KnwDiv(16) PracDiv(17) PracDiv(19) KnwDiv(20) KnwDiv(21) PracDiv(22) AssmntDiv(40)	KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv PracDiv
Standard 1				
HU	5	AssmntDiv(1) AssmntDiv(29) AssmntDiv(37) AssmntDiv(53)	AssmntDiv(1-7) AssmntDiv(25-26) AssmntDiv(32-37) PracDiv(40-41) UndDiv(43-44) PracDiv(43) AssmntDiv(48)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	A	AssmntDiv(3) AssmntDiv(15) AssmntDiv(32) AssmntDiv(43)	AssmntDiv(4) AssmntDiv(15) AssmntDiv(32) AssmntDiv(41-47)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	B	LrnDiv(35) UndDiv(52)	AssmntDiv(44) LrnDiv(34) UndDiv(48)	LrnDiv AssmntDiv UndDiv
HU	C	DivCand(5) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart)	DivCand(4) AssmntDiv(21-22) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart)	DivCand AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
Standard 2				
HU	D	AssmntDiv(14)	AssmntDiv(14) AssmntDiv(24-26)	AssmntDiv

			AssmntDiv(44-45)	
HU	E	AssmntDiv(10) AssmntDiv(39) UndDiv(41)	AssmntDiv(10) AssmntDiv (16-29) AssmntDiv(31) AssmntDiv(38) UndDiv(40)	UndDiv AssmntDiv
HU	F	AssmntDiv(16-23) AssmntDiv(37-44) AssmntDiv(49)	AssmntDiv(16-17) AssmntDiv(37) AssmntDiv(48)	
HU	G	AssmntDiv(18) AssmntDiv(36-40) AssmntDiv(26)	AssmntDiv(16) AssmntDiv(25-27) AssmntDiv(27-30) AssmntDiv(36)	
HU	H	AssmntDiv(22-chart) UndDiv(22-chart) KnwDiv(34-35)	AssmntDiv(1) LrnDiv(34-35) AssmntDiv(chart) DivCand(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(Char) AssmntDiv(chart) UndDiv(chart)	Ideo
Standard 3				
HU	I	LrnDiv(10-14) KnwDiv(24-26) LrnDiv(31-33) LrnDiv(34-36) KnwDiv(39) KnwDiv/AssmntDiv(49)	Ideo(1-2) LrnDiv(10) UndDiv(32) LrnDiv(34) LrnDiv(43) AssmntDiv(48)	LrnDiv KnwDiv UndDiv LrnDiv PracDiv
HU	J	LrnDiv(5-8) AssmntDiv(30-35) KnwDiv(41) AssmntDiv(46) AssmntDiv(49) LrnDiv(51)	AssmntDiv(30) AssmntDiv(50)	LrnDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	K	AssmntDiv(24-35) AssmntDiv(46)	AssmntDiv(23)	
HU	L	AssmntDiv(10-13) UndDiv(16-18) LrnDiv(30-33)	AssmntDiv(6-7) UndDiv(32) Ideo(39)	UndDiv UndDiv Ideo
HU	M	AssmntDiv(10-chart) UndDiv(27-34)	AssmntDiv(1) UndDiv(26)	UndDiv

			DivCand(27) UndDiv(29) DivCand(30) UndDiv(31-33)	
Standard 4				
HU	N	UndDiv(1-7) DivCand(19-25) DivCand(28) LrnDiv(29-31) LrnDiv(37-43)	UndDiv(1-6) DivCand(18) DivCand(25-27) LrnDiv(27-29) DivCand(30) UndDiv(33-34) LrnDiv(38)	UndDiv DivCand DivCand LrnDiv DivCand UndDiv LrnDiv
HU	O	Ideo(10) KwnDiv(13-16) Ideo(19) KwnDiv(21) PracDiv(23) AssmntDiv(24) KwnDiv(35) AssmntDiv(45) KwnDiv(48) PracDiv(49) KwnDiv(50)	Ideo(10) KwnDiv(12) Ideo(18) LrnDiv(19-22) AssmntDiv(23-24) AssmntDiv(42-48)	Ideo KwnDiv Ideo LrnDiv AssmntDiv KwnDiv AssmntDiv KwnDiv PracDiv KwnDiv
HU	P	UndDiv(6) KwnDiv(7) AssmntDiv(9) UndDiv(10-12) LrnDiv(14-17) UndDiv(20) KwnDiv(21) LrnDiv(23) KwnDiv(25-27) KwnDiv(29-33) KwnDiv(34-36) LrnDiv(37) KwnDiv(39) LrnDiv(41) KwnDiv(43-50)	KwnDiv(5-6) AssmntDiv(8-9) LrnDiv(12) LrnDiv(19) PracDiv(21) KwnDiv(27-31) KwnDiv(32-34) PracDiv(35) KwnDiv(37-38) LrnDiv(39) KwnDiv(41-43) LrnDiv(44-46) UndDiv(46-48)	KwnDiv AssmntDiv UndDiv LrnDiv PracDiv LrnDiv KwnDiv KwnDiv KwnDiv LrnDiv KwnDiv
HU	Q	KwnDiv(2-4) KwnDiv(5-6) PracDiv(6-7) KwnDiv(8-9) UndDiv(12-14) KwnDiv(18)	KwnDiv(1-3) KwnDiv(4-5) PracDiv(5-6) PracDiv(8-9) PracDiv(10) PracDiv(17-20)	KwnDiv KwnDiv PracDiv LrnDiv PracDiv PracDiv

		LrnDiv(19-20) KnwDiv(22-24) LrnDiv(25-27) LrnDiv(27-28) KnwDiv(29-33) LrnDiv(34) LrnDiv(36-38) KnwDiv(39-43) KnwDiv(44-46) LrnDiv(47-51)	PracDiv(22-25) PracDiv(29-30) PracDiv(31-34) PracDiv(35-37) PracDiv(39-42) PracDiv(43-46) PracDiv(46-50)	LrnDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv
HU	R	LrnDiv(2) KnwDiv(4) KnwDiv(8) KnwDiv(14) LrnDiv(19) KnwDiv(21) KnwDiv(23) LrnDiv(26) KnwDiv(28) LrnDiv(31) KnwDiv(34) LrnDiv(37) LrnDiv(40) KnwDiv(43) KnwDiv(49)	PracDiv(1-2) PracDiv(3-6) PracDiv(7-12) PracDiv(13-17) PracDiv(18-21) PracDiv(33-38) PracDiv(40-42) PracDiv(44-48) KnwDiv(49-51)	PracDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv PracDiv PracDiv KnwDiv PracDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv
HU	S	KnwDiv(2) KnwDiv(5) KnwDiv(8) KnwDiv(11) KnwDiv(15) LrnDiv(19) KnwDiv(21) KnwDiv(31) LrnDiv(33) LrnDiv(35-36) KnwDiv(36-38) KnwDiv(39-41) KnwDiv(42-44) LrnDiv(44) AssmntDiv(48)	KnwDiv(1-3) PracDiv(4-6) PracDiv(8-9) PracDiv(10-14) KnwDiv(15-17) PracDiv(18-20) PracDiv(21-30) PracDiv(31-34) PracDiv(35-38) PracDiv(40-41) AssmntDiv(42) PracDiv(44-45) AssmntDiv(49)	KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv KnwDiv PracDiv PracDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv KnwDiv LrnDiv
HU	T	AssmntDiv(2-5) PracDiv(7-10) LrnDiv(12-22) LrnDiv(30)	PracDiv(2-4) AssmntDiv(6-9)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv LrnDiv LrnDiv

HU	U			
HU	V	UndDiv(12-15) AssmntDiv(18-21) KwnDiv(24) <i>chart</i> KwnDiv(24) <i>chart</i> AssmntDiv(24) <i>chart</i> DivCand(24) <i>chart</i> DivCand(24) <i>chart</i>	PracDiv(11-12) AssmntDiv(16-21) PracDiv (chart) KwnDiv(chart) AssmntDiv(chart) DivCand(chart) UndDiv(chart) UndDiv(chart) DivCand(chart) PracDiv(chart)	PracDiv AssmntDiv KwnDiv AssmntDiv DivCand DivCand
Standard 5				
HU	W	UndDiv(5-9)	Ideo(5) UndDiv(6-10)	Ideo UndDiv
HU	X	UndDiv(11)		
HU	Y	UndDiv(26) UndDiv(32-38)		
HU	Z	UndDiv(45-50)	UndDiv(18) UndDiv(43-44)	UndDiv UndDiv
HU	AA	UndDiv(19-26) UndDiv(28-32)	AssmntDiv(14-16) UndDiv(18-21) UndDiv(27-29)	UndDiv UndDiv
Standard 6				
HU	BB	DivCand(33-38)	DivCand(33-38)	DivCand
HU	CC			
HU	DD			
HU	EE	DivCand(43-50)	DivCand(43-47)	DivCand
HU	FF	DivCand(2-5)	DivCand(33-37) DivCand(45-46)	
HU	GG			
Addendum				
HU	1			
HU	2			
HU	3			
HU	4	AssmntDiv(5-9)		
HU	5	AssmntDiv(42-45)	AssmntDiv(16-19) AssmntDiv(21) AssmntDiv(31) AssmntDiv(33)	

			AssmntDiv(43)	
HU	6	LrnDiv(5-9) AssmntDiv(36-40) AssmntDiv(42-45) LrnDiv(47-49)	AssmntDiv(7-9)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	7	LrnDiv(1-3) KnwDiv(9-11) KnwDiv(13-17) AssmntDiv(20-28) KnwDiv(29-30)		AssmntDiv
HU	8	AssmntDiv(1-8) AssmntDiv(31-42)		
HU	9	AssmntDiv(25-28) AssmntDiv(41-44)	AssmntDiv(15-17) AssmntDiv(31-33) AssmntDiv(47-49)	AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	10	AssmntDiv(9) AssmntDiv(29-47)	AssmntDiv(8) AssmntDiv(27-28)	AssmntDiv
HU	11	AssmntDiv(1-5) AssmntDiv(39-44)		AssmntDiv AssmntDiv
HU	12	KnwDiv(3-4) LrnDiv(17-25)	LrnDiv(24-26) UndDiv(50)	AssmntDiv
HU	13	UndDiv(42)		AssmntDiv
HU	14	Ideo(11-12) LrnDiv(27-42)	LrnDiv(24-26)	LrnDiv
HU	15			
HU	16	UndDiv(5) UndDiv(38)		
HU	17			

APPENDIX C

Main Category	Subcategories (Cochran-Smith's questions)	Definitions	Indicators	Subcategories Code
Diversity (Div)	<p>A) How should the increasingly diverse student population in American schools be understood as a challenge or 'problem' for teaching and teacher education?</p> <p>B) What are the desirable 'solutions' to this problem?</p>	<p>Unit's definition of K-12 student diversity in relation to teaching and teacher education.</p> <p>Unit describes solutions to the challenges of K-12 student diversity. The unit describes its role in the solution.</p>	<p>Diversity can be defined as a problem or challenge</p> <p>Can be an explicit message and/or an implicit message.</p> <p>The Unit can use the language of equity and high standards, but implicitly answer the question with a deficit attitude or assumption of assimilation this may include one-size fits all approaches to curriculum, instruction, and assessments.</p> <p>Look for consistency in language, terms, definitions in regards to diversity.</p>	Understanding diversity-challenge/problem/solution (Div)

<p>Ideology or social justice (Ideo)</p>	<p>What is the purpose of schooling, what is the role of public education in a democratic society, and what historically has been the role of schooling in maintaining or changing the economic and social structure of society?</p>	<p>Unit describes how the institution views the United States' political, social, and economic system in relationship to public education and its impact on a democratic system.</p> <p>Unit describes how education, including the unit's own efforts, has maintained the status quo or challenged political, social, and economic structures in the United States.</p>	<p>Meritocratic Assimilate Global economy Social justice</p> <p>i.e. "antiracism must be 'front and center' in the teacher education reform agenda (p. 12). This is an example of social justice ideology and going against the status quo.</p> <p>Many times the ideology is not explicitly stated, which suggests that the unit maintains the status quo.</p>	<p>(Ideo)</p>
---	--	--	---	----------------------

Knowledge (KnwDiv)	<p>What do teachers need to know <i>about</i> the knowledge base?</p> <p>i.e. <i>What else</i> do they need to know, including attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs needed to teach diverse groups?</p>	<p>The unit describes specific knowledge that candidates need to know in order to successfully work with diverse K-12 student populations.</p> <p>The unit describes specific dispositions candidates need to have in order to successfully work with diverse K-12 student populations.</p>	<p>It is assumed that subject matter and how people learn is essential in multicultural education. Therefore, knowledge in this framework refers to “The Canon” or “Funds of Knowledge”</p> <p>i.e. specific Educational foundations, pedagogy, culture, learning theories Knowledge of culture and its role</p> <p>i.e. “Critical cultural consciousness” or “sociocultural consciousness” (candidates know their own culture)</p>	<p>Knowledge on diversity</p> <p>(KnwDiv)</p>
Teacher learning (LrnDiv)	<p>How do teachers learn to teach diverse populations and what, in particular, are the pedagogies of teacher preparation (e.g., coursework assignments, readings, field experiences) that make this learning possible?</p>	<p>The unit describes <u>how</u> the institution prepares candidates for diverse K-12 learners by providing <u>detailed information</u> on specific course work, assessments, and field experiences.</p>	<p>Inquiry-based learning, learning within communities (life-long learner) vs. “training” or learning on the job (trial-by-error experiences)</p>	<p>Learn diversity</p> <p>(LrnDiv)</p>

Practice (PracDiv)	What are the competencies and pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse populations effectively?	This is a “subset of the teacher learning question” (p. 13). The unit describes the <u>pedagogical skills</u> candidates need to have in order to successfully work with diverse K-12 learners, which includes teachers’ roles as members of school communities, school leadership, and responsibilities to families and students. by providing detailed information on specific course work, assessments, and field experiences.	Culturally responsive curriculum & pedagogy (i.e. Cultural competence to work well with parents, families, and communities)	Practice diversity (PracDiv)
Outcomes (AssmntDiv)	What should the consequences or outcomes of teacher preparation be and how, by whom, and for what purposes should these outcomes be assessed?	The unit describes the in detail the end result of the institution’s teacher education program by explaining how the institution knows candidates are ready to teach diverse learners, who assess teachers, and how is the assessment data is used for future decision making.	Agents for social change, critical thinkers Teacher portfolio, K-12 standardized assessments	Assessments on diversity (AssmntDiv)
Recruitment and selection (DivCand)	What candidates should be recruited and selected for America’s teaching force?	The unit describes the demographics of candidates in the institution’s teacher	Diversifying teaching force Recruiting candidates who	Candidates diversity

		education program, and how students are recruited and selected into the program. This does not include faculty and staff in the institution.	would do well in high-needs areas (with previous experience and /or mature)	(DivCand)
--	--	--	---	-----------

Coherence Question

Category	Subcategories (Cochran-Smith's questions)	Definitions	Indicators
Coherence	<p>A) To what degree are the answers to the first seven questions connected to and coherent with one another in particular policies or programs?</p> <p>B) How are diversity issues positioned in relation to other issues?</p>	<p>The unit's report to the accreditation board answered the questions by using specific descriptions and examples. The unit demonstrated that diversity issues were central to its mission, recruitment and selection of students, course work, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessments. Faculty is committed to social justice and work together to ensure a cohesive multicultural education and experience for all candidates.</p>	<p>Diversity issues must be central to the curriculum, mandatory, and infused throughout coursework and fieldwork experiences. It should <i>not</i> be a single course.</p>

APPENDIX D

NCATE Unit Standards

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

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.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and

improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

APPENDIX E

Letter from the George Mason University Office of Research Integrity and Assurance



Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

Research Hall, 4400 University Drive, MS 6D5, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Phone: 703-993-5445; Fax: 703-993-9590

DATE: August 26, 2014

TO: Gary Galluzzo

FROM: George Mason University IRB

Project Title: [648548-1] Preparing teachers for diversity: An analysis of accreditation diversity standard

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF NOT HUMAN SUBJECT RESEARCH

DECISION DATE: August 26, 2014

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Office of Research Integrity & Assurance (ORIA) has determined this project does not meet the definition of human subject research under the purview of the IRB according to federal regulations.

Please remember that if you modify this project to include human subjects research activities, you are required to submit revisions to the ORIA prior to initiation.

If you have any questions, please contact Bess Dieffenbach at 703-993-4121 or edieffen@gmu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within George Mason University IRB's records.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L.A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Akiba, M. (2011). Identifying program characteristics for preparing preservice teachers for diversity. *Teachers College Record*, 113, 658-697.
- Akiba, M., Cockrell, K. S., Simmons, J. C., Han, S., & Agarwal, G. (2010). Preparing teachers for diversity: Examination of teacher certification and program accreditation standards in 50 states and Washington, DC. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43, 445-462. doi:10.1080/10665684.2010.510048
- Ambrosio, A. L., Sequin, C. A., & Hogan, E. L. (2001). Assessing performance-based outcomes of multicultural lesson plans: A component within a comprehensive teacher education assessment. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 3(1), 15-22.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2010). *An emerging picture of the teacher preparation pipeline*. Retrieved from <http://aacte.org/pdf/Publications/Resources/PEDS%20Report%20-%20An%20Emerging%20Picture%20of%20the%20Teacher%20Preparation%20Pipeline.pdf>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2015). *AACTE board resolution on CAEP*. <http://aacte.org/news-room/press-releases-statements/488>

-aacte-board-resolution-on-caep

- Artiles, A. J., & McClafferty, K. (1998). Learning to teach culturally diverse learners: Charting change in preservice teachers' thinking about effective teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 98, 189-220. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1002257>
- Atkinson, P. A., & Coffey, A. (1997). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 45-62). London, England: Sage.
- Avery, P. G., & Walker, C. (1993). Prospective teachers' perceptions of ethnic and gender differences in academic achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 27-37. doi:10.1177/0022487193044001005
- AVID. (2014). *What is AVID for higher education?* Retrieved from <http://www.avid.org/what-is-avid-for-higher-ed.ashx>
- Bales, B. L. (2006). Teacher education policies in the United States: The accountability shift since 1980. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 397-407. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.009
- Barnes, C. J. (2006). Preparing preservice teachers to teach in a culturally responsive way. *The Negro Educational Review*, 57(1-2), 85-100.
- Bell, C. A., Horn, B. R., & Roxas, K. C. (2007). We know it's service, but what are they learning? Preservice teachers' understandings of diversity. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40, 123-133. doi:10.1080/10665680701218467

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. doi:10.3316/QRJ0902027
- Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (1992). Coherence, the rebel angel. *Educational Researcher*, 21(9), 4-9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1177014>
- Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G., & Manning, M. L. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 637-644. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(97\)80006-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80006-6)
- Capella-Santana, N. (2003). Voices of teacher candidates: Positive changes in multicultural attitudes and knowledge. *The Journal of Education Research*, 96, 182-190. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27542429>
- Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 5-12.
- Carter, R. T., & Goodwin, L. A. (1994). Racial identity and education. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 291-336. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167387>
- Case, K. A., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education*, 40, 606-626. doi: 10.1177/0042085905281396

- Caulley, D. N. (1983). Document analysis in program evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 6, 19-29.
- Center for Education Policy (2006). *From the capital to the classroom*. Retrieved from www.cep-dc.org/cfcontent_file.cfm?Attachment=FullReport_NCLB4_032406.pdf
- Choi, J. (2008). Unlearning colorblind ideologies in education class. *Educational Foundations*, 22(3-4), 53-71.
- Cho, G., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, D. (2005). Is ignorance bliss? Preservice teachers' attitudes toward multicultural education. *The High School Journal*, 89(2), 24-28. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/40364236>
- Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action*. London, England: Falmer Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). The multiple meanings of multicultural teacher education: A conceptual framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(2), 7-26.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). 2005 Presidential address: The new teacher education: For better or for Worse? *Education Researcher*, 34(7), 3-17. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699795>
- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research practice, and policy. In J. Banks, & C. Banks (Eds.). *The handbook for*

- research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931-975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2011). Teacher education policy and social justice. In P.M. Earley, D.G. Imig, and N.M. Michelli (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in the United States: Issues and tensions in an era of evolving expectations* (pp.182-207). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1992). Interrogating cultural diversity: Inquiry and action. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2), 104-115.
doi:10.1177/0022487192043002004
- Cooper, C. W. (2003). The detrimental impact of teacher bias: Lessons learned from the standpoint of African American mothers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(2), 101-116.
- Cooper, J. E. (2007). Strengthening the case for community-based learning in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 245-255.
doi:10.1177/0022487107299979.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP commission on standards and performance reporting*. Washington, DC: CAEP.
- Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Securing the right to learn: Policy and practice for powerful teaching and learning. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 13-24.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3876732>

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 34-47. doi: 10.1177/0022487109348024
- Delgado, R. C. (2011). *Preparing teachers for diverse learners: A multi-institution analysis of NCATE accreditation applications*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3478841)
- Duncan, A. (2009). A call to teaching: Secretary Arne Duncan's remarks at The Rotunda at the University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/call-teaching>
- Duncan, A. (2009). Teacher preparation: Reforming an uncertain profession. New York City: Remarks by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan at Teachers' College, Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/teacher-preparation-reforming-uncertain-profession>
- Elo, S. & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x
- Fein, A. H. (2004). What's good for the goose...Inconsistency in the NCATE standards? *Multicultural Education*, 11(4) 54-55.
- Ferguson, R. F. (2007). *Toward excellence with equity: An emerging vision for closing the achievement gap*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review*, 18, 176-206.
doi:10.1007/BF01112192
- Foster, M. (1994). Educating for competence in community and culture: Exploring

- the views of exemplary African-American teachers. In M. Shujaa (Ed.), *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of Black life in White societies* (pp. 221–244). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Foster, M., & Peele, T. B. (1999). Teaching Black males: Lessons from the experts. In V. C. Polite & J. E. Davis (Eds.), *Black males in school and society: Practices and policies for effective education* (pp. 8–19). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fox, W. & Gay, G. (1995). Integrating multicultural and curriculum principles in teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 70(3), 64-82.
doi:10.1080/01619569509538835
- Fritschel, A. L. (1978). The 1979 NCATE standards: Implications for teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 9-12.
doi:10.1177/002248717802900102
- Frye, B., Button, L., Kelly, C., & Button, G. (2010). Preservice teachers' self-perception and attitudes toward culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 5(1), 6-22. Retrieved from
<http://digitalcommons.library.unlv.edu/jpme/vol5/iss1/5>
- Gallegos, A. M. (1978). A call for universal accreditation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 24-27. doi: 10.1177/002248717802900105
- Galluzzo, G. (1999). *Aligning standards to improve teacher education and practice*. Washington, DC: The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

- Garmon, M. A. (1998). Using dialogue journals to promote student learning in a multicultural teacher education course. *Remedial and special education, 19*(1), 32-45.
- Gause, C. P., Dennison, S., & Perrin, D. H. (2012). Equity, inclusiveness, and diversifying the faculty: Transforming the university in the 21st century. *Quest, 62*(1), 61-75. doi:10.1080/00336297.2010.10483632
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.
- Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 143-152. doi:10.1177/0022487109347320
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossing: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gollnick, D. (1995). National and state initiative for multicultural education. In J. Banks and C.A.M Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan
- Gollnick, D. M., & Kunkel, R. C. (1986). The reform of national accreditation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(4), 310-314. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20403343>
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking into classrooms*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Goodwin, A. L. (1994). Making the transition from self to other: What do preservice teachers really think about multicultural education? *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*(2), 119-131. doi:10.1177/0022487194045002006

- Goodwin, A. L., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M. Y., Reed, R., & Taveras, L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives from practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 284-302. doi:10.1177/0022487114535266
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24, 105-112. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001
- Groulx, J. G. (2001). Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban Education*, 36(1), 60- 92. doi:10.1177/0042085901361005
- Gubser, L. (1978). Accrediting a profession. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 2. doi:10.1177/002248717802900101
- Hamacheck, D. (1999). Effective teachers: what they do, how they do it, and the importance of self-knowledge. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp.189–225). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. (2012). There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here: A critical race perspective. *Democracy and Education*, 20(1), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol20/Iss1/1>
- Henry, G. (1985). *Cultural diversity awareness inventory*. Hampton, VA: Hampton University.

- Hinton, K. (2006). Trial and error: A framework for teaching multicultural literature to aspiring teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 13(4), 51-54.
- Holen, M. C., & Yunk, D. C. (2014). Benefits of 25 years of school district-university partnerships to improve teacher preparation and advance school renewal. *Educational Considerations*, 42(1), 49-54.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195-202. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477420>
- Humes, K., Jones, N., & Ramirez, R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>
- Hyland, N. E., & Noffke, S. E. (2005). Understanding diversity through social and community inquiry: An action-research study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56, 367-381. doi: 10.1177/0022487105279568
- Jacobowitz, T., & Michelli, N. M. (2008). Diversity and teacher education: What can the future be? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 679-685). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- James, R. L. (1978). Multicultural education: NCATE standard rationale. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29, 13-20. doi: 10.1177/002248717802900103

- Jeffery, J. V., & Polleck, J. N. (2010) Reciprocity through co-instructed site-based courses: Perceived benefit and challenge overlap in an urban school-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(3), 81-99.
- Jennings, L. B., & Smith, C. P. (2002). Examining the role of critical inquiry for transformative practices: Two joint case studies of multicultural teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 456-481. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/library>
- Kaplan, L. (1978). Survival talk for educators-multicultural education standards. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 45-46. doi: 10.1177/002248717802900110
- Keengwe, J. (2010). Fostering cross cultural competence in preservice teachers through multicultural education experiences. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38, 197-204. doi:10.1007/s10643-010-0401-5
- Korthagen, F. A. (2002). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Toward a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 77-97. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1978). An accreditation proposal. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29, 28-32. doi: 10.1177/002248717802900106
- Kumar, R., & Hamer, L. (2012). Preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward student diversity and proposed instructional practices: A sequential design study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64, 162- 177. doi:10.1177/0022487112466899

- LaBoskey, V. K. (2009). "Name it and claim it": The methodology of self-study as social justice teacher education. In D. L. Tidwell et al. (Eds.), *Research methods for the self study of practice* (73-82). New York, NY: Springer.
- Laczko-Kerr, I., & Berliner, D. (2002). The effectiveness of Teach for America and other under-certified teachers on student academic achievement: A case of harmful public policy. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(37). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v10n37.2002>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Liberatory consequences of literacy: A case study of culturally relevant instruction for African-American students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61(3), 378-391.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dream keepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 51, 206-214.
doi:10.1177/0022487100051003008
- Lee, S. (2012). Knowing myself to know others: Preparing preservice teachers for diversity through multicultural autobiography. *Multicultural Education*, 20(1), 38-41.
- Lenski, S. D., Crumpler, T. P., Stallworth, C., & Crawford, K. M. (2005). Beyond awareness: Preparing culturally responsive preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 85-100.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass

- communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 587-604. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00826.x
- Loughran, J. (2014). Professionally developing as a teacher educator. *Journal Teacher Education*, 65, 271-283. doi: 10.1177/0022487114533386
- Lucas, A. G. (2010). Distinguishing between multicultural and global education: The challenge of conceptualizing and addressing the two fields. *The Clearing House*, 83, 211-216. doi:10.1080/00098650903505373
- Lynn, M., Bacon, J. N., Totten, T. L., Bridges, T. L., & Jennings, M. E. (2010). Examining teachers' beliefs about African American male students in a low performing high school in an African American school district. *Teachers College Record*, 112, 289-330. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/library/content.asp?contentid=15835>
- Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please mind the culture gap: Intercultural development during a teacher education study abroad program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(1), 35-47. doi: 10.1177/0022487110381998
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McCormick, T. E. (1984). Some principles and issues. *Theory into Practice*, 23(2), 93-97. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476436>
- McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 49(3), 10-12.

- Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26, 342-379.
- MetLife. (2010). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher. Preparing students for college and careers*. New York, NY: MetLife.
- MetLife. (2012). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher. Challenges for school leadership*. New York, NY: MetLife.
- Morse, J. M. (1997). "Perfectly healthy, but dead": The myth of inter-rater reliability. *Qualitative Health Research*, 7, 445-447. doi: 10.1177/104973239700700401
- Moule, J. (2009). Understanding unconscious bias and unintentional racism. *PhiDelta Kappan*, 90, 320-326. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20446107>
- National Center for Education Information. (2005). *Profile of teachers in the US 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncei.com/POT05PRESSREL3.htm>
- National Center for Education Information. (2011). *Profile of teachers in the US 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/media/pot2011final-blog.pdf>
- National Center of Education Statistics. (2010). *Number and percentage of children ages 5-17 who spoke only English at home, who spoke a language other than English at home and who spoke English with difficulty, and percent enrolled in school: Selected years, 1980-2009*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/tables/table-lsm-1.asp>
- National Center of Education Statistics. (2013). *The condition of education*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_coj.asp

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, & Public Agenda. (2008). *Lessons learned: New teachers talk about their jobs, challenges and long range plans. Issue No. 3. Teaching in changing times*: New York, NY: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality and Public Agenda.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC.
- Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 180-187. doi: 10.1177/0022487100051003004
- Noguera, P. A., & Wing, J. Y. (2006). *Unfinished business: Closing the racial achievement gap in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley/Jossey-Bass.
- Oakes, J., Lipton, M., Anderson, L., & Stillman, J. (2012). *Teaching to change the world*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pohan, C. A., & Aguilar, T. E. (2001). Measuring educators' beliefs about diversity in personal and professional contexts. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 159-182. doi:10.3102/00028312038001159
- Poloman, A.W. (2014). Why teaching faculty diversity (still) matters. *Peabody Journal of*

Education, 89, 336-346. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2014.913447

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., & Garcia, S. G. (2009). Making the implicit explicit: Supporting teachers to bridge cultures. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24, 474-486. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.08.006

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Samaras, A. P., Guðjónsdóttir, H. McMurrer, J. R. & Dalmau, M. C. (2012). Self-study of a professional organization in pursuit of a shared enterprise. *Studying Teacher Education*, 8, 303-320. doi:10.1080/17425964.2012.719127

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2000). Analyzing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 821-834). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcomes expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1086-1101. doi:10.1016/j.tate..2006.07.011

Siwatu, K. O. (2011). Preservice teachers' sense of preparedness and self-efficacy to teach in America's urban and suburban schools: Does context matter?

Teaching and Teacher Education, 27, 357-365.

doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.09.004

Skinner, E. A. (2010). Project *Nueva Generación* and Grow Your Own Teachers:

Transforming schools and teacher education from the inside out. *Teacher*

Education Quarterly, 37(3), 155-167. doi: 10.2307/23479503

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Epistemological diversity in research on preservice teacher

preparation for historically underserved children. *Review of Research in*

Education, 25, 209-250. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167325>

Sleeter, C. E. (2001) Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and

overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2),

94-106. doi: 10.1177/0022487101052002002

Sleeter, C. (2004). *AERA Division K: Teaching and Teacher Education Newsletter, a*

message from the Vice President. Washington, DC: American Educational

Research Association

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five*

approaches to race, class and gender. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1994). *Making choices for multicultural education* (2nd

ed.). New York, NY: Merrill.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five*

approaches to race, class and gender. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Smith-Maddox, R. (1998). Defining culture as a dimension of academic achievement:

Implications for culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

- The Journal of Negro Education*, 67, 302-317. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2668198>
- Solbrekke, T. D. & Sugrue, C. (2014). Professional accreditation of initial teacher education programmes: Teacher educators' strategies-Between 'accountability' and 'professional responsibility'? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 37, 11-20. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.015
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tellez, K. (2008). What student teachers learn about multicultural education from their cooperating teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 43-58. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.07.014
- Tierney, W.G. (2012). AERA 2025: Remembrance of (Academic) things past. Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/tabid/10173/Default.aspx>
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Weiss, D. J. (1975). Interrater reliability and agreement of subjective judgments. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 22, 358-376.
- Tom, A. R. (1980). NCATE standards and program quality: You can't get there from here. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62(2), 113-117. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20385771>
- Trent, S. C., Kea, C. D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice educators for cultural diversity: How far have we come? *Exceptional Children*, 74, 328-350.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2014). U.S. Department of Education proposes plan to strengthen teacher preparation: New rules build on reforms and innovation efforts to ensure educators are classroom-ready. <https://www.ed.gov/news/press>

-releases/us-department-education-proposes-plan-strengthen-teacher-preparation

- Van Hook, C. H. (2002). Preservice teachers' perceived barriers to the implementation of a multicultural curriculum. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*, 254-264.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 20-32. doi: 10.1177/0022487102053001003
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 28-33.
- Walker-Dalhouse, D., & Dalhouse, A. D. (2006). Investigating white preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *The Negro Educational Review, 57*(1-2), 69-84.
- Wild, P. J., McMahon, C., Darlington, M., Culley, S., & Liu, S. (2010). A diary study of information needs and document usage in the engineering domain. *Design Studies, 31*, 46-73. doi:10.1016/j.destud.2009.06.002
- Wilson, S. M. (2006). Finding a canon and core: Meditation on the preparation of teacher educator-researchers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*, 315-325. doi:10.1177/0022487105285895
- Wise, A. E., & Leibbrand, J. (1996). Professional-based accreditation: A foundation for high-quality teaching. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 78*, 202-206. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable20405749>
- Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. (2005). *Diversity and the Ph.D.: A*

review of efforts to broaden race & ethnicity in U.S. doctoral education.

Princeton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.woodrow.org/images/pdf/resphd/WW Diversity PhD web.pdf>

Wubbels, T. (1992). Taking account of student teachers' preconceptions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8, 137-149. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(92)90004-M

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006

Zeichner, K., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., Valli, L., & Villegas, A. M. (1998). A research informed vision of good practice in multicultural teacher education: Design principles. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 163-171. doi:10.1080/00405849809543800

Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. L. Melnick, & S. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education*, (pp. 176-196). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: a personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 117-124. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.001

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and transformation teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1544-1552. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004

- Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 422-432. doi: 10.1177/0022487110375802
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' characteristics: Research on the demographic profile. In M. Cochran-Smith & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 111-156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zygmunt-Fillwalk, E. M. (2005). Disequilibrium and reconstruction: The urban encounter as catalyst for preservice educators' cultural transformation. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 26, 133-147. doi:10.1080/10901020591001317

BIOGRAPHY

Paula Cristina R. Azevedo received her Bachelor of Arts in History from San José State University. She then attended University of San Francisco where she received a Masters of Art in Asia Pacific Studies and later a Masters of Art in Teaching. She taught history at Notre Dame High School of San José prior to entering George Mason University's doctoral program. After completing her Doctor of Philosophy in Education she plans to continue to work with preservice and inservice teachers.