

Implementing a Year-Long Internship in Lieu of Traditional Student Teaching

Shalanda Stanley, PhD

University of Louisiana Monroe
700 University Avenue
Monroe, LA 71209, USA

Myra Lovett, Ed.D

University of Louisiana Monroe
700 University Avenue
Monroe, LA 71209, USA

Sherlyn Ezell Powell, Ed.D.

University of Louisiana Monroe
700 University Avenue
Monroe, LA 71209, USA

Abstract

This case study explores the data and relationships among university interns, faculty and partnered mentors to determine the strengths, needs, and feasibility of implementing a year-long internship in lieu of the traditional one semester of student teaching. Participants included in this case study are two interns piloting the program, their mentors, and university faculty.

The findings of the study resulted in the better understanding of the strengths, needs, and feasibility of the year-long internship specifically targeting three areas: relationships among intern, school, faculty, and mentor; coursework; and classroom roles. Strengths related to classroom roles include classroom management and teaching. Other strengths include relationships between interns, mentors, and students. Needs found in classroom roles included assessment and differentiation.

Keywords: Student teaching, Yearlong Internship, Mentoring, Teacher Candidates

Introduction

No one questions the necessity of authentic classroom experiences for pre-service teachers, the culminating experience being their student teaching or internship. Student teaching is where teacher candidates put into practice the knowledge, skills, and art of their profession, while under the safety net of experienced mentors and supervisors. Professional guidelines, standards, regulations, and recommendations are provided by various professional organizations such as Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), American Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), to name a few. While these respected organizations guide teacher preparation programs by providing stringent regulations aligned to teacher candidates' programs of study and clinical and field experiences, to produce competent qualified teachers with regard to what they know and are able to do in the classroom, they stop short of a delivering a standard length of time teacher candidates should demonstrate these attributes before they are expected to practice them independently. In other words, professional organizations have reached no consensus to indicate how long student teaching or internships should be.

According to CAEP, formerly National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), teacher candidates across the United States presently spend from 10 to 15 weeks student teaching (2010). The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) issued a comprehensive report of student teaching experiences called *Student Teaching in the United States*. The report concluded that a minimum of 10 weeks should be dedicated to student teaching with at least 5 of those weeks at the same school on a full time basis (2011). Is this time frame an adequate amount of time to spend student teaching? Over the past few years some institutions of teacher preparation programs made the decision to increase the time spent student teaching to an entire academic school year or 2 semesters, expecting the time increase will produce better prepared teachers thus increasing PK-12 student outcomes (Dorel, Kearney, & Garza, 2016), (Taylor-Webb, 2006) (Spooner, Flowers, Lambert, & Algozzine, 2008).

The NCTQ advised against increasing the timeframe stating that, "...simply doing more of the same, particularly in the area of clinical practice, is not a solution ... Instead, institutions need to substantially improve student teaching within its current structure" (2011). Research is limited on the feasibility of increasing the timeframe of student teaching. Some such research results will be examined.

Spooner, Flowers, Lambert, and Algozzine (2008) examined the perceived benefits of a full academic year of student teaching experience. They reported on 59 one semester student teachers and 60 two semester student teachers. The students in the year-long student teaching experiences reported statistically significant higher scores on relationship with their mentor teacher, knowledge of school policies and procedures, and perceived adequacy of time spent in school than did the students in the single semester internship. Both groups' perceptions of their teaching ability were generally favorable. In contrast to the finding of Spooner et. al. (2008) on the effects of extended field experiences perception of teaching ability which did not differ from single semester student teachers, Dorel, Kearney, and Garza (2016) found there was a relationship between the amount of time spent in field residency and the perception of candidates' teaching ability. They found that teacher candidates who spent an extra semester in student teaching field experiences scored their teaching ability significantly higher than their peers who did not spend the extra semester in the field.

Ronfeldt and Reininger (2012) surveyed 1057 student teachers to determine if lengthening student teaching improves teacher candidates' perceptions of instructional preparedness, perceptions of their teaching ability, and career plans. The quality of student teaching experiences was also examined. The data suggested that the quality of the student teaching experiences had more impact on student teacher outcomes than did lengthening the timeframe of student teaching.

As indicated from the review of the above articles the jury is still out on the feasibility of lengthening the student teaching experiences. The NCTQ report (2011) and as well as the study conducted by Ronfeldt and Reininger (2012) recommended against lengthening the timeframe for student teaching. Instead they expressed that the focus of teacher preparation programs should shift to the quality of the program or the experiences in which teacher candidates are involved. Other research results reported favorable results with lengthening the student teacher experiences (Dorel et. al. 2016; Spooner et. al. 2008). The researchers in the present study report findings on both lengthening the student teacher timeframe from one semester to two semesters as well as changing the quality of the program or experiences of teacher candidates. A major program change was the implementation of co-teaching between mentor and intern during the first semester of the program, as recommended in findings of promising practices by The Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning (2010).

In July 2014, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) surveyed teachers statewide regarding their student teaching experiences and preparation for the classroom. The results of that survey indicated that teachers felt they needed more time in the classroom prior to employment. Subsequently, a directive was sent from the LDOE in conjunction with the Louisiana Believe and Prepare Grant, tasking school districts across the state with the initiative to pilot a year-long internship in lieu of the traditional one-semester student-teaching placement. This led the University of Louisiana Monroe to partner with area school districts to pilot a year-long internship model with elementary education candidates. The resulting study detailed that effort assessing the strengths, needs, and feasibility of that endeavor.

In order to transition from a one-semester to a two-semester placement during the senior year, mentoring, supervising, and university coursework were examined and adapted. This study served to explore the effectiveness of a year-long internship in terms of strengths, needs, and feasibility before making programmatic changes including redesign, realignment, and rotation of coursework.

As the interns begin their senior year, they still have a full semester's coursework remaining in addition to the traditional student teaching semester. This includes professional courses in teacher education as well as some coursework outside of the School of Education. This becomes problematic as maximum time spent in the classroom pursuant to year-long internship is juxtaposed with campus-based coursework requirements.

Materials and Methods

This case study research method investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its actual context, with multiple sources of evidence used to clearly understand both phenomenon and context. This form of study brings about the understanding of a complex issue through focus on detailed, contextual analysis of a limited number of conditions and their relationships (Yin, 1984). As such, case study is recognized as a prominent means of researching issues in education (Gulsecen & Kubat, 2006). As a case study method allows researchers to go beyond the quantitative and provide a holistic and in-depth exploration of a social phenomenon, this exploratory study serves to prepare a framework for further study (Tellis, 1997).

The purpose of this case study was to explore the data and relationships among interns, faculty and partnered mentors to determine the strengths, needs, and feasibility of implementing a year-long internship in lieu of the traditional one-semester student teaching placement. Questions inherent to this study include the following:

1. What are the strengths of the current year-long model?
2. What are the needs of the current year-long model?
3. What are the strengths in terms of relationships for the interns?
4. What are the needs in terms of relationships for the interns?
5. Is the year-long model feasible as a school-wide endeavor?

With this focus in mind, two interns in the year-long internship pilot were selected as cases for this exploratory endeavor. These two interns were placed in different districts and in different grade levels, so the phenomena of year-long internship could be studied in two cases. Each case's conclusions were then used as data that contributed to the whole study. In this way each case represented a different setting and contributed to the overall study's findings.

The year-long internship pilot was implemented with selected students entering their final year of their teacher preparation program. In preparation for the year-long internship, both potential mentors and selected interns participated in training sessions. As this year-long internship model seeks to deepen, not just lengthen field experience, several components were included in these trainings that are not typical to the standard student teaching model. Mentors participated in extensive evaluation and conferencing sessions, co-teaching training, and an inclusive classroom management strategies course. Interns attended joint sessions with selected mentors specifically for relationship building and co-teaching strategies sessions.

Participants

As a means of maintaining anonymity of all participants, pseudonyms were randomly assigned using a pseudonym generator. Participants named and described below include interns, mentors, faculty, and a liaison.

Lucy is an intern in a fourth grade language arts class at a small K-5 elementary school in an urban setting 10 miles from the university.

Rachel is Lucy's classroom teacher in a Title I urban school and has taught elementary for ten years. She has hosted several student teachers in the past and has served as a host classroom for a reading methods course field placements. She attended 2 mentor-training sessions in preparation for hosting Lucy as an intern.

Oscar is an intern in a first grade class in a small town 30 miles from the university.

Ruby is Oscar's classroom mentor. She is a ten-year teaching veteran for first grade in Title I rural K-3 elementary campus. Ruby attended all 4 mentor-training sessions in preparation for hosting Oscar as an intern.

Alice is one of the faculty members that teaches coursework during the first semester of the internship. Her roles in the internship included accommodating and modifying coursework to better fit the internship placement scenario, observe the interns in their placement, and working with mentors to ensure coursework and internship is understood and well-merged.

Taylor is a faculty member that does not teach coursework for internship. Her role as liaison is to serve as a point of contact for the interns and facilitate communication among faculty, mentors, and interns as needed during the pilot internship.

Faith is a faculty member who served as the university supervisor for both Lucy and Oscar during their second semester of the internship. Her responsibilities included conferencing with the interns throughout the semester to ensure their progression with interning and given assignments. Additionally, Faith conducts formal and informal observations throughout the semester to give feedback to the student regarding readiness as a teacher candidate. Finally, Faith serves as a university presence and means of support in the K-12 environment for the mentor as well as the intern.

Data Collection

The data sources included field notes from site visits, notes from roundtable discussions with faculty and mentors, interviews with interns and mentors, observation and evaluation documents, and course work. These were collected during the spring and fall semesters of year 1 in the pilot internship program.

Year 1 of the internship began in January and ended in December of the same calendar year, resulting in a spring/fall internship. During the spring semester interns, mentors, and faculty involved with the pilot internship program were contacted via email and invited to participate in a case study through interviews, roundtable discussions, and observations. Consent forms were collected with permission to record interviews included. These recordings were then saved in password-protected audio files accessible only by the researchers.

Faculty and mentors observed and evaluated the interns throughout both semesters. A liaison from the university observed as well, and served as a contact for both the mentor and intern during internship. Field notes from these observations and interactions were collected. A roundtable discussion was held each semester with faculty and mentors involved in the given semester. The questions asked at the roundtable discussions were open-ended and sought to identify strengths, needs, and feasibility of the internship for that semester. The data collected at these sessions were then used to frame semi-structured interview protocols for the interns and mentors. These interviews were typically 45 minutes in length and were held after midterm of the second internship semester. The interview questions related to six areas, the interns' backgrounds, the climate and school relationship, the mentor and intern relationship, other professional relationships within the school and university, the interns' coursework and university responsibilities, and classroom roles. The classroom roles focused on teaching, classroom management, lesson planning, assessment and differentiation.

In addition, faculty and mentor evaluations of intern observations were collected. All of the electronic data including coursework grades and observation rubrics were saved on a password-protected cloud server accessible only to the researchers. Field notes and observation data that were not electronic were collected and kept in locked file cabinets in the researchers' offices.

Data Analysis

Using multiple sources and techniques in the data-gathering process, the study relied on both quantitative and qualitative evidence to triangulate data. Interviews with interns and mentors, roundtable discussion with faculty and field notes from observations and visits served as qualitative sources of data. Course work and classroom observations with rubric-based evaluations were utilized as quantitative data.

Once all data were gathered, interview recordings were transcribed and saved to a password-protected cloud-based server. The researchers conducted initial readings to explore the data holistically. This was followed by scrutinizing data through the lens of each research question. As each data point communicated a different perspective (i.e. intern, mentor, faculty), data were then disaggregated by category or type of resource: roundtable, interview, field notes, coursework, and observations. Data were then used to map major concepts based on the framework and research questions, specifically to the a priori concepts of strengths, needs, and feasibility.

Themes were identified that linked to the purpose of the study and research questions. Once identified, the themes were analyzed from each of the following perspectives: case-specific (Intern Lucy and Intern Oscar), disciplinary-specific (teacher education preparatory program), and cross-case comparison.

As a means of addressing concerns of rigor in a two-subject case study, both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered from several sources so that triangulation could be implemented to reach findings (Creswell, 2008). Generalization, which is often suspect in case study, was focused on context-specific stands with the use of standard one-semester student teaching used as a source of comparison or “control” for this context (Yin, 1984; Stake, 1978). Furthermore, means of addressing questions of reliability and validity were found in maintaining consistent and stable research processes over time and across researchers and in ensuring credibility of the findings through member checks (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Miles & Huberman 1994).

Results and Discussion

The data was analyzed to ascertain the strengths, needs, and feasibility of a year-long internship in lieu of the traditional student teaching semester. The findings are reported accordingly.

Strengths

During the intern interview, Lucy noted, in regards to classroom roles that she felt her strengths were classroom management, an often-common area of noted weakness cited among student teachers (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015). She reported, “Every time that I have been observed the past two semesters, they’ve said that I have good classroom management...” Her mentor, Rachel, shared this sentiment, stating, “She’s probably one of the best classroom management people I’ve had come out in a while.”

Lucy’s strength in classroom management was also noted in her formal observations. The observation instruments are divided among three domains: planning, classroom management and instruction. During her formal observations, Lucy scored in the target area of performance for classroom management, with strengths noted in her ability to establish and facilitate routines and transitions that maintain student engagement.

In Oscar’s interview, he also noted that he felt his classroom management skills were strong and his mentor, Ruby, agreed, stating, “He does a really good job with it.” Oscar’s university supervisor, Faith, noted in her formal observations that Oscar scored in the highly effective range for classroom management, specifically his abilities regarding smooth transitions, establishing clear standards of student conduct, and his consistency with responses to students’ misbehavior. In a roundtable discussion, Faith stated that both interns were “kicked into teacher mode,” at the beginning of the second semester when the traditional student teaching semester would begin. She furthered that sentiment by saying that in regards to classroom management, the interns are, “better in their skin,” as compared to the student teachers that she supervises.

Another strength noted in terms of classroom roles was teaching. Lucy stated that what made the year-long internship most attractive to her was the prolonged experience in the field and that after spending two semesters in the same classroom, she feels very comfortable teaching. She stated, “I definitely believe that becoming more comfortable with something comes through experience and time.” The year-long internship afforded her that time and experience. Her mentor, Rachel, agreed that Lucy’s teaching is a strength of the pilot program. Rachel has supervised traditional student teachers in the past and noted that Lucy showed more confidence at the beginning of the second semester of the program than her student teachers did, citing specifically Lucy’s ability to use multiple strategies when teaching and her withitness. Lucy’s observation scores and notes support her strength regarding instruction, specifically in her ability to encourage students in providing specific and high-quality feedback to one another.

Faith, the university supervisor, also stated a strength of the program is the interns’ teaching. She stated that she was “super impressed” with Oscar when she first observed him, stating that in comparison with her student teachers, Oscar was “very good” and specifically stated that he out performed her student teachers in regards to his interactions with students while he was teaching. Oscar’s mentor, Ruby, also stated in her interview that, “He takes full advantage of teachable moments. He keeps his students engaged. I mean he does a really good job...He’s very confident.”

An additional strength that was found, unrelated to classroom roles, was the relationships formed during the prolonged field placement, specifically the relationships between the mentor and intern, the intern and other teachers on campus, the intern and the students, and the interns’ relationship with each other.

When Oscar described his relationship with his mentor, Ruby, he said, “We have a great relationship. We communicate constantly. If we’re in school, we’re talking all the time about what we can do better, what we need to change. Even at home...if I have a question, or if she has a question, we will text each other.”

Ruby shared similar sentiments, remarking that she and Oscar “work very well together.” She commented that she has seen tremendous growth in Oscar from one semester to the next, stating that when Oscar teaches, “I just step back and watch it happen. I’m just in awe of how well he does, and I just respect him more and more each day.”

Lucy and Rachel also commented that they had a very close, positive relationship and that they communicated openly and freely. Lucy cited this communication as a vital role in her success and comfort level in the classroom.

Oscar and Lucy both noted that the other teachers on campus were very encouraging and offered them guidance on planning and instruction. In regards to the administrators at the elementary schools, both interns stated that they were treated with the same respect shown to the teachers. To add to that sentiment, during a roundtable discussion, the university liaison, Taylor, shared comments from the principal at Oscar’s school regarding her opinion of Oscar’s role in the school, stating, “He feels like a teacher to us, not a teacher in training. He takes on responsibilities as if he is a seasoned teacher.”

The relationships among interns and students were also noted as a strength of the year-long internship. Lucy described her experiences with students, stating that during her first semester of the pilot program, the students were very accepting of her and treated her with respect, but that that respect grew even more regarding the new students in the fall semester. Due to the fact that she was with them from the beginning of the school year, they immediately treated her as an equal to the classroom teacher. She said, “I think they look at me more as an authority figure and not just somebody that’s just there.” Oscar shared similar views, “They’re very responsive to me.” In addition, Ruby, Oscar’s mentor, shared an interesting perspective regarding her students and their parents’ feelings concerning Oscar. She stated that the parents of her students were excited and eager to have Oscar in their child’s class, because “they get two teachers.”

Both interns stated that the relationship they developed with each other had a huge impact on their success in the program. The interns took twelve university hours while in the field placement and were required to balance both coursework and field work simultaneously. Lucy stated that she and Oscar developed a close relationship and leaned on each other heavily. If they had questions regarding university coursework, they communicated with each other. “We would ask each other. We would talk to each other at least 3 times a week. ‘What are you doing for this? Do you understand this? Do you get this?’ So it was a really big help...”

Oscar supported this opinion of his relationship with Lucy. “We’re talking all the time,” he said. “We kind of didn’t really know what to do a good bit of the time. So we were constantly in contact with each other... trying to get what we’re going to do and not do.

It helped a lot. It was very helpful. Just having someone there with me and to go through it with me, instead of just being by myself.”

Needs

The needs and/or areas of weakness of the year-long internship in regards to the interns’ classroom roles were in the areas of assessment and differentiation. Oscar shared that out of all of the classroom roles discussed, he was weaker in assessment, stating that in the first semester of the program he had not had a lot of opportunities to design formal assessment. This changed during the second semester, citing his teacher work sample as evidence. Lucy had similar thoughts and feelings concerning classroom roles, saying that she had no experience interpreting assessment. They both, however, stated that they had been given ample opportunity to develop informal assessments in terms of questioning students. While Oscar stated that he felt more comfortable with informal questioning, Lucy reported this area was still an area of need for her. “I feel like I am still working on that as I’m building off of their discussion in the classroom...you know, I mean you can’t really just have them discuss something and then be like, ‘Okay let’s move on.’ I’m trying to find more opportunities to think more quickly on my feet...and get more higher order thinking questions in when they are just discussing.”

In regards to differentiation, Lucy stated that she was comfortable with administering documented accommodations and modifications for those students receiving special services as stated on their IEPs and 504 plans; however, she was initially unsure of how she differentiated during her planning and instruction.

Her mentor stated that Lucy needed more scaffolding regarding differentiation, as she tended to think of differentiation in terms of official accommodations only. Upon further reflection, Lucy explained that she did differentiate during her planning, remarking that in the English Language Arts classes she administered different reading passages to different students based on their reading levels.

Oscar stated in the interview that he felt he was comfortable with differentiation; however, his university supervisor, Alice, noted on an observation that, “all students were treated the same.” It is important to note that this comment was made during the first semester of the pilot program and that Oscar showed great improvement when observed during the second semester by Faith, scoring in the highly effective range. She noted that in his lesson the learning outcomes reflected several different types of learning and took into account the varying needs of the students.

As mentioned earlier, in addition to their duties and responsibilities at their elementary school placement, the interns were enrolled in twelve university hours, a lower and upper mathematics methods course, as well as a science and social studies methods course. These courses were delivered in a hybrid method, with the interns receiving the majority of instruction online and coming to class for face-to-face meetings with instructors twice per month.

It is the opinion of Alice, the math and science methods instructor, that this type of instruction was not equitable to the instruction received by those candidates who did not participate in the pilot program. Those candidates received the twelve hours in a typical face-to-face setting. This course load and type of instruction fed into an area of determined need of the pilot program. Alice evidenced her opinion on the interns’ scores on their math methods final exam, stating, “Lucy made the lowest grade on the final examination in my math methodology class. Oscar was near the lowest grade also.” She went on to say, “I truly believe the grades reflect the lack of equitable exposure to mathematical concepts and strategies.” She noted that the interns “missed vital concepts. Although the material was covered in the online version of the course, this didn’t fill, nor could it, the gap in their knowledge. This is of great concern to me.”

In addition, Lucy’s exposure to multiple subjects within the field placement was also an area of noted concern as she was placed in a fourth grade English Language Arts class and therefore did not have the opportunity to observe, plan, and/or teach in a math and science classroom. This was not an issue with Oscar as he was placed in a self-contained first grade classroom and was afforded classroom experience across all contents. These findings were discussed in the roundtable discussion held at the end of the first semester of the pilot program and it was thusly decided that Lucy would spend part of the second semester of the program in a math and science classroom in order to remediate the noted weaknesses in those content areas.

The coursework required of the interns caused concerns in other areas as well, specifically in terms of the relationship between the faculty responsible for delivering instruction for those courses, Alice and Emily, and the interns and mentors. Although the relationships formed during the pilot program were mentioned as an earlier strength of the internship, the rapport between those faculty, mentors, and interns were an area of weakness of the program. In their interviews, both interns shared that they often felt overwhelmed balancing their university responsibilities and their responsibilities as they pertained to the intern’s placement and that they were often unsure of what was required of them. Lucy felt that too many of their coursework activities were not related to what they were doing in the classroom. Lucy said, “It amounted to too much extra work.” They felt that the courses were not adapted to fit the needs of the year-long internship and that the communication between faculty and interns/mentors was not what it should have been. Rachel, Lucy’s mentor, stated that there was little guidance from faculty in regards to course expectations and that she felt unprepared to assist Lucy in those matters. She also stated that she did not see the correlation between university assignments and her classroom curriculum. Rachel felt that the courses had not been adequately shaped to the expectations of the responsibilities of the year-long internship.

According to Alice and Emily, they did not have adequate time to make changes to the courses to better fit the needs of the interns before the implementation of the year-long internship. Alice stated, “There was lack of adequate communication in the preparation for the pilot program. The time frame to implement the pilot was less than enough to allow for the team planning that should happen for such an undertaking. I had no input on the way this program was done and it was difficult for me to have a clear understanding of the expectations for myself and the students.”

Feasibility

It was important to ascertain the practicality of such an endeavor as the year-long internship in order to determine its feasibility and make the changes necessary for the improvements of the program. As such, the discovered strengths and needs of the program speak to its feasibility. In the areas of increased confidence in classroom roles relating to teaching and classroom management, the program proved feasible. The strong relationships formed among interns, mentors and their students were also achievable and those relationships served to the betterment of all involved parties.

In terms of university coursework and expectations, targeted changes must be made in order to address the identified needs of the program and establish a more feasible outcome. Suggestions for improvement include allowing university faculty adequate time to adapt courses taught during the internship year and modify course assignments to better meet the demands of the classroom. In addition, improved forms of communication must take place among mentors, interns and faculty.

In addition, to improve feasibility, a redesign of the education program is necessary in order to better meet the needs of the interns during the internship year. This will include rearranging courses so that science, social studies and math methods courses are taught before the internship year begins. One idea, mentioned by both interns and mentors, for improvement in regards to rearranging the course load is to move the special education methods courses and classroom management, previously taken during the interns' junior year, to the internship year, as these courses would marry well with prolonged field placement. When asked if there were any courses that would have better matched the interns' schedule and demands in regards to the year-long internship, Oscar stated that he felt his special education courses would have served him better during the internship year, saying, "...if I'm getting all the SPED specific information about all the different disabilities...I think it would have helped better...knowing how to do specific things with student's because we have like dyslexic students, ADHD and stuff like that (in the classroom). I feel like I would have been better prepared to help them and know what to do with the student."

Rachel, Lucy's mentor also shared the notion that the interns would benefit more if the special education methods courses were taught during the internship year. She stated, "I think that would be beneficial for them to have those classes while they're in the classroom...where they can say, 'Oh okay I can see how that would apply to what I'm doing now. I have these special education students...I could do this.' And they could probably bring some ideas to the classroom teacher doing it that way." In this way, having both special education methods courses delivered during the internship would help address the interns' areas of need in their classroom roles regarding differentiation and assessment.

Conclusion

The findings of the study resulted in the better understanding of the strengths, needs, and feasibility of the year-long internship. The areas of mentoring, redesign, realignment, and rotation of coursework need to be addressed to better fit the demands of the program. The researchers are currently having data-driven conversations with faculty and PK-16 stakeholders to begin the redesign process.

Moving to a yearlong student teaching placement is a mandate issued by the Louisiana Department of Education. In the likelihood that more education program providers move in this direction, this research will provide a basis for further study and help address the question of the importance of more time in the field versus university campus experiences.

References

- Christofferson, M. & Sullivan, A. L. (2015). Preservice teachers' classroom management training: A survey of self-reported training experiences, content coverage, and preparedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52 (3), 248-264. doi: 10.1002/pits.21819
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Dorel, G., Kearney, W., & Garza, E. (2016, Winter). Ready from day one? The relationship between length of pre-service teacher field residency and teacher efficacy. *Critical Questions in Education*, 7(1), 38-52. doi:10.1155/2015/202753
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective Evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gulsecen, S. and Kubat, A., (2006). Teaching ICT to teacher candidates using PBL: A qualitative and quantitative evaluation. *Educational Technology & Society*, 9 (2), 96-106.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3D&tabid=7>

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2011, July). *Student teaching in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Student-Teaching-United-States-NTCQ-Report>.

Ronfeldt, M., & Reininger, M. (2012). More or better student teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1091-1106.

Spooner, M., Flowers, C., Lambert, R., & Algozzine, B. (2008) Is more really better? Examining perceived benefits of an extended student teaching experience. *The Clearing House*, 81(6), 263-270. doi:10.3200/tchs.81.6

Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 7(2), 5-8.

Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to Case Study. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/tellis1.html>.

Yin, R.K., (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix 1

Interview Protocol: Intern	Interview Protocol: Mentor
<p>I. Background</p> <p>a. Tell us your specific internship background. How long you have been in your placement? What grade level/content area are you in?</p> <p>II. Climate/School Relationship:</p> <p>a. Describe the climate at your school.</p> <p>b. How do you feel when you are in the school, with the students, among the faculty, with administrators?</p> <p>c. How has this changed since you began the internship?</p> <p>III. Mentor/Intern Relationship</p> <p>a. Describe your relationship with your mentor.</p> <p>b. How has it changed since you began the internship?</p> <p>IV. Other Professional Relationships</p> <p>a. Describe your relationship with your students.</p> <p>b. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>c. Describe your relationship with parents.</p>	<p>I. Background</p> <p>a. Tell us your specific mentoring background. Have you mentored teacher candidates previously? To what extent? What grade level/content area are you in?</p> <p>II. Climate/School Relationship:</p> <p>a. Describe the climate at your school.</p> <p>b. How do you feel regarding your relationships in the school, with the students, among the faculty, with administrators?</p> <p>c. How has this changed since you began mentoring?</p> <p>III. Mentor/Intern Relationship</p> <p>a. Describe your relationship with your intern.</p> <p>b. How has it changed over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>IV. Other Professional Relationships</p> <p>a. Describe your relationship with your students.</p> <p>b. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p>

<p>d. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>e. Describe your relationship with other teachers/administrators.</p> <p>f. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>g. Describe your relationship with other interns.</p> <p>h. How has this affected your experience?</p> <p>V. Coursework/University Responsibilities</p> <p>a. Describe your university responsibilities for your first semester? Your second (if applicable)?</p> <p>b. Explain the strategies you employed to balance responsibilities at both campuses?</p> <p>c. Looking back on your courseload throughout your undergraduate experience, were there any courses that would have better matched your schedule and demands of the internship?</p> <p>d. If you knew earlier in your university program that you would be doing a year-long internship, what would you change?</p> <p>e. Describe your interactions with faculty both inside and outside the School of Education.</p> <p>f. What suggestions for faculty would you give?</p> <p>VI. Classroom Roles: For each category describe your experience during internship and your comfort level across the semester(s) with each.</p> <p>a. Teaching</p> <p>b. Classroom Management</p> <p>c. Lesson Planning</p> <p>d. Assessment</p> <p>e. Differentiation</p>	<p>c. Describe your relationship with parents.</p> <p>d. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>e. Describe your relationship with other teachers/administrators.</p> <p>f. How has it evolved over the course of the semester(s)?</p> <p>g. Describe your relationship with other mentors.</p> <p>h. How has this affected your experience?</p> <p>V. Coursework/University Responsibilities</p> <p>a. Describe your understanding of your intern's university responsibilities for the first semester? the second (if applicable)?</p> <p>b. Explain the strategies you suggested/employed to help your intern balance responsibilities at both campuses?</p> <p>c. Describe your interactions with university faculty.</p> <p>d. What suggestions for faculty would you give?</p> <p>VI. Classroom Roles: For each category describe your experience during internship semester, your methods for instructing your intern, and the level of confidence you have in your intern regarding each of these.</p> <p>a. Teaching</p> <p>b. Classroom Management</p> <p>c. Lesson Planning</p> <p>d. Assessment</p> <p>e. Differentiation</p>
---	--