ECER Porto, September 2014

Professional Learning Of Teacher Educators In A Shifting Landscape

Fer Boei, Jurriën Dengerink, Janneke Geursen, Quinta Kools, Bob Koster, Mieke Lunenberg and Martijn Willemse

nl.**linkedin**.com/pub/mieke-**lunenberg**/17/5b4/302   **www.lunenberg.info**

Registration Certified Teacher Educator (since 2002)

1. The frame of reference (professional standard) and the registration procedure are developed, organised and owned by the Dutch Association of Teacher Educators.

2. Teacher educators compose a portfolio in which they demonstrate that they meet the quality requirements of the professional standard.

3. The procedure encourages teacher educators to reflect on their (further) professional development.

Studies on the 2002- and 2012-Cohorts

2002

25 institution-based teacher educators

First version of the professional standard

Study of the 2002-cohort showed:
-positive outcomes on knowledge and behaviour,
-reluctance to use theoretical input and the absence of deep reflection,
-hardly focused on professional identity, i.e. on attitudes and beliefs.

2012

13 school- and institution-based teacher educators

Third version of the professional standard

Supporting program

FPP-2

Theoretical framework of the supporting program

1. Reference to the professional standard (Greensfeld & Elkad-Lehman, 2007; Murray, 2008; Byrd et al., 2011).

2. Attention for the important roles *of teacher of teachers* and *teacher-researcher (*Lunenberg, Dengerink, & Korthagen, 2014).

3. Learning in a community (Shagrir, 2010; Zellermayer & Margolin, 2005; Hadar & Brody, 2010).

4. 'Inquiry as a stance' (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Carroll, 2005; Davey & Ham 2010).

5. Interaction with practice (Chauvot, 2009; Dinkelman, 2011; Byrd et al.,2011; Greensfeld & Elkad-Lehman, 2007).

Research Questions

1. To what extend did (certain parts of) the programme, according to the participants, contribute to their professional development?

2a. What goals did participating teacher educators formulate for their future professional development?

2b. How do these goals compare to those formulated by the participants of the 2002 cohort?

3a. What kind of professional development activities did the participating teacher educators intend to engage in to achieve their future goals?

3b. How do these activities compare to those mentioned by the participants of the 2002 cohort?

Methods

1. Analysis of each portfolio by two researchers

Research question 1 (2012): Inductive approach (Patton, 2002).

Research question 2 (2002/2012): Categories Professional Standard.

Research question 3 (2002/2012): Categories Model Hoekstra & Bakkenes (2004).

2. Discussion about interpretation issues in the group of seven researchers

3. Overview per research question by two researchers

4. Discussion about interpretation issues in the group of seven researchers

Results: Contribution of the program

Learning outcomes

- Awareness of the professional identity

- Changes in attitude

- Changes in professional behaviour

- Broader theoretical knowledge

- Willingness to read more (academic) literature

- Increase of pedagogical capabilities

- More explicit awareness of the role of teacher educator

Results: Goals professional development

In 2012 more participants formulated more goals than the participants of the 2002-cohort did.

Professional development goals	2002-cohort N=25	2012-cohort N=13
	Percentage of participants that formulated a goal in this category	*Percentage of participants who formulated a goal in this category*
Foundation	40	31
Communication and group dynamics	4	62
Pedagogy of teacher education	44	100
Organization	36	54
Professional development	39	69

Results: Professional Development Activities

In 2012 more participants formulated more professional development activities than the 2002-cohort.

Professional development activities	2002-cohort N=25	2012-cohort N=13
	Percentage of participants who formulated an activity in this category	*Percentage of participants who formulated an activity in this category*
1. Experimenting (intentional)	72	77
2. Reflecting on work experiences	28	46
3. Learning without interaction (Reading)	56	62
4. Learning through interaction	72	100

Conclusions

The pallet of professional development goals and of the professional development activities chosen to achieve these goals has become broader and richer.

Co-operating with peers has supported the choice of goals in the category 'communicating and working together with student teachers and colleagues' and the choice of professional development activities in the category 'learning with interaction'.

Theoretical input connected with practice has supported the choice of goals in the categories 'pedagogy of teacher education' and 'ongoing professional development'. The percentage of participants that planned to reflect more has increased from 25% to 50%.

Half of the participants of the 2012 cohort reported a broadening of their theoretical knowledge as a learning outcome of the programme. The percentage of participants that formulated professional development activities in this category, however, has hardly increased compared with 2002.

Thank you!
mieke@lunenberg.info