Exploring Implicit Bias to Evaluate Teacher Candidates' Ethical Practice in the Internship

Jamie Silverman
Towson University, jsilverman@towson.edu

Jessica Shiller
Towson University, jshiller@towson.edu

Exploring Implicit Bias to Evaluate Teacher Candidates' Ethical Practice in the Internship

Abstract: *To create an equitable and ethical learning environment in the classroom requires teacher candidates (TCs) to develop positive relationships with students and to reflect on who they are. Using the elements of Richard Milner's (2007) Framework of Researcher Racial and Cultural Positionality, this article presents an account of an innovative practice in how to engage secondary education TCs in a reflection of implicit biases, and how to interrupt them to become more ethical professionals. This article takes InTASC 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice as a point of departure and describes how a new teacher mentor piloted a series of exercises for majority white TCs to embark on self-reflection in their internship experiences in the secondary education classroom. In particular, they examined their cultural identities and how they may have developed into implicit biases that influenced their classroom management, planning, and instruction during their full-time internships. The impact of this reflective process moved beyond the self-reflection of TCs' ethical practices and shifted to an outward look at mentor and school-wide ethical practice. An overview of the pilot to address ethical practice is provided.*

Introduction

Public schools are becoming increasingly racially and ethnically diverse, while the teaching force remains predominantly white. According to The State of Diversity in the Educator Workforce, prepared by the United States Department of Education (2016), "while students of color are expected to make up 56 percent of the student population by 2024, the elementary and secondary educator workforce is still overwhelmingly white" (p.1). In addition, "the most recent U.S. Department of Education Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), a nationally representative survey of teachers and principals, showed that 82 percent of public school teachers identified as white" (USDE, 2016, p.1).

Given this cultural divide, it is imperative that future teachers examine who they are in relationship to their students. There is certainly discussion of the need to do this kind of reflection in teacher education (Sleeter, 2016; Milner, Pearman, & McGee, 2013) but not as many accounts of how to do it. To that end, this article details an innovative practice for leveraging the standards of teaching (in this case, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)) to pilot assignments designed to encourage teacher candidates (TCs) to reflect on their cultural identities and implicit biases, and to connect that reflection directly to their teaching practice to create more equitable and ethical learning

opportunities for the students of their current and future classrooms. The co-authors argue that, during this period, there is an opportunity for TCs to engage in focused reflection on their cultural identity and observe implicit bias in their instruction. During the internship year, teacher preparation programs can incorporate these practices more authentically into their programs. Some are doing this, and some are moving beyond just exploring the topic of implicit bias and taking action to mitigate these implicit biases via observations of TCs and teachers.

Grounded in the idea that relationships and the resulting classroom community constitute the cornerstone of any successful classroom (Duncan-Andrade, 2011; Noddings, 1992; Noguera, 2003), this article takes its inspiration from the need for TCs to critically reflect as a building block to creating that kind of community. Teachers need to reflect on who they are, the decisions they make for the students in the classroom, their relationships with others (students, parents, administration, mentors), and how the racial and ethnic differences between themselves and these individuals impact these relationships and in turn the school community to develop positive relationships that any healthy classroom requires. Fortunately, this kind of reflection is required in standards for new teachers. InTASC 9 expects that the teacher:

> Engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, p. 42).

Going beyond simple reflection on pedagogy, this standard opens the possibility for teacher educators to initiate conversations about cultural identity and implicit bias in teaching. Using the phrase "adapting practice to meet the needs of each learner" is especially important to justify the need for teachers to change what they do. While this can be interpreted in a variety of ways, the general nature of this phrasing provides an opportunity for teacher educators to introduce teaching candidates to a kind of reflection on practice that focuses in on cultural identity and implicit bias. Drawing upon the literature on the need for reflective practice as well as the literature on the ethical and moral dimensions of teaching, this article argues that, in order to meet teaching standards like the ones presented in InTASC 9, teaching candidates need to engage in critical reflection and develop a moral and ethical stance, particularly around cultural identity and implicit bias.

As Milner (2007) advises, this requires working through that which is not immediately visible:

> Researchers need to work through seen, unseen, and unforeseen dangers in the practice of their inquiry: researching the self, researching the self in relation to others, engaged reflection and representation, and shifting from self to system. It is important to note that the qualities and features of the framework are not linear; they are interrelated (394–5).

Milner conveys the need for reflection on the part of researchers, but we believe this framework is equally applicable to the work of teachers as well. Teacher candidates and teachers need to reflect on their cultural identities and become aware of potential implicit biases that can directly impact their students by participating in a process that can guide them through seen, unseen, and unforeseen dangers in their planning, instruction, and classroom management.

Moreover, our argument is also that teachers have an ethical responsibility. As Joseph (2016) argues, teachers must cultivate ethical knowledge and understand the layered nuances of classroom and school life (p. 41). The goal of this ethical engagement is to "encourage new teachers to contemplate the ways in which schooling and one's own teaching contribute or fail to contribute to a just and humane society" (p. 42).

Unfortunately, TCs and teachers do not do this often on their own. Consequently, the co-authors propose an innovative practice that fosters such reflection. This work emerged amidst our own college goal of becoming more responsive to K–12 students' needs. To that end, the college developed a professional development program for faculty that provided faculty time and resources to explore issues of equity in their own practice. The co-authors—one who oversees direct instruction of TCs, acting as their Professional Development School (PDS) Liaison and participated in the program, and one who teaches educational leadership and conceived this program worked together over the course of the year to develop this pilot. What follows, describes our initial efforts to enact a reflective practice for TCs. The hope is that this innovative practice can enable TCs to become aware of their own implicit biases and how those biases connect to ethical practice in teaching in the secondary classroom.

Review of the Literature

We draw on several literatures to situate our examination of our teacher education practice. In doing so, we note that there is a strong research base for the need for reflective practice, ethical teaching, and awareness of implicit biases. We bring these literatures together to inform our approach to improving the practice of teachers.

Reflective Practice

While the notion of reflective practice goes back to John Dewey, Don Schon's *Reflective Practitioner* (1987) was a fundamental text in explaining the need for and the process of reflection. Drawing upon the need to link theory and practice, Schon suggests that the way that practitioners learn and improve is by stepping back from their practice to recall what happened and to make meaning of it for the next time. Brookfield (1998) and others took Schon's ideas to develop a series of models on reflective practice that have come to permeate teacher education. While most programs in teacher education emphasize the need for reflective practice, research has shown, however, that teacher educators are not always explicit about how to do it; this has resulted in inconclusive research on the impact of reflective practice (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Dyment & O'Connell, 2014).

Ethics in Teaching

Also drawing from a Deweyan tradition, Maxine Greene (1978) wrestles with the idea of education as becoming, or transforming. The goal of education, she argues, ought to be to make deep meaning out of learning. This approach transfers to the ethical realm, as Greene asks us to consider the self in relationship to the other. In a similar way that Milner (2007) urges practitioners to reflect on the self in relationship to systems, Greene expresses the need to become aware, to keep the imagination awakened in order to dream of other possibilities that are more ethical and just than may currently exist. This requires a deep noticing of others and ourselves, so that we may not become numb to the realities of injustice.

Greene inspired many others to grapple with the ethical dimensions of teaching and learning. As Campbell has noted, educators are aware of "their moral agent state of being" (Campbell, 2008, p. 603). They understand the "significance of one's choices and how those choices influence the development and well-being of others" (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 120). Joseph (2016) further writes about the need for the ethical and moral development of teachers. Drawing from Clarke's (2009) notion of teacher identity development, she explains that the work of teaching is about constructing "moral identities," requiring critical reflection in order to continually develop those identities (Joseph, 2016). She urges teacher education to be more explicit in responding to the need to develop the ethical and moral capacities of new teachers (Joseph, 2016).

Awareness of Implicit Bias

Zeichner has long argued that teacher education should address the needs of diverse learners and urges teacher education to go beyond preparing "good enough" teachers for the "necessary components to prepare teachers to

successfully begin teaching the diverse learners who are in the public schools," (Zeichner, 2006, p. 333). He recommends that university teacher educators take their work more seriously and connect to community to prepare teachers to be culturally responsive.

Scholars of culturally responsive teaching (Ladson-Billings,1995; Gay, 2000; Jordan-Irvine, 2003) have always underscored the need for teachers to adapt their pedagogical practices to the students that they teach. Recognizing that there is a major cultural divide between teachers and students in public education, with a majority-white teaching force, this literature emerged around the need to improve teaching for a diverse group of students. A subset of this work has called on teacher educators to teach teaching candidates to critically reflect on their cultural identities and privilege, and their role in disrupting oppressive practices in the classroom that can result (Zeichner & Melnick, 1996; Milner et al., 2013; Sleeter, 2016). Engaging in this kind of reflection can reveal implicit biases and help teachers approach their students in the classroom in a more responsive way.

Sleeter (2016) has contextualized the problem of implicit bias. She argues that, given that most colleges and universities of education have predominantly white faculty and students, whiteness goes easily unchallenged. One way this occurs is using the notion of color blindness—the idea that race, ethnicity, and culture are irrelevant—as an approach to diversity. This often manifests in race-neutral language of tolerance, a concept used in many required diversity courses. While the idea of tolerance and celebration of diversity are seemingly benign, they can actually serve to maintain white dominance in teaching and teacher education. They can obfuscate issues of systemic oppression and historical inequity and the experience of marginalized groups of people as they are sidelined in courses offered in teacher education programs. As Gorski (2009) has shown, diversity courses in colleges of education, for example, do little to confront systemic inequity, and communicate the idea that notions of tolerance will be enough to help future teachers connect with their students. That, supported by the assertions by Milner et al. (2013) that the faculty in teacher education is majority white and the curriculum used is white-dominated, points to the fact that teacher education does very little to prepare teachers for dealing with cultural difference.

Confronting these structural barriers to improve teaching education is a long process, but Sleeter (2016) suggests that we look to Milner's 2007 framework for researchers, which calls for a very specific reflection on racial and cultural identity to critically reflect and surface implicit biases. Milner has teachers in mind as his audience when he urges the need for cultural responsiveness, (Milner, 2010, 2015). While his 2007 framework was originally directed at researchers, his work has mostly been in teacher education and can therefore be easily transferred into that context, He lays out four practices to

provide a guidepost for teacher educators to prepare teaching candidates to be more culturally responsive to their students: (a) reflection on one's racial and cultural background and identity, (b) learning about the racial and cultural background of students and how one's own beliefs may conflict, (c) engaged reflection community on race and culture, and (d) learning about how race structures community and how to eliminate racial barriers (Milner, 2007).

We apply these practices as a teaching innovation, starting with ourselves, and moving to our practice with teaching candidates. It is our hope that this practice will ignite a critical practice among our teaching candidates that will set them on a course for meeting the needs of their future public school students. What follows is a description of that application of practice, anchored by all four of Milner's elements.

Context: Reflection on our own Identities

As co-authors, we realize that we may be contributing to the problems of maintaining inequity in the development of new teachers. As white teacher educators, we needed to reflect on who we are and make that process of reflection explicit to students. To that end, we present, up front, our reflections on our own identities, which we share with our students, too. The PDS Liaison to TCs (one of the co-authors) explains:

> I am a white, Jewish female that grew up in an affluent community. Not until I began teaching in a predominantly Christian school did I feel for the first time that I was indeed a minority. Though I knew my community with such a concentrated population of Jewish people was rare, I did not fully understand it until this moment, as a teacher. Until students questioned, "Really? You're Jewish?" (Emphasis and eye squint when the word *Jewish* was said.)

This moment was one the PDS Liaison celebrated. She took time to share her cultural identity with students who had never met a Jewish person previously. She allowed students to ask her questions and, in turn, she asked about their families and their cultural experiences. She realized that she had assumed everyone knew more about Judaism than they actually did, and that this assumption required a moment of reflection and shift in communication in her classroom.

The faculty who teaches education leadership, the other co-author, is also Jewish but grew up in a community in which she was in the minority. Although there was a Jewish community in which she was a part and felt proud of, she was always conscious of being in the minority. Growing up, she encountered several

incidents of anti-Semitism, and she subsequently developed a deep empathy with students who felt marginalized in schools and society.

We both acknowledge Brodkin's (1998) work around the ways in which Jews became identified as white in the United States, and how we also identify and are perceived as white within our own contexts. Still, we carry with us a deep feeling that we do not quite belong in the dominant culture. Because this part of our identity is invisible, we share it explicitly with our students, prompting them, we hope, to do the same.

Context: The Internship

The PDS Liaison in the Department of Secondary and Middle School Education at the University is responsible for guiding, observing, and instructing the TC's during their internship year. In the secondary education program, these TCs will be certified to teach grades 7–12 through their part-time and full-time internship year. The secondary students in this program are mostly undergraduate English, History, and/or Foreign Language majors who earn a concentration in secondary education after completing coursework and the internship. The majority of these candidates are white, in their twenties, and have grown up in suburban towns and seek to work in schools that represent their own middle or high school experiences. They represent various religious affiliations. TCs participate in both a middle and high school field experience. In the part-time internship, TCs complete an eight-week rotation in the middle school, followed by an 8-week rotation in the high school, which requires them to report to the schools on two mornings per week for three hours each morning. In the full-time internship, which occurs in the second semester of their internship year, the TCs teach five full days per week in an eight-week rotation in the high school, followed by an eight-week rotation in the middle school.

The demographics of the high schools and middle schools are important. Although the schools are in suburban communities, their student bodies have a mix of students in terms of social class and race/ethnicity. According to the state's department of education data, High School A hosts roughly 2,000 students. Approximately 50% of its students are White, 30% are African American, 10% are Asian, and 4% are Hispanic/Latino. High School B hosts roughly 1,200 students, of which about 50% are White, 20% are African American, 18% are Asian, and 4.5% are Hispanic/Latino. Middle School A hosts roughly 1,200 students. Approximately 66% of its students are White, 8% are African American, 15% are Asian, and 4.5% are Hispanic/Latino. Middle School B hosts roughly 1,100 students. Approximately 50% of its students are White, 32% are African American, 9.7% are Asian, and 5% are Hispanic/Latino (Maryland State Department of Education, 2017).

The focus of the internship is to learn the practice of teaching. TCs are gradually introduced to this practice. They are encouraged to plan and to teach with their mentors as frequently as possible and are also evaluated at various moments throughout both internships. Addressing the needs of learners is a conversation that is initiated early in the part-time internship seminar that TCs attend. Specifically, they are called upon to read articles related to meeting the cultural needs of a diverse student population during that internship. A discussion about this occurs at seminar and is facilitated by the PDS Liaison and a faculty representative. The PDS Liaison also requires her students to participate in a book study of Christopher Emdin's, *For White Folks Who Teach in the Hood... And the Rest of Ya'll Too: Reality Pedagogy and Urban Education* (Emdin, 2015) prior to the start of the full-time internship; this encourages an on-going analysis of culturally responsive teaching and of recognizing the danger of implicit bias that can begin to enter planning and instruction as well as relationships in school community.

Unpacking Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

Professional Learning and Ethical Practice presents a current gap or opportunity for TCs to explore the dimension and impact of implicit biases and how they affect their role as future teachers in the classroom. InTASC 9 focuses on the concepts of professional learning and ethical practice, suggesting the following:

> The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner," (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011).

There is a need to begin a conversation about implicit bias and how it affects teacher planning, instruction, and classroom management in regard to ethical practice with TCs and to call on them to represent it as an artifact to fulfill InTASC 9 so that they can demonstrate their understanding of implicit bias and its correlation to ethical practice in teaching in the secondary classroom.

To fill this gap and meet this need, the PDS Liaison set out on a journey to pilot an assignment and experience for the TCs to take part in during their internship (see Appendix A). This assignment relates to the learning and discovery of implicit bias and calls on interns to participate in all four stages of Milner's Framework: self-reflection, researching the self in relation to others, engaged reflection and representation, and shifting from self to system.

Application of Milner's Framework to InTASC 9

The role of PDS Liaison requires that she engage TCs, future educators in the secondary classroom, to constantly reflect not only on their pedagogical choices but also on who they are as individuals and how this cultural identity will affect their decisions, their actions and reactions to content, to students, to parents, and the school community at large. The first stage of the framework focuses on researching the self. According to Milner (2007), a first feature of this framework is the importance of researchers' engaging in evolving and emergent critical race and cultural self-reflection (p. 395). In the beginning stages of the internship year, the PDS Liaison invited a discussion to take place at seminar, in a safe space, calling on her TCs to consider who they are and how this cultural identity might affect who they will be in the classroom as teachers of adolescents. She argued that, although they are not researchers, it is vital that TCs begin considering questions of cultural background, race, and prior experience to start a discussion of ethical practice in the classroom. This discussion lent itself to the importance of practicing honest reflection as educators. TCs engaged in a discussion and discovered that events that occur in their lives and experiences with race and culture and bias outside of the classroom often affect their relationships and attitudes towards their students and those with whom they work in the classroom. The TCs moved through questions quite similar to those Milner poses in this first feature. Milner (2007) suggests that researchers consider:

> What is my racial and cultural heritage? How do I know? In what ways do my racial and cultural backgrounds influence how I experience the world, what I emphasize in my research, and how I evaluate and interpret others and their experiences? How do I know? How do I negotiate and balance my racial and cultural selves in society and in my research? How do I know? What do I believe about race and culture in society and education, and how do I attend to my own convictions and beliefs about race and culture in my research? Why? How do I know? What is the historical landscape of my racial and cultural identity and heritage? How do I know? What are and have been the contextual nuances and realities that help shape my racial and cultural ways of knowing, both past and present? How do I know? What racialized and cultural experiences have shaped my research decisions, practices, approaches, epistemologies, and agendas (Milner, 2007, p. 395).

Milner's comments concerning the evolution of the individual inspired conversations with TCs at seminar. They began considering how their cultural backgrounds and other aspects of their identities intersect in the planning for adolescents and the development of relationships with these adolescents as well as with their parents and others in the school community. An awareness of the

differences that existed across the group of TCs when they shared these answers in the safety of the seminar proved powerful. The PDS Liaison shared her own self-reflection with her TCs as a jumping-off point.

Reflection on the Self

The PDS Liaison reinforces the importance of ongoing reflection. TCs learn to reflect in terms of not only who they are, but how their identities and experiences affect teaching practices, their relationship-building skills, and many other areas related to their growth as secondary teachers and emerging professionals. Milner (2007) states, "The nature, depth, and meanings of (and answers to) the questions posed above may change, evolve, and emerge as researchers come to know themselves, their situations, and their experiences in a new, expanded, or different way" (p. 395). The TCs in the secondary education program must learn this lesson as well. They must remember to continue to practice the art of reflection to remain ethical in their practices, especially as the students with whom they will spend hours on end in the classroom will continue to change. Moreover, their climate changes as issues students face in their lives change. One of our many responsibilities as educators is to recognize these shifts and to plan engaging and relevant lessons that connect to the world in which our students and we live.

Reflection on Self in Relation to Others

The second feature of Milner's framework revolves around researching the self in relation to others. Milner (2007) summarizes this second feature by stating that "researchers think about themselves in relation to others, work through the commonalities and tensions that emerge from this reflection, and negotiate their ways of knowing with that of the community or people under study" (p. 396). This informed the PDS Liaison as she planned to engage her TCs in a three-week observational period with their mentors (see Appendix B). During their final internship, when they teach full time in the middle and high school classrooms, mentors observe their TC's interactions with students with respect to whom they call on, whom they praise, whom they address for behaviors issues, and who is represented in their planning. This invited an opportunity for TCs to acknowledge shifts in their behaviors or attitudes that arise during their instruction and planning. They were invited to consider relationships; how did the decisions they made in planning, in praising, in correcting, in calling on students in different ways or not at all result in the building of or breakdown of relationships?

Engaged Reflection and Representation

The third construct of Milner's framework focuses on engaged reflection and representation. In this phase, "researchers and participants engage in reflection together to think through what is happening in a research community, with race and culture placed at the core" (Milner, 2007, p. 396). Following each weekly observation, mentors and TCs were provided the opportunity to reflect together and consider how the TC's background and experiences resulted in implicit biases that related to their classroom instruction and planning. Mentors and TCs paused to determine how classroom dynamics were positively or negatively affected due to how the TCs praised students, whom they praised more than others, and whom they corrected as a classroom manager. They considered how often, and whom they had and had not called on during instruction. Why had the TC done so? Did any patterns emerge that result in a recognition and interruption then of implicit bias?

Moving from Self to System

The final stage of Milner's framework is shifting from self to system. Milner (2007) argues that "shifting the process of inquiry from the more personalized level to consider policy, institutional, systemic, and collective issues is important in this framework," (p. 397). Following the period of mentor-led observation of our TCs, an interesting discussion arose. A movement away from the TC's practices related to praise, management, calling on students, and planning occurred and resulted in mentors beginning to consider their own decision making and implicit bias that they bring to their practice. An acknowledgement occurred during discussions between TCs and mentors. When the PDS Liaison and her TCs gathered at seminar to discuss weekly observation feedback and reflection, PDS Site Coordinators joined the group to begin considering their practices—self to system, TC-Mentor, and TC-Mentor-School.

Reflections from InTASC 9 Pilot

As a result of considering their backgrounds, experiences, and identities, and participating in the mentor/TC observation of behaviors that demonstrate potential implicit bias, a discussion occurred amongst the PDS Liaison and the interns that these must somehow influence our teaching. For instance, the 10 TCs shared that, by reflecting on their background, their own school experiences, and culture, they could more clearly note how those factors then present possible implicit bias in the classroom.

In their personal reflections, during which TCs engaged in a discussion of their cultural identities, many expressed that they were raised in "traditional" homes composed of a mother and father and siblings. Most recognized that they

then equate a "normal" family to their own experience of what "normal" means to them in this regard. This also appeared in observational feedback. Mentors noted that many of the TCs access the word "normal" when referencing family structures and commented that the TCs' definition of normal encompassed a man and women marrying and having a family. Mentors stated that, in turn, the TCs are suggesting that students' families who aren't structured in that way are not "normal." The mentors discussed that prior to the collection of data, they had not realized hadn't been aware that the TCs were even accessing the word "normal" as it related to family structure.

In their personal reflections, some TCs noted their comfort, or lack thereof, with names. They discussed that they tend to avoid calling on students whose names they have difficulty pronouncing and that they grew up in communities that were not as diverse as those they had interned in. Mentors also noted in their observations whom their TCs called on and whom they avoided. Many of those students who were called on looked like the TCs and had names that they were familiar from the TCs' cultural backgrounds. A discussion followed, acknowledging the TCs' behaviors in this regard.

TCs also discussed gender attitudes in their personal reflections. Many mentioned that, prior to the observations, they believed they would tend to be more forgiving of female disruptive behaviors than male disruptive behaviors as a result of the way they were treated in school. The female TCs felt they had been given more praise and more chances to improve when they were students, but also noted that this could be a bias in attitude. Mentor observation feedback highlighted that many of the TCs corrected behavior in male students more often than in female students; females would be given more chances, and the TCs assumed that females did not understand a task, whereas males were more quickly corrected and the assumption was that the males were simply off task by choice. No comprehension questions were thought of in association with off-task behavior in male students.

Discussion/Conclusion

The primary goal of this innovative practice was to create an opportunity for our TC's to reflect on their own backgrounds, to learn about implicit bias, to be observed for potential implicit biases in their role as secondary educators, and to then shift their practices to become more ethical teachers (InTASC 9). We did not predict the larger impact and power this practice would have on the school community at large. We saw the beginnings of these larger impacts, however, and will need more time to conduct research on how this practice has affected TCs as they enter the profession.

We did not predict that mentor teachers and PDS site coordinators would come to the table at seminar and join in a conversation about their own implicit biases and backgrounds. Surprisingly, these teacher leaders wanted to participate in the same observations that they conducted of their TCs to improve their own ethical practices in classroom. This could suggest that they may need some or more professional development in this area. Again, more time and research will allow us to find out why these mentors were so interested in participating in this practice and what impacts it may have on their classrooms.

We hope to continue developing this observational tool and encourage our partners at our PDSs to participate in their own faculty reflections, discussions, and observations of implicit bias in the classroom. Clearly, there is a compelling reason to continue this work. According to the US Department of Education (2016), "Unless current trends change, moving forward the disparity between the racial makeup of students and teachers may increase further, fueling the need for substantially more progress in increasing teacher diversity" (p. 2). We recognize that there are other approaches that need to be implemented at the same time to address the needs of the growing diversity among public school students, such as the recruitment of more teachers of color. This does not preclude our suggestion for innovative practice, and there is a strong case for making certain our TCs approach their classrooms as ethically as possible.

This work is in the nascent stages. We work in a predominantly white environment that tends to steer clear of reflection that questions what is normative and reflection on racial and cultural identity as it relates to the work of future teachers. We have reflected and continue to critically reflect on that context, because it presents certain institutional obstacles to doing equity work. We also know that we are not alone among teacher education institutions. Sparked by a college-wide goal to promote equity in our programs, we were inspired to explore what might be possible in a secondary teacher education program. We aspire to do much more, and are looking at initiatives launched by other institutions for putting equity at the center of teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al, 2006).

References

Brookfield, S. (1998). Critically reflective practice. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, *18*(4), 197–205.

Brodkin, K. (1998). *How Jews became white folks and what that says about race in America.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Bullough, R. V., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13–21.

Buzzelli, C. A., & Johnston, B. (2002). *The moral dimensions of teaching: language, power, and culture in the classroom interaction*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Campbell, E. (2008). The Ethics of teaching as a Moral Profession. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *38*(4), 357–385.

Capatosto, K., Jackson, V., Staats, C., & Wright, R. (2016). *State of the science: Implicit bias review*. Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, 2016, 3449. Retrieved from http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/implicit-bias-2016.pdf

Clarke, M. (2009). The Ethico-politics of teacher identity. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *41*(2), (185–200).

Cochran-Smith, M., and Donnell, K. (2006). Practitioner inquiry: Blurring the boundaries of research and practice. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 503–518). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: practitioner research for the next generation.* New York: London: Teachers College Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (InTASC) Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. [PDF]. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf.

Dyment, J., & O'Connell, T. (2014). When the ink runs dry: Implications for theory and practice when educators stop keeping reflective journals. *Innovative Higher Education, 39*(5), 417–429.

Emdin, C. (2017). *For White folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education.* New York: Beacon Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, practice, & research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hatton, N. & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education. 11*(1), 33–49.

Jordan-Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Joseph, P. (2016). Ethical reflections on becoming teachers. *Journal of Moral Education. 45*(1), 31–45.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Milner, H. R., IV. (2007, October). Race, culture and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. [PDF]. *Educational Researcher*, 36, 388–400. Retrieved from http://www.uwyo.edu/education/_files/documents/diversity-articles/milner_2007.pdf

Milner, R. (2014). Culturally relevant, purpose-driven learning & teaching in a middle school social studies classroom. *Multicultural Education, 21*(2) 9–17.

Milner, R. (2010). *Start where you are but don't stay there*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Milner, H. R., IV., Pearman, F. A., III, & McGee, E. O. (2013). Critical race theory, interest convergence, and teacher education. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 339–354). New York, NY: Routledge.

Milner, R. (2015). *Rac(e)ing to class.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2017). 2017 Maryland State Report Card. [Data file]. Retrieved from http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (n.d.). Our mission. Retrieved June 4, 2013, from http://www.naacp.org/pages/our-mission

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner. Towards a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *5*(2), 94–106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2016). Critical race theory and the whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education, 52*(2), 155–169.

Sullivan, F. R. (2009). Risk and responsibility: A self-study of teaching in second life. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 20*(3), 337–357.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

United States Department of Education. (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce*. Retrieved April 18, 2019, from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf

Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.),*Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176-198). New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. (2006). Reflections of a university-based teacher educator on the future of college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*(3), 326–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285893

Appendix A

InTASC 9 E-Journal Questions Interns Complete in Part-Time Internship

Questions students begin to respond to and unpack in the part-time internship are listed below. These begin a conversation about ethical practice and invite the beginning of a discussion and common knowledge of implicit bias.

1. What do you know about implicit bias?

2. Describe the community in which you grew up and the different schools you attended. Who were your teachers? What was the demographic of your school? Who made up the majority? Were you a part of this or were you the minority? How did this experience and growing up in this town, shape who you are today? Are you left with any biases you are aware of as a result? Please attempt to interview parents, community members, former teachers or others who played an important role in your pre-collegiate school years to help you respond to the questions above. Their insight will be valuable.

3. Define Culture. Now participate in scholarly research in order to understand others' views of the word, "Culture." Do the discussions you found align with your definition? How so? How are they different and what did you learn as a result?

4. Have you begun to identify personal identity, worldviews and prior experiences that may affect your perceptions and expectations in the classroom? With your students? Parents of students? Other teachers? Administration? If you have done so, please explain the ways in which you've addressed any of the above. In addition, please begin to create even just a list of personal identities, worldviews, and prior experiences that you think might impact your planning, management, and instruction in the classroom.

Appendix B

Observation Tool Mentors Access to Note Implicit Bias in Intern Instruction and Planning

Calling on Students	Using the data collection tool provided, ask that your mentor note who you call on during both classes. Please also note the language choices or shifts the intern uses with these students. *Post Observation Discussion:* Do you tend to call on more: Boys? Girls? Front of the room? Back of the Room? Left or Right side of the room? White? African American? Latina? Asian? Other? Do you avoid calling on individuals who have their hands raised? Do you call on others who do not have their hands raised? Who are these individuals?
Management of Behavior Issues	Using the data collection tool provided, ask that your mentor note who you "manage" (i.e. ask to stop talking, ask to leave the room, ask to turn around, ask to raise their hand etc.) Please also note the language choices or shifts the intern uses with these students. *Post Observation Discussion:* Whom do you tend to ask to stop talking? Do you give more chances to a particular group of students? If you teach different levels, do you manage these two groups differently? How so? Do you allow for more conversation in one class than another? Why? Do you correct language choices-(Do you correct for "Standard" English conventions?)

Praising Students	Using the data collection tool provided, ask that your mentor note whom you praise. Please also note the language choices and shifts the students uses with these students. *Post Observation Discussion:* Whom do you praise? Some more frequently than others? Is the praise different? Based on behavior? Content? Does it differ according to the persons?
Planning Instruction **(This conversation can be had throughout the process or at the end of it. It does not require a specific moment of observation in the classroom.)**	Look at the lessons you have taught this week. *Observation Discussion:* Were the materials a reflection of those sitting in your classroom? Whom or what was the subject matter? How did the material relate to the lives of your students? Did the materials isolate or leave out any one group?