
Practices of Teacher Educators Committed to Character:

Examples from Teacher Education Programs Emphasizing Character Development

Written by:

Karen E. Bohlin
Susan Dougherty
Deborah Farmer

Editor:

Merle J. Schwartz, Program Director, CEP

Associate Editors:

Andrea Grenadier, Director of Communications, CEP
Esther F. Schaeffer, Executive Director and CEO, CEP

Published by:

The Character Education Partnership
December 2002

"We invite teacher educators to draw their own insights and conclusions from the profiles and promising practices that follow. Our hope is that these programmatic efforts may prompt further reflection within teacher education and offer some adoptable and adaptable practices to strengthen existing programs."

The Character Education Partnership

Table of Contents

Preface	2
Introduction & Overview	6
Three Profiles:	11
<i>Boston University</i>	12
<i>California State University, Fresno</i>	16
<i>University of St. Francis</i>	17
Promising Practices:	21
<i>Mission Statements</i>	22
<i>Courses in Character Education</i>	23
<i>Cultivating a Positive Moral Ethos</i>	27
<i>Service</i>	29
Conclusion	32
References	33
Additional Information	34

Preface

Human beings are vulnerable when they are born into the world. With relatively few survival instincts, we need constant help to stay alive. To grow to maturity and be able to flourish in our community we need both material and intellectual support. In the modern world, much of our intellectual development has been the province of schooling. While our schools have an all but exclusive responsibility to teach the natural sciences and mathematics that are the basis of life in a modern society, schools, nevertheless, share with the family, faith communities, and others, the responsibility to teach morality and the good habits necessary to live in harmony with our neighbors. This important human learning is character education.

Character comes from the Greek word, *charassein*, which means to engrave or write marks on a surface. From that root meaning comes the understanding of character as a distinctive mark or what psychologists would call an individual's pattern of behavior or moral habits. To educate for character, then, involves addressing some of humanity's most important and fundamental issues: What is a good life? What are the habits a good person should cultivate? What contributes to the development of good character? What detracts? And, while the issues and questions here are heady ones, they have, nevertheless always been fundamental to a person's education. This recent concern for character is hardly a modern preoccupation. Socrates defined education as teaching someone to be both smart and good. That is, to aid individuals in the acquisition of knowledge about the world, but also to help them become good persons, good citizens, good parents, and good neighbors. An often repeated description of character education

captures this meaning: character education is what parents and teachers do to help the young know the good, love the good, and do the good.

Character education has deep roots in the traditions of American education. Our nation was a pioneer in the establishment of public schooling for all children. In colonial Massachusetts, one of the early laws passed was the Old Deluder Satan Act that directed towns and villages to tax its citizens to establish elementary and secondary schools. The purpose of these schools is reflected in the act's title. Schools were built and teachers hired primarily to teach children to be able to read the Bible, and thus, form moral constitutions or characters that were strong enough to escape the snares of Satan.

As our Founding Fathers brought a new nation into existence under democracy, an untried form of government, they insisted upon schooling as a major priority. As time passed, the focus of character education became less explicitly religious and more civic. They recognized that citizens needed to possess certain virtues or good habits in order to sustain this new social experiment. James Madison wrote, "Is there no virtue among us? If there be not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks, no form of government can render us secure. To suppose that any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without virtue in the people is a chimerical idea." Benjamin Franklin wrote, "Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of a master...Nothing is of more importance for the public weal, than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue."

The schools, then, that helped support and develop our fledgling democracy had a strong mandate to help children develop their characters.

This focus and priority carried over into the nineteenth and well into the twentieth centuries. Moral adages permeated our schools. The popular McGuffey's Reader with its moral aphorisms was a staple for generations of Americans. Teachers, while poorly paid, were, along with clergymen, looked up to as having moral authority, with the expectation that they would exercise their moral authority responsibly in their work. Somewhere in the mid-twentieth century, schools and teachers began to lose that sense of moral mission and the emphasis on character education began to recede. Commentaries suggest that the social turmoil of the late sixties and early seventies made the educational community lose confidence and draw back. Angry protests over the plight of African Americans and the Vietnam War made many Americans doubt whether we were bound by a common set of civic values. Traditional values surrounding sexuality were altered by the advent of the oral contraceptive. The family appeared to be under attack by television. Teachers were both unsure of what the community's moral values were and whether they had any mandate to teach them.

During this same period, teacher education institutions changed. In the name of "relevance," programs switched from the foundations of education to greater time and attention paid to field experiences. Formerly required courses in educational philosophy and the history of education, which were primary sources of information about the ethical mission of school, were largely dropped from the undergraduate curriculum. The attention that was paid to the moral domain was confined to teaching the theory and practice of values clarification and

cognitive moral development. In both of these approaches, the teacher serves as the facilitator and is encouraged not to "indoctrinate" or moralize, letting students construct their own moral values and codes of behavior. As a result, young people entering teacher education came from elementary and secondary schools with little tradition of character education and learned little, if anything in their training, about helping children develop virtuous characters.

At the same time, the late 1980s and 90s saw an explosion of indicators of anti-social behavior [violent crime, suicide, out-of-wedlock births] among young Americans. A 2000 study of honesty among American high school students reported that 70% of the students admitted to having cheated during the year; nearly half stole from a store; nearly all lied to parents; and one in three said they would lie to get a good job. We are keeping children in school who used to drop out, but many students, regardless of background, are not doing as well academically as we would like. There are many contributing factors. One of these is a lack of the good habits [responsibility, persistence, diligence and courage] that young people need to flourish academically. Increasingly, parents and politicians are expressing their worries about moral values and habits of children and are calling on schools to play a more direct and effective role in character formation. In a recent national poll, Americans ranked "teaching children values and discipline" highest among issues they considered most important for school reform. In the 2000 presidential election, both candidates gave character education a prominent place in their education platforms. In his inaugural speech, President George W. Bush called for schools that "promote competence and character." It appears that both the historical precedent and the public support for character education in schools are in place.

For many decades now, research on why young people choose teaching as a career reveals strong, altruistic motives. “Desire to work with young people” and “value or significance of education to society” are the two most frequently cited motives. We know, too, from the CEP 1999 survey, *Teachers as Educators of Character: Are the Nation’s Schools of Education Coming Up Short?*, that the leaders of teacher education institutions hold character education high as an aim of schooling. But, in fact, attention to character education in formal teacher preparation has, in recent decades, been replaced by other priorities and other activities. Given this context, combined with the growing sentiment within the teacher education community to promote character education, we offer the following list of teacher qualities and competencies for consideration:

- Teachers must make the development of their students’ characters and moral consciences a high professional responsibility and priority.
- Teachers themselves must be individuals of good character. And while they may not necessarily be shining examples of the good life, they must be visibly working on their own characters.
- Without impinging on a student’s religious beliefs, teachers must be able to talk to students about what is right and what is wrong in life. They must be comfortable talking about “the oughtness” of life.
- Without unnecessarily or inappropriately burdening students with their own views and opinions, teachers must be able to articulate their own positions on a range of ethical issues.
- Teachers must be able to help children become considerate of others, helping them to get outside of themselves and to empathize with others.
- Teachers must be able to establish a classroom of high ethical standards, marked by

caring, personal responsibility and respect for all.

- Teachers must be able to guide children toward becoming moral actors, providing them with opportunities and practice in being of service to others.

We believe that these dispositions and competencies should guide all aspects of the teacher preparation program from initial selection to placement, from the formal curriculum to the institution’s rituals and routines, from mission statement to informal conversations with future teachers. A teacher education institution committed to preparing future educators of character creates a powerful ethos. This total environment should not only inspire the education students with a clear mandate, but also equip them with the knowledge and skills they need to help their own students develop good character.

This publication, *Practices of Teacher Educators Committed to Character: Examples from Teacher Education Programs Emphasizing Character Development*, offers some practical insights on how to bring these competencies to life in a teacher education program. The three profiles and selection of promising practices in the pages that follow provide deans and department chairs with a variety of entry points and ideas for integrating character education more deliberately into the training of our nation’s teachers. They are a beginning. The Character Education Partnership will be joining with selected schools of education over the coming months to explore broader efforts that can be integrated in teacher preparation programs. In the meantime, we hope you use this book as a resource to spark important reflection, dialogue, and program planning.

Dr. Kevin Ryan, professor emeritus and director emeritus of the Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character at Boston University

Introduction & Overview

When John Adams, the framer of our Constitution and our third president, said “A teacher affects eternity,” he may have been considering mathematics and rhetoric, but surely he was recognizing the impact a teacher has on a young person’s sense of what is right and wrong, good and bad, and what is worth pursuing in life and what is not. Schools and classrooms are, by their very nature, moral environments. The morally neutral classroom is an impossibility. Teachers, de facto, have power and how they use or abuse that power informs the moral understandings of students. There is an old saying of students about a pompous teacher that captures this well: “Who he was spoke so loudly I could not hear what he was saying.” Teachers have expectations of students and make demands on them. Teachers allow students to interact with one another and set and monitor standards of behavior in their classrooms. The relationships students develop and the ways in which they learn to interact with each other are among the most important and most lasting lessons of school. In effect, educating for character is unavoidable. It comes with the territory of being a teacher.

The question is, however, how well do our teachers know that part of their territory? In 1999 the Character Education Partnership (CEP) and the Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character (CAEC) at Boston University released the results of their joint study, *Teachers as Educators of Character: Are the Nation’s Schools of Education Coming Up Short?* The report was based on an extensive national survey of six hundred deans of schools of education in an attempt to discover their views on character education and what their institutions were doing to

prepare future teachers for this aspect of their work. The findings (see box) showed clearly that leaders of the nation’s schools of education overwhelmingly (over 90%) support the need for character education in K-12 schools. Yet, only 13% were satisfied with their institution’s efforts to integrate character education within teacher education programs. The major findings from this study include:

- The leadership of teacher education is overwhelmingly supportive of the notion of character education. More than 90% of the survey’s respondents agreed that core values can and should be taught in our schools.
- In spite of the high level of support for the idea of character education, less than a quarter of these respondents said that character education is “highly” emphasized in their institutions. Only 13% are satisfied with their efforts to prepare teachers for their responsibilities as character educators.
- There is no consensus about what character education means or how it should be advanced in schools. In fact, a wide range of practices exist, which includes (but is not limited to) service learning, experiential learning, religious education, and moral reasoning.

What this study suggests is that at a time when it is widely agreed that our schools should take a more deliberate and active role in teaching students America’s core moral values and helping them to develop strong character, our schools of education are missing in action.

People from across ideological, cultural, and political spectrums have expressed renewed interest in the core ethical values and ideals that form the foundation of our democratic society. One tangible indication of this interest is our K-12 schools’ steady movement toward

Finding One

More than 90% of the survey's participants agreed that core values can and should be taught in schools.

Finding Two

Only 24.4% of respondents said that character education is highly emphasized within their program's course offerings. Only 13.1% said they are satisfied with their character education efforts.

Finding Three

There is little consensus about what character education is and how it should be taught.

Finding Four

Where preparation in character education occurs, "community" is a dominant framework and a powerful metaphor in character education efforts.

Finding Five

Today's schools of education are more inclined to cite the learning process, rather than curricular content, as the primary vehicle for character education.

Finding Six

Colleges and universities that mention character education in their mission statements (63.2% of the sample) are more likely to teach it.

Finding Seven

Schools of education with religious ties are more strongly committed to character education than their secular counterparts.

Finding Eight

Educators generally (64.8%), but cautiously, favor making character education a requirement for state certification.

Summary of Findings from Teachers as Educators of Character: Are the Nation's Schools of Education Coming Up Short? (Nielsen-Jones, Ryan, Bohlin; Washington DC: CEP)

a stronger commitment to character education. Federal grants to almost all states have helped support character education in their schools and districts. As parents, community members, and teachers come to see that character education is a responsibility shared by schools, the need becomes pressing for teachers who are educated in an understanding of what character is, how good character is developed, and how they can develop it once in the classroom. Nevertheless, teacher education programs across the country have been shown to give sorely inadequate attention to the study of character education.

Given the sharp contrast between support for character education in schools and the lack of serious intellectual and professional attention to the theme in teacher preparation programs, it is not surprising that department chairs and program directors of the nation's schools of education are interested in learning more about character education. More than 80% indicated an interest in information on best practices; 68% requested samples of course syllabi; more than 60% were interested in attending seminars and conferences on teacher education and character education; 73% wanted to be on CEP's mailing list; and 67% expressed interest in a list of character education books and resources.

Several teacher educators have developed their own course curricula dedicated to character education and the Association for Teacher Educators (ATE), with CEP's and CAEC's assistance published a compendium of concept papers outlining the various theoretical frameworks and approaches to character education within teacher preparation (Williams & Schaps, 1999). Nevertheless, there remains a dearth of resources in teacher education that address the intellectual content

of character education and effective ways to incorporate this content into teacher preparation. Thus, schools of education that aspire to improve their efforts to prepare teachers as educators of mind and character have few guiding examples. Eager to provide some examples and insights, the Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character (CAEC) at Boston University with sponsorship from the Character Education Partnership (CEP), John M. Olin Foundation, The Annenberg Foundation, and Lynch Foundation has undertaken an informal study of selected programmatic efforts in various schools/ departments of education that do address character within the context of teacher education.

Prior to identifying and describing effective practices for preparing teachers in character education, the CAEC conducted a phone survey of approximately thirty schools/ departments of education. These institutions were selected on the basis of their response to the 1999 survey in which they indicated that they incorporated character education into their teacher education programs. One of the major findings of this follow-up study, however, is that many fewer schools/departments of education than we had suspected actually do integrate ethics and character education into their teacher preparation programs. In some cases, the deans and department chairs we contacted were only able to identify one professor who addresses the topic in an elective course. Others admitted that what they were doing falls short of what is stated in their mission statement or program description. Some of the individuals from the schools and programs we contacted opted not to return our calls. Others said they did not believe they had a practice worthy of emulation and declined our request for an interview.

Three institutions, Boston University, California State University at Fresno, and the University of St. Francis emerged as the most comprehensive examples of teacher education programs that embraced character education on a variety of levels. Education students in these institutions are inspired with a clear mandate and equipped with considerable knowledge and professional skills to understand and integrate character education into their classroom practices and teaching. These three programs are presented as brief profiles in this report.

Interviews with deans and faculty from seven other schools of education enabled us to identify promising practices currently at work in a range of teacher education programs. Although incomplete, these practices contribute to making character education a tangible component of teacher preparation. Taken together, these three profiles and several promising practices offer ideas and examples for schools/departments of education committed to making character education an integral part of their program. Among the promising practices we identified are mission statements and courses that explicitly examine the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching, ceremonies and traditions that affirm a teacher's responsibility for character education, and service programs that help students to develop and practice good dispositions of character.

CEP and the CAEC believe much more needs to be done. Just as sound character education in our nation's K-12 schools requires a variety of approaches and sustained attention, so too do our efforts to prepare future teachers as educators of character. For this reason, CEP is about to embark on an initiative with several schools of education that are willing to examine

their programs holistically and to identify a variety of means for providing their students with knowledge, understanding, and practice in moral, ethical and character development.

In the meantime, we invite teacher educators to draw their own insights and conclusions from the profiles and promising practices that follow. Our hope is that these programmatic efforts may prompt further reflection within teacher education and offer some adoptable and adaptable practices to strengthen existing programs.

Three Profiles:

- **Boston University**
- **California State University, Fresno**
- **University of St. Francis**

BOSTON UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Among the principles that define Boston University's School of Education is the following:

To be a teacher you must accept responsibility for shaping the minds and characters of young people.

Teachers must consider the larger ends they serve and the obligations they assume in becoming teachers.

*At Boston University you will engage in reflection in these fundamental questions guided by a deeply committed faculty whose members work closely with you.
(p.1 of The Call to Teach, BU School of Education view book)*

The School of Education (SED) provides students with both rigorous coursework and rich field experiences that challenge students to study, observe, and reflect on the formation of students' character in schools. Moreover, all students participate in an SED tradition, the Junior Pinning Ceremony, during which students affirm their commitment to helping their future students achieve both academic and character excellence.

In the fall of their freshman year, Elementary Education majors enroll in "Cultural Foundations for Educators," a course designed and taught by Dr. Steven S. Tigner. The reading list - The Iliad, the Bible, Sophocle's plays, Plato, and Aristotle - closely resembles the syllabus of a core humanities program. The difference is a shift in perspective. Students examine these core texts of western thought while asking the question, "What does this teach me about teaching and learning?" According to Dr. Tigner, the course "offers future teachers a pedagogically reflective engagement with texts and other artifacts fundamental to American culture." The syllabus points out, for example, the purpose of studying Homer:

We see in him a paradigm of a teacher who forges conceptual connections between his subject matter and his listeners' lives, who addresses not only the minds, but also the hearts and appetites of his audience, who strives to clarify their thinking and model fairness in dealing with controversy and to promote empathy for human suffering wherever it occurs.

The Bible illustrates teaching through both didactic explanation and precept as well as through stories and parables. Plato's tri-part soul - reason, spirit, and appetite - gives

teachers three instructional targets: to instruct reason, move the spirit, and delight the appetite. Plato's Meno invites students to consider the dialogue's central question, "Can virtue be taught?" and marks students' specific introduction to character education. Students explore Aristotle's definitions of intellectual virtue, moral virtue, and friendship and the means by which all three are developed and sustained. These concepts, students soon discover, have a direct bearing on a teacher's responsibility to strengthen students' mind and character. In addition to lecture and discussion, students make weekly trips to area museums and libraries. There they study narrative art relevant to course readings. The semester culminates with the preservice teachers developing and presenting lessons at Boston's Museum of Fine Arts to groups of middle school students from urban public schools. The pedagogical goal of these lessons is summarized in the words of Augustine, "to delight, to instruct, and to move."

Many of these lessons focus on moments of decision in a story. They explore how the artist chose to depict this moment and the traits of character revealed by the protagonist at this point in the narrative. The students' lessons are edited and published in a compendium entitled, Great Stories, Great Art. Many veteran teachers have used these interdisciplinary lessons to raise questions of choice and character in their own teaching.

Finally, "Cultural Foundations for Educators" promotes student leadership. At the end of each semester, Dr. Tigner selects three to five teaching assistants from those who volunteer to help him run the lab sections for the next semester's course. This tradition in "Cultural Foundations for Educators" is unconventional as most university teaching assistants (TAs) are graduate students. The TAs in "Cultural

Foundations" make an enormous contribution to the course experience and find it one of their most memorable and rewarding experiences at SED. As one former TA put it,

One of the most common responses freshman make at the end of Cultural Foundations for Educators is, "Wow, I feel so cultured now!" I know that this was a response that I shared. To have learned so much about literature, art, philosophy, and in the meantime, ourselves, makes the experience one that will always be remembered fondly, even if the late nights struggling through The Republic or Nichomachean Ethics left us with confusion, headaches, and dark circles under our eyes during the semester.

This feeling of growth makes Cultural Foundations perfect for a freshman's first semester in college. Coming to college is all about growth; while university life helps freshmen begin to grow as a person and become an adult, Cultural Foundations helps students to develop their intellect and understanding of character. Although you may believe that this is true of all classes, what makes CC101 unique is that the majority of students recognize its effects.

What I love most about being a TA is being able to rediscover the culture all over again while leading others along the same path.

In their second semester, students generally take ED100: "An Introduction to Education." ED 100 is a required course for all undergraduate education majors and includes a pre-practicum field component. Taught by Dr. Karen Bohlin, executive director of BU's

Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character, this course invites students to explore the dignity, complexity, and demands of teaching. An implicit theme running through the course is the inherent moral responsibility of teachers to students, parents, colleagues and community members. While some lectures explicitly address the history and context of character education, the twin goals of education - the development of mind and character - are examined throughout the course. Some of the questions the students explore in ED100 include:

- What responsibility, if any, does a public school teacher have with respect to the character or moral education of children? What influence do teachers have on the character of their students?
- What distinctions can be made between the following: personal values, points of view, and virtues? What is the intellectual history of the various approaches to ethics we find prevalent today?
- How can teachers create and sustain a positive moral ethos in their classrooms?
- How can teachers help students form good habits of character within the context of the subjects they teach?

During the panel presentation given by invited teachers, principals, and superintendents, the students inquire about how character education is brought to life in their respective school communities. Whether the focus is on learning or teaching, the lecture, readings, and discussion prompt students to consider the ways in which teachers influence the developing characters of young people. Throughout the course, students explore virtue, the cultivation of moral and intellectual excellence, as an integral part of teaching and learning and not simply as an isolated topic.

In their second year, students are required to take ED 410/412: “The Social and Civic Context of Education.” In this course, students study the social, political, and economic contexts of education. With an emphasis on social responsibility, equity and equality in education, and the moral ethos of schools, students are encouraged to reflect on character within a much broader context.

During their junior year or before their full-time student teaching, students enroll in “Elementary Education Methods,” which examines literacy, social studies, and science. Within this course, students have the opportunity to learn methods for using the curriculum as a rich context for character education. For example, during a discussion of literature circles, Dr. Carol Jenkins reviews Aristotle’s (trans. 1925) doctrine of the mean, which places courage on a spectrum between two vices: recklessness and cowardice. In literature circles, students discuss which character in Lois Lowry’s *Number the Stars* is most courageous. Students are asked to refer to the doctrine of the mean to make clear distinctions in their analysis of the character’s actions.

In February of their junior year, SED students gather with professors, parents, and friends for the Junior Pinning Ceremony. During this annual event, both a guest and student speaker offer tribute to what it means to be an educator. The evening is designed to affirm the students’ commitment to their future work and to prompt further reflection on what it means to be a teacher. It is a celebration of their dedication. The evening closes with the students’ chorale recitation of the Boston University Educator’s Affirmation.

Student teaching is a potentially stressful and certainly vigorous learning experience. Student teachers are faced with the day-to-day realities

The Boston University Educator's Affirmation

I dedicate myself to the life of an educator, to laying the living foundations upon which successor generations must continue to build their lives.

I dedicate myself to the advancement of learning, for I know that without it our successors will lack both the vision and the power to build well.

I dedicate myself to the cultivation of character, for I know that humanity cannot flourish without courage, compassion, honesty, and trust.

I commit myself to the advancement of my own learning and to the cultivation of my own character, for I know that I must bear witness in my own life to the ideals that I have dedicated myself to promote in others.

In the presence of this gathering, I so dedicate and commit myself.

*Written for the occasion of the April 24, 1989,
School of Education Junior Pinning Ceremony
by Dr. Steven Tigner*

of running a classroom, preparing and teaching lessons, and interacting with a variety of students. The never-ending papers to correct and the various “firsts” of being a new teacher often eclipse the idealism of freshman year. In 1998, with the support of an Eisenhower 2000 grant, Dr. Carol Jenkins, the chair of elementary education, and Professor Judy Chambliss, coordinator of student teachers, joined forces with three local teachers to create a seminar course for student teachers. This course is designed to build morale and support the student teachers, to revisit principles and practices of character education, and to apply the Massachusetts State Curriculum Frameworks in lesson and unit planning. All student teachers now take this seminar concurrent with their student teaching. The seminar examines the following topics:

- Character Education: An Overview
- Respect and Responsibility
- Virtues through Literacy
- Classroom Management and Character Education
- Cooperative Learning
- Involving Parents and Community
- Classroom Ethos

The goals of the seminar include the following:

- 1.** Understand that “the most persuasive moral teaching we adults do is by example” (Coles, 1997, p. 31) and act accordingly.
- 2.** Articulate a moral vision for yourself and for your students.
- 3.** Design curriculum that advances the habituation of virtues and service to others.
- 4.** Understand the inextricable link among character, curriculum, and classroom discipline. As Durkheim (1925/1973) notes, “Discipline is not a simple device of securing

superficial peace in the classroom; it is the morality of the classroom as a small society” (p. 148).

5. Understand the crucial link between home and school in promoting the adoption of universal virtues.
6. Contribute to the development of ethical understanding through participation in the seminars.

Students complete three assignments in conjunction with the seminar. The first is a case study of a particular student in his or her classroom. Each student teacher identifies a student with a specific need - usually connected in some way to respect or responsibility. Over the course of the semester, the student teachers develop four components to the case study 1) background information and identification of need; 2) description of baseline data; 3) plan for an intervention strategy; and 4) a final reflection paper. This assignment gives student teachers valuable practice in “taking other people seriously as persons” - the phrase Dr. Tigner uses in Cultural Foundations to describe true respect, a hallmark of good character.

The second assignment is a curriculum-based lesson plan. After a seminar on using literature as a vehicle for character development, students use the academic curriculum to create and teach a history, literature, or science lesson that has character education objectives. The student teachers videotape this lesson and write a reflection paper on the results.

Finally, the students are required to include a section on character education in their student teacher portfolio. Their final reflections in the portfolio often focus on what character education means, its significance in their student teaching, and how they plan to foster good character in their future students.

Character formation is a central theme in the Elementary Education program at Boston University. Through course work, field experiences, and the culture of SED, Boston University’s future teachers are prepared to help their students develop good dispositions of mind and character.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO, CA

At California State University, Fresno, the Kremen School of Education and Human Development attempts to create a culture of ethics and character from the time of the students’ initial entrance. In 1999, the school, with the encouragement of Dean Paul Shaker, instituted an induction ceremony for all first-semester students admitted to the Multiple Subject (elementary education) programs. The ceremony focuses on the moral commitment inherent in teaching. The students are introduced to an “Educators’ Affirmation,” modeled after the affirmation Steven S. Tigner developed for Boston University. “That statement,” writes Dr. Jacques S. Benninga, “is designed to guide students’ perspectives about their obligations as they proceed along the road to professionalism.” The affirmation is formally presented to the students again at a graduation ceremony at the end of their program. In this manner, the education program is framed by a clear declaration of the moral dimensions of the teaching profession.

Kremen School of Education and Human Development faculty and students are offered evidence of their institution’s commitment to the development of character, including their own. During meetings of student teaching supervisors, they discuss “ethical problems

that arise while evaluating preservice teachers such as ‘unprepared, yet capable student teachers;’ ‘master teachers observed improperly aiding students on state exams;’ and ‘student teachers whose grammar and writing skills are below expected levels.’” In each situation, the moral responsibility of the university supervisor is the focus of the discussion.

A current project, now in pilot form, is assessing the development of the professional ethics of students as they progress through the teacher preparation program. Under the direction of Dr. Pamela Lane-Garon, Associate Director of the Bonner Center of Character Education and Citizenship, faculty have begun work on curricula that will support the students’ development of moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral commitment and moral action. Currently, the early childhood faculty are creating a moral education framework that will give attention to each of the four areas. They are writing cases containing ethical problems representative of those commonly faced by educators of elementary school-aged children. Faculty will use these dilemmas in early childhood education courses to foster growth in moral sensitivity. The faculty is also establishing a program that will inspire moral action and in the near future early childhood students will engage in service work with agencies that support children and their families. Faculty will assess the influence of the new curricula on students’ development of professional ethics throughout the implementation process. Curricula and assessment instruments focused on professional ethics are being developed for other school of education programs.

The Kremen School’s Annual Conference on Character and Civic Education, now in its 18th year, further illustrates dedication to character education. Approximately 750 attendees, including all of the Kremen School

of Education’s student teachers, are reminded of their responsibilities to the moral and emotional well-being of children and their families and are introduced to private and public organizations and businesses that can offer support in this endeavor. Conference sessions such as “Foundations of Democracy,” “Sanctuary Safe Place Project,” and “Values in Children’s Literature” complement the Kremen School of Education students’ coursework in character education. The Kremen School of Education, through its Bonner Center for Character Education, recognizes exemplary schools for their character education efforts. The Virtues and Character Recognition Award program, under the leadership of Center Director Dr. Jacques Benninga, is in its 15th year.

At California State University, Fresno, Kremen School of Education and Human Development’s dedication to character development is evident throughout the teacher preparation program. Ceremonies articulate the responsibilities of teachers as educators of mind and character. Ongoing attention is given to pedagogical practices that introduce students to the moral dimensions of their profession. School and community contributions to character education are highlighted and shared through the annual professional conference.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. FRANCIS, JOLIET, IL

The University of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois, develops the character of its students in three ways: 1) a university-wide commitment to values, service, and character, 2) integration of character education into the required coursework of education students, and 3) a commitment to character development in

the K-12 districts and communities around the school. The university's emphasis on the character development of all its students provides the College of Education with a strong foundation upon which to build.

As a Catholic Franciscan university, the University of St. Francis' mission has always included attention to values, ethics, and service. In order to make this focus more explicit, the university formed the Values 99 committee in 1999. The committee's charge was to identify the specific values encapsulated within the mission of the institution. As a result of this work, integrity, respect, service and compassion were emphasized. These values are integrated into all coursework. In particular, "Introduction to Theology," a course taken by all university students, includes a service component.

At the University of St. Francis' College of Education, dedication to character education is grounded in the conceptual framework USF (Understanding students; Serving the community; and Finding your professional self). The framework is introduced to education students in their first course and built upon throughout their teacher preparation program. As a result, character education is a part of both the formal curriculum and the ethos of the College of Education. Several courses explicitly examine moral development, ethics, and the responsibilities of a teacher as a character educator, while school and campus-wide programs contribute to the development of habits of service and community involvement.

All teacher education students take Dr. Madonna Murphy's "History and Philosophy of Education," a foundations course that addresses the content and intellectual history of character education. This single-semester course has two distinct parts, both of which seek to

integrate the history of character education in schools with its practical application. The course begins with an intensive investigation of the key philosophers in the history of ethics and education. Course readings and lectures cover, in part, Confucius, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Aquinas, Erasmus, Calvin, Rousseau, Locke, Jefferson, Mann, Montessori, and DuBois. In this part of the course, students work in cooperative groups to research one of the key historical figures in education and plan a 20-minute class presentation on their findings.

The second half of the course turns its attention to methodology, thus fulfilling the stated objective to "examine current curricular approaches to character education" in order to teach students to "integrate character education into all they do as a future teacher." Students receive an extensive bibliography of recent books on character education. While studying instructional methodologies, students prepare a paper describing their philosophy of education as it relates to the theories studied in the course; the paper includes a section describing how they plan to integrate character education into their classroom experiences. This paper becomes one of the first entries in the students' portfolios. Every subsequent teacher education class results in a product that is added to the portfolio. In the written reflections that accompany each portfolio artifact, students describe how the piece reveals their understanding of students, service to the community, or the finding of their professional self (USF).

Murphy's course is not the students' only opportunity for studying character and its formation. As part of the "Educational Psychology" and "The Psychology and Development of the Middle School Child" courses, students study the moral

Character Education for Teachers — A 5-Day Intensive Summer Course

Monday	<i>Teaching Respect and Responsibility What are Values, Virtues, and Good Character?</i>
Tuesday	<i>Philosophic Foundations of Moral Education The Moral Nature of the Classroom</i>
Wednesday	<i>The Developmental Approach to Moral Education</i>
Thursday	<i>Effective Moral Schools Respect for Oneself and Others</i>
Friday	<i>Evaluating the Effectiveness of Your Program The Marva Collins Story</i>

development theories of Piaget and Kohlberg and write moral dilemmas for specified age groups. During their methods course, students create a thematic unit and are challenged to integrate principles of character education within the plan. The “Discipline and Classroom Management Techniques in the Inclusionary Classroom” course identifies the importance of creating a caring classroom. During their clinical experiences, students observe how master teachers integrate character education into their teaching. Finally, student teaching placements are within schools that are committed to character education. As a result, the College of Education students develop lesson plans and work with supervisors to integrate character education into the curriculum.

In addition, the University of St. Francis offers “Character Education For Teachers,” a one-week intensive summer professional development course designed to “help teachers develop respect and responsibility in students.” In this course, educators learn to integrate character education in all that is taught. They learn how to create a moral, formative, and character-building school and classroom environment. The course has the following objectives for participants:

- Identify the philosophic and psychological foundations of character education.
- Compare and contrast the pedagogical traits that characterize each of the above approaches to values education.
- Give examples of practical instructional strategies, methods and techniques for classroom utilization and curricular materials that can be used to integrate virtues and character qualities in the school.
- Present a unit in their area of instruction and grade level in which they have integrated virtues into the curriculum.

Like “The History and Philosophy of Education,” the course incorporates the teachings of philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, but also immediately integrates philosophy with practice. For example, Plato’s question, “Can Virtue be Taught?” is coupled with a look at “What values should/can schools teach?” and is followed later in the day with an investigation of school mission statements and internet sites on character education.

In February 2002, the university’s newly created Center for Character Education held its first one-day conference. Teachers who had attended the summer course were invited to share what they had done in their schools

during the past year to promote character development. The College of Education's undergraduates attended as well, giving them the opportunity to work with experienced teachers committed to character education.

The environment of the University of St. Francis encourages students to practice habits of good character. Numerous school and campus activities provide College of Education students with opportunities to serve others. Beginning in the Fall of 2002, students are required to complete a service learning component in their introductory education course, "Teaching in a Diverse Society." Presently, an optional service-learning program places students in local schools as Junior Achievement instructors. The University of St. Francis' College of Education also sponsors a Future Educators of America chapter that organizes service activities and holds fundraisers to support local youth organizations. Last year's efforts raised funds for the Boys and Girls Club of Joliet. Kappa Delta Pi, the School of Education's honor society, supports local schools by holding drives to collect school supplies and paperback books. These activities, along with campus-wide tutoring programs, home-building projects, and work in soup kitchens, foster life-long habits of service to the community.

The University of St. Francis' College of Education places emphasis on character education throughout its program. Pre-service teachers are immersed in an environment that fosters their own development of good character. At the same time, through coursework, these future teachers learn to shape their teaching in ways that will contribute positively to the developing character of their students. During their student teaching, College of Education students practice character education in local K-12 schools committed to character education. Graduates of the University of St. Francis are committed to fostering character education through their teaching.

Promising Practices:

- **Mission Statements**
- **Courses in
Character Education**
- **Cultivating a Positive
Moral Ethos**
- **Service**

The following practices of teacher education institutions provide some ideas to consider in integrating character education more deliberately into teacher preparation programs. We have identified a sampling of:

- mission statements that highlight character
- courses on Character Education
- ideas for Shaping a Moral Ethos
- a Model of Service Learning within the context of teacher education

MISSION STATEMENTS

Mission statements embody the priorities and principles that imbue a school/department of education. The CEP/CAEC 1999 study (Finding Six) revealed a strong connection between an explicit reference to the moral dimensions of teaching in a mission statement and the attention given to character education in the teacher education program. With this in mind, we have identified a handful of mission statements that could serve as examples for those institutions eager to refine their own. The danger of putting too much faith in a mission statement, of course, is that sometimes reality lags far behind the rhetoric. A commitment to character education is not only to be articulated in an institution's vision and mission but also to be embraced and lived within the teacher preparation course work, culture, and field experience.

Some education school mission statements explicitly mention, for example, service to the community. Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey, which began as a Normal School for young women in 1923 and has developed since into a flourishing university, includes the following in its mission statement: "The Rowan ambition: knowledge through study; responsibility through service; and character through challenge."

<http://www.rowan.edu/elan/mission>

Recognition of the importance of preparing teachers to make the ethical decisions required daily of educators is also a theme of some mission statements. Kansas State University's College of Education describes itself as, "Dedicated to preparing educators to be knowledgeable, ethical, caring decision makers." <http://www.educ.ksu.edu/COE/Mission.html>

Other colleges of education pledge to give attention to diversity and equity in their teacher education programs. California State University, Fresno's School of Education and Human Development's statement declares, "The mission of the School of Education and Human Development is to educate students to become teachers, administrators, counselors, and educational specialists to provide for the educational needs of children and adults, with special attention to diversity and equity." <http://caracas.soehd.csufresno.edu>

Mission statements of centers at schools of education dedicated to character education may also serve as models for schools of education.

Bonner Center for Character Education and Citizenship at the California State University, Fresno

Character Education and the Teaching Profession: A Statement of Beliefs (Excerpt)

- We believe that teaching is a moral activity. The teacher's first moral obligation is to be prepared to provide his or her students with the best instruction in the subject matter assigned.
- We believe that the education of children is a moral endeavor. It is the duty of the teacher to reveal the fundamental truths of human experience. It is the duty of the teacher to make meaning and to foster understanding. It is the duty of the teacher to help students explore humanity and to value it. Irresponsible or careless instruction may have profound effects on children's future and should not be tolerated.

The Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character at Boston University

Founded in 1989, the Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character (CAEC) was built on the following convictions:

- Character education is an essential and inescapable mission of schools and thus must be done consciously and well.
- Together with parents, teachers are responsible for character education; they must be selected, educated, and encouraged with this mission in mind.
- A reservoir of moral wisdom exists in great stories, works of art, literature, philosophy, and indeed all academic disciplines; an encounter with this treasure must be a regular part of schooling.

COURSES IN CHARACTER EDUCATION

K-12 schools are once again aware of the power of the formal curriculum to inspire reflection in young people about what makes a life worthwhile, about good and bad choices, about blameworthy and praiseworthy action. Thoughtful educators plan lessons that examine questions of character within every subject they teach. Moreover, they recognize that much of what happens within their classrooms and schools provide their students with the challenge to author their own choices, to begin to shape their own lives. With this in mind, they take advantage of the myriad opportunities to encourage and guide students to meet these challenges well. How can teacher educators prepare future teachers to embrace these goals in their teaching?

Romanowski and Oldenski (1998) point out that "Teachers must begin to understand that they have the power to shape curriculum and that their curricular decisions shape the way students see the world" (p. 113). Indeed, if we hope to give prospective teachers both the knowledge base and understanding they need to help their students develop good character, then one important step they need to take is to ensure their course content specifically addresses ethical and moral issues (Nord, 1990; Weber, 1998).

We were able to identify several courses from a variety of teacher preparation institutions that prepare future teachers to encourage character development through the subjects they teach. What follows is a brief description of some of these courses.

Children’s Literature and Character Education: Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN

Indiana State University (Terre Haute, IN) offers a course that enables future teachers to envision ways in which the curriculum might “ignite students’ moral imagination” (Ryan & Bohlin, 1999, p. 102). Master’s students may take Dr. Sharon Andrews’ “Children’s Literature and Character Education,” a three-week intensive summer course. Dr. Andrews aims to show how literature in elementary school classrooms can promote students’ character development. The students examine how characters make decisions, the motivations driving these decisions, and the consequences of their choices. The course text is Andrews’ (1994) *Teaching Kids to Care: Exploring Values through Literature and Inquiry*. The text begins with two case studies that illustrate the use of inquiry projects as the context for the study of ethical questions. A historical overview of the context for character education and a comparison study of moral concepts present in early and contemporary textbooks is also included. Andrews’ text concludes with an invaluable 25-page bibliography of children’s literature, stories that embody themes of character. Dr. Andrews (1994) addresses preservice teachers with these words:

There are many ways to make your classroom an exciting, thoughtful, challenging place to be....However, unless your curriculum provides a personal and caring connection between the students and the content, the potential for educating students in the rights and responsibilities of living in a democracy is limited. To provide a curriculum that deals with moral dilemmas of everyday life is to give

students the opportunity to consider and practice the decision-making that is required of every citizen. (p. xv)

Through this course, Indiana State University’s School of Education students are provided with a foundation for building classroom environments and units in literature that foster the development of the good character necessary for responsible citizenship.

Curriculum and Methods of Teaching-Secondary: University of San Diego, San Diego, CA

At the University of San Diego, a teacher’s influence on the character development of middle and high school students is addressed directly with secondary education students. Dr. Mary Williams’ “Curriculum and Methods of Teaching - Secondary” course is the final course for education students before their full-time student teaching. Williams introduces preservice teachers to strategies that both teach content and foster habits of good character. Her students learn questioning skills that can be used to engage students in critical thinking, fostering habits of mind such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. She uses case studies as the basis for discussions on the ethical demands of teaching. Williams believes that case studies are effective because “in a teacher education program many students are only thinking about their own experiences. Case studies offer a common context for discussion.”

The course also gives students a chance to practice writing and implementing lesson plans that address themes of character before they enter their semester of student teaching. As part of their coursework, students prepare and teach a content area lesson that includes character education objectives. The students

profit from teaching these lessons to their peers first, so that they have an opportunity to gain practice and critical feedback before they revise and teach it to real students. One undergraduate developed a lesson for a 9th grade English class that required students to examine the attributes of super-heroes. The lesson engaged students in a discussion about the most important traits of a super-hero for the 21st century, inviting reflective thinking about the nature and content of character. Through this assignment, Williams' students come to appreciate the challenge of engaging students in higher level thinking about ethical questions. In addition to writing such lessons, her students regularly join the online national forum on character education through the Character Education Partnership website (www.character.org), thereby engaging them in a broader dialogue with educators from across the country. The syllabus for the "Curriculum and Methods of Teaching - Secondary" course was published in the CEP compendium *Character Education: The Foundation for Teacher Education*, a report of the ATE National Commission on Character Education (Williams & Schaps, 1999).

Williams believes that attention to character as part of the preparation of secondary level teachers is much less common than at the elementary level. As she puts it:

Elementary people seem to take for granted that they are working with communities of learners. This is often not so in secondary education. Her secondary-level preservice teachers are prepared to "teach the whole child and are ready to accept their responsibility as character educators." According to Williams, school administrators often contact her to request student teachers and

claim that University of San Diego students are "more prepared" and are "different" from student teachers in other programs. She attributes the students' success in their teaching placements to the attention given to character in their preservice education. Williams illustrates the attitude shift among her students in this way: Early in the semester students are likely to say, "I teach math." After taking the course they are more likely to say, "I teach kids." This, Williams says, "is one of the biggest contributions I can make."

Developing Values and Character in the School, Home, and Community: University of Rochester, Rochester, NY

The University of Rochester's Warner Graduate School offers a course that is character education content-specific. Students earning Master's in Teaching, Counseling, or Administration may choose to take Dr. Howard Kirschenbaum's "Developing Values and Character in the School, Home, and Community." Thomas Lickona's (1991) *Educating for Character* and Kirschenbaum's (1995) *100 Ways to Enhance Values and Morality in Schools and Youth Settings*, plus a packet of readings, are used as course texts.

Dr. Kirschenbaum leads his students through the examination of four approaches to character education: inculcation, modeling, facilitating (moral development and values clarification), and skill development. Kirschenbaum believes that the integration of traditional with progressive forms of moral education offers the strongest approach. Students in his course learn to blend more directive teaching of ethics and character with progressive methods such as problem solving,

community service learning, values clarification, and goal setting. Kirschenbaum demonstrates the practical application of various approaches to moral education for his students. For example, he might ask them to read a morally rich story included in William Bennett's (1995) *The Children's Book of Virtues* and to consider how the piece might be used to teach about values in a classroom. One class assignment requires students to read such a story to a child or group of children and to ask questions that elicit the theme of the story. Some of Dr. Kirschenbaum's students are surprised by the reactions of their listeners. They are impressed with the children's understanding of moral themes and are heartened by their desire to hear more stories with messages such as "good triumphs over evil," as Kirschenbaum put it.

Another course assignment challenges students to complete an autobiographical paper on the development of their own character. As they apply course concepts to their own experiences, students come to recognize the importance of early influences, especially parental influence on their lives. Many come to appreciate the caring and effective character education their parents offered them and, according to Dr. Kirschenbaum, this assignment often "opens a nice dialogue between students and their parents." Students also write a paper that examines values education in a particular area of interest. For example, students in past semesters have investigated topics such as sports and character education, as well as sex education and character development. The final assignment requires students to create a teaching unit that integrates character education within a specific grade-level and subject area. Dr. Kirschenbaum explains that a future elementary teacher might create lessons that address caring and respect while a student preparing for secondary teaching might focus

on incorporating character education within math lessons. Dr. Kirschenbaum believes that it is important for teachers to help students understand how values come into play in different disciplines. As Dr. Kirschenbaum points out, "Throughout the course, students learn about the theory, research, and controversies surrounding the various approaches to values and character education."

Policy Studies in American Education: California University of Pennsylvania, California, PA

At the California University of Pennsylvania (California, PA), all undergraduate education students are exposed to the basic terms and concepts that frame an intellectual understanding of character education. During their sophomore year, students take the semester-long course, "Policy Studies in American Education." For one week, Dr. Henry Huffman guest lectures on character education. The students complete the following assignments before meeting with Dr. Huffman: 1) reading the Character Education Partnership's Eleven Principles of Effective Character Education and 2) defining five terms: moral, value, ethics, character, and manners/social decorum.

During the course of his lectures, Dr. Huffman reviews both of these assignments and discusses the policy and practice of character education. In his presentations, Huffman has local as well as national policy in mind. The area school districts use CEP's Eleven Principles and have working definitions of the five terms. By examining and matching the students' definitions with those of the local school districts, Dr. Huffman encourages the students to begin to adopt the same lexicon used in the public schools. This study serves not only as an introduction to character education, but also as an introduction to the

culture of the schools where many will complete their student teaching or work full-time in the future.

CULTIVATING A POSITIVE MORAL ETHOS

Recognizing the powerful influence of the environment and culture of a school on the developing characters of its students, educators committed to helping young people develop virtuous dispositions strive to ensure that all aspects of school life help to sustain a positive moral ethos.

Coming UP Short?, the CEP/CAEC 1999 study of teacher education institutions, found that:

Today's schools of education are more inclined to cite the learning process, rather than curricular content, as the primary vehicle for character education. For example, deans say that schools of education tend to emphasize creating a caring classroom environment over explicit instruction in core virtues (Nielsen-Jones, Ryan & Bohlin, p. 13).

In the follow-up conversations with deans of schools of education, CAEC learned that character development is most often addressed in courses that deal with the ways in which teachers shape classroom environments. The school ethos and student teacher relationship have a profound influence on the development of children's character. It comes as no surprise that teacher education needs to include an examination of these topics. Warren Nord (1990) suggests that preservice teachers must be taught to recognize issues of morality within teaching contexts. He argues, "They

should be introduced to the moral assumptions and judgments that inform and help shape the theories, the research methodologies, and the teaching methods employed in the particular subjects they will be teaching" (p. 191). Weber (1998) proposes that preservice teachers examine topics such as discipline and classroom management within the context of character education. He argues, "Perhaps implicit in classroom management, but not always emphasized, is the question of classroom and/or school community-building that is an important part of many character education efforts" (Weber, 1998, p. 91).

Marilyn Watson (1999), former Director of Programs at the Developmental Studies Center, outlines four components necessary to create caring communities and help students develop essential skills and understandings that lead to good character. Such communities, she argues, foster caring relationships, teach humane values, honor intrinsic motivation, and teach for understanding. According to Watson, teacher education programs must prepare future teachers to create caring environments by providing:

- [Help] learning how to view classroom management and discipline as important vehicles for teaching skills, building motivation, and developing understanding in children's social and moral domains.
- Help seeing the limitations of management systems that achieve control through rewards and punishments....
- Help gaining clarity about the values that will guide their classroom and the role of authority in it....
- Help being comfortable with a collection of activities and pedagogical approaches that assist in building a sense of classroom unity, collaborative spirit, personal autonomy and responsibility....

- Help knowing how to engage children in instructional conversations or Socratic dialogues rather than in recitations, on such social and moral topics as friendship, loyalty, courage, fairness, or honesty. (pp. 30-31)

The following examples highlight schools of education with courses that specifically examine implicit and methodological approaches to fostering a positive moral ethos.

Classroom Discipline for Personal and Social Responsibility: The State University of New York College at Cortland, Cortland, NY

Some colleges deal with character education as a framework for looking at a fundamental aspect of teaching. The State University of New York College at Cortland houses the Center for the Fourth and Fifth Rs (Respect and Responsibility) in its department of education. Directed by Dr. Thomas Lickona, the center serves as a regional, state, and national resource for character education. SUNY Cortland education students often visit the center to borrow materials for papers or projects. The center's new, more visible location draws ever greater numbers of students to its "take-one" rack, which features articles on the theory and practice of character education. Through the Center for the Fourth and Fifth Rs, education students come to understand that "character means living by core values - respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, fairness, caring, courage, self-control, and diligence - understanding them, caring about them, and acting upon them" (<http://www.cortland.edu/www/c4n5rs>). SUNY College at Cortland also requires students to take "Classroom Discipline for Personal and Social Responsibility" before they

begin student teaching. The course examines several discipline models. The texts for the course include Butchart and McEwan's (1998) *Classroom Discipline in American Schools*, which instructor Dr. Joy Mosher describes as "a call to action for character development." Mosher introduces the course to her juniors and seniors with the following quote from Butchart and McEwan (1998), "The question is never, 'What works?' - all manner of barbarity works, if the end is orderliness alone. The question is, what works to assure the sorts of civility and dignity that is essential in the short term for effective learning, and vital in the long run for democratic life?"

Dr. Mosher introduces her students to a range of discipline models. Beginning with a behaviorist model that relies on external controls, the students learn to examine the underlying implications inherent in each model. Mosher finds Lee Canter's *Assertive Discipline* a useful resource early in the semester. His ongoing dialogue with critics helps students recognize that by thinking about what they are doing and saying, they become clearer about their goals with children.

As the semester progresses, the students begin to recognize that they will inevitably teach the social curriculum along with the academic curriculum. Lickona's (1991) *Discipline Model*, encountered later in the semester, brings into focus the dual responsibilities of a teacher. Mosher's students learn that it is both a right and a responsibility to teach the values that matter in a democratic society. Mosher explains that teachers are inevitably shaping the character of students through everyday interactions.

The course assignments mirror the progress of the course, moving from reflection on the importance of deliberately teaching character

to applying a critical eye to classroom practice and environments. Students begin the semester by writing a paper on the values and ethics they hope to exemplify and teach within their classrooms. Later in the semester, cooperative groups of students present techniques that may be used to teach social skills. Conflict resolution, restitution, class meeting, communication/behavior window, and cooperative learning are among the methods students examine. Mosher's students then apply their developing abilities to evaluate the social implications of classroom management. The final course assignment invites students to connect their understanding of the course content to their field experience. Using concepts examined in the course, the students write an essay that provides an analysis of the social curriculum in their practicum classroom setting.

By the semester's end, Dr. Mosher's students have considered the ethical dimensions of teaching and the ways in which the social curriculum is implicitly and incidentally taught in a classroom.

Dr. Mosher believes that her students have a professional responsibility to represent the importance placed on character education by their institution. To this end, she prepares her students to serve as practitioners and advocates of thoughtful, reflective character education.

The Educative Process: The University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Located in an urban setting, The University of Illinois at Chicago is committed to preparing teachers for careers in multicultural, urban environments. Therefore, issues related to cultural pluralism and the needs of urban learners are emphasized throughout the program. Education students explore character education as a topic within an educational

psychology course. In Dr. Larry Nucci's course, "The Educative Process," students study the social cognitive domain theory, examining the development of moral understanding. They draw instructive insights from the work done in this area by Dr. Elliot Turiel, Dr. Judith Smetana and Dr. Nucci himself. Consideration of the development of a child's understanding of social convention and morality leads to discussion about how this knowledge might inform teaching and classroom management. Dr. Nucci's *Education in the Moral Domain* (2001) and C. M. Charles' *Building Classroom Discipline* (2001) are guiding texts in the course. While completing course assignments, students are introduced to the university's Office for Studies in Moral Education website. Students continue to access the site throughout their teacher education program. They link to current information and research and gain access to an international community of educators dedicated to the development of character.

SERVICE

Habits of good character are developed through action. As Aristotle notes, "[Men] become builders by building and lyre-players by playing the lyre; so too we become just by doing just acts...brave by doing brave acts."

Our nation's K-12 schools have recognized the importance of providing students with occasions to put altruism, compassion, and service into practice. Increasingly, school-wide service projects and the humanitarian efforts of individual classrooms create opportunities for students to give of themselves. Service learning, in particular, promotes ethical reflection, personal and social responsibility, and a commitment to service.

Schools of education that endeavor to encourage the development of good character among future teachers sometimes make service a part of the education curriculum. As Dale L. Rice, Ph.D., the director of the Office of Academic Service-Learning at Eastern Michigan University, eloquently put it:

Academic service-learning builds character and values of civic responsibility. As students engage in community activities to gain a deeper understanding of subject matter, they also acquire new knowledge and a sense of civic engagement, responsibility, and pride....We are talking about character development infused in the curriculum (personal communication, December 18, 2000).

Service learning offers special benefits for students who are preparing to become teachers. These experiences prepare teachers for culturally diverse contexts (Murtadha-Watts, K., 1998), develop skills of care (Swick, K. J., 1999); foster commitment to social justice and human service (Vadeboncoeur, J. & others, 1996; Wade, R. C. & Anderson, J., 1996); and prepare them to educate future democratic citizens (Butts-Freeman, R. 1993). Most importantly, service learning creates positive moral ethos within the school of education community.

A number of schools/departments of education require their students to participate in service projects. Courses designed, however, to prepare future teachers to help students understand and practice service are less common. A profile of one course that is particularly well developed in this area is described below.

Service Leadership: Seattle University, Seattle, WA

At Seattle University in Seattle, Washington, Masters in Education students participate in a service learning experience that begins with theory, progresses to experience, and ends with reflection. Reflection, however, is a critical component throughout the students' experience. Instructor Jeffrey Anderson builds the "Service Leadership" course within this conceptual framework: "The teacher is an ethical and knowledgeable reflective decision-maker who teaches all learners to function effectively in a global and pluralistic society." The course begins with instruction on service learning as a teaching method. Objectives for this portion of the course include:

- Appreciate the importance and power of service learning in helping students develop self-esteem, civic responsibility, empathy for others, and higher-order thinking skills.
- Identify sources of information pertaining to the variety of human services agencies that can assist teachers in addressing their students' needs.
- Demonstrate knowledge of the elements of high-quality service learning.
- Identify and discuss methods to integrate service learning experiences into the K-12 school curriculum.

In preparation for their service learning field experience, Anderson's students are introduced to the seven elements of high quality service learning: integrated learning, student voice, high quality service, civic responsibility, collaboration, reflection and evaluation.

After formal instruction, the students, in teams of two or three, write a proposal to implement a service-learning project with younger students

under the supervision of a K-12 educator who is committed to service learning. Six full days - a minimum of 25-hours — are reserved for the field experience. Students monitor and work alongside the K-12 students and their teachers in this endeavor. They provide structure and support for the project, making necessary contacts and coordinating logistics. The School of Education students also organize the schoolchildren’s reflection sessions. Often project ownership becomes shared among the classroom teacher, his/her students, parents, community organizations, and the Seattle University students. According to Dr. Anderson, these are the most successful projects.

At the end of the course, each student team gives a 40-minute multimedia presentation at the semi-annual Service Leadership Conference. A sampling of student projects and presentations includes:

- “Woman-to-Woman: Stories from Women on the Streets”: High school girls visited homeless facilities and wrote the oral histories of some of the women living there.
- “Those Rotten, No Good, Unsafe, Unhealthy and Pesky Germs”: After learning about the importance of hygiene to prevent the spread of germs, 3rd grade students collected products such as soap and toothbrushes to donate to a local shelter.
- “Books on Tape”: Young students learned to read “with voice” and create audiotapes for patients at a children’s hospital.
- “The Power of Student-to-Student Tutoring”: Ninth grade students volunteered weekly to tutor 1st graders in reading.
- “Arsenic and Old Lead”: Middle school students collected soil and analyzed results to see whether levels of contaminants of the soil around the school were significant.

- “Looking at Homelessness and Poverty: An Interdisciplinary Service Learning Project”: 120 8th graders studied homelessness and poverty as part of an interdisciplinary project and initiated service projects connected to this theme.
- “Shorecrest Sock Drive”: High school students organized a sock drive to benefit homeless youth in Seattle.

A guest speaker further highlights the value of service-learning at the Service Leadership Conference. In December 2000, Dr. Robert Howard of the University of Washington, Tacoma gave a presentation entitled “The Relationship Between Service Learning and Character Education.”

Dr. Anderson describes the service-learning course as a “win-win partnership between K-12 teachers and the education students.” The preservice teachers assist classroom teachers as they use service learning to provide a strong educational experience for students. At the same time, the education students gain an understanding of the power of service learning and the skills necessary to infuse service learning in their own classrooms. The course’s success is evident in its strong reception and support from the community. According to Dr. Anderson, there is a waiting list of teachers interested in working with his students. Some schools have established partnerships with Anderson’s Service Learning course that have endured for ten years. New schools join the project each semester.

The strength of the Service Leadership course lies not only in its potential to help preservice teachers learn to develop similar practices for their own classrooms but also its ability to create an ethos of service and reflection within the School of Education.

Conclusion

Using the data collected during our the CEP/ CAEC 1999 study, the CAEC identified schools/ departments of education that have included character education in their teacher education programs. Through conversations with deans and faculty from these institutions, this follow-up study allowed us to identify three programs that offer multi-faceted approaches to character education and to gather snapshots of other, more limited, promising practices. Often, the steps that have occurred resulted from the individual efforts of one, or perhaps two, faculty teacher educators who believe character formation is at the heart of teaching and learning. Efforts are thus not comprehensive or well-integrated into the overall teacher education program.

On the other hand, we discovered an array of courses that address the intellectual content and history of character education or examine the teacher's responsibility in shaping a positive moral ethos within the school. We learned of schools of education that foster a culture of service and ethical decision-making among future teachers. Clearly, these practices invite further discussion and reflection. They provide practical insights for schools of education eager to prepare teachers who can more successfully focus their teaching on both fostering excellence of mind and character in their students.

These efforts should be considered first steps. They are largely limited. None have been evaluated. Over the coming months, CEP and several schools of education will be reflecting on and planning new, broader, multi-faceted approaches to preparing their teachers to become educators of character and evaluating their initial efforts. More research and analysis is needed.

In the meantime, we hope that this publication can serve as a resource to prompt those preparing teachers to think about character education. From the various ideas for course content and methodology, to initiatives for culture building ceremonies and programs, these profiles and practices make a modest contribution to the emerging national dialogue about the need to prepare teachers as educators of character. We are confident that schools of education who embrace this commitment in vision and practice will help tomorrow's teachers become strong educational leaders.

References

- Andrews, S. V. (1994). *Teaching kids to care: Exploring values through literature and inquiry*. Bloomington, IN: EDINFO Press.
- Aristotle. (1925). *The Nicomachean ethics*. (D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, W. J. (1995). *The children's book of virtues*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Butts-Freeman, R. (1993). The time is now: To frame the civic foundations of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(5), 326-334.
- Butchart, R. E. & McEwan, B. (1998). *Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- California State University, Fresno web site. (2001). <http://caracas.soehd.csufresno.edu/>
- Character Education Partnership web site (2001). <http://www.character.org>
- Charles, C. M. (2001). *Building classroom discipline*, 7th ed. Boston: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Coles, R. (1997). *The moral intelligence of children: How to raise a moral child*. New York: Plume Books.
- Durkheim, E. (1973). *Moral education: A study in the theory & application of the sociology of education*. (E. K. Wilson & H. Schnurer, Eds. and E. K. Wilson, Trans.). New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Jones, E. N., Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). *Teachers as educators of character: Are the nation's schools of education coming up short?* Washington, D.C.: Character Education Partnership.
- Kansas State University web site. (2001). <http://www.educ.ksu.edu/COE/Mission.html>
- Kirschenbaum, H. (1995). *100 ways to enhance values and morality in schools and youth settings*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Murtadha-Watts, K. (1998). Teacher education in urban school-based, multiagency collaboratives. *Urban Education* 32(5), 616-631.
- Nord, W. A. (1990). Teaching morality: The knowledge most worth having. In David D. Dill and Associates (Eds.), *What teachers need to know: The knowledge, skills, and values essential to good teaching* (pp. 166-198). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Nucci, L. P. (2001). *Education in the moral domain*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Romanowski, M. H., & Oldenski, T. E. (1998). Challenging the status quo of teacher education programs. *Clearing House*, 72(2), 111-114.
- Rowan University web site. (2001). <http://www.rowan.edu/elan/mission>
- Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). *Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Swick, K. J. (1999). Service learning helps future teachers strengthen caring perspectives. *Clearing House* 73(1), 29-32.
- Vadeboncoeur, J. A. & others. (1996). Building democratic character through community experiences in teacher education. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(2), 189-207.
- Wade, R. C., & Anderson, J. B. (1999). Novice teachers' experiences of community service-learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(6), 667-684.
- Watson, M. (1999). The child development project: Building character by building community. In M. M. Williams & E. Schaps (Eds.). *Character education: The foundation for teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: The Character Education Partnership.
- Weber, C. (1999). Pre-service preparation for teaching character and citizenship: An integrated approach. *Action in Teacher Education*, 20(4), 85-93.
- Williams, M. M. & Schaps, E. (1999) *Character education: The foundation for teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: The Character Education Partnership.

Additional Information

For additional information about character education, please contact:

Character Education Partnership

1025 Connecticut Ave. NW, suite 1011

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 296-7743

(800) 988-8081

geninfo@character.org

www.character.org