

IS THE CLOSET DOOR STILL CLOSED IN 2014?
A CIPP MODEL PROGRAM EVALUATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHER DIVERSITY
TRAINING REGARDING LGBT ISSUES

by

JOSEPH WOODRUFF

JOHN PETROVIC, COMMITTEE CHAIR

DAVID DAGLEY
JOHN DANTZLER
SHARON NICHOLS
KAREN SPECTOR

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2014

Copyright Joseph Woodruff 2014
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this program evaluation was to examine the four components of the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations) in the diversity training program conceptualization and design delivered to College of Education K-12 preservice teachers at a large university in the southeastern United States (referred to in this dissertation as University X) as the training relates to LGBT issues. This research focused on each of the four CIPP components through document analysis of targeted courses and qualitative interviews of program stakeholders. This CIPP evaluation model focused on the formative (Content, Input, and Process) and summative (Product) approaches to improvement of projects, programs, personnel, products, institutions, and systems within the K-12 preservice teachers degree program.

CIPP Program Evaluation Research Questions

1. “What is the local climate surrounding University X as it relates to LGBT issues?” (Context)
2. “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for K-12 preservice teachers?” (Input)
3. “How is diversity training for K-12 preservice teachers implemented programmatically?” (Process)
4. “What is the perceived impact of the program on K-12 preservice teachers?” (Product)

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to everyone who helped me and guided me through the trials and tribulations of creating this manuscript.

In particular, this work is dedicated to Dr. Craig Teasdale. This final product is as much yours as it is mine.

I would also like to dedicate the work to Dianne Gambrel, Nicholas Gambrel, and Nick Gambrel. I would also acknowledge extended family and friends for their support and patience in completing this work.

I would specifically acknowledge Dr. Kathleen McCaffrey. Without your patience, persistence, and caring motivation, this final phase would not have been completed. You are an inspiration, encourager, and motivator. I am definitely a better person because of you.

I would also like to acknowledge Susan Cole, my first principal and dear friend, for her recommendation of this program.

*This work is also dedicated to all K-12 students who endure the trials
faced growing up in any LGBT situation.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank the many colleagues, friends, and faculty members who have helped me with this research project. I am most indebted to John Petrovic, the chair of this dissertation, for sharing his knowledge, expertise, and patience. I would also like to thank all of my committee members, David Dagley, John Dantzler, Sharon Nichols, and Karen Spector for their invaluable input, inspiring questions, and support of both the dissertation and my academic progress. I would also like to thank all participants for their time, knowledge, and shared experiences.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose.....	8
Program Evaluation	9
Research Questions Using the CIPP Model.....	10
Method	11
Significance of the Study	14
Limitations of the Study.....	16
Summary	16
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	18
Introduction.....	18
Contributing Factors to Creating a Hostile Environment	18
Moral Law.....	24
Teacher and Curricular Leadership Modeling	25
Legal Concerns	28
Inherent “Rightness”	36
K-12 Preservice Teachers/Training	39

Educational Effectiveness and Training	46
Framing the Research	53
The Context, Input, Process, and Product Model	59
Summary	60
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	62
Introduction.....	62
Research Design.....	63
Context, Input, Process, and Product	64
Data Collection, Population, and Setting	66
Interviews.....	69
Data Analyses	73
Verification of Data	74
University Artifacts.....	74
Course Descriptions	75
Foundations Syllabi	76
Elementary Education Syllabi.....	79
Secondary Education Syllabi	79
Student Evaluation Documents.....	80
Data Collection Plan	83
IRB	84
Research Design Concerns	84
Researcher Positionality.....	86
Summary	86

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS OF THE STUDY	88
Data Exposition and Results	88
Situational Context.....	88
Local Context.....	88
University Context	93
Context, Input, Process, and Product	101
Analysis.....	102
Pseudonyms	103
Direct Dialogue.....	103
Case One	104
Context.....	104
Foundations.....	104
Sexual Discrimination.....	104
Conservative nature of University X	105
A climate that invites openness.....	106
Elementary Education	107
Conservative nature of University X	107
A climate that invites openness.....	109
Secondary Education	109
Conservative nature of University X	109
A climate that invites openness.....	111
Issues of race.....	111
Input	111

Foundations	112
Autonomy in course design	112
Influence though individual perspectives	113
Pedagogical complexities.....	115
Elementary Education.....	115
Pedagogical complexities/limitations	115
Programming.....	116
Secondary Education	117
Sexuality as controversy	117
Movement towards inclusion.....	119
Process	121
Foundations.....	121
Programming.....	121
Awareness of race and identity.....	123
Nature vs. nurture.....	124
Conservatism	127
Pedagogical complexities.....	128
Elementary Education.....	129
Lack of opennes and programming/autonomy ...	129
Awareness of race and identity	130
Programming.....	130
Secondary Education	132
Programming.....	132

Product	132
Foundations.....	133
Products and assessments	133
Feedback	133
Evaluation	134
Elementary Education	135
Products and assessments	135
Secondary Education	135
Products and assessments	135
Summary of Case One	136
Case Two	138
Context.....	139
Foundations.....	139
Greek influence and conservatism.....	140
Avoidance	141
Issues of race.....	142
Elementary Education.....	143
Avoidance	144
Conservative nature of University X	145
Secondary Education	146
Conservative nature of University X	146
Greek influence.....	147
Input	148

Foundations.....	148
Programming.....	148
Elementary Education.....	149
Programming.....	149
Secondary Education	151
Perceptions of effectiveness.....	151
Programming.....	151
Process	153
Foundations.....	153
Programming.....	153
Elementary Education	154
Topic avoidance	154
Secondary Education	155
Programming.....	155
Product	156
Foundations.....	156
Products and assessments	156
Elementary Education.....	157
Products and assessments	157
Evaluation/feedback.....	157
Secondary Education	157
Programming.....	157
Evaluation/feedback.....	157

Summary of Case Two.....	159
Comparing and Contrasting of Cases One and Two.....	162
Similarities	162
Differences	163
Primary Research Questions Revisited.....	164
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS	168
Introduction.....	168
Major Findings.....	169
Environmental Issues	169
Reflections of Moral Law	170
New Beliefs.....	172
Social Justice and Barriers	173
Culture.....	174
Conclusions and Recommendations	176
Future Research and Proposals for Program Improvement	178
REFERENCES	184
APPENDICES	194
A. IRB letter (approved)	194
B. IRB informed consent form (approved).....	195
C. Primary Research Questions	200
D. Guided Interview Questions.....	201
E. Contact Script for Interview Solicitation (email or phone)	202
F. Course Descriptions.....	204

G. Student Interview Volunteer Form206

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The CIPP Model Evaluation.....	64
Figure 2: Safe Zone Ally Graphic.....	94

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

It is the timeframe of the university experience that holds many of the lessons for an educator learning how to understand and meet the needs of diverse learners in order to ensure social equity. Although thousands of educators are prepared annually to go forth and teach, there is an apparent hole in training programs for K-12 preservice teachers. “Among the programs that ignored sexual orientation topics..., 40% (of participating educators) responded that time constraints relative to other diversity topics was the primary reason for ignoring sexual orientation” (Sherwin and Jennings, 2006, p. 215). At best, these educators passively add to sustaining homophobic and heterosexist cultures within public schools (Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). Sherwin and Jennings also included other extenuating reasons for dismissing the need for inclusion of instruction dedicated to negotiating the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students. Some of these include lack of faculty knowledge, student disinterest, and faculty unwillingness or discomfort with the subject matter (Sherwin and Jennings, 2006). In addition, one program coordinator surveyed stated that sexual orientation was not a major issue being dealt with in their rural area (Sherwin and Jennings, 2006). This type of attitude of avoidance or oversight perpetuates the intentional or unintentional maintenance of a normative set of cultural ideals that ostracizes based upon, among other things, sexual identification. The term sexual identification was utilized throughout this research to refer to outwardly acknowledged identification as LGBT as well as LGBT perceptions. Students who have not acknowledged their LGBT identity or even those who are inaccurately perceived as

members of the LGBT community are subject to harassing situations, also. Sexual identification serves as a blended term to include all LGBT participants, whether real or perceived.

Grossman (2008) supports the findings that confronting and managing feelings or apprehensions of dealing with unknowns can be difficult and challenging; acknowledging these challenges can be important when planning curriculum study and field support for a novice teacher. Additionally, a separate Grossman (1990, p. 147) study utilizes a structure that examines the pedagogical understanding of subject matter composed of four major components:

“conceptions of purposes for teaching subject matter, knowledge of students’ understanding, curricular knowledge, and knowledge of instructional strategies”, yet there is no mention within this framework of the knowledge or understanding and acceptance of the student.

John E. Petrovic (2002, p. 151) suggests that LGBT students are harmed by a lack of support and a lack of “positive systematic inclusion” within the school community. Teachers can “hold great influence over the thoughts, opinions, and actions of their students” (Petrovic, 2002, p. 152), a lack of inclusion likely leads the LGBT student to imagine that their thoughts and inclinations do not warrant merit and thus lead to feelings of invalidation. Positive systematic inclusion would require educators to reflect positively when discussing gay and lesbian issues or family situations. This type of inclusion would, at the very least, deter educators from negatively reflecting on gay and lesbian situations regardless of their personal beliefs. This sort of forward thinking is compelling and motivating for further research in this field.

However, in spite of the research already discussed emphasizing the importance of a feeling of a safe learning environment for all students (including LGBT students), sometimes a more “black and white” reasoning is needed to reach necessary officials. Money talks, and the financial costs to school systems are becoming increasingly apparent each time there is a

settlement mandated. Expense is one of the most compelling reasons for justification for legitimate and authentic diversity training. The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (ACLU) posts a fact sheet periodically sharing information on relevant issues current to K-12 environments. Citing the *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District* legal case, the fact sheet shared information relevant to this case as well as the school's handling of the harassing situation.

In 1998, Alana Flores, Freddie Fuentes, Jeanette Dousharm, and three other students sued the Morgan Hill Unified School District in Morgan Hill, California. They charged that school district employees repeatedly ignored or minimized reports when students reported that others who thought they were gay were abusing them. According to the plaintiffs, school officials usually did nothing about the incidents; on the rare occasions when they did respond, it was so ineffectual that it only made the attackers bolder in their harassment. Students were known to brag about how school officials let them get away with harassment or punished them very lightly. Jeanette Dousharm eventually felt she had no choice but to drop out of school because of the pervasive harassment. Another student entered independent study to escape the daily taunting and attacks at school. In their lawsuit, the students sought to obtain improved training for district personnel and students as well as damages.

As a result of the settlement in the *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District* case (2004), the district was mandated to implement a comprehensive training program for administrators, staff, and students to combat anti-gay harassment. The lawsuit also precipitated a historic ruling from the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. The school district's argument was the law did not prescribe how schools should respond to anti-gay bias among students, therefore the law was unclear. Because of this lack of clarity, the school district argued that school officials should

not be held legally responsible for letting harassment continue. In 1999, U.S. District Court Judge James Ware upheld the right of the students to sue the district. Although the district appealed this decision, a panel of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals unanimously ruled that if a school knows anti-gay harassment is taking place, it is the obligation of the school to take meaningful steps to end harassment and protect students.

The school district was ordered to pay 1.1 million dollars in settlement costs; however, there was also another by-product of the settlement. Schools in Morgan Hills have incorporated a training program to combat anti-gay harassment. The ACLU posting also included paragraphs detailing twelve cases from 1996 to 2005, which cost school systems portions of their operating budgets. The settlements from these twelve cases mentioned in the ACLU posting totaled approximately \$4,476,000. This of course does not include peripheral costs such as attorney fees or personnel costs during the trials or mediations.

Standard 4 on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) website deals specifically with diversity. The wording in the following NCATE related paragraphs references diversity. However, the meaning of diversity often refers to racial, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity rather than sexual orientation/perception or identification. While references are consistently made to racial or ethnic group inclusion, reference to the LGBT student is not apparent. The standards are divided into several subcategories:

4a. DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM AND EXPERIENCES

4b. EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE FACULTY

4c. EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE CANDIDATES

4d. EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE STUDENTS IN P-12 SCHOOLS

Although this is certainly important and meaningful training, there is a formidable gap left for educators regarding LGBT students and surrounding issues. NCATE standards regarding diversity are outlined under each of the above headings with descriptors outlining unacceptable performance, acceptable performance, and target performance. The framework is in place, so modification needs to be implemented to include training covering LGBT issues. For example, standard 4d deals with experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools. It reads as follows:

ACCEPTABLE

Field experiences or clinical practice for both conventional and distance learning programs provide experiences with male and female P–12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. Candidates also work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn (NCATE, 2012).

This explanation for acceptable performance should be revised to include the experiences that would assist in a more enlightened experience for educators dealing with LGBT students. The supporting explanation for diversity on the NCATE site refers to America’s classrooms becoming increasingly diverse with over 40% of the students being students of color. Certainly among those students of color, numerous LGBT students may experience a double-dose of discrimination, harassment, and intimidation not to mention the challenges that same-sex parents would experience. NCATE strives to empower candidates to develop knowledge of diversity with a global reach while developing professional dispositions that respect and value differences.

One of the goals of this standard is the development of educators who can help all students learn or support their learning through their professional roles in schools. With the increased percentages of bullying and discrimination of LGBT students and their families, it is paramount that this group be identified in order to develop open-minded, caring educators. As shown in the review of literature, litigation due to issues of bullying and harassment of these students is increasing as LGBT students are even more vulnerable due to personal physical characteristics, as well as their real or perceived gender orientation (Conn, 2006).

NCATE also mentions that field experiences and clinical practices support the development of educators who can apply their knowledge of diversity, including exceptionalities, to work in schools with all students. These experiences should provide opportunities for candidates to reflect on their observations and practices in schools and communities with students and families not only from diverse ethnic/racial, language, gender, and socioeconomic groups, as well as issues related to sexual identification, orientation, and perception. Clinical learning experience for candidates in a College of Education must help them process diversity concepts as well as provide feedback about their performance. Again, the missing piece of the collective puzzle deals with the LGBT student and the sensitive issues surrounding an educational experience while combating prejudice, discrimination, and perception.

Statement of the Problem

GLSEN (the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network) is the leading national education organization focused on ensuring safe schools for all students. In 2009, GLSEN conducted the sixth National School Climate Survey (NSCS), a biennial survey of the experiences of LGBT youth in U.S. secondary schools. The national sample consisted of 7,261

LGBT students from all 50 states and the District of Columbia (2011). A total of 175 respondents were attending schools in a state neighboring University X's state. The majority of this sample was White (65%), 12% was African American/Black, 10% was multi-racial, 8% was Hispanic/Latino, 3% was Asian/Pacific Islander and less than 2% identified as Middle Eastern/Arab American or Native American/Alaska Native. Most identified as female (54%), 36% as male and 5% as transgender. Most (93%) attended public schools, and 77% attended school in urban or suburban communities.

GLSEN (2011) reports in one research brief that LGBT students most often did not have access to in-school resources and supports. Several of the findings are listed below:

- Nearly all heard “gay” used in a negative way (e.g., “that’s so gay”) and nearly all heard other homophobic remarks (e.g., “fag” or “dyke”) regularly at school.
- Nearly all regularly heard other students in their school make negative remarks about how someone expressed their gender, such as comments about someone not acting “feminine” or “masculine” enough.
- Students also heard biased language from school staff. 31% regularly heard staff make negative remarks about someone’s gender expression, and 29% regularly heard school staff make homophobic remarks.

Knowing the percentages reported, the two-fold justification for increased research on LGBT concerns and effective training for teachers presents itself with a convincing argument. With so many students reporting negative remarks and expressions, the moral justification for increased training for K-12 preservice teachers becomes increasingly important and clearly presents itself as the main research initiative. The cost to school systems is the second reason for research toward increasing diversity training and accepting attitudes for teachers within a teacher

education program, and this is raising awareness for the root problem within these public school situations. With budgets already tight, increased expenses to school systems in the form of court judgments are unacceptable. The expense to school systems is exposed more readily in legal cases discussed in Chapter II.

Purpose

In the book *Queering Straight Teachers: Discourse and Identity in Education*, the question is posed “What would a curriculum be like if the curriculum began with the problem of living a life” (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 75). This question presents the underlying emphasis for the research in stating that the “problem” is not a wrongdoing or a situation but rather the living of a life. Addressing the issues faced by students inside as well as outside the classroom may directly affect the effectiveness of instruction as well as the reception of the teacher by the students. Given these concerns, the purpose of this program evaluation (following the CIPP model) was to examine the program components influencing the diversity training that focuses attention on LGBT issues delivered to K-12 preservice teachers at a large university in the southeastern United States through their College of Education (referred to in this dissertation as University X).

Creating and maintaining programs that empower future teachers is paramount to making legitimate change for LGBT students within schools and communities. This can only be achieved through teacher education programs preparing teachers to combat the issues and situations they will inevitably face. These programs must prepare K-12 preservice teachers to face the challenges of the diverse student populations they will encounter. The effectiveness of this training not only can affect the students within the classroom but may also lead to a more empowered feeling for the teacher.

Program Evaluation

Evaluation of a program must evaluate the quality of a program's performance as it relates to the effectiveness of some or all aspects of the program's intent (Rossi, 2004). Rossi (2004) also states that evaluation of a program typically involves analysis of one or more of five domains, which include: 1) the need for the program, 2) the program's design, 3) implementation and service delivery, 4) impact or outcomes, and 5) efficiency of the program. Through use of the CIPP evaluation model, the core concepts of Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations are examined (Stufflebeam, 2003). The individual evaluation categories should provide differing types of data. The Context evaluation should focus on determining objectives; the Input evaluation should focus on exposing program design; the Process evaluation should examine program operations; the Product evaluation should direct attention to judging and reacting to program goals (Stufflebeam, 2003). All of the evaluation categories retained a focus toward LGBT training issues at University X.

The need for the study of the program is justified through stated research, (e.g., Sherwin and Jennings, 2006) which show the jeopardy students are in when needs are not addressed. Ignoring the needs of LGBT students places them in harsh situations. The design of a program plays directly into its effective implementation as well as delivery of service to the intended clientele (K-12 preservice teachers). James Sears (1992, p. 53) states that prospective teachers "woefully inadequate knowledge and homophobic attitudes and feelings mean that relatively few...prospective teachers believe that this group of largely invisible, at-risk students merits special attention or assistance". Purposeful examination of a program may certainly lead to a more effective delivery of intended instruction and produce a more enlightened and effective preservice teacher.

Research Questions Using the CIPP Model

As previously mentioned, Rossi (2004) stated that evaluation of a program typically involves analysis of five domains, listed again as 1) the need for the program, 2) the program's design, 3) implementation and service delivery, 4) impact or outcomes, and 5) efficiency of the program). The first three of the five above relate directly to the CIPP domains in different ways. The first three apply to the need of the program as well as the implementation and service delivery (which refers to the formative aspects of the program development). Understanding the basic purpose of the evaluation is key when addressing the basic needs of the program to be met. Also, understanding the questions at the most basic level assists in defining the methods to implement the program. The second issue relates to program outcomes (and refers to more of a summative narrative for the program).

The focus of the research questions examined four categories of diversity training delivered throughout the courses at University X. All of the research questions were based upon typical evaluation questions targeting specific program evaluation components utilizing the four phases of the CIPP model components. As previously stated, the Context evaluation should focus on determining objectives; the Input evaluation should focus on exposing program design; the Process evaluation should examine program operations; the Product evaluation should direct attention to judging and reacting to program goals (Stufflebeam, 2003).

The primary research questions were as follows and were listed with their corresponding CIPP category:

1. "What is the local climate surrounding University X as it relates to LGBT issues?"
(Context)

2. “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for K-12 preservice teachers?” (Input)
3. “How is diversity training for K-12 preservice teachers implemented programmatically?” (Process)
4. “What is the perceived impact of the program on K-12 preservice teachers?” (Product)

Questions 1, 2, and 3 concentrated on the formative aspects of the program, while question 4 focused on the summative aspects of the program. The combination provided insight into the CIPP examination of the university program.

Rossi (2004, p. 3) states that “...program clientele need to distinguish worthwhile social programs from ineffective ones and launch new programs or revise existing ones so as to achieve certain desirable results”. The bottom line of any social program is that it should show improvement for the social conditions addressed. Sherwin and Jennings (2006) reference research data to state research indicates that homophobic and heterosexist attitudes are prevalent among both preservice teachers and licensed teachers (Butler and Byrne, 1992; Maddux, 1988, Maney and Cain, 1997; Petrovic, 1998; Roffman, 2000; Sears, 1992; Szalacha, 2004). Through considered analysis of this social program at this large university in the United States (for K-12 preservice teacher training), research may indicate suggestions for improved delivery.

Method

The program evaluation following the CIPP model endeavors to judge the program as it relates to chosen categories (Rossi, 2004; Stufflebeam, 2003). In this research, it was program context, program input, program process, and program product.

University context was established by examining the situation in which University X is affixed. Archival documents included campus online information as well as state and local legislative decisions as they relate to LGBT concerns.

Archival documents and interviews with participants within University X's stakeholder group were examined next. Archival documents included syllabi and course descriptions. Analyzing and coding these assisted in exposing the context in which University X's College of Education operates. Coding of archival documents (targeted syllabi and course descriptions) was included in the CIPP evaluation, as well. Analyses of these documents fostered a more complete exposition of the situation for University X as well as the situation/climate for the LGBT training of K-12 preservice teachers. This provided some input into the context portion of the research as well as input from the coordinators and faculty members. These documents were coded in the same manner as all other documents and interviews (coded to reveal recurring words and key phrases).

Qualitative interview data were gathered from two sources and were conducted as two separate cases. Case One began with interviews with program coordinators from Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Multiple Abilities Program (MAP), and Foundations programs along with other faculty members. The program coordinators were contacted via phone and/or email to establish a time to interview each of them regarding their programs. All program coordinators were interviewed; however, several weeks after the initial interview with the MAP coordinator, I received an email informing me that the MAP faculty had decided to withdraw participation from this research study. They also indicated that I would not be allowed to visit classes to solicit student volunteers. The email also stated that the department was afraid that the research would not show instruction in the MAP program in a favorable light as it relates to

LGBT issues and concerns. I also share that the email stated that the faculty would be taking this as a “wake up call” as they examine their future planning. The email from the MAP coordinator did not indicate from where the research would come to formulate any basis for reform.

Case One also included six faculty members from those targeted programs. When combined with the program coordinators, the interview breakdown for Case One was as follows: Four Foundations faculty members, two Elementary Education faculty member, and three Secondary Education faculty members. Their interviews were coded and analyzed and are discussed under the four components of the CIPP model in Chapter IV.

Case Two consisted of students who volunteered to participate in research interviewing from targeted programs within the College of Education at University X. This included two courses of study under the Curriculum and Instruction degree program (the Elementary Education program and the Secondary Education program) and the Foundations program. The target interview group for Case Two included thirty students who volunteered to be interviewed after I (as the principal researcher) visited a class meeting to explain the focus of the research. Student volunteers were informed that they would receive fifteen dollars in compensation as an incentive to participate.

Student volunteers were solicited within the recommended courses to foster a purposeful random sampling of students. This encouraged a more authentic sampling of student responses rather than soliciting student names for contact from the faculty instructors. This also provided an additional level of anonymity for these interview participants.

While all coding was conducted similarly, the results from the two cases were not merged. Instead, there was analysis that focused on a compare/contrast format between the two cases in Chapter IV.

Significance of the Study

Findings from the *GLSEN 2009 National School Climate Survey* demonstrate that schools in a state neighboring University X's state were not safe for many lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) secondary school students. In addition, many LGBT students did not have access to important school resources, such as Gay-Straight Alliances, and were not protected by comprehensive bullying/harassment school policies.

- The majority experienced verbal harassment (e.g., called names or threatened): Almost 90% because of their sexual orientation and almost 66% because of the way they expressed their gender.
- Many also experienced physical harassment and physical assault: About 30% were physically harassed (e.g., pushed or shoved) because of the way they expressed their gender and about 20% were physically assaulted (e.g., punched, kicked or injured with a weapon) because of their sexual orientation.
- Students also reported high levels of other forms of harassment at school: 89% felt deliberately excluded or “left out” by peers; 85% had mean rumors or lies told about them; 71% were sexually harassed; 55% experienced electronic harassment or “cyber bullying”; and 49% had property (e.g., car, clothing or books) deliberately damaged and/or stolen.
- 72% of students who were harassed or assaulted in school never reported it to school staff, and 48% never told a family member about the incident. Among students who did report incidents to school authorities, only 45% said that reporting resulted in effective intervention by staff.

LGBT students in one southern state most commonly heard homophobic, sexist and negative remarks about gender expression. Most LGBT students in a neighboring state had been victimized at school, and many of these incidents were not reported to adult authorities. Petrovic (2002, p. 147, referencing Elze and Due) states that, as a coping mechanism, “Students report that they create straight identities in order to fit in”. Petrovic (2002, p. 148) coins the term “positive systematic inclusion” as a reference to including positive allusions (or at least the absence of negative comments) to gay and lesbian relationships. Examples of this could include stories of two men cooking for children or two women working on school projects with their children. The terms gay or lesbian need not appear; however this would show the existence of same-sex friendships or partnerships to the students as the stories are read. This is certainly not the norm for most classroom teachers across the nation; this type of forward thinking reveals another angle of need for future research.

Education information and research related to a neighboring southern state is included as this state and University X’s state are neighboring states, and both share many similarities throughout their histories. Students who find themselves graduating from colleges in University X’s state often find themselves seeking employment within the metropolitan area school systems for the neighboring state. In the neighboring state’s metropolitan work area, the highest starting salary for a new teacher with a bachelor’s degree in education is \$44,312. This state uses an aggressive salary schedule to attract applicants from not only from local colleges and universities but also from neighboring state colleges and universities. In a special report of the Southern Legislative Conference called “Filling in the Gaps: Solving Teacher Shortages”, it was reported that one of the most influential ways to attract new, highly qualified teachers was an “increase in the starting salary for teachers from \$32,000 to \$39,000. In the South, this neighboring state has

developed a recruiting strategy that highlights the district's high salaries (which is \$36,500 for first-year teachers, \$7,500 more than the national average, with a top salary for experienced teachers of \$75,000) and unabashedly targets districts where budget cuts have resulted in layoffs or stagnant salaries. The district's budget, \$550 million, is generous enough to allow for these recruitment efforts" (Hull, 2003, p. 9). This shows the attractiveness of the increased salaries within a neighboring Southern state.

Limitations of the Study

The most prevalent limitation to this study was the scope of the study. The participants were recruited from one college within one university, and this in turn did not lend itself to generalizability to other programs or situations. However, the research was conducted as a program evaluation using the CIPP model and by design was limited to a specific programming setting and situation. The research conducted in this study is simply offered as information for progress for this particular College of Education.

Through examination of all collected data, themes supporting or ignoring LGBT issues within the K-12 preservice training program presented themselves and streamlined further direction for the research. If themes did not present themselves, then this would have in turn exposed inconsistencies within the program itself. There were, however, common themes exposed along with one theme unique to Case Two; when combined with the research data, suggestions for directions of improvement have been formulated.

Summary

Program evaluations are important parts of the function and operation of organizations that provide educational services, so evaluation of the quality of diversity training provided can provide legitimate data for increased effectiveness (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). The overarching

goal of this CIPP evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of diversity training within K-12 preservice teacher education programs as the training relates to LGBT topics at University X. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, it is my premise that in order to improve teaching and learning for all children, universities must focus their goals not only on high quality professional preparation, but also on training which includes study and preparation around issues of equity, diversity, and cultural competence. By building occasion and opportunity for awareness, K-12 preservice teachers would also have opportunities for reflection about the LGBT student and equitable practice. Without awareness or reflection, there would not be an opportunity for future action or sustainable change within our school settings.

CHAPTER II:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this literature review was to provide the reader with a knowledge base of LGBT concerns in public school settings. Issues concerning the LGBT community and the increasing situations within public school systems concerning LGBT issues are at the forefront of much debate from educational and political entities. Some literature even addresses situations involving diversity training for many students. However, the two issues do not seem to cross paths often. There is a definite need for more research regarding the LGBT issues faced in public school systems throughout the United States from both the perspectives of the faculty/staff and the students. The research here dealt with a CIPP program evaluation of K-12 preservice training program as it relates to LGBT issues within the College of Education at University X. To provide a look into the historical literature and attempt to provide the necessary background, this chapter reviewed literature addressing contributing factors to creating a hostile environment, teacher and curricular leadership modeling, legal concerns, diversity training and K-12 preservice teacher situations, education effectiveness and training, as well as other related studies.

Contributing Factors to Creating a Hostile Environment

A valid teaching and learning system must represent a legal and equitable interpretation as to how schools relate to all students and their legal rights. Bullying and harassing behaviors deny students the opportunity for a full and enriching educational experience. Although similar, the terms “bullying” and “harassment” are not necessarily interchangeable. In fact, Conn (2006) points out that *Black’s Law Dictionary* does not include the term *bullying* but does define

harassment; the online version of this dictionary defines harassment as “repeated conduct that is not wanted and is known to all parties as offensive” (Black’s Law Dictionary, 2012).

Harassment refers to unsolicited words or conduct, usually repeated or persistent, that tend to annoy, alarm or abuse another person, whereas bullying involves a real or perceived power imbalance. Bullying is unwanted, aggressive behavior among school-aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behavior is repeated, or has the potential to be repeated, over time (Bullying, 2012). Bullying sometimes also refers to a perceived physical threat, whereas harassment infers non-physical infringements.

These definitions are often used interchangeably because of defined similarities, such as the repeatedness of the offensive behavior; however, bullying is typically the preferred term when dealing with school-age children. Both terms were used and discussed here since harassment typically refers to offensive behavior with a sexual context. Although the persons perpetuating the harassment are not always intending a sexual overture, it does often deal with a feeling or thought of sexual preference and may indeed be perceived as sexual harassment.

Much of the educational, psychological, sociological, and medical literature now expands ideas of bullying to include issues of sexual identification. Cases such as *Flores*, *Davis*, and *Nabozny* outline the possibility of an accepted practice of bullying and harassment for LGBT identified youth or even those perceived LGBT. The ACLU website states that “lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth should have the freedom to be open (or not) about their identity and ideas in schools and government facilities. The ACLU LGBT Project strives to protect their right to be safe and visible and to have their identity embraced rather than belittled or erased” (ACLU, 2012). They also strive to foster education programs so that all students may be taught

in an environment respectful of their perceived sexual identification. Many of these issues were addressed in the legal section.

Bullying based on sexual identification is intentionally aggressive behavior designed to incite fear of further aggression and subjugate the victim (Conn, 2006). This expanded characterization of bullying and harassment provides extended meaning to how these behaviors are viewed in the legal arena, and accordingly becomes increasingly relevant to the rights of students who are targeted and victimized because of their actual or perceived sexual identification. As issues of sexual identification become linked to issues of bullying and harassment, it is imperative that educators understand the role that they must play in creating a school environment that is free of the mistreatment and oppression of this specific population of students.

While bullying and harassment are not new to schools, the effects of these behaviors have more recently resulted in serious, even fatal, consequences. America has witnessed increasing incidents of school violence rooted in bullying behavior, such as the tragic 1999 school shooting at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. This disturbing trend is echoed beyond America's borders, as evidenced by a statistical analysis of data gathered by the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute (CEPI) regarding bullied or harassed students internationally (Friedman-Nimz, 2006). Conn (2006), of the CEPI, reported that 39% of teens report bullying on account of personal physical characteristics such as their looks, body size, or even cultural background. In order for our schools to ensure the safety of all students regardless of race, religion, gender, and most notably, gender orientation, our schools must become both inclusive and respectful places (Friedman-Nimz, 2006).

The following statistics reflect a disturbing trend of bullying directed towards sexual minority youth. They also reflect the effect of a negative school environment that is neither inclusive nor respectful for not only the LGBT student, but also the entire school population. Besides being bullied because of personal physical characteristics, Conn (2006, p.2) indicated students report that “bullying on account of real or perceived gender orientation is second in prevalence, with 33% reporting frequent bullying because they are, or are perceived as, gay, lesbian, or bisexual”. Results from a 2005 National School Climate Survey documenting the experiences of students who self-identify as LGBT revealed that 74.5% of students heard derogatory remarks such as ‘faggot’ or ‘dyke’ frequently at school; 37.8% of students experienced physical harassment at school on the basis of sexual orientation; 26.1% of students have been physically harassed on the basis of their gender expression; 17.6% of students have been physically assaulted because of their sexual orientation; 11.8% have been physically assaulted because of their gender expression (GLSEN, 2005).

Youth risk behavior surveys in Massachusetts, Washington, and Vermont (Center for Disease Control and the Massachusetts Department of Education, 2001; Safe Schools Coalition of Washington, 2002) have provided data about the extent of bias that persists in U.S. schools against sexual minority youth. These surveys reported that 97% of students in public schools report hearing homophobic remarks from peers; 53% of students report hearing anti-gay remarks made by school staff; 80% of prospective teachers report negative attitudes toward sexual minority youth; 67% of guidance counselors harbor negative feelings toward gay, lesbian, bisexual, and/or transgendered people; 77% of prospective teachers would not encourage a class discussion on homosexuality; 85% oppose integrating gay/lesbian themes into their existing curricula; and 80% of gay and lesbian youth report feelings of severe social isolation (Center for

Disease Control and the Massachusetts Department of Education, 2001; Safe Schools Coalition of Washington, 2002). Sears (1992) also reported that eight out of ten K-12 preservice teachers held negative inclinations regarding homosexuality.

The unwelcoming and often hostile school environments in which LGBT youth find themselves exact a high toll; sexual minority youth are known to be at greater risk for a variety of social, emotional, physical, and educational hardships. Roffman (2000) reported that, in comparison to their peers, LGBT youth were two to five times more likely to report skipping school because of feeling unsafe, three times as likely to be threatened with a weapon at school, twice as likely to report having seriously considered suicide, four times as likely to report having attempted suicide, twice as likely to be a teen parent, three to ten times as likely to report having tried cocaine, and twice as likely to report bingeing on alcohol at least once in the previous month. These statistics suggest that LGBT students are at a higher risk for behaviors that decrease the likelihood of success in the educational setting when compared to their straight classmates.

Studies also indicate a negative school environment and mistreatment of LGBT youth affect more than just the targeted victims. A report from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2001, p. 5) stated, “When victimization through bullying, verbal abuse, and physical violence is prevalent in a school, the entire school community experiences the consequences”. Roffman’s (2000) report revealed that anti-gay harassment could be targeted toward both LGBT students and those students that are merely perceived by others as being LGBT. Regardless of a child’s ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, sexual orientation, or physical status, all children have a right to safety while at school. Students who are worried about being targeted or worried about possible threatening behavior will not consider their school environment safe or nurturing.

Most would agree that school administrators and legislators have the responsibility to ensure the well-being of all students regardless of race, religion, and gender by enforcing policies intended to prevent both verbal and physical bullying and harassment. The attention paid to such issues of bullying, verbal abuse, and physical violence by the school's leadership can be viewed as an influential factor on the overall tone of the school community. This influence can be seen in multiple school climate studies by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN, 2005) indicating the negative impact of prejudice, stereotyping, and general discomfort with the issue of homosexuality when left unaddressed by a system's or school's leadership. Armstrong (1994) also expressed concern that the public education system may be failing to deal with issues concerning sexuality and sexual orientation simply by the reluctance to take action to address these concerns.

D'Augelli, Grossman, and Starks (2006) share that educational research has not properly addressed sexual orientation in the development of adolescents. They report victimization based on sexual orientation, including trauma symptoms and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), among 528 lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. Nearly 80% reported verbal victimization, 11% reported physical victimization, and 9% reported victimization of a sexual nature; males reporting significantly more victimization. Rankin also shares that higher education often ignores LGBT issues on campus as "this climate of exclusion certainly creates a campus environment that marginalizes LGBTQA students" (Rankin, 2006, p. 111). Historians have also reported that college campuses historically have presented more challenging environments for LGBT students than those of their heterosexual classmates (Bieschke, Eberz, & Wilson, 2000; Dilley, 2002; Rankin, 2003). "Our challenge as researchers is to embrace fully the differences within the

LGBTQA population in our research questions, methodologies, and samples” (Rankin, 2006, p. 116).

Moral Law

Circumstances still exist and surface today to verify a strong contingent of those individuals and groups opposed to the equal treatment of the LGBT community. This would certainly bleed into a school culture where students combat their issues. As noted in court cases, students often see the reinforcement of intolerance and non-acceptance. One website exhibiting an attitude of non-acceptance and rejection is the Foundation for Moral Law (FML). Judge Roy Moore and his wife, Kayla, founded the FML website, found at www.morallaw.org (2013). Kayla Moore is currently president of the organization. The website’s main focus is a push for a return to the inalienable right to acknowledge God; however under this request for a return to a more “Godly” operation within the government, there are multiple court cases in which this organization has taken a stance against the acceptance or even tolerance of LGBT issues. The following court cases show a current crusade against LGBT acceptance.

In 2009, the FML argued to the Supreme Court in University X’s state that it was against the state’s law and public policy to force a mother from University X’s southern state to grant her former lesbian lover visitation rights to the mother’s biological child. Since the split with her lesbian lover, the mother had become married to a man. A California court order was requiring the mother now grant her former lesbian lover, residing in California, visitation rights to the child. The FML argued that this was directly contrary to the federal Defense of Marriage Act as well.

In 2010, Ward v. Wilbanks gained the support of the FML. They argued that a former student at Eastern Michigan University was wrongfully dismissed from a graduate counseling

program when she refused to validate and affirm the homosexual lifestyle. The FML argued that the university had violated the former student's right to freedom of speech as well as the freedom to exercise one's religion.

Shortly thereafter in 2011 in *Log Cabin Republicans v. United States of America*, the FML argued that homosexuality is not protected by the Constitution, and the military ban on homosexuality was constitutional (Foundation of Moral Law, 2013). The FML also reported that homosexual activity posed a health threat within the military and would be an internal threat to the armed forces. The FML asked the courts to interpret the Constitution as it was originally intended, and they asked that it not be rewritten to fit a radical, liberal agenda.

Most recently in 2013, *Welch v. Brown* found the FML arguing with the Ninth Circuit Court of California that it was unconstitutional for the state of California to ban counselors from sharing the opinion that homosexuality is not normal (Foundation of Moral Law, 2013). The Foundation argued, "Under the guise of affirming the homosexual lifestyle, (this action) actually established by law the religious and moral belief that homosexuality and homosexual acts are morally acceptable when in fact a large portion of the population and of the counseling community believe on religious, moral, and scientific grounds that homosexuality and homosexual acts are wrong" (Foundation of Moral Law, 2013).

These court cases show attitudes of intolerance still exist in 2013. School settings are often considered reflections of society, and these court cases demonstrate a group of people who are not accepting of others (in this case, the LGBT community).

Teacher and Curricular Leadership Modeling

Lack of leadership is one significant factor that adds to the reluctance of school personnel to combat anti-gay bias at school (Roffman, 2000). School personnel and administration may not

feel empowered to intervene or feel adequately educated on the proper steps to address the legitimate or perceived harassment. Perhaps if more school administrators understood their legal obligations regarding LGBT students, they would be more willing to protect LGBT student rights and ensuring access to an equitable education. If the leadership of a school refuses to address issues concerning sexual identification, that leadership is failing simply by its silence (Armstrong, 1994). Like all students, LGBT students and their supporters are afforded equal protection under the law. Therefore, school administrators need to be aware of the protections they must provide for LGBT students in public schools, so as to avoid costly litigation on behalf of their employers (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2006).

Another area of concern would be the seeming avoidance of inclusion of LGBT topics and stories in elementary school classroom. Elementary school teachers possibly do not consider the topic of LGBT issues as appropriate or relevant for their students' age group. However, this could prove to be the most appropriate place to set up situations to "avoid nuances that suggest a norm and can actively challenge pervasive stereotypes" (Kissen, 2002, p. 37). One example included by Diana Straut and Mara Sapon-Shevin suggest that "rather than 'Mary and Sue are baking cookies for the school bake sale', the story might say 'Dan and Mark are baking cookies'" (Kissen, 2002, p. 37). They also include that it could be appropriate to discuss LGBT issues much in the same way teachers "teach about racism, anti-Semitism, and others acts of exclusion that have occurred throughout history" (Kissen, 2002, p. 40).

In the book *Getting Ready for Benjamin: Preparing Teachers for Sexual Diversity in the Classroom* (2002), lesbian partners Michelle Hoffner-Brodsky and Denise Hoffner-Brodsky discuss their son, Benjamin, and outline ideals for his school experience as well as for all children. "We want him to be able to see his own image reflected in stories, songs, and games.

We don't want him to learn from his environment that he is abnormal, 'different', or that there is anything wrong with his family. Nor do we want him to feel invisible" (Kissen, 2002, p. 250).

This feeling extends to faculty and staff as well. Freedman adds that too often colleagues and administrators are suspicious of the intentions of LGBT teachers who include LGBT content in their lessons (1994). Many fear this is stemming from a political agenda rather than an academic one. He also references the fact that teachers often draw upon their own experiences to enrich and illustrate their teaching, but many LGBT teachers feel topics and experiences reflective of their gender expression are off limits.

Also mentioned within the Kissen book, *Getting Ready for Benjamin: Preparing Teachers for Sexual Diversity in the Classroom*, is the questioning of many regarding the role of male teachers within the classroom. Male teachers are often regarded as desirable commodities within school settings, particularly elementary settings; however, many male teachers are concerned about perceptions of themselves and their own sexual identity. Unmarried male teachers may certainly appear suspect. Epstein and Johnson (as reported in Kissen, 2002) report research that "perception of certain teacher behaviors as gendered led many male teacher candidates to question their ability to form relationships with students, for fear of being perceived as sexually suspect" (Kissen, 2002, p. 60). A male training to be an elementary school teacher often needs to be more concerned than his female counterpart as more of a "sexual threat" (Kissen, 2002, p. 63). Maney and Cain (1997, p. 240) reports that over fifty percent of respondents to their research believe that "male homosexuality represents a lifestyle that should be condemned".

Teachers who identify as LGBT are often distressed and perplexed about whether or not to reveal their gender identification within their communities and classrooms. Personal conflict

can certainly arise from the inability to be honest with their students, parents, and colleagues. This reflects back on the assumption of teaching and reinforcing a normative set of behaviors and expectations. Most LGBT teachers “would like to be open and honest about their sexual orientation. They desire to be available as role models, mentors, and advocates for homosexual and heterosexual students alike. They would like to do their work without fear of harassment, humiliation or pressure to resign” (Sanlo, 1999, p. 121).

Legal Concerns

Contemporary litigation demonstrates that, in order to protect LGBT student rights on a day-to-day basis, more teacher education and more legislation that recognizes the rights of this student population are necessary, as this litigation becomes increasingly prevalent (*Davis v. Monroe County School District*, 1999; *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District*, 2003; *Loomis v. Visalia Unified School District*, 2001). Educators must learn to recognize that it is the importance of student-led and student-initiated acts that takes precedence in these court rulings as the schools, due to unchecked harassment, fail to provide a safe educational environment for individual students. The following cases show a prevailing attitude of blatant negligence by school officials with some, at the very least, displaying attitudes of indifference.

Nabozny v. Podlesny (1996) was a landmark case regarding the issue of bullying and harassment for LGBT students. The decision demonstrated the need to understand that schools and teachers have a responsibility to protect students from antigay abuse (verbal and physical), as well as any discrimination and harassment based on sexual identification. During his four years at his public high school in Ashland, Wisconsin, Jamie Nabozny, a male student, was subjected to relentless antigay verbal and physical abuse by fellow students. Students urinated on him, pretended to rape him during class, and when they found him alone kicked him so many

times in the stomach that he required surgery. Although school officials were aware of the abuse, no interventions were put into place. School officials even stated at one point that Nabozny should expect this type of treatment to happen if he identifies himself as gay. Nabozny attempted suicide several times, dropped out of school, and ultimately ran away. However, he ultimately decided that he wanted to make sure that other students did not go through the same kind of nightmare. He sued his former school; however, a trial court initially dismissed his lawsuit. Lambda Legal reviewed and accepted his case, which was taken before a federal appeals court. The court issued the first judicial opinion in the nation's history finding that a public school could be held accountable for not stopping antigay abuse. The case went back to trial and a jury found the school officials liable for the harm they caused to Nabozny; the decision carried a settlement close to \$1 million.

Some cases have mandated school boards in the United States to conduct harassment training for all middle and high school students, faculty, and staff in order to create a safer school environment (*Boyd County High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Board of Education of Boyd County*, 2003; *Colin v. Orange Unified School District*, 2000; *Fricke v. Lynch*, 1981; *Merrick v. Board of Higher Education and State of Oregon*, 1992). Because such rulings have occurred at great financial cost to schools and public exposure of the denial of students' rights to safety, the fiscal awareness and responsibility of a school board is called into question as it decides how to address issues of harassment. Cases such as these show that the term harassment is applicable to LGBT concerns and situations.

Many of the legal cases display a tendency for school systems to, at the very least, ignore the turmoil faced by LGBT youth or add to their torment. Not only are LGBT students physically and emotionally bullied, but they are also denied equal access to the opportunities afforded to

their heterosexual peers. The *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District* case (2004) saw students sue the Morgan Hill Unified School District in Morgan Hill, California. The students alleged that school district employees repeatedly ignored or minimized reports when students stated that others who thought they were gay were abusing them. According to these student plaintiffs, school officials usually did nothing about the incidents, and on the rare occasions when school officials would respond, it was so ineffectual that it only intensified the brazenness of the attackers. In fact, students were known to brag about how school officials let them get away with harassment or punished them very lightly. One student eventually felt she had no choice but to drop out of school because of the pervasive harassment. Another student entered independent study to escape the daily taunting and attacks at school. In their lawsuit, the students sought to obtain improved training for district personnel and students as well as damages.

The school district contended the law was vague; it did not prescribe how schools should respond to anti-gay bias among students. Because of this lack of clarity, the school district argued that school officials should not be held legally responsible for letting harassment continue. In 1999, a U.S. District Court judge upheld the right of the students to sue the district. Although the district appealed this decision, a panel of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals unanimously ruled that if a school knows anti-gay harassment is taking place, it is the obligation of the school to take meaningful steps to end harassment and protect students.

As a result, the Morgan Hill School District was ordered to pay over \$1 million dollars in settlement costs. There was, however, a more significant result of this landmark case. The district was mandated to implement a comprehensive training program for administrators, staff, and students to combat anti-gay harassment.

In *Boyd County High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Board of Education of Boyd County* (2003), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) assisted in settling a lawsuit involving students who requested formation of a Gay-Straight Alliance (GSA) club at Boyd County High School in Ashland, Kentucky. The settlement not only required the school to treat all clubs equally and allow the GSA's formation, but it also required that the school conduct anti-harassment trainings for all students and staff. Interestingly, the school found a loophole in the settlement and took extreme action. Since the settlement required that it treat all clubs equally, the school decided to suspend all student clubs rather than allow the GSA. Rather than allow a club that endorsed gay and lesbian lifestyles, the school essentially stripped all organizational opportunities from its students.

In *Colin v. Orange Unified School District* (2000), a school system found itself in a similar situation as Boyd County; it was struggling with a request for a Gay-Straight Alliance club. The Orange Unified School District Board formally denied an application by the Gay-Straight Alliance to become a recognized student club and to meet on campus at El Modena High School. This official denial was issued after several months of denying students permission to meet. The board stated that it would reconsider the club's application if the club officially changed its name and agreed to limitations on topics covered by the club. This, however, was a limitation not required of other clubs at the school. The GSA pursued the case all the way to federal court, seeking relief for violation of legal rights under the Equal Access Act and the U.S. Constitution. A preliminary injunction was issued that allowed the club to meet while awaiting the trial, but in 2000, a favorable settlement was reached. The club won on all counts; not only was the GSA allowed to keep its original name, but the club was also granted the same access to school facilities as all other student clubs.

In *Loomis v. Visalia Unified School District* (2001), the Gay Straight Alliance Network alleged that the school district committed constitutional and other civil rights violations by deliberately acting with indifference to the pervasive harassment and discriminatory acts by teachers, administrators, and other students against students perceived to be gay. *Loomis* is significant because of its inclusion of students that are merely perceived to be gay, thus extending the school's realm of responsibility.

Cases like this may also be intensified by the locale and the prejudice perpetuated in certain regions of this country. James T. Sears (1991) chronicles numerous biographical stories in his book, *Growing Up Gay in the South: Race, Gender, and Journeys of the Spirit*. This bears mention here due to the heightened feelings of oppression in Southern cultures (as with the above case in Mississippi). This would typically be amplified for middle and high school students; with the maturity level of adolescents and young adults, those feelings of oppression and rejection may overwhelm. Sears (1991, p. 11) states that "the phenomenon of acquiring a lesbian or gay identity in the South may be much more representative of the United States as a whole...than is the gay and lesbian experience in the nation's coastal and industrial cities". This alienation in the South again serves to amplify the isolation and rejection felt by many gay and lesbian students in public schools. This case is presented with special attention given the site of this research project.

Davis v. Monroe County School District (1999) is one of the most famous cases regarding LGBT issues in public school settings. Aurelia Davis sued the Monroe County Board of Education because she believed school officials had failed to prevent her fifth grade daughter from being sexually harassed by another student. The lower courts rejected Davis' claim that the school allowed an abusive environment that deprived her daughter of educational benefits

promised under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (*Davis v. Monroe County School District*, 1999). The United States Supreme Court, however, decided to review the decisions of the lower courts.

The Court reminded the school district that Title IX's prohibitions against harassment were clear enough to have served as proper notice to school boards and stated that the board should have known that Title IX requires a school to ensure the safe education of all students (*Title IX*, 2006). The ruling also reminded the school that these requirements were in line with the Spending Clause, noting that the Title IX guidelines that Congress attached to its school funds obligated all recipient schools to comply or face loss of funding (*Title IX*, 2006). Since the school ignored several complaints from Ms. Davis, the Supreme Court further determined that the school acted with deliberate indifference and that the harassment in question was serious and systematic.

LGBT students have also faced barriers to equality in selecting prom companions. In April of 1979, Paul Guilbert, then a high school junior, sought his principal's permission to bring a male date to the junior prom at Cumberland High School in Rhode Island. The principal denied the request, stating that he feared that other students' reactions would be incendiary and would in turn lead to a disruption at the dance. He also expressed concern that Guilbert might be in danger of physical harm. Guilbert's own father also opposed his plan to attend the prom with a male date. Relying in part on the stance taken by Guilbert's family, the Cumberland School Department denied a public hearing to Paul Guilbert. Guilbert and his male friend did not attend the prom.

The following year, Aaron Fricke, who incidentally was a friend of Guilbert's, found himself facing a similar situation. Fricke also petitioned the principal for permission to bring a

same-sex date to a school dance. Fricke's request was denied. Like Guilbert's principal, Fricke's principal cited his fear of physical harm for Fricke, his male date, and possibly others attending the school function. The principal added that the adverse reaction from and the detrimental effect on Fricke's classmates would only be amplified by what the principal felt was an inevitable request for approval of overt homosexual interaction (Fricke v. Lynch, 1981).

Fricke's lawyers filed suit in the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island seeking an injunction that would allow Fricke to attend the dance. The court acknowledged Fricke's freedom of speech claim, and it decided that even a legitimate concern for a possible school discipline issue does not outweigh a student's right to express peacefully his views in an appropriate time, place, and manner (Fricke v. Lynch, 1981). One of the most important acknowledgements from the court's decisions was the school's inadvertent issuance of a heckler's veto. Basically, if the school did not enforce the policies for fair treatment of all students, any "heckler" would be empowered with the equivalent of a veto for the decision. The Court wrote that threats of physical violence against Fricke and his date gave homophobic students a perceived power of intimidation and ridicule.

The judge ruled that the precedent of *United States v. O'Brien* (1968) was the appropriate framework for judging the constitutionality of the decision. *O'Brien* required that the government and its agents pursue the least restrictive alternative and method before making any decision to limit free speech. The judge ruled that the principal's decision failed to meet the requirement of *O'Brien* because the school could have pursued acceptable steps to minimize the risk of harm or incident, and the principal had not made any effort to determine the need for and logistics of additional security. The judge ruled that the First Amendment requires that the principal take

steps to investigate and implement security measures before making a fair and informed decision.

The court also noted that the school was affording privileges to some students that it was not giving to others. By allowing a certain class of students (heterosexual students) to attend a school function free from fear of personal harm and denying requests from a separate class of students (gay and lesbian students), the school was, in fact, establishing different policies and unfair circumstances for certain students. The court noted that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment required the school to treat all students with the same consideration and opportunities. The court also noted that the principal and school had not properly analyzed the need for and logistics of adding additional security. If there were indeed a concern for students' physical harm, this need would most certainly require attention. Although the court did not state the following directly, it would seem a realistic assumption that this type of security concern would have been addressed for heterosexual students.

Aaron Fricke did attend his senior prom with his male date. Following the decision from *Fricke* and the precedent it set, many American public high schools now allow gay and lesbian students to attend school functions with their same-sex partners. This move toward allowing same-sex prom dates needs to be prefaced with schools coaching attitudes of acceptance throughout students' school experiences. This case further demonstrates the support for positive influences and equal environments outlined in Petrovic's discussions of "positive systematic inclusion". Petrovic (2002, p. 148) again serves as a reference to including positive representations (at best) or the absence of negative references to gay and lesbian relationships (at least). Without this conditioning of a new way of thinking, permitting homosexual pairings for school events would be arenas for harassment.

A similar incident occurred at a Mississippi school in 2010, when Itawamba Agricultural High School canceled its prom after a student, Constance McMillen, asked to attend with her girlfriend and wear a tuxedo (Lee, 2010). Rather than address the issue of attendance by same-sex couples and potential criticism from the community, the school instead chose to cancel the event. The school believed it would be better to cancel the prom rather than grant the student's request to attend with her girlfriend or even pursue an alternative solution. As backlash for the cancelled event, McMillen reported hostility from other students over the cancellation. She sued the school over the cancellation and consequent backlash.

These cases indicate a weakness in the school system, where schools are poorly prepared and sometimes unwilling to address the plight of students bullied or treated inequitably because of their sexual identity. Further research into training future educators to create environments more accepting to all groups may be the best combative action. Although in most cases faculty and staff are making decisions they feel are in the best interests for their schools and communities, court rulings are revealing schools' inadequate decisions. Further training for educators regarding situations outside of their personal experiences or the expected experiences for their respective communities may prove beneficial for avoiding future litigation.

Inherent "Rightness"

Many issues are surfacing in public school settings, and the students are basically experiencing a form of discrimination. The opportunities allowed for other students are not accessible for those identifying as LGBT. Unfortunately, throughout history interventions to issues have always been reactive, so the students who are currently facing these challenges are the pioneers for future generations. For example, one issue revealed in the legal section concerned issues surrounding forming gay/straight alliances. The federal Equal Access Act is a

law passed in 1984, and it is intended to protect the right of students interested in forming clubs at public high schools. The Equal Access Act defines two types of school clubs: curricular and non-curricular clubs. Gay/straight alliances are considered non-curricular as the subject of identifying as LGBT is not a part of the general academic curricula (i.e., math, reading, etc). The Equal Access Act states that if the administration of a school allows the formation of one non-curricular school club, it must allow the formation of any type of non-curricular school club. If a school has other clubs operating then it would be illegal under the Equal Access Act for them to deny the formation of a gay/straight alliance.

However, the Equal Access Act also states that all clubs must adhere to the same guidelines. If the school requires all clubs to have a faculty sponsor, this rule applies to a gay/straight alliance as well. “So if the school allows some clubs to make announcements about meeting over the P.A. system or post signs in the hallways about their activities, it can't then say any other clubs can't do those things. Also, schools can't require students to have parental permission to join a GSA unless they also require that for all other clubs” (ACLU, 2007). The recommendation of the ACLU on this site is to find out the rules for all clubs at the local school and follow them carefully. If the gay/straight alliance has opposition, adherence to the school's policies is crucial.

The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects your right to free speech and expression, and forbids the government from violating that right (ACLU, 2007). Since schools often receive federal monies as part of their operating budgets, they are considered part of the government or operating as part of a government agency; consequently, it is generally illegal for a public school to tell someone that they may or may not discuss any topic as long as the

conversation does not happen during or conflict with instructional time. The following bullet points are usually considered free speech/free expression issues (ACLU, 2007):

- My school told me I shouldn't talk about being gay at school,
- My school told me I couldn't wear my gay pride t-shirt,
- My school won't let us publish an article about gay rights in the school newspaper,
- My school won't let me wear makeup or a skirt because I'm a guy, and/or,
- My school won't let me wear a tux in my senior yearbook photo or to graduation because I'm a girl.

“That right to expression usually extends to things like t-shirts, as long as the school treats all students the same. Schools can enforce dress codes, but they have to enforce the dress code equally for all students. For example, if your school allows other students to wear t-shirts that express their political or social beliefs, then the school shouldn't tell you not to wear a gay pride t-shirt. But if your school doesn't allow t-shirts at all, then it's probably legal for them to tell you not to wear yours” (ACLU, 2007). The root issue for all concerned is fairness and equality of treatment.

Another recurring issue for high schools seen in litigation is the right to take a same-sex date to a school dance; this issue is typically viewed as a matter of free expression. Attendance at the school dance is permitted for all students fulfilling all of the requirements outlined by the school, and historically most schools do not publish guidelines for dates in regards to gender. However, dress code for dances and school functions are often outlined more clearly. In addition, if pictures are appearing in publications sanctioned by the school, the administration typically has more control. The ACLU site details that the school newspaper is typically considered the school's free speech and not a student's individual free speech because the school pays for the

publication and publishes it. This gives the school more discretion regarding any issues surrounding photographed and published activities.

Generally, most cases have been reactions to behavior that was considered harassing in nature. The ACLU outlines these bulleted points as issues that are usually considered harassment issues (ACLU, 2007).

- Other students call me names and threaten me at school,
- Other students call me names and threaten me on the bus,
- My school didn't do anything about it when I reported being harassed, and/or,
- Another student is telling people at school that I'm gay without my permission.

As in the case of *Nabozny v. Podlesny* (1996), federal courts have ruled that schools have to take action when they know students are being harassed because he or she is identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. The school administration and faculty must take steps to stop the harassment and protect the students. Ultimately, the equal protection clause is part of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. This allows that the government must treat all its citizens equally under the law. Consequently this means that it's illegal for public schools, which operate as a government agency, to treat one group of students differently from another group of students just because of who they are or because of associations (in this case LGBT identification or participation in LGBT groups). “The formation of gay-straight alliances, same-sex prom dates, and growing numbers of gay lesbian parent teacher student organizations are among the harbingers of victory of LGBT students” (Kissen, 2002, p. 29).

K-12 Preservice Teachers/Training

Lee (2004) suggests that preservice teachers are newly forming their teacher beliefs within their university studies. Consequently, it becomes increasingly important that K-12

preservice teachers experience preparation and development programs for public school educators that embody rigor, innovation, and attention to the needs of each learner so that these new educators will learn to build on the strengths of diverse children and youth. Conducting this type of research may begin the process of moving toward a future where all students will have the opportunity to learn and succeed in school, regardless of sexual identification. The necessity of understanding the role of schooling in preparing educators to sustain and promote social equity concerning sexual identity (legitimate or perceived) is often superficially addressed, if addressed at all. It is necessary to guide educators in rethinking and reformulating schooling in order to empower them and spark their desire to be agents of change.

In chapter one of *Getting Ready for Benjamin: Preparing Teachers for Sexual Diversity in the Classroom* (2002), Arthur Lipkin discusses the Massachusetts State Board of Education and their decision to add sexual orientation verbiage to the equity competencies of its teacher certification standards in 1994. This required teachers to master “effective strategies within the classroom and other school settings to address discrimination based on each student’s race, sex, religion, socioeconomic class, or disability” (Kissen, 2002, p. 14). This author notes that inertia was one of the factors impeding the success of equity initiatives; he also mentioned that no one really blamed the board because of the emphasis placed upon high-stakes testing rather than diversity/equity training. Lipkin also includes this powerful quote from a tenth-grade teacher when asked what causes lesbianism; he responded, “I’m not sure about women, but I think gay men have domineering mothers and weak fathers’. Those who readied him for his classroom must share the blame for this teacher’s inadequate response” (Kissen, 2002, p. 17).

Gay and Howard (2000) have reported research as having shown that many K-12 preservice teachers enter the field of teaching lacking the knowledge and skills necessary to

effectively instruct culturally diverse students. It is changing this type of education preparation that is key to meeting the needs of diverse learners. Although thousands of educators are prepared annually to go forth and teach, fewer than 40% of teacher education programs even address sexual orientation, and unfortunately, even these may passively add to sustaining homophobic and heterosexist cultures within our schools (Sherwin & Jennings, 2006). Grossman (2008) asserts similar beliefs in regard to the mindset that is attached to confronting and managing personal feelings about children that can be difficult and challenging, especially for a novice teacher where diversity training is vital. She claims that “all good teachers try hard to treat each child fairly and kindly, with care and concern” (Grossman, 2008, p. 147); but she also admits that despite her best efforts there were times she could not hide her true feelings for certain students. Grossman also discussed wondering what unspoken communications young children notice, especially kindergarteners since their first language is non-verbal. Additionally, Grossman’s (1990, p. 147) study of teacher knowledge and teacher education utilized a framework to examine the pedagogical understanding of subject matter that examined (a) conceptions of purposes for teaching subject matter; (b) knowledge of students’ understanding; (c) curricular knowledge; and (d) knowledge of instructional strategies. Nowhere in this framework are the knowledge or understanding and acceptance of the student’s identity expression emphasized.

Grossman’s framework is most representative of what is happening within our teacher preparation programs today. Weist (1998) reviewed a large body of research that advocated the preparation of K-12 preservice teachers by universities for diverse learners through experiences with representatives from diverse populations in order to accept and understand the teachers’ future students. Weist has indicated that such field experiences would allow for a pedagogical

knowledge and understanding along with opportunities to apply concepts learned in class rather than just stockpile knowledge. In turn, this could build the foundation of multicultural education for K-12 preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and understandings. These very same attitudes, beliefs, and understandings influence the teaching behaviors that affect student learning and behavior.

Marquez-Zenkov, Corrigan, Brockett, and Lehrian (2008) considered the importance of an education teacher's diversity training to revolve around the social justice-orientated characteristics that are most important for a teacher "quality" that is based on more holistic components. The researchers believed this quality would only be developed with the integration of a social justice component into the curriculum for K-12 preservice teachers; they believed this would better prepare teachers for diverse and challenging settings that would include LGBT students and their needs. This claim was supported by Lee (2004) in case study data that revealed the need for K-12 preservice teachers to examine the importance of addressing issues of equity and social justice along with the influence of these issues. Lee examined the autobiographical stories of six individuals including himself as the stories related to social justice. Lee argued that as student teachers are newly forming their teacher beliefs within their university studies, the influence of collaboration and "connectedness" must be examined as it relates to learning, equity and social justice, just as it is for the students. As mentioned earlier, Lee also indicated that if K-12 preservice teachers can be reached while they are in their university studies, the university's preparation program can supply this influence of "connectedness" that best relates to and serves learning in terms of equity and social justice.

The task of educating students for a multicultural, multiracial society and including the voices of those who are in minority and even oppressed groups is a challenging one. K-12

preservice teachers who have multicultural experiences are more inclined to have favorable attitudes toward diverse populations and situations than their more sheltered colleagues. It is under this premise that researchers propose the need for increased educational experiences including meaningful diversity training that these teachers should be able to sustain after they enter their work situations (Kyles and Olafson, 2008; Kurz and Paul, 2005).

Giambo and Szecsi's (2008) study indicated the need for K-12 preservice teachers to understand the diversity of students' backgrounds and connect this background to the learning population through factors such as student teachers' diversity-related beliefs, sensitivity toward diversity, relationship between personal/professional diversity beliefs, and the effect of diversity-related courses on issues that would best serve our K-12 preservice teachers as well as their students. Participants in this Giambo and Szecsi study included junior level students enrolled in a diversity-related course as part of a teacher preparation program. Data were collected using a two-faceted survey; one survey measured personal beliefs about diversity and the other targeted professional beliefs about diversity. The data revealed that these participants demonstrated more personal than professional sensitivity on issues of race, ability, gender, and cultural diversity and more professional than personal sensitivity to language and sexual orientation. The extent of the personal or professional sensitivity had much to do with how the K-12 preservice teacher had encountered the target area. For example, if the K-12 preservice teacher spoke a second language already, there was a stronger personal sensitivity to language. The stated result above showing a more professional than personal sensitivity to language and sexual orientation would indicate that most K-12 preservice teachers in this study spoke only one language and were heterosexual. This would in turn lead teacher education programs to possibly look at increasing their professional requirements for language and LGBT training.

This may prove to be an important point to consider as it reflects a base mindset placement for addressing the varying concerns of a school environment. The Giambo and Szecsi findings concerning education teachers' professional and personal beliefs all move in the direction toward equity for the LGBT student.

The Giambo and Szecsi (2008), Kyles and Olafson (2008), and Kurz and Paul (2005) studies make apparent a need for comprehensive solutions to prepare teachers with the necessary awareness to address the needs of all of their learners. Although scarce, there are a variety of tools for use to create a safe space for LGBT students and to create awareness and reflection for their teachers. Research organizations such as Advocates for Youth (2008) and the National Council of English Teachers (2008) provide a variety of teaching lessons aimed at breaking barriers of misunderstandings and building bridges to better understandings of differences. The National Center for Teacher Education (NCTE) also provides extended information demonstrating modeling to K-12 preservice teachers on how they can begin to take action on important issues of social justice, whereby colleges of education can lead questioning on why certain groups are separated from the group as outcasts and treated as "others" (NCTE, 2008). NCTE studies advocate a necessity for dialogue to take place on these barriers to inclusion of socially marginalized groups and ways to promote social justice.

Not only must the historical context be examined, but also the nature of the barriers and the "otherness" that society has created. Similar claims by Advocates for Youth (2008) point to education as a way to create group agreement, draw conclusions, and clarify values in order to build the knowledge and the understanding that must take place. This is particularly true concerning moving teachers and students to take action for social justice in their classrooms, their schools, and their communities (Advocates for Youth, 2008).

Sylvia Valentin (2006) authored the article titled *Addressing Diversity in Teacher Education Programs*. As mentioned above, although the article does not directly address or focus solely on LGBT issues, the article addresses aspects of equality as well as the concern over effective training for educators. One of the first questions Valentin (2006, p. 196) posed in the article is “Do K-12 preservice teachers feel prepared to meet the needs of their diverse student populations?” She stated that courses may not be enough to counteract preconceived notions and prejudices regarding diverse populations; she continued to say that in addition to these courses, “preservice teachers must also have opportunities to interact with students from diverse backgrounds during their field experiences and teaching placements” (Valentin, 2006, p. 199). Valentin stated that educators are increasingly faced with a variety of issues stemming from the diverse backgrounds of the students within the school facilities. Banks and Banks (2004) reported that even though the nation’s student population is becoming increasingly diverse, 87% of teachers continue to be white with 74% being female. This set of statistics does not reflect the diversity of the student body. Teachers are faced with the challenge of teaching students and meeting their individual needs regardless of their own backgrounds. Valentin (2006, p. 196) stated that it is the “obligation of teacher education programs to prepare K-12 preservice teachers to be competent as they face the challenges of today’s diverse classroom settings”.

One challenge of teacher education programs is deciding on what is important to teach within required courses. According to Erickson (2005, p. 34) efforts to define what is important have not produced great results and “even experts have not been able to agree on what culture really is”. Not knowing what to address may certainly impair the quality of instruction within teacher preparatory courses; identifying focus areas is imperative to the success of a training program. Cushner, McClelland & Safford (2003) have identified twelve sources of cultural

identity; these are race, ethnicity/nationality, social class, sex/gender, health, age, geographic region, sexuality, religion, social status, language, and ability/disability. These scholars state these universal sources influence teaching and learning and are present in every culture. Cultural knowledge is filtered or transmitted to the individual through different socializing agents such as family, school, church, community, etc. (Cushner, McClelland & Safford, 2003). These twelve sources of cultural identity are responsible for the numerous ways in which individuals are unique and diverse. Each individual is a product of various experiences that bring about the uniqueness of his/her being. They report that it is essential to understand diversity in this broader sense and not only because of race and ethnicity, which are commonly the primary foci for diversity programs.

Education Effectiveness and Training

As mentioned in Chapter I, teacher education programs accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adhere to its definition of diversity. NCATE (2002) has defined diversity as the differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation and geographical area. It is expected that these teacher preparatory programs address diversity, as well as demonstrate their competence in training teacher candidates. It is encouraging to see phrasing mentioning sexual orientation or gender identification in the NCATE literature as well as the scholarly writing of Cushner, McClelland and Safford (2003); the push forward should focus on ensuring consistent attention to include LGBT concerns and groups.

Researchers such as Valentin (2006) have posed questions about the effect of a required course on K-12 preservice teachers' cultural awareness (Brown, 2004; Larke, 1990; Locke, 2005;

Middleton, 2002; Milner, Flowers, Moore, Moore III & Flowers, 2003). Larke (1990) examined K-12 preservice teachers' awareness of cultural differences after completion of a required multicultural education course, concluding that K-12 preservice teachers had not developed the necessary sensitivity to cultural differences. In addition, concerns have been registered regarding K-12 preservice teachers not having significant interactions with students from diverse backgrounds. In a replicated study, Milner, Flowers, Moore, Moore III & Flowers (2003) determined that K-12 preservice teachers' attitudes about cultural diversity had improved, and that K-12 preservice teachers were more likely to agree with statements that emphasized cultural inclusion and respect for diversity in the classroom. However, the study also indicated that K-12 preservice teachers were not quite sure about how they felt when integrating their learning environments with curricula, assessments, and programs that support multiculturalism in the classroom. This is the turning point for effectiveness (at least in this instance). The teachers acknowledged that they would be willing to integrate a respect for diversity into their teaching and classrooms, but they did not feel they had the insight and the resources to make that happen effectively.

Brown (2004) reported that even one course has the potential to increase factors of cultural diversity awareness. In her study, which examined the influence of instruction methodology on cultural awareness, she concluded that there was a relationship between the instructional methods used in a stand-alone course and changes in the students' awareness of cultural diversity. Middleton (2002) also examined changes in attitudes, beliefs, and commitments toward diversity of K-12 preservice teachers after completing a required course in diversity. These findings indicate that there was a significant overall difference from pretest to

posttest on self-reported personal and professional beliefs toward diversity on all four sections of the course.

Garmon (2004) concluded in a single subject case study that multicultural courses and field experiences by themselves may not prove to be sufficient to offset students' predisposed attitudes and beliefs. He also concluded that dispositions seem to be important predictors of K-12 preservice teachers developing greater multicultural awareness and sensitivity during their program, and that these might be considered when making program admission decisions (Garmon, 2004). This is an interesting notation since most university degree programs for education do not require an interview process and most do not include inquiry into this area on application essays. Wasonga and Piveral (2004) believe that focusing on teacher preparation without changing K-12 preservice teacher dispositions will produce teachers who are less culturally sensitive.

K-12 preservice teachers should also have opportunities to interact with students from diverse backgrounds during their field experiences and teaching placements. Addressing K-12 preservice teacher perceptions is important information, but follow-up to this information would be important as well for realistic, systemic change. Even though this was not a portion of my research, acknowledging the importance of this follow-through acknowledges a required action piece for true growth and change. Teacher education programs must pursue a commitment to diversity to foster more accepting attitudes among teachers in a changing society. Diversity is a reality of society and must be embraced for a truly nurturing environment to be fostered within school facilities. Gay (2005, p. 233) said that "teachers, counselors and administrators need to become conscious of their own cultural values and beliefs, of how these affect their attitudes and expectations toward students from different ethnic groups, and how they are habitually exhibited

in school behaviors". Without acknowledgement of one's own biases, acknowledging the diverse needs and beliefs of others is truly impaired. Gay (2005) also stated that teachers play a crucial role in the educational experiences their students receive, thus diversity training and education are crucial to providing educational equality.

Reiter and Davis (2011, p. 41) reported that there is an expanding "student-teacher cultural mismatch" and that this leads to "cultural and ethnic ignorance that is increasingly dangerous in the increasingly diverse classroom climate in the U.S. today. They also reported that students who come from different backgrounds from the educators serving them face an increased risk for negative stereotypes and prejudices as opposed to their white counterparts (Reiter and Davis, 2011). Much of this statement was based upon the reported statistic from the U.S. Department of Education in 2009 that 84% of the nation's teachers are white (Reiter and Davis, 2011). Reiter and Davis (2011, p. 41) conducted a study with a sampling of K-12 preservice teachers and found that there was a "lack of association between completing a diversity training program and reports of cultural biases regarding student background characteristics' influence on their learning". This study acknowledged the fact that there was a recognized need of a cultural disparity, and that there should be something put in place to support that need. Most programs responded with the implementation of diversity training programs in schools of education. However, most studies have not tested the true effectiveness or even the perceived effectiveness.

Research has shown that teacher-training programs in education schools must be in place and be effective if social justice is to be achieved for all students (Gorski, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Wallace, 2000). Reiter and Davis (2011) pursued research examining the effectiveness of a specific diversity program at a Southern, mid-sized university that consisted of weekly diversity

seminars over the course of two semesters. Senior-level teaching fellows and traditional seniors constituted the two sets of pre-service senior education students that were surveyed as part of this research project. A total of 281 students were contacted with 153 completing the questionnaire. Due to missing values on variables of interest, the final total sample size for this analysis was 133. Reiter and Davis reported using descriptive statistics, and both noted that there did not seem to be a significant correlation between the diversity-training program and the responses involving the students' background characteristics. The main focus of the research was to examine the influence of the teacher-training program on K-12 preservice teachers' attitudes regarding the possibility of influence that students' background knowledge might play. They noted that there was basically no association between the completion of the program and the K-12 preservice teachers' attitudes (Reiter and Davis, 2011). The goals of Reiter and Davis' research as well as my upcoming research were similar; both attempted to aid in the development of procedures to help expose knowledge that eliminates bias in schools and other social institutions (Reiter and Davis, 2011).

Bullock et al (2010, p. 161) discussed schools of education as "places where democracy and social empowerment are emphasized"; this goal can be severely impaired if teachers are not feeling prepared to encounter and manage social issues present today and presenting themselves in the future. The process can be somewhat problematic since these researchers also report that K-12 preservice teachers can also be resistant to new knowledge and ideas (Bullock et al, 2010). Also, many K-12 preservice teachers "tend to cling to and defend discourses that privilege those of the dominant culture" and "support discourses that deny opportunities for people who are seen as 'Others,' people who are underrepresented, and/or who are marginalized by society" (Bullock et al, 2010, p. 161). After the K-12 preservice teachers of Bullock's 2010 study entered the

workforce as certified teachers, many admitted that their chosen teacher-training program was ineffective.

Bullock et al's research focuses on the elementary teacher education program in a Mid-Atlantic university where all of the authors were professors. These professors conducted self-examination of their program to illuminate possible strengths and weaknesses within their program for underrepresented students. Diversity often refers to concerns of race and culture, but NCATE has expanded its definition to include other areas including sexual orientation. The NCATE definition of diversity was emailed to all teacher education faculty, and they were asked to submit feedback and additional considerations. The following was a statement issued after all data were compiled:

To align with the strategic direction of the university [system] and [this university within the university system], the Teacher Education Unit within the School of Behavioral Sciences and Education at [this university] developed a very specific definition of diversity that we believe reflects the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that should be evident in both our candidates and our faculty. Diversity means differences related to identities, subjectivities, experiences, and cultures. It may incorporate attributes such as race, gender identity, ethnicity, sexual identity, religious beliefs, geographical location, age, socioeconomic status, local/state/regional/global/country of origin, culture, language, physical size, ability, learning style, educational background, social status, employment, professional status, marital status, historical experiences, traditions, customs and rituals, values and lifestyles. Acceptance of diversity acknowledges and respects people's total identity and social existence based on their individual social values

and beliefs to ensure social justice for everyone. Our definition of diversity guides and influences the recruitment and retention of candidates and faculty, our research and pedagogy, our programming, and our outreach and service to both internal and external communities (Bullock et al, 2010, p. 163).

One of the goals of the research was to formulate strategies for planning professional development for the faculty; this research hoped to enlighten areas of concern and provide direction for LGBT trainings for the faculty. Three key findings were discovered from the analyses of the data. First, the curricula within the syllabi presented the underrepresented parties as “at risk”, and this showed a “superficial understanding of diversity and as a means to propagate deficits” (Bullock et al, 2010, p. 164). Second, analyses revealed understandings within the courses that promoted and reinforced dominant cultural practices. Third, analyses revealed that the first two findings seemed to emanate from teachers who possessed dominant cultural identities and present a danger of reinforcing a normative culture. Identifying and acknowledging your own identity proved to be important in Bullock et al’s research, and I have also included a section covering researcher positionality in Chapter III.

Finally, one of the concerns is understanding the preparation for K-12 preservice teachers and the attitudes of those future educators. Jane A. Page and Delores D. Liston in *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom* mention that “among the first steps in preparing K-12 preservice teachers to deal with Tuohy in the schools is assessing the attitudes of K-12 preservice teachers themselves” (Kissen, 2002, p. 72). It has also been found that prospective teachers often hold even more negative feelings toward LGBT groups than other populations (Sears, 1992). Sears (1992) also reported that although what year a student was in his or her education program, the level of intended teaching placement was a

factor. He found that elementary K-12 preservice teachers held more negative attitudes than their secondary counterparts (Sears, 1992). Perhaps this is a predisposed inclination to preserve a normative culture.

Framing the Research

Students should be able to rely on school personnel to be supportive and assist them in sorting out the conflicts they encounter throughout different developmental stages in their lives. John E. Petrovic (2002, p. 151) asserted that LGBT students are forced to create “straight” identities in order to fit in with their peer group and often feel that there is no one to whom they can turn for support; he suggested that LGBT students are harmed by a lack of support and a lack of “positive systematic inclusion” within the school community. Kissen (2002) reported how Deborah P. Berrill and Wayne Martino explore the concept of escaping the historical normalization of teacher candidates; Berrill and Martino discussed the complex decision that LGBT teachers must make regarding whether to come out to their students and communities, and they mentioned that this is particularly challenging for male teachers (Kissen, 2002). Female teachers are often perceived as nurturing due to their ability to become mothers (whether straight or lesbian), and this is often seen as less intimidating than perceptions regarding male teachers. Certain nurturing behaviors, such as showing affection or touching, are not acceptable for men because they are associated with feminine characteristics.

Because teachers can “hold great influence over the thoughts, opinions, and actions of their students” (Petrovic, 2002, p. 152), a lack of inclusion likely leads the LGBT student to imagine that their thoughts and inclinations do not warrant merit and thus lead to feelings of invalidation. Positive systematic inclusion would require educators to reflect positively when discussing gay and lesbian issues or family situations. This type of inclusion would, at the very

least, deter educators from negatively reflecting on gay and lesbian situations regardless of their personal beliefs. As Petrovic (2002, p. 152) argues, a robust conceptualization of equality of educational opportunity requires that teachers “refrain from expressing their negative positions against same-sex sexual orientation and to include positive portrayals of [LGBT] youth, adults, and their families in the curriculum; for children best flourish in schools when they can see themselves, their lived experiences, and their families in the curriculum.”

Petrovic’s discussion of positive systemic inclusion requires this minimum refrain from teachers to have even the very least opportunity for safe educational environments for LGBT students. By knowing that they are not going to hear negative slurs within their school setting, LGBT students may choose to look to their teachers as supporters (whether the teachers support gay and lesbian rights or not). This certainly bears mentioning, as perceptions of effectiveness within the K-12 preservice program as related to LGBT training issues were a portion of the qualitative interview data.

Educators must consider “how they might be implicated in the angst of so many of their students and how to make democratic educational practices consistent with their own beliefs” (Petrovic, 2002, p. 154). This requires them to “engage in explorations of their own autobiographies and the sources of their views about homosexuality” (Petrovic, 2002, p. 154). Accordingly, positive systematic inclusion does not demand the educator to abandon or betray his or her own convictions, but rather asks the educator to become a caring individual who appreciates the struggle of another oppressed individual. Educators must care for their students, and this includes the emotional and spiritual well-being of their students. This requirement for care is directly impeded when educators demean family situations or personal feelings of the very students they should be validating. This may also be seen when LGBT educators feel they

are forced to remain in the closet for fear of employment repercussions rather than being open and honest with their students and communities.

True teaching and learning reform take place only when these principles are in place, and professional development is a special case of teaching and learning. There may be a wide range of implementation options that may be applied to the research. This should be seen as a natural outgrowth of the sociocultural emphasis. The Holmes Partnership (2012), a consortium of 96 research universities with professional education programs, also identifies the key to change within the school culture as being based on better preparation in teacher education training. These findings were based on the group's studies and that impact on culture being both natural and sustainable based on organizations working in partnership to create high quality professional development for K-12 preservice teachers and significant school renewal (The Holmes Partnership, 2012). This consortium began as a response to the *Nation at Risk* outcry (Nation at Risk, 2014). The members of the partnership saw two areas of interest or concern. The first wanted to strengthen the connection between the college of education for universities with other college disciplines, particularly colleges of arts and sciences (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). The second relates more directly to the workplace as it strives to construct allies and partnerships within the profession itself among teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012).

One of the main goals of the Holmes Partnership ties directly into the proposed research for this study. The first goal mentioned for this consortium deals with changing the ways teachers are educated (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). This could of course include better preparation for dealing with the current issues, including LGBT issues faced by teachers and administrators on a daily basis. Along with this goal, the partnership mentioned to help

construct a true profession of teaching, cooperate with schools to create an arena for genuine inquiry that could transform schools, and to restructure college of education programs to reach these ends (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012).

In 1986, the group published “Tomorrow’s Teachers” which addressed their new vision and recommended an agenda of action for five goals. Although all five are certainly relevant to the improvement of teaching, three goals present themselves as the most relevant to this research. The first is to make teaching intellectually sound (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). This would “require that prospective teachers gain a broad, coherent liberal arts foundation that incorporates enduring, multicultural values and forms of inquiry, and that is taught to a depth of understanding that enable them so to teach” (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). This might not have been intended to include LGBT issues in 1986, but this would be the natural evolution of the current trend to make teaching and the education environment sound. In addition, even though the goals are written to focus on preparing teacher candidates to work with culturally and socio-economically diverse students, the next step would be to include all oppressed groups (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012).

In addition, study of a bounded system such as a college education program does not always reveal ineffectiveness. Certain characteristics of some juvenile awareness programs may show promise. For example, Klenowski et al. (2010) noted that those programs that utilized a non-confrontational approach seemed to offer the greatest impact on juvenile recidivism rates. These findings may lead to a more effective program and outcomes that are more successful.

The two remaining goals for focus deal with connecting schools of education to the public schools, and making schools better places for teaching and learning (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). The partnership proposed constructing partnerships with schools and

naming them Professional Development Schools; this would be a way for teachers to continue to gain the expertise of other teachers as well as university educators (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). The partnerships also proposed to “revise the professional education of school administrators and other professionals who work in schools so that they can recognize and enhance professionalism in teachers and work in partnership with university faculty to inquire into and invent new methods and structures for their schools” (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012).

The Holmes Partnership illustrates that, in order to improve teaching and learning for all children, universities must focus their goals on not only high quality professional preparation, but also equity, diversity, and cultural competence. By actively working on equity, diversity, and cultural competence in the programs of K-12 schools, higher education, and the education profession, K-12 preservice teachers who reflect on the implications of the rich diversity of cultural perspectives within their schools will utilize research and best practice approaches in their teaching design, content, and delivery (The Holmes Partnership, 2012).

Educators, specifically teachers, need to eliminate the toxic school culture of harassment in order to create a learning environment that builds a positive school culture (Safe Schools Coalition, 2002). It is the underground stream of norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals that build up over time as people work together, solve problems, and confront challenges that forms a positive and productive culture; the routines teachers come to expect in the workplace help define the school culture. As evidenced by Lovell (1998), the toxic culture cultivates the dangerous mix of unnoticed student-to-student harassment that is based on gender identification or perceived gender orientation. Over time, this type of environment becomes not just unproductive, but also fragments staffs and denies the student-centered culture that is necessary

for student learning (Peterson & Deal, 1998). When left unattended by teachers, the lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered (LGBT) student becomes a victim of discrimination and harassment based on orientation. When tolerated, this harassment contributes to a negative learning environment (Anti-Defamation League, 2008). It is precisely this negatively charged culture that both serves as a breeding ground for discrimination and unequal treatment, and hampers any effectiveness of efforts aimed at creating safe schools (Macgillivray, 2004a; Macgillivray, 2004b; Safe Schools Coalition, 2008).

As indicated by Friedman-Nimz (2006), the blending of educational support and social action will dissolve the oppressive framework of harassment, discrimination, and disconnectedness for the LGBT student. Critical issues must be addressed in order to make school an inclusive and respectful place, beginning with K-12 preservice teachers challenging the normative structures that are vital to building physical and emotional health of students (Rottman, 2006). As further supported by Griffin (2008), educational support and social action can begin by eliminating gender stereotyping and incidents of discrimination and harassment for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered youth. Gregory (2004) has indicated this is particularly true as educators begin to rethink personal and professional beliefs and how they relate to students and their legal rights, as well as educators paying special attention to acts of discrimination, harassment, threats, and/or violence in schools. In addition, because public schools receive federal financial assistance, schools must address educational support and social action within equal protection as a mere matter of law as it applies to issues of equity concerning sexual orientation based on gender identity (National Center for Lesbian Rights, 2014). By utilizing the opportunity to work with education educators as a captive and engaged audience on these important issues of equity, researchers can begin to build a model for helping schools to

address policy options and to develop new attitudes of connectedness for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered youth (Get That Freak, 2008). While Roffman (2000) has indicated that awareness can influence teacher reflections and that education may be key to developing these teacher reflections, statistics still indicate a national problem. The question for both educators and education researchers focuses on how schools will rise to meet these challenges.

The expense to school systems is one of the most compelling reasons for justification for legitimate and authentic diversity training. The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (ACLU) posts a fact sheet periodically sharing information on relevant issues current to K-12 environments. Citing the *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District* legal case, the fact sheet shared information relevant to this case as well as the school's handling of the harassing situation. The school district was ordered to pay 1.1 million dollars in settlement costs; however, there was also another product of the settlement. Schools in Morgan Hills have incorporated a training program to combat anti-gay harassment. The ACLU posting also included paragraphs detailing twelve cases from 1996 to 2005, which cost school systems portions of their operating budgets. The settlements from these twelve cases mentioned in the ACLU posting totaled approximately \$4,476,000. Regardless of the moral and ethical implications of the research, a monetary component may increase attentiveness from supporters not otherwise solicited.

The Context, Input, Process, and Product Model

The CIPP model is a comprehensive framework for guiding formative and summative evaluations of projects, programs, personnel, products, institutions, and systems (Stufflebeam, 2003). The CIPP model's main purpose is to improve the function of the program (Stufflebeam, 2003). Each of the components of the CIPP model addresses separate aspects of the evaluation. The Context evaluation assesses needs, assets, and problems within a defined environment; the

Input evaluation assesses competing strategies and the work plans and budgets of the selected approach; the Process evaluation monitors, documents, and assesses program activities; and the Product evaluation assesses a program's reach to the target audience (Stufflebeam, 2003).

Summary

This chapter contains literature intended to direct attention to the need for further research in the area of LGBT sexual identification for K-12 students and the educators working with them. The initial literature within the chapter exposed situations and factors that contribute to hostile environments for LGBT students. Bullying and harassment terms are “catch phrases” that cover a myriad of behaviors that infringe on the positive educational experiences for LGBT students. Statistics showing the percentages of bullying and harassment for many LGBT students show the difficulties many face. This combined with the percentages of teachers/educators who do not actively combat the bias produces a formidable combination for LGBT students.

The lack of leadership within the school setting is definitely an area of concern and motivator for continued research. This lack of leadership not only affects LGBT students but affects the openness of faculty and staff as well. Teachers who identify as LGBT combat a personal dilemma about whether or not to be honest in the workplace with their colleagues as well as their students about their sexual identification. This lack of freedom and comfort has the potential to create a feeling of blatant dishonesty, and this in turn may certainly lead to a lack of connection with students. Students and teachers need to operate in an environment of trust, and a lack of disclosure can certainly affect teacher/student relationships.

Numerous legal cases demonstrate the incidents occurring within public school systems, and they demonstrate the lack of interventions from school personnel. The two main reasons indicating the need for future research for LGBT student issues are outlined in these legal cases.

The complaints and infringements prompting the legal actions initially combine with the settlement amounts levied against school systems create a dynamic duo demanding future research and movement toward sustainable change. These cases go hand-in-hand with the inherent right to an education free of bullying and harassment. Equal access to education is entitled to all students, including those with an LGBT sexual identification.

At the heart of the literature and the research is the training for K-12 preservice teachers and their subsequent influence on the educational situations of all of their students. As stated in Chapter I, creating and maintaining programs that empower future teachers is paramount to making legitimate change for LGBT students within schools and communities. This can only be achieved through teacher education programs preparing teachers to combat the issues and situations they will inevitably face. These programs must prepare K-12 preservice teachers to face the challenges of the diverse student populations they will encounter. The effectiveness of this training not only can affect the students within the classroom but may also lead to a more empowered feeling for the teacher.

CHAPTER III:
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The literature review supports the idea that undergraduate education programs may have significant areas of needed improvement at least as they relate to conveying Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender (LGBT) information and training. This is evidenced by the number of court cases presented in Chapter II's Review of Literature which show a pervasive, intolerant attitude within public school systems (Boyd County High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Board of Education of Boyd County; Colin v. Orange Unified School District; Davis v. Monroe County School District; Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District; Fricke v. Lynch; Loomis v. Visalia Unified School District; Merrick v. Board of Higher Education and State of Oregon; Nabozny v. Podlesny).

The purpose of this study was to conduct a program evaluation using the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) evaluation model (Stufflebeam et al, 2000) to examine the LGBT diversity training for K-12 preservice teachers at University X. It is my assertion that in order to improve teaching and learning for all children, universities must focus their goals on high quality professional preparation that embodies equity, diversity, and cultural competence. By building occasion and opportunity for awareness, K-12 preservice teachers would also have opportunities for reflection about the lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) student and an equitable practice. This program evaluation using the CIPP model endeavored to examine the various approaches taken within these programs, identify the educational expectations of the program coordinators, faculty, and K-12 preservice teachers and show the inherent need for the program (Rossi, 2004; Stufflebeam, 2003).

Research Design

Qualitative methods are often used to capture and communicate the story of participants (Patton, 2002). As mentioned in Chapter I, the focus of the research questions surrounded the type of diversity training delivered throughout the courses at University X using the CIPP evaluation model. The primary research questions focused on each of the program components of the CIPP acronym, which are Content, Input, Process, and Product (Stufflebeam, 2003).

The primary evaluation questions were as follows and have been listed with their corresponding CIPP category:

1. “What is the local climate as it relates to LGBT issues?” (Context)
2. “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for students?” (Input)
3. “How is diversity training implemented programmatically?” (Process)
4. “What is the perceived impact of the program on K-12 preservice teachers?” (Product)

Interview questions were constructed to contain questioning for each of the CIPP categories so that each respondent will have input dealing with each of the categories.

To conduct the proposed evaluation, I utilized the CIPP model to frame the evaluation. The individual evaluation categories provided differing types of data. The Context evaluation focused on determining objectives; the Input evaluation focused on exposing program design; the Process evaluation examined program operations; the Product evaluation directed attention to judging and reacting to program goals (Stufflebeam, 2003).

The following example of the CIPP model of evaluation is provided along with relevant questioning for this research study.

The CIPP Model Evaluation

Characteristic of Evaluation	Type of Decision	Questions to Ask
Context	Planning decisions	“What is the local climate as it relates to LGBT issues?”
Input	Structuring decisions	“What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for students?”
Process	Implementation decisions	“How is diversity training implemented programmatically?”
Product	Recycling decisions to judge and react to students performance	“What is the perceived impact of the program on K-12 preservice teachers?”

Figure 1 (adapted from Stufflebeam, 2003).

This evaluation model is predominantly used in education by evaluators that would like to identify and assess outcomes to see if the desired goals are reached and serve as the recycling decision to determine the worth of the program (Stufflebeam, 2003).

Context, Input, Process, and Product

The first evaluation component of the CIPP evaluation model is the context. The context evaluation stage of the CIPP Model creates the big picture of where both the program and evaluation fit (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). Key stakeholders in the evaluation are identified. Data collection can use multiple formats, such as analysis of existing documents (course descriptions

and syllabi) and case study (stakeholder) interviews (Mertens, & Wilson, 2012). The following questions were utilized in formulating the primary context research question.

- How do you define the climate surrounding the location of the training program?
- How do you define the training environment?

To complement context evaluation, input evaluation is addressed. In this stage, information is collected regarding the mission, goals, and plan of the program. Its purpose is to assess the program's strategy and merit as well as the responsiveness of the program to stakeholder needs (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The intent of this stage was to choose an appropriate strategy to implement to resolve the program problem. The following questions were utilized in formulating the primary input research question.

- What is the K-12 preservice teacher's current LGBT sensitivity or awareness?
- Is the course content clearly defined?

The process portion of the evaluation is designed to detect defects in the procedure design or implementation (Stufflebeam, 2003). The following questions were utilized in formulating the primary process research question.

- Are there any problems related to learning?
- Is knowledge only transferred to K-12 preservice teachers, or do they use and apply it?

The product portion of the CIPP evaluation is designed to examine the measurement of the goals and interpretation of the attainment of those goals (Stufflebeam, 2003). The following questions were utilized in formulating the primary product research question.

- How do students use what they have learned?
- How was the overall experience for the teachers and for the students?

- What are the main ‘lessons learned’?

Data Collection, Population, and Setting

The program evaluation following the CIPP model endeavors to judge the program as it relates to chosen categories (Rossi, 2004, Stufflebeam, 2003). The purpose of this study was to collect multi-layered perceptual data from individuals and groups who have varying levels of familiarity with LGBT training for K-12 preservice teachers at University X. There are many ways to collect qualitative data to evaluate curricula and delivery of the curricula (in this case training for K-12 preservice teachers as it relates to LGBT issues). These include but are not limited to discussion with a class, informal conversation or observation, individual interviews, and organizational documents (Stufflebeam, 2003).

As previously stated in Chapter I, university context was established by examining the situation in which University X is affixed. Archival documents included campus online information as well as state and local legislative decisions as they relate to LGBT concerns.

Archival documents and interviews with participants within University X’s stakeholder groups were examined next. Archival documents included syllabi and course descriptions. Analyzing and coding these assisted in exposing the context in which University X’s College of Education operates. Coding of archival documents (targeted syllabi and course descriptions) was fed into the CIPP evaluation, as well. The analyses of these documents fostered a more complete exposition of the situation for University X as well as the situation/climate for the LGBT training for K-12 preservice teachers. This provided some input into the context portion of the research as well as input from the coordinators and faculty members. These documents were coded in the same manner as all other documents and interviews (coded to reveal recurring words and key phrases).

University context was established by examining the situation in which University X is affixed. Archival documents included campus online information as well as state and local legislative decisions as they relate to LGBT concerns.

Archival documents and interviews with participants within University X's stakeholder group were examined next. Archival documents included syllabi and course descriptions. Analyzing and coding these assisted in exposing the context in which University X's College of Education operates. Coding of archival documents (targeted syllabi and course descriptions) was included in the CIPP evaluation, as well. Analyses of these documents fostered a more complete exposition of the situation for University X as well as the situation/climate for the LGBT training of K-12 preservice teachers. This provided some input into the context portion of the research as well as input from the coordinators and faculty members. These documents were coded in the same manner as all other documents and interviews (coded to reveal recurring words and key phrases).

Qualitative interview data were gathered from two sources and were conducted as two separate cases. Case One began with interviews with program coordinators from Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Multiple Abilities Program (MAP), and Foundations programs along with other faculty members. The program coordinators were contacted via phone and/or email to establish a time to interview each of them regarding their programs. All program coordinators were interviewed; however, several weeks after the initial interview with the MAP coordinator, I received an email informing me that the MAP faculty had decided to withdraw participation from this research study. They also indicated that I would not be allowed to visit classes to solicit student volunteers. The email also stated that the department was afraid that the research would not show instruction in the MAP program in a favorable light as it relates to

LGBT issues and concerns. I also share that the email stated that the faculty would be taking this as a “wake up call” as they examine their future planning. The email from the MAP coordinator did not indicate from where the research would come to formulate any basis for reform.

Case One also included six faculty members from those targeted programs. When combined with the program coordinators, the interview breakdown for Case One was as follows: Four Foundations faculty members, two Elementary Education faculty member, and three Secondary Education faculty members. Their interviews were coded and analyzed and are discussed under the four components of the CIPP model in Chapter IV.

Case Two consisted of students who volunteered to participate in research interviewing from targeted programs within the College of Education at University X. This included two courses of study under the Curriculum and Instruction degree program (the Elementary Education program and the Secondary Education program) and the Foundations program. The target interview group for Case Two included thirty students who volunteered to be interviewed after I (as the principal researcher) visited a class meeting to explain the focus of the research. Student volunteers were informed that they would receive fifteen dollars in compensation as an incentive to participate.

Student volunteers were solicited within the recommended courses to foster a purposeful random sampling of students. This encouraged a more authentic sampling of student responses rather than soliciting student names for contact from the faculty instructors.

Data analysis included examination for exposed themes as well as analyses of commonalities and inconsistencies when the interviews from Case One and Case Two were examined. Cases One and Two were analyzed and presented in a compare and contrast manner rather than a merging of the two data sets.

Interviews

In an in-depth interview, the person being interviewed is viewed as the expert and the researcher is seen as a student who is motivated to learn everything that the participant can share about the topic (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005). While conducting the interview, the researcher poses questions in a neutral manner, listens attentively to the interviewee, and asks follow-up questions based upon their responses (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005).

Interviews are typically unstructured, structured, or semi-structured. Unstructured interviews are usually free flowing and conversational in nature and may be guided by a general topic; structured interviews are more fixed and driven by a predetermined set of questions in which the researcher is reluctant to waiver (Madill & Gough, 2008; Hoepfl, 1997). A semi-structured interview blends unstructured and structured interview formats together, using a set of guiding questions and prompts as well as employing an informal conversational style so that the interviewee feels comfortable enough to share their story (Hoepfl, 1997). This type of interview format also makes the best use of limited interview time, makes interviewing more systematic and comprehensive, and helps to keep interactions focused (Hoepfl, 1997).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in this study with all research participants because this interview format strikes a balance between the needs of the researcher and the interview participant. These interviews ensured that the study's research questions are covered but also allowed participants to freely share their personal stories, experiences, and perceptions. Each stakeholder was interviewed once for a time period lasting from thirty to sixty minutes on a day, time, and location of their choice. Some interviews were conducted on campus, in classrooms, or in conference rooms coordinated through the College of Education department at

University X, while others were conducted off-campus. This was based on availability as well as the interviewee's preference.

As the primary researcher, I assured participants that neither their identities nor the information they provided would be revealed to any other parties and their particular information would not be identifiable in the completed study. All interviews were audiotaped to ensure accurate interview transcription. If a possible participant had declined an audiotaped interview, he or she would have been dropped from the study and another candidate would have been chosen from the pool of volunteers. However, no one refused to be audiotaped. In addition, all participants were informed that all audio recordings of interviews would be erased after the transcriptions had been completed.

Along with these interviews, course documents (syllabi and course descriptions) were coded and analyzed for thematic/keyword exposition. A course description and a syllabus were gathered for each participating instructor's course. These documents were analyzed using the same coding as the interviews. By coding and analyzing course syllabi and descriptions for key phrases and repeated words, I gained a better understanding of the education program in general concerning diversity training as well as a better understanding of the teacher education program at University X. Course description analyses took place concurrently with the interviews of the program coordinators and covered courses that reach across the three targeted programs. Course descriptions from the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 undergraduate catalog as well as current course syllabi were examined for common key words and phrases.

The course syllabi were solicited from the instructors recommended for interviewing by the program coordinators. All recommended course syllabi were examined for their contribution to diversity training across their degree programs. Each interview, each syllabus, and each course

description was coded for recurring keywords, ideas, and concepts to reveal common themes (Saldaña, 2013).

Saldaña (2013, p.3) defines a code as “a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data.” Coding in this research was assigned to recurring keywords or phrases that may prove to expose a common theme that may be categorized within one or more interviews. It is also stated that codes may be divided into categories and merit sub-coding before being assigned to thematic, conceptual, or theoretical clusters (Saldaña, 2013). This corresponded with the transcription of written texts in terms of field notes, interviews, supporting documents, recordings/audios of interviews, and analysis or artifacts that allowed summaries, coding, and memos as part of an ongoing analysis (Hesse-Biber, 2011). This analysis wove itself into overall themes and clusters. Analysis was guided by asking, “What do the data say?” and interpretation was guided by saying, “What does it mean?” (Hesse-Biber, 2011 ; Strauss & Corbin, 2008).

Qualitative interviewing with each case provided rich details that otherwise could have been missed with quantitative data collection. Through these interviews, the interviewees can express their views and provide models of identity and agency to their members (Brunner, 1986). Bloom (1998) furthers this discussion by asserting that by connecting patterns and meaning and experiences of respondents, the researcher is able to draw from a wide array of theories to set forth his/her interpretation. More importantly, the end result of data analysis was a synthesis of themes and recurring thoughts into a descriptive narrative. The interviewing process used linguistic data in an attempt to understand a given reality from the perspective of the teller. I used these data to understand the organizational scheme revealed within the data collection. As previously stated, themes are the “outcome” of the coding and sub-coding (Saldaña, 2013;

Hesse-Biber, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Finalized themes came near the end of the data analysis phase.

Again, all interviewing was conducted as two cases. Case One involved interviewing program coordinators and faculty for undergraduate education programs that lead to certification and licensure. This included two program coordinators under the Curriculum and Instruction degree program (C&I), which included the program coordinator for Elementary Education and the program coordinator for Secondary Education, and finally the program coordinator for Foundations. The finalized interview group for Case One included nine faculty members (including the program coordinators). As previously stated the program coordinator for the MAP program was interviewed, and she was included originally as interview number ten. However, during the data collection phase of the study, the MAP program coordinator was emailed to attempt to schedule faculty recommendations as well as secure class visits, and she returned the email and stated that the MAP department had decided to withdraw participation in the research.

Case Two consisted of interviewing K-12 preservice teachers within the designated programs. Student volunteers were recruited after visiting a class meeting allotted by faculty members participating in interviewing in Case One. Again, the target grouping for interview quotas was eight to ten participants (students) from each targeted degree program, and ten students from each program were interviewed. Preprinted sheets were distributed to K-12 preservice teachers within the class visitation, and those sheets were collected within the course meeting. All students were asked to participate in filling out the volunteer cards so that anonymity of participation was increased. Those who indicated a willingness to participate in the interview process were contacted to establish interview times for each degree program. One Alternative MA student was available for interviewing, and he was allowed to participate as this

program still leads into initial K-12 certification. As previously stated, all student participants were awarded fifteen dollars in compensation for participation in the interview process.

The month of January 2014 was allotted for completion of all interviews; however, the beginning of February 2014 was also utilized to complete student interviewing for Case Two. The completion of the interviews in both Case One (along with document analysis and coding) and Case Two concluded the data collection phase. All participants (program coordinators, faculty, and K-12 preservice teachers) were given IRB-approved informed consent sheets to acknowledge voluntary participation (Appendix B).

All interviewees were informed that transcripts would be maintained for one year after degree conferment, and that all transcripts would be shredded after passage of that year beyond degree conferment. All audio recordings were erased after completion of each transcription.

Data Analyses

All interviews were transcribed and then coded using a scheme that parallels the study's research questions (Appendix C). As the initial step in analyzing and interpreting data, coding is an interactive process that allows researchers to classify data into conceptual categories that can later be labeled and organized to align with a study's questions and purpose. While reading the transcripts, different color highlighting was used to identify commonalities within the participants' responses. After each related response was coded with a color and general categories of responses were established, more detailed commonalities appeared through the coding scheme. The coded interviews were analyzed by grouping similarly colored responses together and carefully reading each group of responses with the intent to discover any patterns, relationships, or disparities in the participants' responses. Major themes were revealed as the initial coding and sub-coding progressed.

This type of coding is inductive coding, and this allows the codes and consequently the themes to present themselves (as opposed to deductive coding where themes are preconceived and either confirmed or refuted). The initial coding began using the components of the CIPP program model. These were categorized into positive, negative, and neutral categories. Repeated words, phrases, or terms, such as diversity and LGBT, subsequently these were then broken down into additional sub-categories. These sub-categories provide the headings for outlining the narrative found in Chapter IV. As the coding continued, descriptive themes and relationships emerged that developed across analyses. Finally, further examination of the sub-coded sections revealed the major themes, which are identified in Chapter IV.

Verification of Data

The verification of data is a critical component in establishing confidence in a study's findings. This study used perceptual data collected from multiple sources to investigate and gain insight into a particular group (K-12 preservice teachers). The verification of data collected from one-on-one interviews combined with the purposeful collection and analyzing of data from archival document sources enhanced the dependability and legitimacy of the study's findings.

University Artifacts

Various artifacts such as syllabi and course descriptions were collected from courses found within each of the degree programs; these included Foundations, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education. The Elementary Education and Secondary Education syllabi constitute the material pulled from the Curriculum and Instruction department.

The College of Education has also put into place a Conceptual Framework summary which is to be included with every syllabus for courses within the College of Education at University X. The theme asserts three key words: unite, act, and lead. The framework's vision

focuses on developing professionals who are capable of meeting the needs of all learners. The vision statement includes the categories of “race, social class, language, gender, sexual orientation, health, disability and religious and political affiliations”. Interestingly, the category of race is listed first within the above series, and this proved to be a recurring theme within the interviewing process. However, for this research, perhaps the most prominent category is the inclusion of sexual orientation as a category listed for protection. This is the first mention of the issue of equal treatment in regards to sexual orientation as a requirement across all programs within the College of Education degree programming.

Course descriptions

The course descriptions analyzed were chosen for research examination due to their inclusion within the targeted programs. Syllabi for one Foundations section, one Elementary Education section, and one Secondary Education section were solicited and coded. These course descriptions and their corresponding syllabi were included for analysis because of visits to those courses to solicit student volunteers for Case Two data collection. Tom, a Foundations faculty member, also referred to one Foundations course as the “Frankenstein course”, because of the manner in which it was “pieced” together. This course description was also included for review of the wording of the course description. The dissertation proposal stated that the 2012-2013 undergraduate academic catalog would be used; however, I also included the 2013-2014 descriptions for comparison. Upon quick examination, it could be noted that both sets of course descriptions were exactly the same.

With examination of the course descriptions, it was noted that LGBT topics are not mentioned within any of the course descriptions. The Foundations course description included wording for “social justice” which certainly lends itself to the inclusion of topics for

marginalized groups. Perhaps the Secondary course would be the most apparent course to envision inclusion of LGBT topics because there is a focus on diversity within this course. However, the term LGBT is not included in the course description, nor is sexual identity or sexual orientation included.

Foundations Syllabi

Three syllabi were gathered from separate sections of a targeted section of the Foundations curriculum. Again, the course descriptions and syllabi of courses were gathered after securing faculty volunteer interviews. Sheila utilizes a syllabus that includes the new Conceptual Framework for the College of Education on the front page of her syllabus for this course. This framework receives a very prominent position as it is the first information shared with her students after contact information. The course description for Sheila's Foundations course includes a statement for "supporting equal opportunity for **all**". The bolding of the word "all" bears mention because of the inclusive nature of the word itself.

Social justice, diversity, and ethics are terms that recur throughout this syllabus. Social justice can often be measured through examining "a set of institutions which will enable people to lead a fulfilling life and be active...contributors to their community" (Social Justice, 2014). Preservice teachers in this course are expected to relate the concepts of social justice (enabling people, leading fulfilling lives, being active community contributors) through their assigned coursework. One specific demonstration of this focus is the use of controversial issues in curriculum and LGBTQ students and the school community. The use of these topic choices displays an acknowledgement of the importance of open discussion of these topics and how they are relevant in today's school settings. These are offered as equal topic suggestions along with topics such as resegregation, high-stakes testing, school discipline, and inclusive education.

Although the aforementioned assignments reflect the sincere effort of the professor to address diversity, the meanings and the implications for the terms are never discussed or how they would attach directly into the concept of diversity in education. While the definition of diversity is found online as “the condition of having or being composed of differing elements, especially the inclusion of different types of people (as people of different races or cultures) in a group or organization” (Diversity, 2014), it is never directly defined within syllabi.

While ethics can be defined in several ways, some examples would include a system of moral principles, such as the ethics of a culture (Ethics, 2014). Another example states ethics as the rules of conduct “recognized in respect for a particular class of human actions for a particular group or culture,” such as with medical ethics or Christian ethics (Ethics, 2014). The last definition mentioned deals with “that branch of philosophy dealing with values relating to human conduct with respect to the rightness and the wrongness of certain actions and to the goodness and the badness of the motives and ends of such actions” (Ethics, 2014). Consequently, definitions and meanings vary and remain nebulous.

Respect for diversity and a focus on diversity training are mentioned four times in as many pages, demonstrating the importance that individuals like Sheila do place on this concept. The use of the phrasing “respect for diversity” demonstrates that Sheila consciously has considered the need for a level of respect for cultural situations different from oneself. These conversations challenge the expectations of preservice teachers and assist to prepare them for circumstances outside of their comfort zones. An example of this type of conversation would be having conservative students discuss scenarios and situations involving gay and lesbian issues as they relate to student success with students.

One of the Foundations syllabi includes readings on LGBT issues as well as a book selection. There is a reflection assignment required for the LGBT topics covered within this section. This topic, however, is only allotted one week of the course. Most other topics are only given one week, too. Even though one week might not seem like enough time to properly research and cover LGBT material, it at least appears encouraging that they are given the same allotment as other topics.

One other important fact from one Foundations syllabus was the exclusion of the term sexual orientation in the section for Student Learning Outcomes. At the top of the same page within this syllabus, there was direct mention of the Conceptual Framework, but in the following section the categories listed for inclusion were race, class, gender, and ethnicity. This would appear to indicate that this syllabus was prepared with less attention to detail than others. Bullying and harassment are covered as topics in this syllabus for four separate class meetings. The syllabus does not indicate if these topics deal with these subjects as related to LGBT concerns.

The third syllabus examined contains a Conceptual Framework section, but it is not the new one required for attachment to all College of Education syllabi. This syllabus, however, does contain mention of NCATE (Standard 1), and both are missing reference to LGBT issues/topics. However, the syllabus does include a reading list and book reflection that does include LGBT material. LGBT material does receive as much of a focus in this course as any other topic. In this particular Foundations course, LGBT is given three days. Additionally, there is a required book reflection from the booklist choices, so not every student will choose to use the LGBT material; however, all students will be exposed to the material covered in the three days of class devoted to the topic.

Elementary Education Syllabi

The review of an Elementary Education syllabus comes from a section targeting the management of the classroom environment; it also contained the new Conceptual Framework model adopted by the College of Education. One aspect from this syllabus that stands out immediately is the list of forty-one course objectives focused on (this state's) Quality Teaching Standards (QTS). Diversity is a term that appears three times but is used as it relates to diverse learners or students with diverse needs. Three of the course objectives which could be related to LGBT topics involve promoting positive social relationships among students including students from different backgrounds and abilities, creating a learning community in which individual differences are respected, and creating a learning community in which individual differences are respected. Unfortunately, LGBT acceptance is not mentioned specifically.

Two of the suggested readings for this course deal with the topic of diversity. None of the suggested readings from the list deals with LGBT topics specifically. The interviews following for the Elementary Education portion of Case Two further revealed that LGBT issues are missing from this particular program.

Secondary Education Syllabi

The syllabus examined for the Secondary Education example comes from a section of a course that focuses on diversity topics. Although diversity is a common term within this syllabus, it is accompanied by the term equity. Establishing an attitude of equitable treatment in education is an outstanding focus for this course syllabus. The words equity and equitable appear nine times within the first two pages of the syllabus. There is, however, no specific mention of LGBT concerns or topics. Course objectives include a focus on knowledge of cultural, ethnic, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences and how these may affect individual learner needs,

preferences, and styles. Again there is a noticeable absence of any mention of LGBT concerns or topics.

One aspect unique to this syllabus is the inclusion of the College of Education Disposition Rubric. Dispositions 1 and 2 deal with a commitment to diversity and the ideals of fairness and equity, but again there is an absence of mention of the LGBT community. The required text for this course is the 2007 edition of “Building on Student Diversity” by Cowdry et al. This text devotes one short vignette chapter to an LGBT person, but the fact that he is actually gay is acknowledged as an afterthought at the end of the chapter. This acknowledgement as an afterthought undermines the suggestion of a deliberate programming of LGBT content within this course.

Student Evaluation Documents

Also included in the document analysis portion of the research were all forms presented to students as they evaluate their internship placement. These forms were secured through email from the person in charge of securing teacher placements for the preservice teachers in the College of Education at University X. All documents are labeled Fall 2013.

While most documents were generic in nature and did not address diversity topics directly, there were sections where open-ended comments were available. For example, on the form titled “CLASSROOM TEACHER EVALUATION FORM BY TEACHER INTERN”, there were spaces for narrative responses to the following questions:

1. What were your Classroom Teacher's major strengths?
2. How could your Classroom Teacher improve?
3. Would you recommend your Classroom Teacher to future teacher interns? Why or why not?

4. Additional comments

Again, although this does not specifically address LGBT concerns, it is a basic opportunity for feedback. This form, however, is for the teacher with whom the preservice teacher is interning. Although this does not directly relate to instruction within the College of Education courses, it does give a view of context for the environment of the preservice teacher.

The form that deals with comments for the supervising professor is titled "COLLEGE SUPERVISOR EVALUATION FORM BY TEACHER INTERN", and it provides space for open-ended, narrative responses to the following questions:

1. How many times did your College Supervisor visit you at your school this semester?
2. What were your College Supervisor's major strengths?
3. How could your College Supervisor improve?
4. Would you recommend your College Supervisor for the supervision of future teacher interns? Why or why not?
5. Additional comments

The form with the most space for open-ended responses for any concerns was the "TEACHER INTERN FEEDBACK" form. This form asked five questions that were open to interpretation and allowed for individualized experiences to be shared. The questions were as follows:

During your teaching internship...

1. What came as the biggest surprise?
2. What was the most difficult?
3. What was the most outstanding?
4. What was the funniest?

5. Describe what the internship has been like for you. Include information related to your interaction with your College Supervisor(s), your Cooperating Teacher(s), your Clinical Master Teacher(s), the Office of Clinical Experiences, the Office of Student Services and Certification, your school, and the students in your classroom. Describe your feelings about being observed, evaluations, conferences, weekly seminars, or any other matters. Include specific examples when possible, and make suggestions or recommendations about ways to improve our teaching internship program.

Perhaps the form most available to sharing reflective information pertaining to coursework within the College of Education department is the form titled “STUDENT TEACHING QUESTIONNAIRE – ADDENDUM”. This form asks the following questions:

1. In your opinion, what were the three most useful courses you took at the College of Education at...University (X)? (Be as specific as possible- instructor, semester, why they were useful, etc.)
2. In your opinion, what three courses you took in the College of Education at...University (X) were of the least value to you? (Be as specific as possible- instructor, semester, why they were of least value, etc.)
3. Was there someone (faculty member, student teaching supervisor, etc.) or some office at the University you felt you could contact if you had some kind of problem during your teacher education program? Who? Please describe your relationship?
4. If you could change one thing about any aspect of your experience in your Teacher Education program, what would it be?
5. Additional Comments (please be frank)

This form and these questions demonstrate an opportunity provided by the College of Education for the preservice teaching students to be reflective and share true and honest information for this aspect of the education program.

A total of twelve forms were shared with me as the primary researcher, and only the forms and questions included above allow for even the possibility of reflection on diversity topics or specifically LGBT topics.

Data Collection Plan

Data collection was executed using the following timeline:

- In December of 2013, context data were gathered to begin coding within archival documents (university online documents and state and local legislative decisions as all relate to LGBT issues).
- Program coordinators (Elementary/Secondary/MAP/C&I) were contacted to secure permission and to schedule a qualitative interview. Each interview was transcribed and coded for thematic analysis (December, 2013 and January, 2014).
- Running concurrently with the above bullet, course descriptions and course syllabi for selected courses were coded for key words and repeated themes (December, 2013 and January, 2014).
- MAP withdrawal from research study (January, 2014)
- Faculty and student interview participants were scheduled for interviews. Faculty participants were chosen based upon the suggestions of the program coordinators. Student interview volunteers were solicited through visits to previously secured faculty members' courses. Student volunteers were encouraged to participate with the offer of fifteen dollars in compensation given upon completion of individual

interview. Student contact information was secured for interviewing of Spring semester students (January and February, 2014).

- Interviews were examined and coded for recurring keywords and phrases (January and early February, 2014).
- Data analyses and interpretation/compilation of results (February, 2014).

IRB

Although Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was secured from University X, the solicited participants were over the age of eighteen, and all were included based upon their acknowledged participation (Appendix B). The qualitative interviews collected totaled forty; however, the MAP program coordinator's interview was withdrawn, so the total number of interviews included in final data analyses was thirty-nine. Because participants in this study were drawn from a large, established university, they served as valuable contributors as each are an integral part of the current education system as a student and future educator. Through the interviewing opportunities, they each had opportunity to offer input on interventions, reflections, and suggestions for education diversity training in the future.

Research Design Concerns

One of the concerns many have for qualitative research and the resulting data is whether or not the interview narrative can ever be truly accurate when there is so much subjectivity in the informants' stories being shared as well as the interpretation of the written narrative that follows from the researcher. This is why the researcher must use coding to discover themes in the transcripts, as well as memoing to accurately document the experience.

Habermas (1981) has been eager to anchor rationality and not leave it up for grabs. He demonstrates that rationality is anchored in everyday communication and in the validity claims

made by each of us when we talk non-strategically to each other aiming only at mutual understanding. Habermas (1981) assumes that narrative inquiries claim that: (1) they truthfully represent their feelings, intentions, etc; (2) their stories are socially acceptable; (3) the contents of the narratives are true with regard to what they describe; and (4) the language is comprehensible. The emphasis here is on claim, not on ensuring that all works comply. Habermas (1981) sees these four validity claims as anchors to a rationale inherent in everyday communication and as criteria that present narrative inquiry from sliding into fiction. Claim #2 might prove to be the most relatable to this research, as there are many questions regarding the social acceptance of LGBT groups.

While quantitative researchers judge the rigor and integrity of their study by their ability to generalize their findings to a broader audience, the quality of qualitative research is evaluated by the degree to which a reader or practitioner can transfer the findings based upon the description and contextual elements embedded in the study (Myers & Sylvester, 2006). If readers determine that their contextual variables, such as geographic location, population, or economic circumstances, are somewhat similar to those described in the study, then they may relate, or transfer, the study's findings to their own situations (Shenton, 2004).

The credibility of a qualitative study refers to the degree to which the study measures or tests what is actually intended (Shenton, 2004). Credibility in this study was enhanced by interviewing people who could provide accurate answers to the study's research questions (stakeholders). The context in which the data is collected must be conducive to producing accurate results. For instance, if data from teachers are collected in the presence of faculty or program coordinators, the data collected could be suspect because one could claim that their presence might cause the K-12 preservice teacher not to be as honest with their responses. In

order to increase the creditability of this study, every effort was made to consistently collect data from the appropriate participants in a proper setting (Myers & Sylvester, 2006; Bygstad & Munkvoid, 2007).

Researcher Positionality

As the primary researcher I must acknowledge the possible bias of preconceived notions of needed research into the area of K-12 preservice teacher training in regards to LGBT issues. The focus of the CIPP evaluation is on LGBT issues as they are contained within the training of K-12 preservice teachers at University X. I acknowledge my bias as a member of the gay community that I am predisposed to believe that additional training focusing on LGBT issues would be beneficial (if not essential) for K-12 preservice teachers. I recall feeling pressure in middle and high school to fit in with “straight” criteria. I chose to ally myself with popular, intellectual classmates so that I could feel I was a part of the school community. I certainly do not recall feeling that there were teachers or administrators that I could confide in and depend on to support me otherwise. Having given this acknowledgment, I did strive to analyze all data with an open, ethical attitude. I fully acknowledge that my positionality influences my view of what is notable and accurate as it ties to important aspects of my identity.

Summary

The methodology and the plan to collect data are critical components of the research design. Establishing a proper design and plan for implementation is important to the success of any program. The design on this proposed study mirrored that philosophy.

Document analysis and semi-structured, one-on-one interviews comprised the data collection for K-12 preservice teachers and faculty in regards to LGBT training within the identified degree programs in the College of Education at University X. Through highlighting

keywords and phrases within the documents and interview transcripts, themes emerged that guided further study into the strengths and weaknesses of the LGBT training program for K-12 preservice teachers within this one university setting.

CHAPTER IV:
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Data Exposition and Results

Before the exposition and results could be reported, it was significant to establish the context for University X. This university represents a complex entity that is not isolated but is rather represented by various connections to campus organizations, departments, offices, and resources that are critical to the context in which the university operates.

Situational Context

Local context. The context portion of the CIPP program evaluation required a look at the context in which University X operates. University X is a large university in a southeastern state located in the United States of America. It should also be noted that University X is the single largest university within the state. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the state in which University X operates has a population of almost 5,000,000 (4,822,023). In addition, seventy percent of that reported population is white. The next largest percentage is for African-American residents at twenty-six percent. The median income for households in the state is \$42,081.00; this places 17.1% of the residents within the poverty level (Demographics by Cubit, 2014).

University X also finds itself located within the fifth most populated city within the state, making it fifth out of 574 cities. One notable area is with the racial breakdown when compared with the state data. The city's demographic breakdown for Caucasian and African-American is more balanced than the state. The percentage for Caucasian city residents is 52.6%, while African-American residents rank 41.4%. The median household income of residents for this city is \$31,874. Also noted is the median age for residents within the state and University X's city site. The median age for the state is 37.9, while the city site median age is much younger at 25.4

years. The younger demographic may have proven to be an advantage to a tolerance and acceptance of LGBT issues and conversations at the university (Demographics by Cubit, 2014).

University X's state is located in the middle of the "Bible Belt", a region of numerous Protestant Christians. The state has been identified as one of the most religious states in the US, with about 58% of the population attending church regularly. "As of 2010, the three largest denominational groups in the state in which University X operates are the Southern Baptist Convention, The United Methodist Church, and non-denominational Evangelical Protestant" (Demographics by Cubit, 2014).

Documented LGBT statistics are more ambiguous, but are reported as follows. The state in which University X operates is ranked forty-third when compared to all other states and the District of Columbia when considering the percentage of estimated LGBT citizens residing within the state. As is common among the Southern states, there is a constitutional ban on same-sex unions within University X's state. It is estimated that 2.8% of the state's residents identify as being part of the LGBT community (McClendon, 2013).

In addition, in a poll regarding the level of support for gay marriage, the area in which we find University X operating reported a discouraging poll statistic. The poll reported 34% were in support of gay marriage, while the majority at 66% were opposed (Tuohy, 2013). There were comments posted on both sides stating comments such as "Because it is biblically and morally wrong" for the opposition, and comments in the affirmative such as "Because everyone has the right to love" and "I think it's about time people weren't treated like inferior citizens because of who they love" (Tuohy, 2013, p.1).

Having examined some of the hindrances for LGBT context enlightenment, there are some cases to evidence a more progressive attitude. One such case tells the story of a lesbian

student (although labeled gay in the title of the article) who reportedly found walking the halls of her school easier even though she stated that “support [was] still not 100 percent” (Gray, 2012, p.1). Elizabeth G. was a student in a town surrounding University X. The town is composed of 1,828 people, so Elizabeth was working with a small town in the heart of the “Bible Belt”. Elizabeth stated that at times “administrators treated her worse than her fellow students did” (Gray, 2012, p.1). Elizabeth at one time gave in to the demands of school administrators to remove a hoodie showing support of other gay people (the shirt displayed the caption **WARNING: THIS INDIVIDUAL INFECTED WITH “THE GAY”---PROCEED WITH CAUTION**). However, Elizabeth G. felt that the administrators had gone too far when they dismissed her request to attend the prom with a female date. Students at several high schools in neighboring areas had formed GSA’s; this along with the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), who had been fighting for the rights of a student in one of the neighboring areas, provided Elizabeth G. a newfound vigor to fight for her rights. She contacted the SPLC for help, and they in turn issued a letter threatening to sue Elizabeth G.’s school if the school’s policies did not change. The school reevaluated their decisions, and Elizabeth, wearing a tuxedo, attended the prom with her female date.

Sarah N. was a 15-year old student in a neighboring school system to Elizabeth G. who found opposition when she formed a GSA at her high school. She stated the opposition came from the students rather than the administrators, although she also stated that the administrators were not supportive (Gray, 2012, p.2). No one felt that Obama’s rebuke of the military’s “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy sent a message to the community; even though she felt that there was a growing acceptance for the club, there was still work to do. “Until (the GSA formed, the

students) didn't have anyone they could turn to. We were able to provide moral support and build their self-esteem" (Gray, 2012, p.2).

Glenda E., the chair for the coordinating committee of the state's Safe Schools Coalition, stated, "Schools could be safer and more welcoming for LGBT students if anti-harassment policies specifically protected them" (Gray, 2012, p.2). The state in which we find University X seems to be making some steps toward the above-mentioned "safer and more welcoming" attitude. In 2009, a state law passed requiring public school districts to enact anti-bullying and anti-harassment policies (Gray, 2012, p.2). This state's Department of Education also developed a "model anti-harassment policy for school districts saying that violence, threats of violence, harassment and intimidation are prohibited based on race, sex, religion, national origin or disability" (Gray, 2012, p.2). Interestingly enough, it did not specifically mention sexual orientation in the policy's language.

One attorney for the SPLC stated that "school leaders need to set the tone...they have the power to send the message that all students are welcome. Otherwise students are left feeling isolated and without a lifeline" (Gray, 2012, p.3). However, each situation is unique and special. Elizabeth G. stated that she was not worried about a backlash from her situation. Some students were upset with her because they thought prom would be canceled because of her. Elizabeth G. stated she only really cared about the comments from her friends. She commented that a supportive teacher who told her how proud she was of her calmed her worries. Nevertheless, Elizabeth G. was allowed to attend her prom as she liked, and she was allowed to wear her pro-gay hoodie to school and continue her support of LGBT issues.

Not all students operate within the same situation. One 17-year old girl told one support group that "she's been kicked out of her house after someone outed her to her parents" (Gray,

2012, p.3). Someone else stated “We are in the Bible Belt. Kids have been disowned” (Gray, 2012, p.3). This barrier is supported by a statistic reported through the Parents, Family, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays of New York City stating that “LGBT teens are 8.4 times more likely to commit suicide when they are not accepted into their community, and that 25-50 percent of homeless youth are LGBT and were kicked out because of their sexual orientation” (Tuohy, 2013, p.1).

Also in the news was a university in a neighboring city to University X. There was a group of university students, alumni, and faculty who support gay rights and equality that was attempting to raise \$6,000.00 to bring Jennifer Knapp, a Christian musician who announced herself as a lesbian in 2010, to campus to coincide with the university’s homecoming (Gray, 2013). At the time of the printing of the article, the university had already established a date to bring her to campus and signed a contract with her management. This shows evidence of the pockets of support for LGBT issues and equality in the area surrounding University X. A student at this neighboring university formed a Facebook group to encourage support for the LGBT group on campus, and he was surprised at how quickly the group grew. Within a few weeks, the group had grown to over 500 members; the group acknowledged that the “Facebook group is not sanctioned by the university, which is a private Southern Baptist institution” (Gray, 2013, p.2).

One news article even discussed the problem of Republicans losing the support of gays because of voting stances for LGBT issues. The chairman of this equal rights group reported that while “the civil rights movement has long been considered a crusade of the liberal Democrats...it’s becoming increasingly evident that marriage equality is just as consistent with conservative values as progressive ones” (Tuohy, 2013, p.1). One comment mentioned within the article asked the reader to “consider the impossible positions businesses are forced into when

considering transferring talent between states. How could a company ask a married gay executive in its Washington, D.C. office to move to (a conservative Southern state) and abandon the hundreds of rights he or she currently enjoys? Shareholders of such companies are now up in arms about the onerous prohibitions which obstruct free market capitalism” (Tuohy, 2013, p.2). This article appeals to the Republican tenet of a free market society and the free enterprise American dream.

In addition, for the first time since 1996, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) was debated on the Senate floor in 2013 (HRC, 2013). This was reported through the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) website as a historic step toward achieving workplace protections for all LGBT Americans (HRC, 2013). The HRC also reported that “the AWO campaign, along with Project Right Side, commissioned prominent Republican pollster Alex Lundry to conduct a nationwide survey on support for ENDA. The poll found nearly seventy percent of Americans – including fifty-six percent of Republicans – support ENDA. Eight out of ten voters already thought discrimination against workers based on their sexual orientation or gender identity was illegal (HRC, 2013).

University context. University X’s website does show some concessions in attempt to educate and equalize the field for LGBT employees. The website shows information outlining insurance options for same-sex couples in the aftermath of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) decision. Since the DOMA legislation only affected portions of the law, this left issues where “federal and state laws intersect” (Safe Zone, 2013). University X does have in place a program called the “Safe Zone Project”, and it is designed to “increase awareness and knowledge of, and sensitivity to, important issues affecting LGBT students, faculty, and staff ” (Safe Zone, 2013). This program is not unique to University X; however, it does show a level of

progressiveness and acceptance of the LGBT community. “Whatever their content differences, all Safe Zone projects are united in philosophy and in the adoption of a Safe Zone symbol to visibly affirm the acceptance of LGBT people and to inform members of the LGBT community, or individuals who may be questioning their sexuality or struggling with other LGBT issues, who is available, open, and safe to talk with about their concerns.” (Safe Zone, 2013).

University X’s Safe Zone Program was originally started by two students in the Spring of 2002, and the program is currently operated by a committee of faculty, staff, and students on University X’s campus (Safe Zone, 2013). The following graphic is displayed by allies of the Safe Zone program.



Figure 2: Safe Zone Ally graphic

This graphic gives a visual acknowledgement to all of those on campus, including faculty, students, and visitors, that there is an advocate present for those concerned with and sensitive to LGBT issues. These individuals are known as Safe Zone Allies. To become a Safe Zone Ally, a training session is required. “Safe Zone trainings are three hours and include information regarding basic LGBTQ vocabulary, topics specific to bisexual and transsexual identities, issues LGBTQ individuals may face, how to create a more inclusive classroom and campus environment, how to report harassment and/or discrimination, and information about LGBTQ related resources on campus. Following training, participants are invited to sign up to serve as [University X] Safe Zone Allies. Allies are provided with a Safe Zone decal that can be displayed on their office door. Allies are also given the option to have their name listed on the

Safe Zone website to indicate they are an available resource for LGBTQ and Ally individuals” (Safe Zone Ally, 2014).

The following are established goals for the Safe Zone Program:

- To educate Safe Zone allies regarding LGBTQ needs and concerns to include the following: a) support for LGBTQ individuals; b) increased awareness of the issues facing LGBTQ individuals; c) referral process specific to the needs of LGBTQ individuals; and d) increased visibility for LGBTQ individuals and concerns on campus.
- To foster a university climate where every individual has the right to be treated with dignity, respect, and self-worth, including a) publicity for Safe Zone Program mission and goals; b) promotion and advocacy for safe environments respectful of all individuals; and c) education of students, faculty, and staff regarding harassment and discrimination policies.
- To provide ongoing support and training to Safe Zone allies.
- To work collaboratively with other diversity groups on campus.
- To provide educational materials/programming regarding LGBTQ needs and concerns. (Safe Zone, 2013).

University X also put together a suggested expanded nondiscrimination policy for inclusion within course syllabi in which the Safe Zone coordinators at University X asked that faculty consider expanding the non-discrimination policy within their classrooms to include information and identities not currently listed within the university non-discrimination policy (Safe Zone, 2013). University X also released a statement covering diversity and nondiscrimination. “As an academic community, our educational mission is enhanced by the

robust exchange of ideas that occurs between a diverse student body, faculty, and staff within a respectful and inclusive learning environment. As a campus community, we are dedicated to the pursuit of personal and academic excellence, to advancing the ideals of individual worth and human dignity, and to maintaining a nurturing and respectful learning environment. All members of the [University X] community are expected to contribute positively to the environment and to refrain from behaviors that threaten the freedom or respect that every member of our community deserves” (Safe Zone, 2013).

University X also has an online statement revealing the university “is committed to providing an inclusive environment that is free from harassment or discrimination based on race, genetic information, color, religion, ethnicity, national origin, socioeconomic status, political beliefs, sex, sexual orientation, gender expression, gender identity, age, ability, size, or veteran status. [University X] prohibits any verbal or physical conduct that threatens or endangers the health or safety of any individual or group, including physical abuse, verbal abuse, threats, stalking, intimidation, harassment, sexual misconduct, coercion, and/or other communication or conduct that creates a hostile living or learning environment. Harassment or other illegal discrimination against individuals or groups not only is a violation of university policy and subject to disciplinary action, but also is inconsistent with the values and ideals of the university” (Safe Zone, 2013).

University X also supports a graduation ceremony to highlight and “honor the accomplishments of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer and allied students at [University X]. Students honored at this event have not only completed the academic requirements for a college degree but have also overcome the odds of being sexual minorities or at-risk populations

during their school years. We honor them for that as much as their papers, reports, and projects” (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

University X supports several campus organizations, departments, offices, and resources that are critical to the context in which the university operates. I highlight the following organizations.

- **Women’s Resource Center**

The Women’s Resource Center (WRC) provides free and confidential counseling for students, faculty and staff who have experienced interpersonal violence, including stalking, sexual harassment, relationship violence, and sexual assault. All services are available to members of the LGBTQ community, and counselors are trained to address same-sex violence. The WRC also provides academic advocacy, criminal justice and law enforcement advocacy, hospital accompaniment, and assistance with protection orders and social services (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013). There is a special library “housed in the Women’s Resource Center and [it] has a collection of books on LGBTQ issues, a video collection that includes several documentaries, and a variety of brochures, such as *Being Gay/Lesbian; Be an Ally to Gays & Lesbians; Transgender: Understanding Differences; Man to Man: Three Steps to Health for Gay, Bisexual, or any Men who have Sex with Men; and Woman to Woman: Three Steps to Health for Lesbian, Bisexual, or any Women who have Sex with Women; Health for Gay, Bisexual, or any Men who have Sex with Men; and Woman to Woman: Three Steps to Health for Lesbian, Bisexual, or any Women who have Sex with Women* (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **Counseling Center**

The staff of the Counseling Center is committed to providing a supportive environment for LGBTQ-identified and questioning students (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **Housing and Residential Communities**

The Housing and Residential Communities at [University X] are committed to providing a safe environment for all students. The Community Living Standards require that all residents help develop and maintain an atmosphere that promotes social awareness, social appreciation and acceptance (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **Office of Student Judicial Affairs**

The Office of Student Judicial Affairs handles Code of Student Conduct Violations, including harassment related to sexual orientation or gender expression (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **University Recreation**

University Recreation staff members are committed to providing a safe environment for all members of the university community. The Student Recreation Center provides gender-neutral changing space in addition to its men's and women's locker rooms (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **Student Health Center**

Student Health Center staff members are committed to providing a safe environment for all members of the university community. The Student Health Center provides gender-neutral restrooms in addition to the men's and women's restrooms in the waiting area (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

- **Career Center**

The Career Center provides job search information for LGBTQ students (Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations, 2013).

All of the context information discovered specifically for University X seems to indicate a level of acceptance or at the minimum a level of tolerance for LGBT issues as well as LGBT community members working at University X or enrolled in degree programs within the university. This type of information should indicate a progressive attitude within the setting for University X in spite of the fact that it was noted that the university is situated within the Southeast and the “Bible Belt”.

- **Spectrum Campus Group**

Spectrum was founded on January 13, 1983. “Spectrum is a student group for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and otherwise queer students and their allies” (Spectrum, 2014). The stated mission of Spectrum is to “promote community for LGBTQA people, advocate for their equality on campus, state, and national levels, and make a positive impact on the (city’s) community” (Spectrum, 2014). Membership in Spectrum is open to anyone who identifies as a member of the LGBTQA community as well as an ally of the community. However, voting rights within the organization are reserved for a full member (a full or part-time undergraduate or graduate student of the university). A secondary level of membership is available to others; this membership, however, does not include voting rights.

The formation of Spectrum came in response to a group of gay students visiting a bar location, and they were addressed in a “queer phobic” manner. They responded by approaching the bouncer, and the bouncer in the bar asked them to leave rather than asking the people who made the comments to leave. Spectrum initially was started by one gay

student and his partner in their home. Spectrum was organized and operated from their bedroom until 1983 when they were recognized and funded by the university as a campus organization.

I was able to speak with a Spectrum representative to gain more in-depth information about Spectrum and some of the goals they have set for themselves. This representative (referred to as Lexie) shared some insights into the organization. She stated, “The organization was really formed from a place of advocacy, but more so wanting a place where people feel safe. Spectrum works toward three main goals, which are social advocacy, outreach advocacy, and political advocacy. The group is working to ensure students feel welcome and safe on campus, as well as working to change policy within the university system.”

Lexie feels that the support of the university depends on what Spectrum is asking them to do and when they are asking the university to act. In 2007, sexual orientation was added to the university’s non-discrimination policy. They are still advocating for gender identification to be added to that same policy, but they have not been granted that as of yet. Lexie feels that the politics and the leadership of the university play a role in those instances, and she feels that university culture does not always match university policy.

Lexie also went on to briefly discuss the Greek system of fraternities and sororities, and she stated that she feels that the sororities are generally more receptive to LGBT topics and students than the fraternities are to the same topics. Lexie spoke about an individual collaboration between Spectrum and one sorority in response to decorations for a Halloween event. The sorority decorations included tombstones that were labeled, “Freshmen died of being dodge-ball dykes”. The two organizations reached out to each other, and Spectrum

even spoke to the sorority's national organization. Collectively, the sorority ended up organizing a charity event to benefit Spectrum. Lexie also added it is the only time a sorority has invited Spectrum into their sorority house for dinner to sit and talk about resolutions to move forward and benefit both groups.

Lexie added that Spectrum is a group that strives to better the everyday functioning of the university for students belonging to or supporting LGBTQ issues, students, and concerns.

Context, Input, Process, and Product

As mentioned in Chapter III, the first evaluation component of the CIPP evaluation model is context. The context evaluation stage of the CIPP model creates the big picture of where both the program and evaluation fit (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). Key stakeholders in the evaluation are identified, and the main question to be answered is "How do you define the climate surrounding the location of the training program?"

To complement context evaluation, input evaluation is addressed. In this stage, information is collected regarding the mission, goals, and plan of the program. Its purpose is to assess the program's strategy and merit as well as the responsiveness of the program to stakeholder needs (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The main question to ask research for this section is "What is the K-12 preservice teacher's current LGBT sensitivity or awareness?"

Third, the process portion of the evaluation is designed to detect defects in the procedure design or implementation (Stufflebeam, 2003). The process portion's main question is "Are there any problems related to learning?"

Last, the product portion of the CIPP evaluation is designed to examine the measurement of the goals and interpretation of the attainment of those goals (Stufflebeam, 2003). The focus

question for the product portion of the evaluation is “How was the overall experience for the teachers and for the students?”

Analysis

The qualitative analysis of data was guided by using the study’s research questions. Both the artifacts and transcriptions aided the analysis of data as I built a theoretical sensitivity by coming closer to the data and having a unique opportunity to improve the process (Hesse-Biber, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). It was the transcription of written texts in terms of field notes, supporting documents, recordings of interviews, and analysis of artifacts that allowed me to have a unique viewpoint in order to produce summaries, codes, and memos as part of an ongoing analysis (Hesse-Biber, 2011). Analysis was guided by asking, “What do the data say?” and interpretation was guided by saying, “What does it mean?” in order for me to develop a deeper understanding (Hesse-Biber, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 2008).

As I searched for commonalities, codes and themes began to develop with contrasts and comparisons through coding, memoing, and recoding. Using an inductive process, I continued to break data down into additional clarifying codes with key words and phrases playing a significant role (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). After saturation of coding was achieved, connections were found between codes with descriptive themes and relationships (Strauss & Corbin, 2008).

The initial coding began using the components of the CIPP program model. These were categorized into positive, negative, and neutral categories. Repeated words, phrases, or terms, such as diversity and LGBT, subsequently these were then broken down into additional sub-categories. These sub-categories provide the headings for outlining the narrative found in Chapter IV. As the coding continued, descriptive themes and relationships emerged that developed across analyses. These emerged as issues of race, the conservative nature of

University X, and course-programming concerns emerged as final themes for Case One, and Case Two themes emerged as the same three with an additional theme being Greek influence.

Pseudonyms

Anonymity was a goal during this research endeavor. In order to encourage honest responses to all interview questions, pseudonyms were assigned to program coordinators and faculty. Assignments of pseudonyms were not needed for Case Two since the students are identified only by degree program and gender.

Case One was composed of program coordinators and faculty (totaling nine interview participants). Program coordinators and faculty have been combined and assigned pseudonyms to assist with anonymity due to the specific nature of their positions. Program coordinators and faculty will be discussed equally within the dissertation narrative to assist with anonymity.

Case Two was composed of the student interview volunteers (with all combined student interviews totaling thirty). Case Two interviewees consisted on nine female Foundations students and one male Foundations student; ten female Elementary Education students; and seven female Secondary Education students with three male Secondary Education students.

Direct Dialogue

The use of direct dialogue from the interview transcripts has been utilized in the dissertation narrative to assist in telling the stories of the participants. This strategy is utilized for exposing the data from both Cases One and Two. “Tourist interviewing” is a characterization of this type of interviewing (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). This type of interviewing is “where the researcher...meets the subject for a brief period of time, records a conversation in snapshot mode, and subsequently tries to say something interesting about it” (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p. 299). Including direct quotations from the interview transcripts allowed the interviewees to

“speak for themselves”, and this assists in eliminating some of the element of researcher interpretation.

Case One

As previously stated, Case One consists of program coordinators and faculty from targeted programs within the College of Education at University X. This included two programs under the Curriculum and Instruction degree program heading (the Elementary Education program and the Secondary Education program) and the Foundations program. Case One consisted of nine faculty members (four Foundations faculty members, two Elementary Education faculty members, and three Secondary Education faculty members). Their interviews were coded and analyzed and are discussed under the four components of the CIPP model. As the coding of the interviews emerged, it became apparent that even within Case One it would be important to separate data findings into degree programs.

Context

While interviewing each department, the question, “What is the local climate as it relates to LGBT issues?” spoke to the context within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Sexual discrimination. Although progress seems evident within the climate of University X, it does not seem to be transparent as demonstrated by interview comments such as Tom stating that, “Climate here is improving slowly so we do have a group on campus that is a very active LGBT group.” His awareness over issues related to the addition of same-sex partner domestic benefits translated to a positive view. He did, however, point out that sexual orientation was included in the non-discrimination policy, but he felt that it was, “Done under cloak of darkness in the middle of the night and the media never picked up on that and that’s why it was

done.” This would indicate that while equity is being imbedded in University X’s policy, it is not yet visible in practice. A quote from this interview that made this even more evident was that a local legislator allegedly said, “You know we need to dig a big hole and burn all these books that promote homosexuality.”

Conservative nature of University X. Another common factor mentioned for climate was the issue of the conservative nature of the community. Within one Foundations interview, it was acknowledged that “the climate is more conservative and therefore your teaching has to be more conservative even as it’s perceived as fairly radical here.” This type of conservative attitude apparently impedes the content or delivery of material covered within courses.

Bo revealed that much of his teaching involves preparing preservice teachers to go out and teach in an environment in which the level of sensitivity to these issues is less than optimal. “Although less than it should be, it is better than having these teachers walk out into an environment of culture shock. It is better to raise the awareness of sheltered teachers with a limited background in self-awareness and cultural awareness than to just have them assimilate into the conservative climate of University X”. Bo added that since these preservice teachers will be impacting children within diverse communities, they need experiences that will aid them in handling a variety of issues in the process of their teaching. This reference demonstrates the impact of the conservative nature in which the university operates, as well as the underlying assumption that students enter the program with a lack of understanding of the complexities of personal and professional development.

Additionally, Bo affirmed that there have been a number of students resistant to issues of diversity. He attributed this discomfort to what he sees as a prevalent air of conservatism for this entire region of the country rather than simply University X. Bo acknowledged that students

who come from more diverse experiences within larger cities and extensive travel are more willing to embrace discussions in regard to diversity as opposed to those from smaller local areas and cities surrounding the university. Bo did include the need to mediate discussions and to remain sensitive to over-guiding conversations that should occur naturally; however, he acknowledged that these conversations are dependent on the cultural awareness and open dialogue that may or may not occur amongst students. While he is hopeful that debate will illuminate the issue, he is also aware of diverse perspectives and acceptance of opinions coloring the class conversations.

A climate that invites openness. Bo also expressed an interesting point about LGBT topics in class and wondered why they matter at all in the course work. He shared, “We talk about intersexuality. What I try to do is to always come back to basic concepts, and what I tell my students (is) that...we keep coming back to...sort of a litmus test in respect to that. There are certain things that matter and certain things that don’t matter.” He indicated that it is the teacher’s responsibility to distinguish those things that do or do not matter in order to develop a purposeful course. In terms of gender related issues, it would be significant to determine if one can construct a way in which the issue matters or a rationale for how addressing the issue might make a difference. This type of thinking draws course conversations back to a basic human level for students to find a common ground for discussion.

Sheila articulated the significance of University X’s historical situation. She conveyed that three years ago discussions surrounding sexual orientation, sexuality, or sexual identity could not have been addressed within courses. Even a topic choice such as gay marriage would carry a level of discomfort and elicit strange glances from the students. This statement insinuates

that from a historical perspective perhaps the university is (at least) in the infant stages of progressing forward in regard to LGBT issues.

Sheila's climate comments ended with, "The context is horrible. I had to deal with my child one time when the whole Chick-Fil-A thing happened." She admittedly indicated that she was the most political of all her community friends, and was not surprised when they all took photographs of themselves standing in line at Chick-Fil-A as supportive action in regard to their public anti-gay sentiments. This resulted in Sheila having to have a pointed conversation with her own daughter on private and public philosophies and expressions, thus indicating the convoluted impact of context as it frames the issues.

Elementary Education

Conservative nature of University X. The interview with Kim, a faculty member, included a quote stating that she feels that the main issue for climate is that the university operates within a very conservative situation. Kim also stated, "I think there is going to be a huge problem if we have...preservice teachers who don't believe its right to be gay." Acknowledgment of this awareness demonstrates that there is a lack of successful programming and delivery for preservice teachers within the program because of the conservative attitude that is pervasive throughout the student body. Kim goes on to state that "it's almost like this is not an issue that is up for conversation" when asked about discussing LGBT issues. She quantified that it is introduced within her course, but that students do not discuss or comment; it is basically a lecture-and-listen format, lacking dialogue and discourse. Additionally, Kim confided that LGBT issues have never been presented to her as questions or concerns as the majority of students believe that LGBT issues will not be present in their future teaching environments. This belief would mirror the same idea as represented in conservative and traditional beliefs in regard to

Thanksgiving, Christopher Columbus, and Native American perspectives. Kim shared that students have responded negatively during discussions about these traditional holidays when other aspects of history have been introduced. Kim shared that her students feel the community would be unaccepting of other perspectives when challenging the established norm. Kim believes that the conservative environment surrounding University X would only allow for the dated, “one-sided” community perspective. This illustrates the effect the climate and the community can have on a teaching situation as Kim went on to add that the preservice teaching students just “haven’t had enough, you know, they haven’t had enough discussion about it (LGBT topics).” Realistically, awareness and discussion can only occur when a comfort level has been established, whereby real discourse can occur.

Likewise, Denise acknowledged that she is a Christian (a statement she offered voluntarily as this information was not asked), and she stated that it is interesting negotiating topics in class. She related this statement back to “when I was a child, the big thing was divorce. You didn’t talk about it. It was shameful. If you did it, you did it quietly. So it seems to me that homosexuality is the divorce of my childhood.” She explained that while divorce has always been there, it was just one of those topics that you did not approach. In other words, Denise acknowledged that LGBT issues are the “divorce” issues of her time, and she affirmed that the topic is current and relevant for discussion in today’s classrooms.

Elementary Education faculty indicated that the university functions within a conservative setting with most of the surrounding community operating within a conservative Christian set of beliefs. This type of climate can be seen in the basic misunderstanding of students regarding diversity training in general. Kim allowed that “We’re still growing and we’re still learning, and you know, we just have to research and study and think about it and read books

and meet people on campus....think about all the diverse students we've ever had and diverse situations and so forth and so on." Even with that said, there are still students who express confusion over why a semester course focused on diversity topics is necessary. This kind of student outlook totally disregards the necessity of knowing information about students and their families different from themselves along with their diverse backgrounds and histories.

A climate that invites openness. Denise stated that her perspective is that the university atmosphere is not openly hostile. She personally has not seen controversy over LGBT issues at the university, but she ventured to say that she would not feel comfortable saying that about the state in which University X operates. Denise stated that she did not grow up knowing any gay or lesbian people, and she had never really been presented with the issue. Moreover, she admitted that she does have gay and lesbian acquaintances now, and that she feels it has really only been within the last ten to fifteen years that gay and lesbian people have had a voice. These comments speak to the opportunity of acceptance available on campus that perhaps does not exist as readily when expanded across the state.

Secondary Education

Conservative nature of University X. Data from the interview process seemed consistent with some of the conservative comments regarding religion. Kate stated, "I was really shocked when I came here in, when topics that were just regularly spoken of in other places where I was in the Midwest...were taboo and in fact, people afraid to talk about race or class and certainly the last thing anyone wants to talk about is LGBTQ plus issues." She honestly felt that she could successfully discuss topics related to race, class, and typical gender roles; however, when LGBTQ issues would arise, students would raise "flags.....and they [would] get red faced

and cry and leave the room.” Topics appeared to be delineated to “discussable” and “untouchable”.

This statement affirms earlier climate comments that discussed the continued talk about race and other topics, which have long been struggles in the South; however, the introduction of LGBT discussions is often met with silence. One example came from Kate when she was sharing information about a student who came to her to drop a course because of the LGBT material offered within the course. The student stated, “I have to drop this class for religious reasons.” Kate was concerned as every English student is required to take a multicultural literature class; however, choice is available at the discretion of professors within the English department as long as “it’s not dead white men literature.” The student’s concern centered on the fact that this course offered exposure to Queer Literature, which the student felt would violate her religious beliefs. For this reason Kate facilitated a course override, which was met by the student’s reply, “Oh praise the Lord, and thank you so much.” Kate reaffirmed with the student that she might have to teach gay students within the classroom, whereby the student indicated, “Not where I come from.” This experience alone shows the convergence of a conservative religious influence along with a denial of acceptance on even the most basic level. This instructor also affirmed that the student does plan to teach public school.

Kate does acknowledge that LGBT students feel the conservativeness of the climate. She stated, “I mean I have had talks with gay students who are here and we talked about how they can’t wait to leave and live somewhere better, more accepting...a place where they can be themselves and just not be afraid of whatever.”

In addition, Jerry stated that he believes that the climate of the community in which the university sits is very conservative, and most students fit into the “cultural norm” within that

conservative climate. While he admitted the university community is generally more forward thinking and accepting than the state, the state is reflective of its location in the South. He made reference to a metropolitan area nearby as being more receptive than the conservative norm due to a preponderance of the people in that locale not originating from the South. This is an important point that returns in many of the student interviews, which is the feeling that much of the progressive momentum of the university comes from students entering from outside of the South and growing up in larger and more diverse urban areas.

A climate that invites openness. Kate went on to say that she feels that her colleagues within the department of education are on the same page as far as devoting course time to including LGBT issues. She stated, “Everybody knows that we as a college have diversity as one of our highest...dispositions. We embrace this.” Her concern centers around the students in general who she believes put up walls for conservative religious reasons for both novel selections and discussions. As previously stated, the conservative religious climate is a factor.

Issues of race. Kate shared that, “Maybe in some ways, a fearless grasping of this idea of racism, and maybe a more fearful pandering about the fringes of this other issue” are necessary but difficult as related to living in the South; Kate believes “ racism, is still alive and well, I mean it is everywhere. But, at least where I came from before, people didn’t speak it so freely.” With this statement, race is revealed as still being the dominant concern for University X’s location, overshadowing LGBT issues and concerns.

Input

While interviewing each department, the question, “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for students?” spoke to the input within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Autonomy in course design. All of the Foundations faculty surveyed (Tom, Sheila, Virginia, and Bo) stated that they feel they have control over the delivery of the material contained within the courses they teach. Tom indicated “you are always going to exclude something”. This would indicate that there are certain topics that are going to be included in course syllabi over other topics. He also stated that you have to “pick and choose” those topics, and he went on to state that he looks for LGBT issues to be included within the syllabi for the graduate teaching assistants (GTA’s). Tom also added that one of the challenges is that “you can’t do a lot on any given topic. We do try to include LGBT issues. I include it every time I teach the course, and I try to make sure that all the GA’s who are teaching it include it in the course cause I think in this climate it’s an important piece of that kind of course that we do.”

Bo shared that “we each, as a matter of fact, develop our own syllabus; however, in terms of content, we all try to touch the same bases. Our sequence of doing it is really a matter of a personal style. My approach is to spend the first half of a semester grounding them into the historical development of education and the theories and philosophies of education so that they have a tool belt if you will, and then the last half or a little more than half of it deals with the sociocultural issues.” He integrates philosophical discussion to examine just how a problem did arise and develop, as well as how best to deal with it as a current issue impacting future teachers and their teaching. While the freedom to program your own course content and schedule is certainly an empowering strategy. it may also be necessary for a system to be in place to monitor the delivery of the content for equity. Tom stated in his interview that course syllabi are reviewed by the program coordinator, but he did not indicate how course delivery is monitored past syllabi review.

Influence through individual perspectives. Much of the instruction programmed concerning LGBT issues comes as planned discussions with assigned or selected readings. Tom also mentioned that he likes to include videos concerning LGBT issues that involve subsequent discussions. This seemed to be a theme for any instructor mentioning LGBT content. Discussions were the most common format for delivery of LGBT topics.

One very interesting turn in Bo's interview came when he was asked about programming for his Foundations course. He stated that, "How can I be sensitive to this issue and be supportive or helpful to students with respect to this issue when it's an issue that I have strong negative feelings about personally." He demonstrated sincere concern about his own personal biases and the need to recognize his own limitations based on personal beliefs and how to handle those beliefs. In fact, he indicated that there may be times where a teacher's best course of action would be to refer a student with an LGBT concern to another individual without the same personal bias. This instructor went on to explain that he "had tried to work through the issues and understanding that as a teacher there may be certain cultures, values, lifestyles, beliefs, whatever that you don't necessarily agree with, but you [encounter] as a teacher." His effort avoid harmful responses tied to his need to be respectful and aware of diverse students in order to be supportive and helpful in ways that a teacher should be. This idea is certainly relevant to input in that it can impact what the instructor deems important. In addition, even if content is mandated to the instructors, they are typically able to determine the emphasis and time topics will receive.

Bo said in programming his courses, he deliberately adds in essay topics, small group discussion, reading reflections, and group reporting as teaching devices. He reaches for more than just what the article says, he tells that students that he has "read the article, I know what the article says, I want to know what you think about it, how do you react to it." Finally, in his final

exam, there are questions that address a variety of different sociocultural issues that allow for reflective thinking and processing.

Sheila shared a comment about gay marriage, and how this can play into her programming for her course. She referenced conversations about gay and lesbian issues surfacing in future classes and referenced gay marriage specifically; she stated, “I’m just saying I will bring it up now, and I have more ammunition. I will link it to civil rights and race.” She challenges her students by asking them if they “will you be on the wrong side of history”. She moves the LGBT issues from abstract to concrete by framing them this way, as she feels that this gives her more credibility in the discussions of gay rights as framed by civil rights.

In addition, with the programming of instruction for her course, she added that she addresses disability studies as more than simply special education, but rather how you conceptually theorize race and other issues as norms within our culture. Just as queer theory is about disturbing the normativity, she challenges her students to examine ethics as they might relate to lesbians and lesbian ethics. She attempts to challenge her students to examine how gender identities have ethical implications in a broader application.

Sheila endeavors to engage students at different levels and spaces in a space where they may talk freely. She shares concerns over her young daughter’s educational environment because her “daughter’s teachers have never discussed these issues.” Once, when her daughter’s friend indicated that she wanted to marry a girl when she grows up, it was actually represented as purely logical. The young girl went on to share that her mother takes care of everything at home. The young girl did not complete the statement by saying she wanted to marry a woman when she grows up because she is attracted to girls; she wanted to marry a woman when she grows up because of the desire to be cared for. She views her mother as the nurturer within the home. This

logical representation of a casual occurrence at school while in line for the bathroom, was presented to the teacher by other students as an inquiry of, “can you marry another woman?” The confronted teacher responded that she did not know, rather than a more accepting response, according to Sheila, of “you could have said everybody can love everybody.” The innocence of the young girl’s desire in this episode is focused on care giving and nurturing versus sex. However, Sheila sees the community as very sexist, and silence on the issues only makes them more complicated. By the teacher reacting like “Oh my God, I don’t know what to say,” the teacher (at a minimum) made it a bigger issue than it needed to be for these young children, and possibly colored their thinking on female pairings.

Pedagogical complexities. Sheila explained that in 1998 there were limited articles dealing with LGBT issues, so she chose an article titled *Dear Anita*, centered on religion and the idea that “I pray to the same God you do.” Students took exception to the article dealing with LGBT for religious reasons. In fact, Sheila was surprised to only have one supporter who revealed that she had an uncle who was gay that she loved him dearly. This student was the antithesis of the class norm. The student also shared that she had been appalled her the way her family was treating him and forcing him into silence. Sheila felt that this was representative of society and how ‘queer’ subjects that have to be forced into silence.

Elementary Education

Pedagogical complexities/limitations. One of the limitations discovered within this program input is the lack of programming for LGBT topics. Kim shared that there had only been a diversity course at the university since 2011. Although not in great depth, Kim explained that diverse cultures are also addressed through the idea of complexity within future classrooms, family dynamics, sensitivity, cultural responsiveness, the issue of same sex parents. Kim’s

statements paint a picture of touching on one aspect of LGBT concerns for teachers dealing with same-sex parents, but through her own admission there is no depth to the study and delivery.

Kim added that she believes the faculty do not receive the training needed to successfully deliver this material. She stated, “I don’t feel we have training. Of course you can do your own research and teach the way you want to but as far as someone coming forward and saying, here is training, you need to do this, that’s not happening.” This shows that some of the faculty within the Elementary Education program do not feel they have the knowledge to deliver LGBT-related instruction for their students. Kim admitted that although there is no true delivery of LGBT content within the Elementary Education program, she feels it could be facilitated.

Another aspect of the Elementary Education program came when Kim was asked what would be something very important to do to increase the sensitivity of elementary school teachers to diversity issues for their students. She responded that the first thing you have to do is have a classroom environment that is both fair and firm where there is an accepting environment established up front. Kim affirmed that there is so much more to the classroom than just the delivery of content; the accepting and nurturing environment that the teacher establishes “can be an empowering situation for both a teacher and his/her students. However, this can also be an isolating event for an LGBT student or a student whose parents identify within the LGBT community.

Programming. Denise stated that she treats LGBT topics like any other social justice issue, and she said she tries to present LGBT material in a way that does not feel threatening to students. Denise shared that for most topics she has selected reading material, but that she does not have an article that she typically uses for LGBT topics. She stated that she looks for material that challenges students’ thinking. She wants them to have identified some areas that resonate

with them when they come to class so there will be momentum to the discussion. If they disagree with the assigned material, they should come with a basis for discussion in opposition. She stated that her attitude toward teaching is that "...we are here together to explore things and to understand who we are...and why we think about children in certain ways." She feels that creating this type of environment is critical for students to feel free to say what is of interest and concern to them within their program's assignments.

Denise shared, "Last semester I used a book called *And Tango Makes Three*, where two male penguins partner and try to raise rocks. They actually put rocks in their nest and try to have a baby." It is noted here that Denise makes reference within Elementary Education literature of material encompassing a non-traditional family unit. She continues to share that the scientists who were reviewing this particular group of penguins in the wild took an egg from another nest that had two eggs, and they placed the borrowed egg in the nest of the two male penguins. The two male penguins raised the borrowed egg as their own, and he is assigned the name Tango. She also stated that in the literature they are all represented as a happy family unit. She also stated, "I don't tell them it's true until the end...there's a blurb about it at the end...they're just sort of astonished...like using animals in children's books to talk about race or anything else...it removes the idea from people so it makes it a little easier to talk about." Denise presents the idea of sharing this type of literature within the Elementary Education program; however, this sharing is evidenced within any other interviews from neither Cases One nor Two.

Secondary Education

Sexuality as controversy. A portion of the programming for Secondary Education courses considers the inclusion or exclusion of material of a sexual nature. Kate stated, "I think (the community is) against the idea of having novels that show promiscuity, sexuality, at all

besides I mean like kissing and holding hands, between straights, right? Kate shared that she utilizing one piece of literature titled *Aristotle and Dante, Discovering the Secrets of the Universe*, and she adds that she feels the students accept this book because there is no controversial sexuality in it. She shared that both of the main characters come to realizations within the text. One boy always understands that he is gay; the other boy, because he has always felt like an outsider, later comes to the understanding that he was repressing that part of himself. This character sees this repression manifest itself in horrible dreams and difficult family relationships, but when he comes to understand and acknowledge his identity, he is able to open himself to new possibilities. Kate also mentioned that the two main characters share a kiss in the end of the literature. She mentioned the kiss because she feels that if the main characters were a traditional, straight couple, her students would not have any issue with it. She states this would be so because with a straight couple showing affection it would not be promiscuity. She said they would see it as what teenage kids “should be doing”. She added, “But in this case, for some people, it’s problematic. So, there is a difference, it’s not just they don’t want any sex.” The homosexual affection shared between these two main fictional characters is problematic for students in Kate’s experience.

Kate also states, “I do...have a variety of different books that are choice books, and I never choose a book that’s principally about LGBTQ as a required book.” She stated that she offers it as a book choice. However, she also admitted that if the conflict had to do with the subject of race, she would require the student to read the material. She also stated that she thinks requiring a student to read material concerning race would be acceptable but would fear more refusal from students regarding LGBT material. After stating that race literature could be a requirement with coursework, Kate added that if a student indicated that reading the material

would be unacceptable to them, she would say, “You’re going to have to read this. It’s important for you to read this. I want you to be on board with this. I want you to be on board with exploring. And I think I could probably get away with that. There might be trouble for me if I did that (with) a requirement to read LGBT material”. This concern over degrees of material acceptability could indicate a degree of concern within the course programming as well.

Kate came to a realization about the requirements she was contemplating. During the course of the interview questioning, she began to realize that she might be entertaining double standards within her own course programming. She shared that if a Muslim student came to her and explained that certain literature of a sexual nature was prohibited because of religious beliefs, she would most likely accept the reasoning and excuse the student. Conversely, she stated, “If say a good ol’ boy came in here, and said I’m not reading a book by this [black person] These people were our downfall or something, I’d be like, not only would I make him read it, but I’d report him for his attitudes. So, that’s a double standard I didn’t even realize myself. I am actually shaking inside that I’ve come to this self-realization.” This demonstrates that not only do double standards permeate the student population but creep into the faculty as well; however, this realization also shows an openness for dialogue and an opportunity for influencing future course programming.

Movement towards inclusion. Another aspect of input relates to the work of the coordinators and faculty as they prepare for change within the designated program. Kate stated that the secondary faculty consciously gather and discuss opportunities for change. She shared that a main focus statement for the Secondary Education department is “the teacher candidate develops culturally responsive curriculum and instruction to respond to differences in individual experiences, cultural, ethnic, gender, sexuality and linguistic, social class, disabilities and

learning styles.” Kate shared that there are readings on each of the designated issues, and students are required to formulate lessons that reflect positive regard for culture, gender, sexual orientation, and linguistic background among other topics. Publicly acknowledging sexual orientation as a written part of the program documentation indicates a progressive direction taken to expand the inclusive attitude of the college.

Kate stated it is the “first semester that we are taking a measure of students before they’ve done any of the readings.” This is an important statement showing an effort at a valid attempt for evaluation (collecting formative data). She stated that the process involves the students being asked a series of questions, including what they think about the statement “All children can learn”. Students may also be asked what they think about diversity. The Secondary Education faculty seem to be attempting to assess their students’ prior knowledge in order to program more effective content within courses. Kate stated, “So we try to get them before they’ve had any readings, then we give them a variety of readings and discussions and activities and then we do a post-test which is the same questions and see how they’ve come along in that first course. But these are the same standards that follow them throughout the program. And we assess them on them from day one up until their final day of internship.”

Programming specific literature can also pave the way according to faculty within the Secondary Education program. Kate shared that she uses a unit with students that includes gay characters, but the unit topic is not specifically a gay or lesbian issue. She shared that the work is about human connections and disconnections, as well as connection to the earth. Kate argues the tenet with her students that everyone should be able to see themselves within the body of literature. She added, “They should make sure that they sample widely and broadly, and [they

should ensure] throughout the year [that] everybody in their class has been seen in the literature in a positive light.”

Jerry discusses in his interview how the programmed time for LGBT issues is limited. “Fifty minutes of the whole semester are devoted to LGBT issues.” This lack of programming for this topic could be one of the reasons for so many student interview responses about the lack of discussion about the topic. Jerry shares that the book used in his course contained one chapter related to LGBT issues indirectly. Juan Ramirez is the focal character in Chapter 5 of the book *Diversity Matters*, and Jerry shares that the information of Juan’s sexual identity is abruptly shared as almost an afterthought. Jerry shared that the main issue for Juan is the cultural disconnect he is experiencing from his Hispanic heritage. It seems that the information related to Juan’s gay identity is shared as a justification for his other areas of disconnect. Jerry added, “It is shared as another reason for shame.”

Process

While interviewing each department, the question, “How is diversity training implemented programmatically?” spoke to the process within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Programming. For process concerns, Tom stated that programming must be relevant to the educational level. He added, “I want to get it at the rational level first because I think that...feelings can change. Alright, but that has to happen, to my mind, through reason.” Tom’s approach shows an approach of acceptance and rationality for differing opinions. Because he believes that beliefs and opinions are constructed over time, his approach is to try to enable students to envision topics from a rational viewpoint rather than an emotional or religious one. This type of approach allows students to engage in discussion over topics they support or topics

to which they are inherently opposed. He believes this is necessary “because...those visceral reactions are built up over a long period of time, and [they are] the way you are acculturated.” This outlines an insightful way to approach controversial topics within the classroom setting without infringing upon the beliefs and convictions of others.

Bo’s programming did not seem to be as methodical as some of his colleagues. He shared that he believes it is important that the students spend the first part of the course getting grounded and learning the common vocabulary. “Two weeks may deal with race and ethnicity and then we may deal with religion...we may deal with LGBT, you know, gender bias...disability.” Bo’s statements seem to indicate that the course discussions and issues manifest themselves, and he in turn challenges his preservice teachers in dealing with those. He shared that the students have already discussed their approach to education as well as examining what kind of a teacher they want to be and what kind of classroom they desire to create.

When asked what types of implementations were used, Bo stated, “Well, I use different approaches for different issues.” He continued to share that with respect to the LGBT issue, the approach that he feels is effective is acknowledging that many of the negative views or biases students hold are products of ignorance or disinformation. Bo shared that he is careful to provide students with some sort of background information about that, and he shared that he uses an article that utilizes the metaphor of straight white teeth. Bo said that many students find this concept challenging. He stated that the story details a boy who was raised with his parents telling him that to be healthy and successful, he would have to have straight, white teeth. The book also shares the sacrifices the boy made, like wearing braces, and enduring the pain and discomfort of pursuing straight white teeth. Bo added that the boy knew all the time that his teeth were not straight and white, but that since he was told he would not be accepted by other people without

straight, white teeth he continued to struggle in that pursuit. Bo shares that he feels this is an effective strategy to prompt discussion because "...it sort of comes at you backwards and then once you begin to realize what he's talking about, then the discussion just seems to flow from there."

Awareness of race and identity. Bo stated that his approach to teaching is mainly based upon the research that has been done about the age range children become conscious of group stereotyping about identity issues and societal interaction. He added that much of the research places that consciousness around five or six years of age. He shared that by the time the children enter elementary school, they are aware of the issue. Whether or not it is a conscious thought is not discussed, but he makes mention of the fact that an elementary age child is conscious of these types of situations and issues. He states that obviously the level of sophistication in conversation would be different depending on grade level, but the issue still becomes part of an awareness. He added, "If you're trying to develop a culturally aware classroom, and that begins at the first stages of elementary school, then I think you have to begin to teach children the social skills and social graces of how to interact with others and to not intentionally hurt someone and if you do something that's hurtful that you'd be aware of that." This statement alone dictates a mandate to the Elementary Education program.

Sheila was also asked about any unusual implementation strategies she uses. She responded, "Have you ever seen 'Tongues and Tides'?" She shared about Marlon Riggs, an African filmmaker who had passed away from AIDS. Sheila shared that in the film, Marlon Riggs is actually talking about race issues, and she shares how he takes you through many of the important events that shaped his life. He discusses the notion of even being gay, and he includes discussion about moving to San Francisco. Sheila feels this is relevant programming for her

course because Marlon Riggs discusses coming from a small, southern town in Tennessee. While the issues of race are discussed in the film, Sheila said she has noticed how many of her students tense up more when Marlon Riggs shares about finding love with a white man. This shows one more instance of concern over the topic of race within coursework. Marlon discusses how he finds the love the black community will not give him, and how he now thinks his liberation is in “his whiteness”. Sheila continues to share Marlon Riggs’ story, how his travels lead him to New York, and his renewed realization that he is a black, gay man. The film shows the popular drag balls of New York and includes a level of eroticism that Sheila knows many of her students find shocking. She recalled one scene where a naked black man and another man are kissing, and she stated that the visual seems to be too controversial for some of her college students. Sheila finally added that this is why she does not include this in her class programming unless she is familiar with most of her students. This again draws attention to the reserved programming many faculty acknowledge due to the conservativeness of the setting.

In final reflection on the programming questions, Sheila stated, “If you’re homophobic, it’s going to impact kids.” She also stated that she does not call her students homophobic during class, but she does ask them to dialogue about possible consequences. Sheila shared, “I try to be more savvy about the way I present it to them so I can get them to think about the consequences. I want them to think.”

Nature versus nurture. Bo was the only faculty member to discuss the belief of homosexuality as a choice. He also shared that students struggle with “...this notion that it’s something that a person chooses to do as a lifestyle and could be otherwise if they just wanted to.” He said they struggle with the notion that from their standpoint or disposition that someone could be born homosexual. Bo added, “It’s odd that they can grapple with the notion that

someone's race, even though race is a social construction, but skin color is something that they're born with, and they don't get to choose to be otherwise. But it's much more difficult for them probably because of religious upbringing to accept the notion that someone is born gay." This statement shows a return to the conservative nature of the community. Bo said that students state they personally think homosexuality is wrong on a basic level and that homosexuality is sinful. He added that some of them combine this categorization of sin with the perceived responsibility of being judgmental with respect to being sinful. Bo and Sheila both shared they hear a common phrase of "hate the sin, love the sinner", and Bo stated that this sort of approach is the true behavioral choice.

Bo continued to share that many times his students do not want to address the issue at all; however, he attempts to engage them in class discussion to the extent that they have to address it. He considers this at least to be the idea of counseling a person to make better choices. Approaching this from the context of the teacher/student relationship, Bo revisits the notion of students who frequently start out from the position of preferring exclusion of LGBT topics. Bo shares that he attempts to move them from this notion to one of realizing that as a teacher, there is no choice of passivity. The teacher is an influence on the student in one direction or another. "We have to go through that door of saying that if a student has a relationship with you as a teacher and you refuse to discuss something then there's troubling concern for the student then that in and of itself is a message. And given the fact that teaching is not neutral, then you don't really have the option of saying, 'Well, I'll just pretend that it doesn't exist, now what?'" Bo has stated that avoidance of the issue is not an appropriate direction for preservice teachers.

Bo revisited some comments showing methods of avoidance other than students who simply believe homosexuality is morally wrong. He said some students will try a method of

avoidance and attempt to shift the topic off to someone else. This is also a method teachers utilize, as evidenced in Sheila's statements from her daughter's teacher. Just as Sheila's daughter's teacher pursued advice from the counselor, many students will have this as a method of avoidance. This method allows them an escape that does not require endorsement or denouncement to the student. However, as previously stated by Bo, the role of teacher is inherently active rather than passive; students realize when teachers are practicing avoidance.

Bo shared the goal for programming is to convey to preservice teachers that they should not attempt to judge a student or to force their beliefs on a student. The teacher is also not there to necessarily even ratify a student's beliefs, but simply to be a sounding board that assists the student in resolving something that is troubling the student. Topics that are uncomfortable to the teacher should be treated just like any other issue that might be troubling the student. This could provide a level of appreciation and understanding based upon the feeling of respect and responsibility for another person's (student's) feelings.

Bo shared that he witnessed a very direct discussion in one of his class meetings between an African-American female and white female. He shared they were both coming back with the same argument regarding homosexuality as a choice. Bo stated that both women acknowledged and pondered the same quandary. Given the kind of pressures and discrimination experiences that someone has and you read every day about the difficulties that the LGBT community faces, why would anyone choose a homosexual lifestyle and choose to undergo those kinds of pressures. Bo stated that one of the women asked, "If it was truly a choice?" Bo shared that the true turning point for many of the other students in the class was when the African-American woman stated, "I'm fine with being black, but given the discrimination that occurs and the

history and all of the problems with respect to society and stuff like that, it's hard to imagine why someone would choose to be different, you know...if it was a free choice."

Conservativism. Bo stated that there seems to be a pervasive fear in some of the students when asked to address LGBT issues and topics. He added that he includes discussion to expose students to some of the myths about LGBT concerns and the contagion myth. Bo said that classes have had discussions using the prompt, "If you are heterosexual, male or female, does that mean that every male that encounters you hits on you and makes an advance or vice versa?" He added that he tries to direct the conversation around societal behavior, and this in turn has prompted discussion about making responsible choices about what they do and say.

One very telling statement from Sheila was when she shared, "My students always used to tell me before I had a child, these discussions don't happen. But this is my child in kindergarten. They are asking if it is a bad word. In her school, there is a lesbian family who has a boy in school...and they are not out [openly within the school], but everyone knows that Allen has another mom. Allen has two moms, but there's no conversation." The community knows that Allen has two moms, but it is simply not discussed. This story shares perspective of avoidance within the immediate community surrounding the university. This story is similar to one shared by Bo regarding his class and the "don't ask, don't tell" attitude.

In light of the fact that Sheila had shared stories about her daughter, I asked if she thought LGBT training was appropriate to include in an Elementary Education program. She said, "It is." This was clearly the expected answer after the Sheila's previous quotes. Sheila also shared a common assignment for elementary school children. Children are often asked to draw their families. Sheila recounted the story of her daughter drawing their family within her class. She stated that had lost her husband while her daughter was in kindergarten, and she shared how

when her daughter draws her family she draws everyone, including her father. This is a joyful story for Sheila. This is included because Sheila also stated, “So if that conversation is happening then I am pretty sure the conversations of the other students are happening. There are lots of conversations going on. Once I was having lunch in the lunchroom, and a boy told that ‘my mommy threw my daddy out of the house because he has a baby with another mommy’. This is all kindergarten, but sex. Yes, it is an issue in elementary, but my students still tell me these issues are not there.” This last statement speaks volumes as it reveals that in spite of knowledge to the contrary, the conservative climate of the community feels issues of equality for marginalized groups are not a concern.

Pedagogical complexities: Sheila was asked about how she facilitates course discussions. Specifically, she was asked if she leads the discussion or if the students participate fully. She shared that the dynamic is different in different classes and that the dynamic dictates much of the momentum. Sheila shared a story from one class occurrence when she was covering some historical context, and she stated, “ We were doing belief systems with *Plato’s Cave*.” Sheila shared with the class that one system would be race and the other would be sexuality. Sheila stated that immediately she could see some of the students processing their comfort levels. She asked them, “If you believe homosexuality is wrong...what are the implications?” Sheila then shared with her students statistics about K-12 students who commit suicide or who attempt to harm themselves because of questions of their sexuality. Sheila restated that this includes students who are not “out”. She included those who are simply questioning their sexual identity.

She shared that the consequent programming includes two articles focusing on sexuality. She stated that she shares these because the articles focus on guilt rather than desire. Sheila uses these to prompt the discussion about how society dictates that pre-marital sex is unacceptable.

She segues into a conversation about gay and lesbian issues, and how historically gay and lesbian people have not been allowed to marry. She shared that this conversation prompts interesting conversation about gays, lesbians, and celibacy.

Sheila's comments are often colored by recollections from conversations with her young daughter. It is evident that Sheila sees influence even at an elementary school age from these comments. Sheila stated that she has a daughter "whose all into queer rights." She stated that this could also be because she has been with her at conferences sometimes, and her daughter hears conversations among colleagues concerning LGBT topics. Sheila shared one story about her daughter at a conference; she said, "She comes with me to conference. She has an American Girl doll and someone gave her a wheelchair. So she said 'Mommy, I have a disabled American Girl doll of the year...but why can't two girl dolls like each other?'" Sheila indicated that this could be a question that was prompted after attending a lesbian wedding of a friend. Sheila went on to add that someone within her daughter's class said, "Gay marriage is a bad word", and Sheila's daughter responded, "It's not. I am going to be a flower girl at a lesbian wedding". Sheila continues to add that this discussion took place during her daughter's year in kindergarten. The teacher of the class was uncomfortable dealing with the conversation, so Sheila said she was called for advice. This type of occurrence prompts conversations for different levels of this research, but certainly one of them would be the apparent need for more concentrated programming of LGBT topics within the education degree programs. Elementary age children often feel empowered to discuss topics adults avoid.

Elementary Education

Lack of openness and programming/autonomy. Kim stated in her interview that the delivery process of the curriculum is paramount to a teacher's success. She recalled reading that

the feeling of rejection is the worst thing that can happen to a person. One powerful statement from Kim's interview was this: "It has been my observation that the relationship the teacher has with the children [is going to be the one] they are going to have with each other. If the teacher's unaccepting, the children are going to be that way. If the teacher is sarcastic, the children will be that way. So, I just think that we have got to have quit hiding, you know, and just be more open about what people are." This acknowledgement of a lack of openness can impact the effectiveness of instruction within the K-12 classroom. The influence of the teacher can directly affect the successful delivery of instruction.

Awareness of race and identity. Kim stated that race continues to be a controversial topic within this degree program. She added, "Well, one of the things we have them do is, they have to go out and do ten hours of interaction with groups that are not like them. So, they spend a semester out there. There are so many diverse groups here, so they can do ten hours of anything." She added that the obstacle of white privilege has not vanished. She stated that there are issues that people do not want to face, but she restated her previous comment saying that people have to look critically at themselves first. This statement touches on the major points of race as well as the introspection of the teacher in preparation for teaching. This touches on comments from Bo's interviews about personal feelings and how this can impact the effective delivery of instruction.

Programming: Kim shared that the hour requirement for University X's education students to be in schools is much more rigorous than other universities. She stated that the minimum number of contact hours with schools to satisfy the state requirement is 150 hours, but University X exceeds that requirement with facilitating visits to local schools for preservice teachers with over 1,000 hours. Kim shared that the first semester preservice teachers start observing in the classroom, and then they are phased into teaching some of the K-12 course

content. She shared that many of her student report that they are encountering numerous race issues. The ELL students emigrating primarily from Mexico to the United States seem to be culturally challenged according to student reports to Kim. This type of avoidance of cultural inclusion could also yield similar feelings seen by other marginalized groups. Kim also shared a comment about LGBT issues; she shared, “Somehow this is not at the forefront yet here. And it’s not because it’s not happening or it’s not here. It’s because people aren’t talking about it.” Kim admits that addressing LGBT issues and topics are a concern for her program, but she also felt passionate about inclusion for other minority communities.

Probing a little further, Kim was asked about examples of implementations within the course. She stated, “We do scenarios.” She admitted that there could definitely be more inclusion of gay and lesbian issues, but she felt a specific need for scenarios that are truly appropriate for what preservice teachers within University X’s community would encounter. However, the root problem for this faculty member and this course is her admission that the topic is introduced but never discussed. When I asked, “They do their field work over the course of a thousand hours, and it’s never come up? Or they’ve never brought a concern back to discuss?” Kim’s response was, “Not to me. No.” This indicates a hole in the elementary program for delivery and discussion of LGBT topics as well as feedback.

Denise shared that teachers need to look at themselves and affirm who they are and what they believe. Following this, they need to have a look at their children and make a decision about whether or not they believe those children should be represented in the literature presented. Denise was asked what she would say to a student inquired as to why material such as this should be included in an elementary program, she responded that she has not been asked that question in the past. When asked what she thinks she might say, she said it would be hard to

speculate an answer. However, after she thought for a few seconds, she said she might turn it back onto them and ask, “Do you think it’s important for your students to understand that racism still exists? Do you think it is important for you to think about how you would interact with people who aren’t like you?”

Secondary Education

Programming: Kate attempts to survey her current students to see what the perceived needs are in the program. In the survey, she asks them to list topics and to indicate what topics they want to learn more about. She also asks them to rate their top three choices as well as asking them to give their bottom three. She also inquires as to what might have not been mentioned that they want to learn more about. She says she does this to get a feeling for where they think the holes are in their education or what they think they have learned already. Kate stated that in one recent survey, LGBT topics were at the bottom. She stated, “Like that’s the last thing they wanted to learn about.” This in turn raises the question of whether they feel it is not important in their future teaching situations or if they are personally uncomfortable with the proposed material. She added that even though LGBT material was at the bottom of the students’ surveys, she still included material within her young adult literature choices. Kate included a choice that had primarily gay characters. This type of inclusion with programming can be a subtle way to incorporate LGBT material and could reveal a non-threatening strategy for inclusion of LGBT topics within courses. This non-threatening approach could prove to be effective for sharing LGBT topics within the conservative climate of University X.

Product

While interviewing each department, the question, “What is the perceived impact of the program on preservice teachers?” spoke to the product within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Products and assessments: This area of questioning revealed a modest selection of assignments and consequently a minimum variety in product selections. Sheila, Virginia, and Bo were surveyed regarding their assignments, and all stated initially that the most common products come from course readings and class discussions. One course included required BLOG reflections based upon the readings, and this course also required a subsequent response to at least one other student's BLOG posting. The entire class can view the BLOG postings. More conversation surrounding BLOG postings follows in the data exposition for product in Case Two as students had opinions regarding the effectiveness of open BLOG postings.

Bo added that there is a final exam in his course, and he stated that this involves students essentially dealing with applying theory and concepts to issues; one of the issues they may have to deal with in the final exam could concern an LGBT topic. This would at least allow for one assessment opportunity that is not as subjective as BLOG reflections. He stated additionally students have to produce a statement of their own personal teaching philosophy. Part of the evaluation criteria surrounds their cultural awareness. Bo again stated that this is not specifically tied to LGBT concerns. This particular section would allow for grading in writing style and mechanics, as well as the opportunity to grade on subjective theoretical and philosophical material.

Feedback: When asked, "Have your students ever commented about issues with LGBT issues or has anyone returned to tell you about something after they graduate?", Sheila shared that she has not had any students physically return, but she shared that two students have written to her on separate occasions. She stated that the last project in her class is a teaching philosophy assignment where students are required to compose a narrative of their personal teaching ideals.

She stated that after the philosophy is written, she has had notes come back where students have written to essentially come out of the closet to her. She said she then immediately tries to think back to everything that she said during the entire course hoping that she was uplifting and never offensive. Sheila stated, “The whole thing about sexuality unleashes a lot of things in these students. You may have heard this before but sometimes I hear ‘hate the sin, love the sinner’, and I kind of tell them ‘how benevolent, how problematic’ because you are telling someone they are rotten anyway. I never let any kind of mean comment go without some kind of careful, thoughtful challenge, so I feel good about it, but at the same time I feel the pain.”

Evaluation: Sheila was asked about the process of students evaluating her teaching, and she shared that students do provide feedback through evaluations at the end of the semester. She also admitted that undergraduate evaluations can be mixed. She said that students do not seem to be upset about the issues and conversations concerning sexuality, but that they are more upset about issues of race. Interestingly, her next statements were, “I think they say that because I am a person of color. They’ll say stuff like she hates white people. I don’t know what it is about race. I don’t say anything different about race than I say about the other stuff.” These statements again display the pervasive concern of race within University X and these degree programs.

I continued by asking, “So the input of your course, would you say that you have good control of that?” Sheila stated, “Complete.” When she was asked if she felt she would be supported if there were a complaint on an evaluation, Sheila was quiet for a couple of seconds. She soon responded with a retelling of a story about a former dean. During a conversation, Sheila was chatting about how many of the topics covered in Foundations courses could be considered controversial and challenging; Sheila added that her former dean replied that she did not need to worry because he had not had any complaints about her. She said she was not quite sure how to

interpret the response because she viewed it as partially problematic that her value as a professor came because of the absence of complaints. She added, “So what he was trying to say was that he was supporting me because no one had come to him and said ‘(Sheila) sucks.’ In terms of support, I’m not sure what kind of support I would get because I haven’t reached that space if someone were to complain. I’ll just put it like that.”

Elementary Education

Products and assessments. The challenge with the product section in the Elementary Education degree program is a basic one; there is a limited selection of product options for the LGBT requirement within the program. There is limited expectation or delivery of LGBT topics within this degree program, so even discussing product as enlightenment or product to benefit the preservice teacher and the program are void. The most active product comes in a subjective manner with the discussion of elementary literature that offers hints at LGBT situations.

Secondary Education

Products and assessments. When asked about some of the possible assigned products or choices, Kate recalled a student presentation that focused on LGBT issues. She stated that LGBT options are always included as a recommended area for further study. Two years prior, she had a team of students; one student was openly gay, and he and his female best friend put together a website of resources for teaching LGBT books. They also videoed trailers for the website, and they presented it to the class. Kate shared that the class was “very polite and wonderful and clapped and nothing bad happened because of it.” The mention of the polite clapping as well as the acknowledgement that nothing bad happened during or after the presentation related to LGBT material exhibits the feeling that there was a possibility of a negative reception of the

material. Kate also stated that she felt that delivery of this material coming directly from the students empowered her with more defensibility if anyone complained about the topic selection.

Summary of Case One

Case One interviews revealed the following overall themes:

- Race as an overriding issue
- Conservative climate
- Programming

As mentioned above, one of the initial unexpected exposures from Case One interviews was the revelation of the issue of race. All six of the interviews conducted with members of Case One on January 16, 2014 contained statements that race issues are typically a challenge to teach effectively in diversity training. The subject of race is an uneasy one for students to discuss, and those same students typically withdraw participation in classroom discussions when the subject of race is raised. Those interviews also revealed that faculty members believe that the cause of this reluctance is the conservative nature of the community. Deep-rooted religious beliefs and small-town upbringing was also mentioned as a cause for preventing open discussions of race as well as LGBT issues. This type of withdrawn attitude could certainly impede open discussion and this in turn could certainly limit the enlightenment of preservice teachers. In her interview,

Kim, Virginia, and Bo discussed how race is a challenge for students to openly discuss. The issue of race commonly seems to make students at University X uncomfortable, and this usually inhibits open dialogue within classes. Without the process of open discussion and exposure to oppressed realities, the reality of change to a more enlightened preservice teacher, and in turn classroom, is impeded. However, with the exposition of concern over race, an additional code presented itself.

The conservative climate in which University X operates is present in a majority of the Case One interviews (67%). The reluctance of students to participate in discussions within courses where LGBT topics are covered is also mentioned as a factor. Kate revealed in her interview a student who requested a course substitution because she was “unable” to take the course due to portions of the readings were against her religion, specifically the LGBT material. Another issue revealed within the interview data for Case One that ties into the conservative climate is when one of the programs adds in an initiative or decides to exclude something included in another program. One example was found within Kate’s interview when she stated, “We all have the same thing, but there are some subversive things that I think I’ve done particularly on this issue of LGBTQ and that is that sexuality wasn’t in the diversity statement and I just included it in ours and I talk about it in the class.” The belief that the university climate is so conservative and resistant in turn forces choices like this for individuals who believe the material should be included. Even within programs there is somewhat of a discrepancy of the amount of time and emphasis placed upon LGBT topics. For example, within the Foundations program one of the syllabi shows more attention devoted to the topic than the other two. This inconsistency within the department is evidenced through the variety of interview data coded within the College of Education faculty interviews.

The conservative climate may also be a factor in preventing additional training within the College of Education programs, particularly in the Elementary Education program. Kim expressed the need for increased training, and she indicated the place to start might be by bringing in experts within the field. She stated, “It has to be someone who is trained to talk with pre-service teachers and pull them out and talk about this openly.”

The inconsistency of programming also surfaced as a theme from Case One data. Some faculty stated that inclusion of LGBT topics are present within their syllabi and subsequently their courses; however, actual implementation methods are limited and lack equitable delivery across courses. Faculty within the Foundations program shared consistent programming of LGBT topics within interviews, yet there was evidence of inconsistent data verification within one course syllabus. Within the Elementary Education program, there was a basic lack of evidence of LGBT topic programming. Faculty interviews revealed a knowledge of LGBT literature, there was negligible programming evidenced within the visited program course and syllabus. The Secondary Education program interviews revealed an awareness of LGBT topic knowledge and desire for inclusion within the program; however, the lack of student engagement influences the instructors' willingness to imbed these topics as required course materials. Additionally, when LGBT topics are included, instructors categorize material content as superficial and cursory.

Case Two

As previously stated, Case Two consisted of students who volunteered to participate in research that interviewed from targeted programs within the College of Education at University X. This included two courses of study under the Curriculum and Instruction degree program (the Elementary Education program and the Secondary Education program) and the Foundations program. The target interview group for Case Two included thirty students who volunteered to be interviewed after I (as the principal researcher) visited a class meeting to explain the focus of the research. Student volunteers were informed that they would receive fifteen dollars in compensation as an incentive to participate.

The goal was to gather ten student interviews from each of the three programs in order to meet the minimum desired goal of thirty interviews. As previously stated, semi-structured interviews were used to enable fluidity within the questioning if needed. These interviews were coded and analyzed and are discussed under the four components of the CIPP model.

The mix of students from the three programs was limited. As expected, the pool was predominantly female. All males who volunteered (except one) were successfully interviewed. The male who was not interviewed was contacted several times through email (his preferred method of contact), and he corresponded to set up an interview; however, he did not follow through with the meeting. He was contacted again, and simply stated he would get back with me about scheduling a meeting. He did not. Four males (one Foundations student and three Secondary Education students) were interviewed. The remaining participants from the degree programs were female. All participants from the Elementary Education degree program were female.

Context

Foundations

The Foundations student interviews conducted consisted of nine female students and one male student, and the interviews focused on answering the question, “What is the local climate as it relates to LGBT issues?” As a whole, these students considered University X a more open atmosphere than the community and state in general. Four of the females interviewed stated that they believed the university is progressing in regards to climate and receptiveness to controversial topics because of the increased student enrollment from outside the South. Three of the female students interviewed also mentioned that they were required to take a course in LGBT sensitivity to qualify as a resident advisor (RA). Although this does not reflect on the

Foundations program directly, it displays an applicable attitude toward LGBT sensitivity within the campus housing assignments.

Greek influence and conservatism. This theme relates to comments made in student interviews regarding Greek society. Five of the females volunteered statements within the questions concerning campus climate as stating that Greek societies do not show sensitivity and acceptance to students who identify as LGBT. One female Foundations student agreed that the Greek society is not accepting of the LGBT community. She stated it would be difficult for openly gay males to pledge fraternities. Another student stated that she felt that openly gay females would be easier and more readily accepted among the sororities. One other female student stated that she believes the Greek community attempts to keep the climate of the university conservative. She admitted that she has heard anti-gay conversations within her sorority. Another comment made came from a female Foundations student stated that she feels that the Greek society is an opposing factor to the LGBT community progressing to equality on campus. She did state that Spectrum, the on campus LGBT group, came to her sorority to talk with members of the sorority, and Spectrum was inviting them to join their membership in order to support the LGBT community. She added that she feels that Spectrum is the active group handling any LGBT issues on campus rather than the university's administration being proactive and addressing issues themselves.

Additional comments focused on the Greek society's perceived influence on campus. While interviewing one Foundations student regarding prior interview statements, "Do you feel like the university is able to progress in spite of the (conservative) climate?" she responded positively with the hope that the university can progress to a more positive climate than the current one. She added that the recent controversy with an African-American student not being

accepted into a sorority is embarrassing to the university as a whole. She stated, “I don’t think that the [university] president responded to it that well...and there are other issues out there as well that need to be addressed...especially with Greek life and the conservative nature.” She added that she feels there just was not enough of a response as there are definitely people on campus ready for a more accepting climate, and she said she is frustrated by the opposition and lack of visible support. As I am not as familiar with the Greek influence on campus as a student might be, I followed up by asking, “So about the Greek life, what are the options here? You join a fraternity or sorority or you don’t?” She responded quickly, “Yes.” My next question was, “And so then are there certain things that are off limits to you if you don’t?” Her response indicated that girls are free to socially participate in any fraternity setting that they choose, however, it is much harder for boys as they are not freely invited to just attend social events at fraternity houses if they are not a member of that fraternity. This acknowledgement of a double-standard within the university community indicates a more socially open atmosphere for females, specifically within the Greek community, as well as a lack of inclusion across community and campus groups.

Avoidance: The one male student interviewed within the Foundations courses stated that he felt that LGBT topics were simply “pushed under the rug” at the university, and these are topics that people tend to avoid. If an issue comes up, he feels that it is dealt with as quickly as possible, and then everyone likes to pretend nothing happened. He said he feels people treat LGBT topics or concerns as the “elephant in the room”, and no one wants to discuss LGBT topics.

Overall, the majority of the comments (80%) of the students interviewed in the Foundations courses felt that the university climate was extremely conservative and not

accepting of LGBT issues. Many felt that the topics were not openly discussed, and most commented about LGBT community issues or students being discussed privately or not at all. As mentioned above, the Greek community was referenced as opposing LGBT inclusion on campus. One unique comment came from a male Foundations student. When asked if he thinks LGBT training should be included in the teacher education program, he stated that he did not think it should need to be included. I asked him to clarify, and he said, “I don’t think it should be needed because it shouldn’t be an issue. People should just be accepted, and it should not be an issue.” He added that it should not be the concern of the teacher who someone wants to be or with whom he or she shares a life. He stated, “It should not be an issue for the kids” because society should not have judgment on this issue.

However, one female Foundations student did share that perhaps there is a possibility for change. She shared that she had attended public school in a large nearby city, and that controversial topics were avoided entirely. She also stated that the teachers did not want the students discussing controversial topics including LGBT issues. However, she did continue to add that hopefully there is evidence that things are changing. She recalled that there recently had been a homecoming parade where group participants could make parade floats. She expounded, “There’s like a Republican group, a democrat group, an outdoors club, a fishing group...everything...and this year they had their first gay one. We would not have been allowed to talk about it in class...but then again, they have a new principal...things change.”

Issues of race. When asked about the university climate and if she felt it was conducive to delivery of LGBT topics, a Foundations student answered “Yes and no.” She indicated that the further along a student was in the program, the more challenging the discussions would typically be. She confirmed in her statements that “...race is the main topic.” This again confirms the

dominance of race as an overriding factor in discussion topics. She stated that programs such as Psychology and Foundations programs seem to be more likely to contain controversial topics, but that she does not recall anything specific to LGBT.

Several female Foundations students shared that the inherent variety of people in classes bring as many different viewpoints as there are students. While this diversity should foster an environment of controversial discourse within the discussion, this is not always the occurrence. One student added that "...a lot of people say they are open to different teaching and different ideas, but they say that more than they are." She shared that she is from out of state, and that she felt the people in her home state seem to be more accepting as opposed to the people in University X's state. She felt that when having conversations with students at the university, judgmental statements are commonplace. She shared, "Where I am from, people don't make as many judgments... people are more accepting of the world in general."

Another female student stated, "I feel the climate affects the conversations in class...even conversations of race." She expanded by explaining that she feels that sometimes students are uncomfortable with the topics that teachers propose, and that the students in turn do not actively participate in class discussions. She feels that because of this, topics of race, religion, or LGBT concerns do not get introduced with frequency because students are uncomfortable interacting with topics that might be seen as controversial. She specified, "People often just don't talk about it." This reserved attitude about even discussing LGBT topics presents the College of Education with a challenging problem in an area of identified deficit.

Elementary Education

All of the interview participants within the Elementary Education group were female. Seven of the ten females within this group evaluated the university climate as conservative.

Three of the females thought that the university climate is progressing, but they indicated that it could be improvement in the areas of acceptance and tolerance.

One student stated that the “university climate is not what it should be.” Another student stated that she felt like the Greek society was also a factor in holding the university back as it assisted in keeping the climate more conservative. She also stated, “Perhaps the climate could change. We have had some sorority controversy recently, so sometimes things can change,” indicating that the environment at this time may be receptive.

Avoidance. The concept of avoidance of controversial topics was a reoccurring theme in interviews of Elementary Education students. One student echoed the comments of others when she stated, “It’s just a topic (LGBT issues) in passing.” She further explained that if you are in a Foundations class you will be exposed to an array of topics such as diversity and home life, however, there does not seem to be meaningful discussion or depth to the topic as it is one of many. This student’s concern demonstrates a feeling of potential unpreparedness upon exiting the program into the workplace.

Another interviewee shared, “When people (faculty) talk about it, they just skim the surface...and they cover it very quickly and they are very vague...I feel like people don’t really talk about it.” Another student added that she feels LGBT topics are considered “touchy” subjects, and she reaffirmed that most students do not seem to feel comfortable discussing these topics in class. She equated the uneasiness to discussing topics like religion, and she shared that many people adopt a pattern of avoidance as a method of just not having to address the uncomfortable issues. She concluded by stating, “No one talks about this topic and the community is not very accepting. It’s just pushed aside.” Avoidance of the problem or ignorance of the problem is not helpful for diversity training issues.

Conservative nature of University X. When asked about the climate, one student shared that she feels the climate at University X is more conservative than other parts of the country. She added that she thought if this research was being conducted at a northern college, the data collected would be different. She added that she feels that the South is closed-minded and operates with an attitude of a past society. She indicated that she does not feel that there is much momentum for change.

Another student was also asked about climate, and she added, “I want to say that the College of Ed(ucation) is more progressive, but we are in a class of twenty-five white girls. But we go into schools, into all these classes and there is diversity, so I feel like they want us to be prepared but at the same time. I feel like they preach it, but they don’t believe it, so it’s kind of contradicting.” This statement of concern echoes the feeling of unpreparedness previously mentioned, as well as the reluctance to directly address a variety of issues of diversity.

When asked at the end of the interview if there was anything I forgot to ask or anything the interviewee would like to add, one stated, “I think what the university is doing is wrong. I think we should be a lot more open-minded.” She added that other states and regions, including California and northern regions, are making policy changes to be more inclusive, and she does not see the same happening near University X. She stated that she feels the area surrounding the university is in denial regarding acceptance of diverse groups. I asked, “Do you think it is on purpose or is the university just a victim of the climate?” She commented that the university was perhaps a victim of the climate as the university community is mired in issues such as race even though the year is 2014. This response demonstrates the repeated acknowledgement of race as a dominant topic across programs, and this in turn could direct future researchers to program research focused directly on climate.

Secondary Education

Gathering data addressing the topic of LGBT concerns specifically for Secondary Education is important for examination. A review of court cases presented in Chapter II reveals that much of the litigation for LGBT concerns occurs in reaction to incidents in Secondary Education settings. The student interview groups for the Secondary Education program were comprised of seven female students and three male students. This interview pool was also a female dominated group; however, more males are typically present within the secondary programs. One faculty member clarified this phenomena as the allure of teaching individualized subjects as well as the desire for teachers to assume coaching positions.

Conservative nature of University X. In gathering data for perceptions regarding the climate for University X, one student stated that from her experiences with the people that she is acquainted, she feels inclusion of LGBT issues and topics in curriculum is not conducive to the majority's beliefs. She stated, "I mean, it is the deep South, so I don't think it is the most conducive environment for things like that (LGBT topics)." These conservative outlooks contribute to the avoidance of controversial topics of discussion.

When asked about students' attitudes in classes about remaining to teach in this geographical area, one Secondary Education student responded that she feels several students do desire to return to areas around their hometowns to teach, and she also specified that preservice teachers express that LGBT issues are not going to be a concern for them when they return to their more rural settings. She disclosed that controversial topics appear to be dismissed and ignored perhaps because many of the preservice students believe they will not be teaching where LGBT issues are a common concern. However, she concluded with her concerns that this may

only be a perception versus a reality as she indicated, “If you’re not paying attention now, you can’t deal with it then.”

Conversely, one of the male students within the Secondary Education program shared that he feels that every generation has its issues to combat and address. He said that in the 1950’s and 1960’s it was civil rights for African-Americans, and he added that during that time the majority was uncomfortable addressing those issues. He acknowledged that just as progress has been made in that arena of civil rights, LGBT issues and equality are the issues that his generation is facing. He also shared that he feels it is helpful when people see the Safe Zone emblem as he views that as an openly positive sign of acceptance on campus.

One Secondary Education student shared that in “certain areas there is dissent and others there is consent” when asked about the university climate. She said that she perceives the feeling on campus to be progressing to a more accepting stance in spite of the fact that the area is conservative. She added that she feels some of the larger cities are more receptive to members of the LGBT community. In her estimate, while University X’s geographical location is one that would indicate a more rural conservatism, because of the university setting it may be more receptive. However, after stating this, she repeated, “The area is conservative...conservative Republican, but there are progressive areas and I think it just depends on the area you go to.”

Greek influence. Greek life was also mentioned during these Secondary Education student interviews as an influencing factor related to climate. “Greek life is huge here, and a lot of the time those people (LGBT community) are segregated from that,” was a sentiment shared from a Secondary Education student. She also added that she has heard from numerous people that the Spectrum group is comparable to a Greek community for the LGBT community. Her perception is that participation with Spectrum is valued as a positive and rewarding experience

for the LGBT student as it is perceived as an open and accepting community with a fairly large member population. While this observation indicates that Spectrum offers a welcoming family atmosphere for the LGBT student, it also reinforces other statements from the Foundations student interviews sharing that the Greek community of fraternities and sororities are not receptive to openly gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students.

Input

While interviewing the foundations department the question, “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for students?” spoke to the input received within the foundations program evaluation.

Foundations

Programming. When asked about the input portion of the Foundations class, one Foundations student opted to talk about a psychology class, and he discussed how there was open discussion of LGBT in the psychology class. He added that there additionally would be a book choice in his Foundations class coming up later in this semester, but he admitted that he did not choose the LGBT book. He said he chose a book targeting race because he felt like that was one that would be easier to discuss in class. This statement seems to again showcase the importance of race topics for the students in these degree programs at University X, as well as the avoidance of more controversial and less mainstream topics.

Another Foundations student added that she has not had a course with LGBT topics at this point in her program, but that she believes LGBT topics will be covered within her current Foundations course. She also stated that she participated in training as an RA (resident advisor), and that the training had been the “most enlightening experience as far as LGBT sensitivity on campus. Safe Zone facilitated the training.” When she was asked about the need for LGBT topic

inclusion within her degree program, she expressed the need for this exposure by stating, “Yes, because children are not naïve. Their perceptions start early. I started hearing things in fourth and fifth grades. We can teach to sixth here as elementary. Sixth grade you (can) definitely have issues.”

Another student stated that her teacher uses reflections and/or BLOG postings in response to readings, but she feels that teachers use topics within the course that are very opinionated. She feels that responses are phrased very carefully because the postings are public. She also expressed that postings would be more valuable and transparent if they were private and shared confidentiality between student and teacher whereby a more confidential dialogue could take place.

Elementary Education

All of the interviewees were asked if they felt that LGBT training should be included in the Elementary Education program, and all interviewees (including the female student who did not know initially what LGBT stands for) stated that they felt it would be valid training. However, when asked about their classmates, they all responded that they felt like many of their classmates would think that LGBT issues would not be a concern for them in the classroom.

Programming. When asked about the conceptual framework literature that is now attached to every syllabus, six of the ten Elementary Education female students admitted that they had not even read it. One student stated, “It’s just a lot of words that I am not sure if people read it.”

When asked about if they felt that this training is needed, one student responded that it definitely should be. She acknowledged that the South has a prominent gay population, and she believes that many conservative Southern citizens prefer to remain in denial. She added that

LGBT community members are becoming more prominent in society, and she feels people should be more open-minded to the situation.

One student shared a story told to her within a Foundations course. The story recounted the experiences of a male, elementary student in Colorado who identified as a female. The parents were supportive of the gender identification for their child. The students within the Foundations course had trouble understanding the possibility of a seven-year-old boy identifying his gender as a female. However, the story was relayed that the elementary student identified as a female. Some of the other students' parents did not want the physically male student to be allowed to use the girls' restrooms. They would have been more comfortable with the male student denying his gender identification and participating as a boy. The question for the students within the course was what would be appropriate for faculty and staff in that situation. Since this preservice teacher was not forthcoming with solutions after retelling this story, I asked if she felt she is receiving training within her program to address this topic, she responded that she did not feel that she was getting the training to address an issue similar to the story from Colorado.

She stated, "A lot of things for elementary schools are gender based, like boys line up and girls line up. There's no room for anyone who is in the middle. We don't really receive any training on how to handle situations surrounding LGBT issues."

I posed the scenario to the preservice teacher of a set of parents coming to inquire and saying, "We heard that another student in your class has same-sex parents. What are you doing to protect my child from anything they may hear from that other student?" Having used the pseudonym Suzie within the question, one student answered, "Well, I don't know. I guess I would tell them that Suzie's parents are Suzie's parents, and that I am not teaching the children about different family units. We are covering science and math and social studies. " Then when

asked about what response might be given if Suzie herself starts talking about her same-sex parents, the response was, “I don’t know...I mean I don’t want to tell Suzie to stop talking about her parents. She should be able to talk about her parents.” This sentiment was echoed through other interviews; overall, the Elementary Education students shared that LGBT topics are not discussed often, if ever, in their courses, and they feel unprepared to combat issues should they arise while teaching. Most shared that if they had been exposed to these topics, it was in their Foundations experience.

Secondary Education

Perceptions of effectiveness. When asked about the perceived effectiveness of the addition of the conceptual framework within each syllabus, one student’s immediate response was that she felt that it is effective; however, after a short pause she added that she noticed that her teachers sometimes say that the college added this, and the teachers do not really take ownership of the document. She also stated that teachers really do not dedicate any time to it. She said that it appears as if the teachers feel that the college added it and are forcing the teachers to include it. She shared that she really has not seen it implemented. She added that in her opinion, the college is taking the correct step with the inclusion of the document, but the teachers are stopping it from succeeding because they are not addressing it positively and appropriately. This shows a missed opportunity within this program to be inclusive of the identified marginalized groups regarding race, social class, language, gender, sexual orientation, health, disability, and religious and political affiliations.

Programming. When asked about course input and how teachers are programming the content, one student stated that she is not sure that discussion is the best way to legitimately address these issues. She felt that in a large class, there are some people who do not want to

publicly voice their opinions; conversely, there are those who dominate the discussion. She added that BLOG posts would be her recommendation if classmates were not required to read it. She felt that a closed BLOG, where only the teacher had access, would be a safe space to say what you feel and to share your reaction to a topic. She thought this would be an acceptable option for those who might be too reserved to speak honestly in class.

Students within the Secondary Education program were asked if they feel inclusion of LGBT training is strictly a secondary topic, or if this training also should be included in the Elementary Education program. Eight of the ten students interviewed believed the training should be included within both programs. One student stated, “I think this (training) is something that should be included in Elementary Education as well as in Secondary. I mean, you would address it differently in Elementary, but it is something that should at least be discussed.” Two students felt that it would be strictly a Secondary topic, and that the Elementary Education department would not need to include LGBT training within their program.

One of the male Secondary Education students shared that LGBT topics are discussed quite a bit within his current Secondary Education course (which is the course focusing on diversity topics). He shared that within the previous week’s class, students had discussed how to relate to someone within their classrooms who identifies within the LGBT community. He added that he felt he would be able to empower that student with material specific to his Secondary English content area by choosing literature relevant to them. He then stated, “It’s kind of like if you have a black student or a Muslim student. It’s a conversation that must be had and must be had productively within your classroom.” So when asked what are some of things that have been suggested, this male Secondary Education student responded that controversial topics should not be avoided in the K-12 public school setting. He said he feels teachers should be ready to talk

about the topics and be able to talk about the topics from the students' perspectives as well. This student concluded with, "I want my students to know that what goes on within those four walls stays there. I think that's productive to try and create a little dissonance between the students, and I think that training is being reached here within the diversity block."

Process

While interviewing the foundations department, the question, "How is diversity training implemented programmatically?" spoke to the process within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Programming. One comment made by a male Foundations student included him stating that he feels that a good way to approach LGBT issues is similar to race concerns (1960's) and women's rights (1920's). His suggestion for the program would ask them to bring in people to talk about the subject of concern. This is repeated in the comments from another Foundations student who stated that she believes it would be best to tie LGBT topics in with other controversial topics. She said she thought it would be helpful to discuss civil rights, women's rights, and LGBT rights as rights of every person. She would treat them all as civil rights topics and not separate into minority groups.

Another Foundations student stated that she does not understand why the topics are not integrated into the coursework. She added that she feels it would work best to integrate LGBT or other controversial topics into the coursework, particularly since controversial topics do not typically work in isolation. She also stated, "I would compare it to something like religion. You cannot force the topic on people or it gets overwhelming. You have to work it in with other topics." She also stated that she feels some teachers are open to change, and some are not. She

feels her current Foundations teacher is open to changing and presenting controversial topics more readily. She said, “Right now, teachers don’t really address topics in practice.”

One student said she feels like controversial topics are discussed in her class and that the implementation is effective because the teacher will engage the students and lead them through discussion with leading questions. She added that the topics so far have not been LGBT topics, but have focused more on racial issues. Some other topics touched upon have been religious issues as well as cultural differences.

Elementary Education

Topic avoidance. During the Elementary Education interviews, one common idea emerged; the focus was not on inclusion of LGBT topics. The topics “focused more on behavior management, technology...depends on the teacher too.” This shared statement outlines the omission of LGBT topics within the Elementary Education program. Statements from another Elementary Education student further support this. She shared that a large portion of course time is devoted to Common Core information, and learning to teach math and reading. She acknowledged that obviously this is material she needs as well, but she was unclear as to why other topics were not being included. She indicated that she felt unprepared for many other situations within the classroom. She compared the hours per week as nine hours per week working on Common Core standards to one hour per week learning about other issues in the classroom.

Another student shared, “There seems to be more content like this in a women’s studies course that I took. There was some in my Foundations course, but it still wasn’t like we talked about scenarios and what we might do in different situations. It was more read a chapter and talk about the chapter, read an article and talk about the article. There didn’t seem to be application to

a situation, and we have not covered anything like that in elementary courses.” She agreed that there is more policy in place than practice. These statements reinforce the sporadic programming of LGBT topics within degree programs.

Secondary Education

Programming: One female interviewee from the Secondary Education degree program felt that discussion groups were not the best way to conduct topic enlightenment. She felt that many of the students within the class would not fully participate for fear of judgment from others. She felt that perhaps closed BLOG posts would be the most useful tool to achieve open and honest comments from students; this way only the professor would have access to the postings and would be able to make comments to the students. Obviously, this would eliminate a class dialogue or response to student postings on the BLOG site; however, students commented that they felt many of their classmates were very careful with their responses due to the viewing availability. One student shared that “I don’t know that they are the most effective when students have not already been exposed to these issues. I mean I came from a fairly large school in Florida and I have seen members of the LGBT community...it’s a non-issue for me...I have grown up around it...but if people are asked to respond to something that they have no experience (with) or context for...they don’t see these issues, so a passing reference doesn’t do them justice.” This interview statement echoes a repeated statement across departments in that programming seems to be sporadic. When LGBT topics are included, they are usually done so briefly and superficially. Intermittent or unintentional programming of topics and assignments across degree programs not only affects the content effectiveness but also assigns degrees of importance to topics, whether intended or unintended. Specific and thoughtful inclusion of key topics is vital to programming an effective degree program.

Product

While interviewing each department, the question, “What is the perceived impact of the program on preservice teachers?” spoke to the product within the CIPP program evaluation.

Foundations

Products and assessments. Students indicated that most of the assignments within their Foundations courses are assigned readings and class discussions. Some discussed a group project as well, but that their topics are choice. Not everyone does the reading and research on LGBT for the group topic. With LGBT topics being offered as only optional choice, this creates a gap in purposeful programming. In a separate Foundations section, students are required to read LGBT material and make reflection comments on the readings. This repeats an inconsistency of programming across courses.

Another assignment has been a paper about what it means to teach called “Why teach?” One Foundations student shared that they suppose, “If we were put into another culture what would we do. [This] asked us all about the past twelve years [of public education] and what did we experience, [and] why would it be a culture shock when we teach. Our teacher is the only one who sees our paper.”

Another Foundations student added that there have been class meetings that used “deep thinking” discussion where topics were introduced and students were challenged to think sensitively about topics that might be challenging for teachers in the work setting. She stated they have also been creating lesson plans focusing on hopes and strengths. She said, “We have been finding out our strengths, so that we can find out the strengths of the students. LGBT topics are not discussed that much.” She added that she does not understand why LGBT topics are avoided and not discussed that much.

Elementary Education

Products and assessments. Elementary Education students shared that their assignments tend to be related to lesson planning or Common Core standards. The products they are asked to produce usually are readings and discussions as well as lesson planning. As stated earlier in the review of the syllabus, there are required readings for the course, but there are no LGBT topics included in those readings.

Evaluation/feedback. When asked about evaluation for their courses, an Elementary Education student added, “The only thing that I think they have university wide [for evaluation and feedback] is the evaluation, and I guess you could put in the comments section what you think, but there’s nothing else really. I know some teachers give out bonus for completing the evaluation, and some teachers keep sending out emails to remind us to do our evaluations. Sometimes I do the evaluations just to get the emails to stop coming. ”

The only male Foundations student who volunteered to be interviewed stated that he feels like most of the formative assessments he has been asked to do have been ineffective. He stated that he feels “like I am being asked to jump through hoops” rather than show where he is in understanding the material and where the instructor should plan for the course to go from there.

Secondary Education

Programming. Secondary Education students reported that most of their assignments related to LGBT topics, or other topics, were done through assigned or choice readings followed by in-class discussions or required written reflections. These reflections came in the form of BLOG posts with feedback from the instructor.

Evaluation/feedback. When asked about whether the assessments so far had been accurate and fair, a Secondary Education student added, “Yes, I would say that the assessments

have been pretty fair, but I don't know how accurate they are if we are talking about LGBT issues. Again, it's hard to assess something you haven't really been exposed to." When asked if LGBT topics had been introduced in any of her classes, she stated that LGBT topics had been briefly discussed when she was enrolled in her Foundations course requirement. She stated the course required a reading on identity. The reading was a story about a male student and his struggle in finding his identity in his high school situation. The story conveyed the hardship he faced in trying to acknowledge his gender identity in his conservative community, and the story compared his journey after transitioning to a more liberal school up north. She shared that the story showed a much easier and accepting setting for the main character to be his true self. She related this back to her past high school experiences as a student and her future experiences as a teacher, and how she feels that high school is "...such a formative time that I don't think it should be restrictive." Preparing preservice teachers to facilitate empowering situations within school settings seems important for this student as she investigates her preservice program.

When asked what kinds of products are required within their Secondary Education course, one student shared that most of the course time is devoted to class discussion and that the topic of conversation goes wherever the students take it. He mentioned that one of his group members within this current course is gay, and this class member provides input openly and classmates are comfortable with the direction of discussions. He added that, "It's neat... everybody comes from different places and it all converges at the university...but most of the time it is just discussion...teachers will ask, hey how do you feel about this and the discussion will start." This type of interview acknowledgement, however, seems to be the exception rather than the standard. In addition, his reference to his classmates sexual identity as "neat" might further the indication of novelty rather than an accepted norm.

Summary of Case Two

Case Two interviews revealed the following overall themes:

- Conservative climate
- Race as an overriding issue
- Influence of the Greek society on campus
- Course programming

Twenty-six of the thirty students (87%) interviewed felt that the climate of the university was conservative. Comments included references to the South, the “Bible Belt”, and Christian religion in particular.

Twenty-three out of the thirty (77%) interviewees from Case Two stated that they feel the topic of race is discussed more than any other topic within diversity courses. Nineteen of the thirty (63%) shared that they do not believe they have discussed LGBT topics at all in any of their course work.

Twenty-nine students (97%) who participated in the interviewing process commented favorably regarding LGBT students on campus. In spite of the fact that some students stated that they do not approve of homosexuality themselves, these same students answered the questions favorably and with receptiveness for training of some kind. Four female students specifically shared that they do not believe homosexuality is acceptable because it is against their Christian beliefs, but they also were approachable and did believe that LGBT training could serve them as teachers. One of the four students stated, “The Bible says that homosexuality is wrong.” I asked her to what scriptures she was referring. She said she “could not quote them from memory”, but she thought there were several scriptures in the Bible that spoke against homosexuality.

One student was eliminated from this statistic because she entered the interview without knowledge that the acronym LGBT stood for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. She answered questions to the best of her ability; however, she is in the Elementary Education program, and she stated she had never been exposed to the term LGBT.

One Foundations student suggested a sensitivity training for all faculty and students. She stated that she felt that a goal when raising children should be to raise them to be accepting of all orientations. Although teachers may not go on record as raising children, teachers are definitely important formative factors in children's lives.

Another suggestion that was made for improvement of the program came from a Secondary Education when she stated "multiple organizations on campus that deal with this issue. I know...because I went through RA (resident advisor) training, and you have two separate days addressing LGBTQ issues within housing and it really opens your eyes...especially in the college setting...so I think if you spend one or two class periods using something like they use and bringing more attention to it...instead of taking it as a piece of an article and spending five minutes on it...spend two classes on it to at least work your way into more attention."

The category of product seemed to be the most difficult on which to gather data. The product options were limited; readings, BLOGS, reflections, and discussions were the most common types of formative assessments.

In addition, comments from a Secondary Education student were unfortunately of an outlier nature. His comments were uncommonly positive about the delivery of LGBT instruction within the degree programs. He felt that the class discussions were inclusive of LGBT topics, and that the course was helpful in understanding how to deal with LGBT issues as a teacher when he would enter the workplace.

Although the overall themes from Case One were also present in Case Two, there were two themes that emerged specific to Case Two. The first was the perception of the Greek society at University X, and its reluctance to be receptive to LGBT identified students or topics. The second theme presented was the feeling of insufficient programming within the College of Education programs. Within the interviews for Case Two, 40% of the students felt that the Greek society on campus is not supportive and accepting of those students who have identified as or are perceived as identifying with the LGBT community. One student did state that she felt there was a double-standard with fraternities with a more liberal acceptance of lesbians to parties and events as opposed to openly gay males. Another female student acknowledged that Spectrum had visited their sorority to collaborate in response to a controversial event. These data reveal the possibility of more acceptance among sororities than fraternities.

Sixteen out of the thirty interviews (53%) suggested that it would be effective to have a course focused on LGBT issues or a course, which targeted controversial issues including LGBT issues. One Foundations student suggested a course tailored to address current, controversial topics. This student also felt that the delivery of current and controversial topics might be effectively delivered with consistent integration within the other courses if a new course was not possible. Two other students (10%) within the interviews for Case Two mentioned that they thought of a similar reform. One Secondary Education student shared, “I think it would be important...for me it’s an issue that’s shoved off into a corner in so many classes...and I think it is becoming a much more huge issue...more relevant inn today’s society that I think it should be incorporated into its own class. I think as teachers we need to be taught an entire course about how to address these issues and how to address the processes that are going on.” Two

Foundations students agreed that it would be beneficial to have a course tailored for covering LGBT issues.

Comparing and Contrasting Cases One and Two

Similarities

In collection, transcription, coding, and analyses of the data from both Cases One and Two, thematic concepts were revealed. Race as an overriding issue presented itself as a major factor in the interviews from both Cases One and Two. Faculty and students stated that much of their course time labeled diversity is focused on race issues, historically and within the classroom. The faculty programming the course offerings all stated they have good input or even total control of the material that is contained within their syllabi and consequently their courses; however, the faculty from Case One did state that race is a focus. Bo stated in his interview, “I mean a lot of them have a fair distance to go with respect to race issues.” This statement is included to acknowledge the importance of the discussions of race and equality in the course work, but to encourage a faculty dialogue about a more appropriate balance of topics.

Second, the conservative climate in which University X finds itself situated proved to be a common thread among interview participants from both Cases One and Two. As previously stated from Case One data, the conservative climate in which University X operates is present in a majority of the Case One interviews (67%). The reluctance of students to participate in discussions within courses where LGBT topics are covered is also mentioned as a factor. Case Two data revealed twenty-six of the thirty students (87%) interviewed felt that the climate of the university was conservative mainly due to religious influence. Despite this understanding, students and faculty shared that they believed it is appropriate to incorporate LGBT concerns and rights into training programs. They also shared that one of the easiest ways to do so is to weave

LGBT topics into topics of civil rights and women's issues, as the concerns are predominantly about equality, fairness, and acceptance.

Third, 78% of all faculty indicated that they had deliberately exposed their preservice teachers to LGBT literature and issues, while 37% of the preservice teachers indicated that they had exposure through various readings and articles supplied by their instructors. In addition, 7% of all students interviewed indicated that although they had exposure or discussion of LGBT literature or issues in their preservice training within education, they had been exposed to limited literature and discussion through the English department at University X. These data indicate a discrepancy between course programming and delivery.

One of the major areas of concern was discovered within the Elementary Education program. 70% of the elementary preservice teachers noted that training would be helpful and desirable for their preparation (thus indicating they feel they are not currently receiving effective training). Furthermore, 30% of the preservice elementary teachers indicated that they were not certain of what LGBT meant or encompassed. Overall, students in this program were not clear as how this training would apply to their young students, overlooking the diversity in family situations such as same sex parents.

Differences

In collection, transcription, coding, and analyses of the data from both Cases One and Two, thematic concepts were revealed with only one notable difference between Case One and Case Two.

The major difference surfaced when 40% of preservice teachers across programs and gender indicated gender identification discrimination was definitely an issue within the Greek Fraternity and Sorority organization. Even though there are LGBTQ representative fraternities

and sororities on a national level, none are supported and in existence at University X. Furthermore, students indicated that they did not believe that such organizations would be supported in the religious and conservative atmosphere at University X. No faculty members referred to any form of fraternity or sorority organization; however, Greek influence was also included within the interview with the Spectrum representative.

Primary Research Questions Revisited

Finally, the primary research questions have garnered feedback from the research study's qualitative interviewing process. Some observations are included in the following and have been broken down to associate with individual research questions.

1. "What is the local climate surrounding University X as it relates to LGBT issues?" (Context)

As stated above, the conservative climate in which University X finds itself situated proved to be a common thread among interview participants from both Cases One and Two. As previously stated from Case One data, the conservative climate in which University X operates is present in a majority of the Case One interviews. The reluctance of students to participate in discussions within courses where LGBT topics are covered is also mentioned as a factor. Case Two data revealed twenty-six of the thirty students interviewed felt that the climate of the university was conservative mainly due to religious influence.

Students (40% of preservice teachers), across programs and gender, indicated gender identification discrimination was definitely an issue within the Greek Fraternity and Sorority organization. No faculty members referred to any form of fraternity or sorority organization.

2. “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for K-12 preservice teachers?” (Input)

Faculty indicated in the input section of the research that programming for the course offerings was autonomous. All stated they have good input or even total control of the material that is contained within their syllabi and consequently their courses. Resources included mainstream literature, personal narratives, anecdotal stories, journal articles, online resources provided through BLOGS, and critical classroom discussions. However, the programming questions revealed an area of concern. The faculty from Case One did state that race is identified as a topic of focus in their classes when the concept of diversity is raised. Additionally, twenty-three out of the thirty interviewees from Case Two stated that they feel the topic of race is discussed more than any other topic within diversity courses.

3. “How is diversity training for K-12 preservice teachers implemented programmatically?” (Process)

The research information regarding the process element of the targeted programs from University X indicated that this section of the instruction is loosely organized. Although several faculty members indicated that LGBT topics are included within syllabi and course content, there is not a consistent implementation of the topics evidenced. Student interviews also confirmed that the implementations within courses are not purposeful or programmatic.

During the Elementary Education interviews, one student stated that the topics “focused more on behavior management, technology...depends on the teacher too.” This shared statement outlines the omission of LGBT topics within the program. Statements from another Elementary Education student further support this. She shared that “we spend a ton of time working on

Common Core, and learning to teach math and reading...and yes, that is obviously important stuff, but I don't understand why we are not learning how to deal with the other stuff, too." She compared the hours per week as nine hours per week working on Common Core standards and one hour per week learning about other issues in the classroom.

In the Secondary Education interviews, one student added that teachers in courses seem to be predominantly checking that students have a basic understanding of what is covered within assigned readings and are not evaluating opinion responses. She shared that this seems to be the focus of this type of assignment rather than a more investigative and inquisitive discussion. When asked if she finds that sometimes, when students are speaking in class about topics, including religion, that they are unable to back up their comments, she shared that this is often true.

4. "What is the perceived impact of the program on K-12 preservice teachers?" (Product)

While product evidence is somewhat included, there is little to no consistency within the separate programs. The evidence of products required within courses does not give the impression of being analytical, allowing for critical discussion, or acting as a catalyst for rigorous and relevant conversations. Multiple interviews included statements about class readings and BLOG postings; however, students felt like the BLOG responses might be more honest if the content was only accessible to the teacher rather than everyone within the course. The students valued the concept of anonymity as they felt it would add transparency to responses.

Elementary Education students shared that the required products for their classes are usually readings and discussions, as well as lesson planning. As stated earlier in the review of the

Elementary Education syllabus, although there are required readings for the course, there are no LGBT topics included in those readings. Therefore, a course could be void of any discussion related to issues of gender identification or LGBT issues.

When asked about whether the assessments so far had been accurate and fair, one Secondary Education student stated, “Yes, I would say that the assessments have been pretty fair, but I don’t know how accurate they are if we are talking about LGBT issues.” This would be in agreement with the concept that it is difficult to assess something you have not really been exposed to within the course. When asked if LGBT topics had been introduced in any classes she has had, she stated that LGBT related discussions had taken place during her Foundations course.

When asked about evaluation for their courses, one Elementary Education student stated the only evaluation tool used university wide is the standardized evaluation form provided through the university. Although there is a comment section provided on the form, students are reluctant to be totally transparent. Part of this reluctance is based on students believing that the repetitive emails from faculty requesting completion of the course evaluation could possibly indicate that their responses are not totally anonymous.

The overall climate from all data analyzed would indicate the need for a purposeful training program for all education preservice teachers so that it can occur with equity and fidelity throughout the curriculum.

CHAPTER V:
CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

If we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity.

- John F. Kennedy

While the necessity of preservice diversity training is at the forefront of this research, it is also at the heart of a cultural shift in terms of moving from addressing versus avoiding current needs concerning diversity training. John F. Kennedy's quote introducing this chapter addresses diversity. As he spoke about worldwide peace, he quantified, "If we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity" (Kennedy, 1963). However, is it not still relevant today in regards to LGBT concerns? Even over fifty years later, we are still struggling with our own awareness in making the world safe for diversity. Perhaps "safeness" refers to a different kind of acceptance concerning peace and diversity, but diversity never the less.

In 2014, it is not enough to simply make our campuses "safe" for diversity, but rather enriched and empowered by diversity. At the university level, normative culture has allowed for the avoidance of the implementation of purposeful and meaningful preservice diversity training to occur with fidelity. This seldom-investigated focus on diversity training to include the LGBT learner and family guided this study in educational research. This research reported findings from various archived documents, course syllabi, and interviews with program directors, faculty, and preservice education students, whereby several themes emerged that although not mutually exclusive, did capture the subtleties of the embedded nature of diversity within one's professional and personal beliefs.

Major Findings

Research findings from this CIPP program evaluation revealed that a more consistent delivery of LGBT diversity training is needed for preservice educators. Although it is often indicated within course descriptions and/or syllabi, professors and students alike openly admitted that diversity training is directed more toward race than allowing for a more inclusive focus reflected within topics addressing gender identification and/or perception within the LGBT community. Both professors and students in this study expressed concerns, observations, misunderstandings, and questions in regard to diversity training and lack of training.

Environmental Issues

Throughout interview coding, themes regarding environmental issues specific to this university climate continued to occur. While most data validated a concentrated effort to address diversity issues as related to race, curriculum and courses were regarded as lacking in addressing issues for the LGBT learner and/or their families. Many individuals even insisted that this would not be an issue for them as they would be working with a younger age group of learners, thereby ignoring the possibilities of a kindergarten student having two mothers rather than what one might consider a traditional father/mother nucleus. This outlook alone demonstrates the difficulty that an unprepared teacher will have in establishing relationships with his or her classroom's learners and families.

An additional finding would be the need for allocated time to specifically provide a focused course where the result would be to directly address and work to eliminate a hostile environment toward gender perception and identification. Not only is this an environmental need, but a legal and equitable interpretation as to how institutions of higher learning and competent professionals are responsible to prepare their preservice teachers with the ability to

relate to all students and their legal rights. Although organizations, such as the ACLU LGBT Project, strive to advance understandings and protect the individual's right to be safe and visible. Organizations of higher learning must strive to build a positive and accepting environment (ACLU, 2012).

As statistics reported, it is readily acknowledged that lack of acceptance of diverse learners as represented by LGBT identification builds a toxic environment, one that teachers could profoundly influence through their daily interactions if properly provided the tools and training. As stated in Chapter I, at least 74.5% of students have heard derogatory remarks such as 'faggot' or 'dyke' frequently at school; 37.8% of students have experienced physical harassment at school on the basis of sexual orientation; 26.1% have been physically harassed on the basis of their gender expression; 17.6% of students have been physically assaulted because of their sexual orientation; 11.8% have been physically assaulted because of their gender expression (GLSEN, 2005). The preservice teachers within the training program at University X have shared that the predominant perception of climate is a conservative one, and that without purposeful and proper training within preservice teacher preparation, they cannot expect to be able to change the current unwelcoming and often hostile school environments in which LGBT youth find themselves. These toxic environments exact a high toll; sexual minority youth are known to be at greater risk for a variety of social, emotional, physical, and educational hardships. So when, if not now, will we address these issues that are engrained in our learning environments (Roffman, 2000)? It is not a matter of personal belief, but rather professional duty.

Reflections of Moral Law

Additionally, at this university, findings indicated a reflection of moral law in society whereby 82% (thirty-two out of thirty-nine) of preservice teachers and professors interviewed

indicated the conservative nature of University X is one that could be interpreted as non-accepting (rejecting at worst, and one of avoidance at the very least). Data indicated that the conservative nature was aligned with the overall religious beliefs of the community and non-acceptance more than acceptance.

These religious groups might comprise a contingent of those individuals and groups opposed to the equal treatment of the LGBT community as expressed by the Foundation for Moral Law (FML). FML has even lent support to what would be considered a “Godly” operation within the government, represented by multiple court cases in which this organization has taken a stance against the acceptance or even tolerance of LGBT issues. It is within this sharing of the opinion that homosexuality is not normal, that moral law is called into question as well as personal and professional belief systems. Several interviewees cited “religious” beliefs as reasoning for not wanting to address or be more aware of LGBT students; however, no specific Bible passage or verse could be quoted. According to the FML argument, it is the normative practice for a conservative university environment to condemn homosexuality and a homosexual lifestyle as morally unacceptable within a large portion of the population that bases beliefs on religious, moral, and scientific grounds that the homosexual lifestyle is sordidly wrong (Foundation of Moral Law, 2013).

This indicates an even more profound need for expanded diversity training at the university level as our universities as well as schools are but mere reflections of society and great catalysts for change. It is this very lack of leadership in LGBT diversity training at the university level that indicates a significant factor adding to the reluctance of school personnel to know how to combat anti-gay bias at school (Roffman, 2000). This continued avoidance of LGBT topic inclusion within preservice diversity training reflects that perhaps the topic of LGBT issues is not

deemed as appropriate or relevant for their students' thorough preparation. However, higher education could prove to be the most appropriate place to initiate situations to "avoid nuances that suggest a norm and can actively challenge pervasive stereotypes" (Kissen, 2002, p. 37).

One observation from this research study is firm: Education and increased legislation that recognizes the rights of this student population, as well as attention to the specific needs of this student population, are necessary as litigation becomes increasingly prevalent (Davis v. Monroe County School District, 1999; Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District, 2003; Loomis v. Visalia Unified School District, 2001)

New Beliefs

Lee (2004) suggests that preservice teachers are newly forming their teacher beliefs within their university studies. Consequently, it becomes increasingly important that K-12 preservice teachers experience preparation and development programs for public school educators that embody rigor, innovation, and attention to the needs of each learner so that these new educators will learn to build on the strengths of diverse children and youth (Kissen, 2002). This is not unusual. Gay and Howard (2000) have reported research as having shown that many K-12 preservice teachers enter the field of teaching lacking the knowledge and skills necessary to effectively instruct culturally diverse students. "All good teachers try hard to treat each child fairly and kindly, with care and concern" (Grossman, 2008, p. 147). These research statements tie directly to many of the statements from student interviews suggesting the addition of an entire course to properly address LGBT concerns within the classroom. As previously stated in the summary section for Case Two in Chapter IV, sixteen of the thirty student interview participants (53%) stated that the addition of a course dealing with LGBT concerns would be appropriate. These students also stated that having experts within the field would be an effective

implementation within this new course. If a new course is not possible, they felt integration of expert guest instructors within current courses could improve their training.

Kissen additionally noted that inertia was one of the factors impeding the success of equity initiatives (2002). As an impeding factor, this inertia was best illustrated when a Foundations professor explained, “You may have heard this before but sometimes I hear ‘hate the sin, love the sinner’, and I kind of tell them ‘how benevolent, how problematic’ because you are telling someone they are rotten anyway. I never let any kind of mean comment go without some kind of careful, thoughtful challenge, so I feel good about it, but at the same time I feel the pain.” It is professionally problematic if a perspective does not allow for growth or understanding on the preservice teacher’s part. While one professor may address it head on, others may choose to sidestep the issue due to the environmental and moral culture of the university. This leaves us with both the pain and the aftermath that we, as educators of educators, have the professional responsibility to address.

Social Justice and Barriers

Social justice is one of the terms specifically mentioned numerous times within course documents. When LGBT topics were delivered within coursework examined (with the exception of the Elementary Education course), the social justice mindset was present. The faculty and students within the College of Education do feel that currently there is a need for LGBT training within the program, and the acknowledgement of this imminent need alludes to the possibility of a social injustice against this marginalized group otherwise.

Formally, NCATE studies advocate a necessity for dialogue to take place on these barriers to inclusion of socially marginalized groups and ways to promote social justice. Not only must the historical context be examined, but also the nature of the barriers and the “otherness”

that society has created. As previously stated, Valentin (2006, p. 196) asks, “Do K-12 preservice teachers feel prepared to meet the needs of their diverse student populations?” I would venture to say not completely, based upon the responses from the Case Two interviews. With over half of the respondents indicating a need for an additional training course specifically addressing LGBT topics, I would, again, believe the training is not currently optimal.

Lee (2004) argued that as student teachers are newly forming their teacher beliefs within their university studies, the influence of collaboration and “connectedness” must be examined as it relates to learning, equity and social justice, just as it is for the students. As mentioned earlier, Lee also indicated that if K-12 preservice teachers can be reached while they are in their university studies, the university’s preparation program can supply this influence of “connectedness” that best relates to and serves learning in terms of equity and social justice.

The task of educating students for a multicultural, multiracial society that includes the voices of those who are in minority and oppressed groups is a challenging one. K-12 preservice teachers who have multicultural experiences are more inclined to have favorable attitudes toward diverse populations and situations than their more sheltered colleagues. It is under this premise that researchers propose the need for increased educational experiences including meaningful diversity training that these teachers will be able to sustain after they enter their work situations (Kyles and Olafson, 2008; Kurz and Paul, 2005). The information gained from this literature as well as from this research study may certainly influence the direction of the questioning for impending research.

Culture

According to Erickson (2005, p. 34) efforts to define what is important have not produced great results and “even experts have not been able to agree on what culture really is”. Many

topics are covered in the Foundations course. These topics include race, ethnicity/nationality, social class, sex/gender, health, age, geographic region, sexuality, religion, social status, language, and ability/disability. Additionally, scholars state these universal sources influence teaching and learning and are present in every culture where cultural knowledge is filtered or transmitted to the individual through different socializing agents such as family, school, church, community, etc. (Cushner, McClelland & Safford, 2003). As is evidenced through the student interviews of Case Two, much of the student population feels that the delivery of LGBT training is minimally delivered at University X.

Teacher education programs must pursue a commitment to diversity in order to foster more accepting attitudes among teachers in a changing society. This diversity is a reality of society and must be embraced for a truly nurturing environment to be fostered within school facilities. Therefore, one of the research goals for this study was to expose data for LGBT training delivery for preservice teachers, such as the Milner, Flowers, Moore, Moore III & Flowers (2003) research of K-12 preservice teachers' attitudes about cultural diversity. Although one faculty member acknowledged that they would be willing to integrate a respect for diversity into their teaching and classrooms, they did not feel that they had the insight and the resources to make it that happen effectively. This very insight mirrors perceptions from student interviews in Case Two suggesting the additional course in LGBT training. Typically, students do not suggest more training in fields if they feel properly prepared already.

While Brown (2004) reports that even one course has the potential to increase factors of cultural diversity awareness, Middleton (2002) has noted that changes occur in attitudes, beliefs, and commitments toward diversity of K-12 preservice teachers after completing a single, required course in diversity. Furthermore, Wasonga and Piveral (2004) believe that focusing on

teacher preparation without changing K-12 preservice teacher dispositions will produce teachers who are less culturally sensitive. Thus, by sending new teachers into the field without the proper training to deal with not only the academic curricula but the ability to appreciate and celebrate diversity, we are not only doing a disservice to them but to all of their students throughout their careers.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In examining some of the possible implications for this research, I realized that ignorance of the law or unawareness of the problem must not be an excuse. As stated in Chapter II, the Reiter and Davis (2011, p. 41) study showed a sampling of K-12 preservice teachers, where they discussed that there was a “lack of association between completing a diversity training program and reports of cultural biases regarding student background characteristics’ influence on their learning”. This study acknowledged the fact that there was a recognized need of cultural disparity, and that there should be something put in place to support that need. This same need emerges through the qualitative interview responses from Cases One and Two in this research study.

Research has shown that teacher-training programs in universities must have purposeful and meaningful diversity training programs in place and be effective if social justice is to be achieved for all students (Gorski, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Wallace, 2000). Just as Reiter and Davis (2011) pursued research examining the effectiveness of a specific diversity program at a Southern, mid-sized university that consisted of weekly diversity seminars over the course of two semesters, this research has revealed the same need. Periodic seminars could be one suggestion for improvement of the training program for LGBT topics at University X, and this would be aligned with recommendations that surface through interviews. The goals of Reiter and

Davis' research, as well as my research, both attempt to aid in the development of procedures and protocols that would help to ensure knowledge that eliminates bias in schools and other social institutions (Reiter and Davis, 2011).

As the university moves forward, it has an amazing opportunity and challenge to embrace the opportunity to work with preservice educators as a captive and engaged audience. Through this professional engagement on these important issues of equity, researchers can begin to build a model for helping schools to address policy options and to develop new attitudes of connectedness for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered youth. Many K-12 preservice teachers “tend to cling to and defend discourses that privilege those of the dominant culture” and “support discourses that deny opportunities for people who are seen as ‘others,’ people who are underrepresented, and/or who are marginalized by society” (Bullock et al, 2010, p. 161). University X must strive to break down this type of thinking and move toward a culture of acceptance and celebration of diversity. Until the normative culture becomes a culture of acceptance, change will not occur.

Since teachers “hold great influence over the thoughts, opinions, and actions of their students” (Petrovic, 2002, p. 152), a lack of inclusion likely leads the LGBT student to imagine that their thoughts and inclinations do not warrant merit and thus lead to feelings of invalidation. Preservice teachers must be trained to facilitate inclusion of all students into the daily teaching and learning process, as all students should see themselves reflected in their school's academic literature. As Petrovic (2002, p. 152) argues, a robust conceptualization of equality of educational opportunity requires that teachers “refrain from expressing their negative positions against same-sex sexual orientation and to include positive portrayals of [LGBT] youth, adults,

and their families in the curriculum; for children best flourish in schools when they can see themselves, their lived experiences, and their families in the curriculum.”

Petrovic’s discussion of positive systemic inclusion requires this minimum refrain from teachers to have even the very least opportunity for safe educational environments for LGBT students. True teaching and learning reform happens only when these principles are in place, and professional development is a special case of teaching and learning.

Future Research and Proposals for Program Improvement

The first suggestion for program improvement is to make teaching intellectually sound (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). This would “require that prospective teachers gain a broad, coherent liberal arts foundation that incorporates enduring, multicultural values and forms of inquiry, and that is taught to a depth of understanding that enable them so to teach” (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). To assist with this goal, a sound training program must be in place. Recommendations for the program include a sensitivity course for all faculty and students. The students from Case Two who also participated on campus as RA’s mentioned that the sensitivity training they experienced did assist in preparing them for resident housing issues related to LGBT concerns.

Another recommendation would be for the College of Education to program into their courses LGBT community speakers and/or guest instructors who would be available to visit courses and speak about their school experiences. One Foundations student suggested this because of the importance of having relevant, life experience with a topic. This student felt it would be powerful to hear someone speak within the classroom of their personal experiences and struggles, and they could share consequences or resolutions that shaped future thinking. This student felt that a guest speaker who could come in and share what a teacher had done for them

in the past, it would be helpful for planning for their future experiences as they enter the workplace.

Two recommendations were offered related to LGBT course offerings. As stated in the summary for Case Two in Chapter IV, sixteen out of the thirty interviews (53%) suggested that it would be effective to have a course focused on LGBT issues, or a course that targeted controversial issues including LGBT issues. Another option mentioned was the delivery of current and controversial topics with consistent integration within other courses if a new course was not possible. If the latter were chosen, then an analysis of the amount of time devoted to each topic in courses would have to be conducted as twenty-three out of the thirty (77%) interviewees from Case Two stated that they feel the topic of race is discussed more than any other topic within diversity courses. Perhaps within the courses, a questionnaire could be included for students in the beginning and at some mid-point of a course. This would allow all students opportunities to share input into the course and share with the instructor perceived needs that have been met with material covered or supplementary material that could be added.

An additional recommendation would be the inclusion of BLOG postings that are available for teacher response only. Some students felt that reading responses were not always as honest and insightful as possible because of the public nature of the postings and responses.

Fifth, we must also ensure that all groups are included within the training program, even if the topic is somewhat controversial or new; no topic can be avoided. Course goals should be written to focus on preparing teacher candidates to work with culturally and socio-economically diverse students, as well as all oppressed groups (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). We must also make sure courses are inclusive and welcoming to all. One Secondary Education student shared that she did take one course through her content focus that had LGBT topics

scheduled through the use of queer literature. Because the instructor prefaced the course with her own “outing” as well as a statement declaring she would assume all students taking the class as gay unless they “came out” as straight, this female student felt ostracized from the class, and she felt that exclusion was forced upon her.

Thirdly, we must deal with connecting schools of education to the public schools, and making schools better places for teaching and learning (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). The partnerships also proposed to “revise the professional education of school administrators and other professionals who work in schools so that they can recognize and enhance professionalism in teachers and work in partnership with university faculty to inquire into and invent new methods and structures for their schools” (Origins of the Holmes Partnership, 2012). This would create not only an optimum environment for the preservice teacher, but also for observations and the sharing of critical information between the university and a broader audience within public education.

Finally, in order to improve teaching and learning for all children, universities must focus their goals on not only high quality professional preparation, but also equity, diversity, and cultural competence. By actively working on equity, diversity, and cultural competence in the programs of K-12 schools, higher education, and the education profession, K-12 preservice teachers who reflect on the implications of the rich diversity of cultural perspectives within their schools will utilize research and best practice approaches in their teaching design, content, and delivery (The Holmes Partnership, 2012).

Future research may be enhanced through the inclusion of a designation for a student’s position within the assigned program. It might be beneficial to acknowledge if a student is beginning a degree program, is nearing completion of a program, or is close to a midpoint in the

program given that at different points in the program courses may emphasize different topics, content, or concepts (e.g., heterosexism). Thus, stratifying the sample by year and cohort (if applicable) might also be useful information for data analyses. A future researcher might also include inquiry into the past experiences of interviewees vis-a-vis issues of diversity (e.g., friendships with people of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, etc.) that might have generated awareness of (positive or negative) or sensitivity to a particular issue prior to their coursework.

Future research might also be enhanced by examining how multiple factors might work together -- creating a culture -- to keep LGBT topics in the closet. For example, the combination of a lack of programming (specific courses or inclusion of LGBT issues across the curriculum), faculty approaches, student campus experiences (through, for example, sororities or fraternities), and the overall influence of a conservative climate may be a formidable congeries of forces to the progression of a more enlightened preservice program.

This combined set of factors would lend itself to a belief that future research would benefit from a more extensive ethnographic approach. Many of the responses revealed within this study, particularly from Case Two data collection, could be regarded as basic or superficial. This could be due to the lack of exposure students have had to LGBT issues and topics. A more extensive ethnographic research study could provide more insight into the development of the preservice teacher over time. A possibility for future research could include following a preservice teacher or teachers throughout their program of study over the span of a designated period of time. This could be from inception to completion, or a researcher might choose a specific set of years to study (for example, the first two years of a program or the culminating two years of a program).

Ultimately, it is the creating of a safe and inclusive classroom environment that will foster an increased chance for student success. As educators we must rethink personal and professional beliefs and how they relate to students and their legal rights, as well as paying special attention to acts of discrimination, harassment, threats, and/or violence in schools. It can only be through an effective teacher education program that preservice teachers will be prepared to combat the issues and situations they will inevitably face as the challenges of the diverse student populations they will encounter. Topics for conversation within courses must be presented from a non-threatening stance; this should increase the receptiveness and invite an openness for conversation within the assigned course. As Margaret Wheatley emphasizes in her “Willingness to be Disturbed” conversation, “Sometimes we hesitate to listen for differences because we don’t want to change. We’re comfortable with our lives, and if we listened to anyone who raised questions, we’d have to get engaged in changing things. If we don’t listen, things can stay as they are and we won’t have to expend any energy. But most of us do see things in our life or in the world that we would like to be different” (Wheatley, 2002). Without first listening, and then by expanding the energy to get engaged, we cannot begin to change things for the better for the LGBT student and their teachers. We must be willing to “work together to restore hope to the future, we need to include a new and strange ally—our willingness to be disturbed. Our willingness to have our beliefs and ideas challenged by what others think. No one person or perspective can give us the answers we need to the problems of today (Wheatley, 2002).”

As stated in Chapter I, validated through the literature in Chapter II, and reinforced with the data gathered in Chapter IV, the necessity for creating and maintaining programs that empower future teachers is not only paramount, but is also the only goal that legitimizes a program’s effectiveness as it addresses its own normative, which should be a culture of

acceptance rather than one of avoidance. As Dyer stated, “If you change the way you look at things, the things you look at change” (Dyer, 2014).

References

- ACLU (2007, March 1). *American civil liberties union: because freedom can't protect itself*. [What's Your Problem?]. Retrieved on April 4, 2013 from http://www.aclu.org/lgbt-rights_hiv-aids/whats-your-problem.
- ACLU (2012). *American civil liberties union: Because freedom can't protect itself*. [LGBT: Youth & Schools]. Retrieved on April 4, 2013 from <http://www.aclu.org/lgbt-rights/lgbt-youth-schools>.
- Advocates for Youth. (2008). *Creating safe space for GLBTQ youth: A toolkit*. Retrieved September 10, 2008, from <http://www.advocatesfor youth.org/publications>
- Anti-Defamation League. (2008a). *ADL Curriculum Connections*. Retrieved September 17, 2008, from <http://www.adl.org/education/curriculum>
- Anti-Defamation League. (2008b). *A world of difference institute: Recommended multicultural and anti-bias books for children*. Retrieved September 15, 2008, from <http://www.adl.org/bibliography>
- Armstrong, K. (1994). *The silent minority within a minority: Focusing on the needs of gay youth in our public schools*. 24 Golden Gate U.L. Rev.67 LEXIS (1994).
- Banks, J. A., & McGee-Banks, C.A. (Eds.). (2004). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bieschke, K. J., Eberz, A. B., & Wilson, D. (2000). Empirical investigations of lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students. In V. A. Wall & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Toward acceptance: Sexual orientation issues on campus* (pp. 29-60). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Black's Law Dictionary Free 2nd Ed. and The Law Dictionary (2012). Retrieved on October 12, 2012 from <http://thelawdictionary.org/harassment/>.
- Bloom, B. S. (1984). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyd County High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Board of Education of Boyd County, 258 F. Supp. 2d 667 LEXIS 7356 (E.D. Ky. 2003).
- Brown, E.L. (September/October 2004). What precipitates change in cultural diversity awareness during a multicultural course: The message or the method? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(4), 325-340.

- Brunner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bullock, P., et al. (September 2010). Looking below the surface: An analysis of an elementary teacher education program diversity transformation. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 1(3), 161-167.
- Bullying. (2012). Retrieved December 1, 2012, from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-is-bullying/index.html>.
- Butler, K., & Byrne, T. (1992). Homophobia among pre-service elementary teachers. *Journal of Health Education*, 23(6), 355–359.
- Bygstad, B., & Munkvold, B. E. (2007). *The significance of member validation in qualitative analysis: Experiences from a longitudinal case study*. In System Sciences, 2007. HICSS 2007. 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on (pp. 243b-243b).
- Center for Disease Control (2001). *School health guidelines to prevent unintentional injuries and violence, and prevention*. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/>
- Colin v. Orange Unified School District. 83 F. Supp. 2d 1135 LEXIS 1742 (C.D. Cal. 2000).
- Commencement Address at American University (1963). (John F. Kennedy: Presidential Library and Museum) [video file]. Retrieved on February 13, 2014 from <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/BWC7I4C9QUmLG9J6I8oy8w.aspx>
- Conn, K. (2006). *Bullying in K-12 public schools: Searching for solutions*, Commonwealth Education Policy Institute. Retrieved August 22, 2008, from www.cepionline.org
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Courses. (n.d.) retrieved from <http://courseleaf.ua.edu/education/#courseinventory>
- Cushner, K., McClelland, A. & Safford, P. (2003). *Human diversity in education: An integrative approach* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- D'Augelli, A, Grossman, A, & Starks, M. (2006). Childhood gender atypicality, victimization, and PTSD among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(11), 1462-1482.
- Davis v. Monroe County School District, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 1673 LEXIS 3452 (1999).
- Demographics by cubit (Alabama). Retrieved February 11, 2014 from <http://www.alabama-demographics.com/tuscaloosa-demographics>

- Dilley, P. (2002). *Queer man on campus: A history of non-heterosexual college men, 1945-2000*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Diversity. (n.d.). In m-w.com. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diversity>
- Diversity standards. (2012). The University of Alabama Course Catalog. Retrieved on May 3, 2012 from <http://courseleaf.ua.edu/education/#courseinventory>.
- Dyer, W. (2014). Retrieved on February 13, 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wayne_Dyer
- Equal Access Act. (n.d.). In HB-Rights. Org. Retrieved January 29, 2014 from <http://www.hb-rights.org/4students/equal1>
- Erickson, F. (2005). Culture in society and in educational practices. In J.A. Banks & C.A.M Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp.31-60). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ethics. (n.d.). In Dictionary.com. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/ethics>
- Freedman, E. (1994). Small-group pedagogy: Consciousness-raising in conservative times. In *Tilting the Tower*, edited by L. Garber, 36-50. New York: Routledge.
- Friedman-Nimz, R. (2006). Blending support and social action: The power of a gay-straight alliance and PrideWorks conference. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*. 17(4), 258-264.
- Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District, 324 F. 3d 1130 LEXIS 25599 (9th Cir. 2003).
- Foundation for moral law (2013). Retrieved October 15, 2013 from www.morallaw.org.
- Fricke v. Lynch, 491 F.Supp. 381 (D.C.R.I., 1981)
- Gall, M., Gall, j., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research* (7th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Garmon, M. A. (May/June 2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(3), 201- 213.
- Gay, G., & Howard, T. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, 36, 1-16.

- Get That Freak - Interview with Rebecca Haskell and Brian Burtch on Global [Video file, 2008]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K_EN_eUo2Ks
- Giambo, D., & Szecsi, T. (2008). *Does diversity education make a difference in teacher education?* Retrieved September 5, 2008, from <http://epa.oszk.hu/01400/01428/00004/pdf/0404-Szecsi-Giambo.pdf>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
- GLSEN. (2005). *The 2005 national school climate survey, Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from www.glsen.org
- GLSEN. (2011). *School climate in Georgia (Research Brief)*. New York: GLSEN.
- Gorski, P. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 309-318.
- Gray, J. (2012, May 29). *Gay students in Alabama find it easier, though support still not 100 percent*. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://blog.al.com/spotnews/2012/05/gay_students_in_alabama_find_i.html
- Gray, J. (2013, August 28). *LGBT equality group wants to bring Jennifer Knapp to Birmingham for Samford university homecoming*. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://blog.al.com/spotnews/2013/08/lgbt_equality_advocacy_group_w.html
- Gregory, A., Note, Rethinking homophobia in sports: Legal protection for gay and lesbian athletes and coaches, 2 Depaul J. Sports L. Contemp. Probs. 264 LEXIS (2004).
- Griffin, P. (2008). *Chalk talk: Title IX and discrimination based on sexual orientation, Women's Sports Foundation Free Resources*. Retrieved June 21, 2008, from www.womenssportsfoundation.org/cgibin/iowa/issues/itat/resources/article.html?record11175.
- Griffioen, J. (1998, February 10). *Greek fraternity traditions has strong root in homosexuality*. Message posted to <http://www.daghattotymz.com/rkyvz/articles/greeks/greeks.html>
- Grossman, S. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grossman, S. (2008). I just don't like that kid: Confronting and managing personal feelings about children. *Childhood Education; Spring 2008*, 84(3). ProQuest Education Journals, p. 147.

- Habermas, J. (1981). *Postmetaphysical thinking: philosophical essays*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hoepfl, M. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*, 9(1), 115-132.
- The Holmes Partnership. (2012). *The Holmes Partnership goals*. Retrieved on September 5, 2012, from <http://www.udel.edu/holmes/origins.html>.
- Hull, J. W. (2003). *Filling in the gaps: Solving teacher shortages*. Retrieved on December 23, 2012 from <http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/slc-0306-FillingInTheGaps.pdf>.
- Human Rights Campaign (HRC). Retrieved December 2, 2013 from http://www.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/ENDA_Accomplishments-HRC_4.pdf
- Kissen, R. M. (Ed.). (2002). *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, Inc.
- Klenowski, P. (2010). Empirical evaluation of juvenile awareness programs in the United States: Can juveniles be "scared straight"? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 49(4), 254-272.
- Kurz, N., & Paul, P.V. (2005). Toward an inclusive teacher education program. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 15-27.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kyles, C., & Olafson, L. (2008). Uncovering preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity through reflective writing. *Urban Education*, 43(5), 500-518.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 37, 104- 109.
- Larke, P. (1990). Cultural diversity awareness inventory: Assessing the sensitivity of preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 12(3), 23-30.
- LGBT Demographics of the United States. (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_demographics_of_the_United_States
- Lee, A. (2010). *Fear and trembling in Mississippi*. Retrieved January 29, 2014 from <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/daylightatheism/2010/04/fear-and-trembling-in-mississippi/>

- Lee, Y. A. (2004). *A self-study of student teacher supervision for social justice: Six case studies*. Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, United States -- Ohio. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from www.ohiolink.edu database. (Publication No. osu1095515439).
- Loomis v. Visalia Unified School District, 262 F. Supp. 2d 1088 LEXIS 25317 (U.S. Dist., 2001).
- Lovell, A., Note, Protecting students from peer sexual orientation harassment, 86 Calif. L. Rev. 617 LEXIS (1998).
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide*. Triangle Park, NC: Family Health International.
- Maddux, J. A. (1988). *The homophobic attitudes of pre-service teachers*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49(08A), p. 2091.
- Madill, Anna & Gough, Brendan. (2008). Qualitative research and its place in psychological science. *Psychological Methods*, 13(3), 254-271.
- Maney, D., & Cain, R. (1997). Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Journal of School Health*, 67(6), 236-241.
- Marquez-Zenkov K., Corrigan, D., Brockett, C., & Lehrian, S. (2008). *Show me what you know: Student city teachers and social justice in action*. Retrieved August 8, 2008, from www.urbanedjournal.org
- McClendon, R. (2013, February 18). *Alabama gay population 9th smallest per capita in the country, poll shows*. Retrieved from http://blog.al.com/wire/2013/02/alabama_gay_population_9th_sma.html
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Merrick v. Board of Higher Education and State of Oregon. 116 Or.App. 258, 841 P.2d 646 (Or.App., 1992).
- Mertens, D., & Wilson, A. (2012). *Program evaluation theory and practice*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Middleton, V.A. (December 2002). Increasing preservice teachers' diversity beliefs and commitment. *The Urban Review*, 33(4), 343-361.

- Milner, H. R., Flowers, L., Moore, Jr., E., Moore III, E., & Flowers, T. (2003). Pre-service teachers' awareness of multiculturalism and diversity. *The High School Journal*, 87(1), 63-70.
- Myers, J.S. & Sylvester, P. J. (2006). Mantle and crustal sources of Archean anorthosite: a combined in situ-isotopic study of Pb–Pb in plagioclase and Lu–Hf in zircon. *Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology*, 165(1), 1-24.
- Nabozny v. Podlesny. 92 F. 3d 446 LEXIS 18866 (C.A. 7th Cir., 1996).
- Nation at risk (NAR), Retrieved January 1, 2014 from http://datacenter.spps.org/uploads/SOTW_A_Nation_at_Risk_1983.pdf
- National center for lesbian rights (NCLR). Retrieved February 11, 2014 from <http://www.nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/AnnualReport-2007.pdf>
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2008). *Breaking barriers, building bridges: Critical discussion of social issues*. Retrieved September 17, 2008, from <http://www.readwrite think.org/lessons>
- NCATE: The Standard of Excellence in Teacher Preparation. Retrieved July 7, 2012 from <http://ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd4>.
- Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Education Leadership*, 56(1), 28.
- Petrovic, J. (1998). The democratic sieve in teacher education: Confronting heterosexism. *Educational Foundations*, 12, 43–56.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2002). Promoting democracy and overcoming heterosexism in schools: And never the twain shall meet? *Sex Education*, 2(2), 147-156.
- Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people: A national perspective*. New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.
- Rankin, S. (2006). LGBTQA students on campus: Is higher education making the grade? *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 3(2/3), p. 111-116.
- Reiter, A. and Davis, S. (2011). Factors influencing pre-service teachers' beliefs about student achievement: Evaluation of a pre-service teacher diversity awareness program, *Multicultural Education*, Spring, 41-46.
- Rodriguez, N, & Pinar, W. (2007). *Queering straight teachers: Discourse and identity in education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

- Roffman, D.M. (2000). A model for helping schools address policy options regarding gay and lesbian youth, *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 25(2/3), 130-136.
- Rossi, P, Lipsey, M. & Freeman, H. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Safe School Coalition. (2002). *Eighty three thousand youth: Selected findings of eight population-based studies*. Washington: Safe Schools Coalition.
- Safe Zone: LGBTQ campus organizations. (2013). Retrieved December 2, 2013 from <http://safezone.ua.edu/?s=LGBTQ+CAMPUS+ORGANIZATIONS>
- Safe Zone: Updates on employee benefits. (2103). Retrieved December 2, 2013 from <http://safezone.ua.edu/news/updates-on-employee-benefits-for-same-sex-couples-at-ua/>
- Safe Zone. (2014). Retrieved December 6, 2013 from <http://www.coastal.edu/media/studentaffairs/counselingservices/pdfs/CCU%20Safe%20Zone%20Manual%202nd%20Edition%208-13.pdf>
- Safe Zone Ally. (2014). Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://safezone.ua.edu/training/>
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Sanlo, R. L. (1999). *Unheard voices*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Sears, J. (1991). *Growing up gay in the south: Race, gender, and journeys of the spirit*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Sears, J. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? In K. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curriculum* (pp. 29–79). New York: Haworth Press.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63-75.
- Sherwin, G., & Jennings, T. (2006). Feared, forgotten, or forbidden: Sexual orientation topics in secondary teacher preparation programs in the USA. *Teaching Education*, 17(3), pp. 207-223.
- Smith, J. (2012, January 25). *SPLC accuses county schools of violating gay rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.tuscaloosaneews.com/article/20120125/NEWS/120129866/1007template=printart>

- Social justice. (n.d.). Retrieved January 29, 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice
- Sound off. (2013, November 6). In Tuscaloosa news.com. Retrieved from <http://www.tuscaloosaneews.com/article/20131106/NEWS/131109816/0/search>
- Spectrum (2014). Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://spectrum.ua.edu/about.html>
- The Southern Poverty Law Center. (2006, Spring). *Teaching Tolerance*. Retrieved September 17, 2008, from <http://www.tolerance.org/teach/magazine>
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models* (2nd ed.). Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Stufflebeam, D. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Szalacha, L. (2004). Educating teachers on LGBTQ issues: A review of research and program evaluations. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, 1(4), 67– 79.
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. 20 U.S.C.A. §§ 1681-1688 (West Supp. 2006).
- Tuohy, F. (2013, September 3). *Equal rights for LGBT citizens should be a core value of Alabama's Republican Party* (Opinion from Equality Alabama). AL.com. Retrieved from http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/09/equal_rights_for_lgbt_citizens.html
- U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014). *State and county quickfacts*. Retrieved February 11, 2014 from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/01/0177256.html>
- United States v. O'Brien. 391 U.S. 367, 88 S. Ct. 1673; 20 L. Ed. 2d 672; (1968 U.S. LEXIS)
- University of Alabama 2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog. (2012). Retrieved February 13, 2014, from <http://courseleaf.ua.edu/pdf/2012-2013.pdf>
- Valentin, S. (2006). Addressing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education*, 127(2), 196-202.
- Wallace, B. (2000). A call for change in multicultural training at graduate schools of education: Educating to end oppression and for social justice. *Teachers College Record*, 102, 1086-1111.
- Wasonga, T.A. & Piveral, J.A. (2004). Diversity and modeling of multicultural principles of education in a teacher education program. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 6(3), 42- 47.
- Weist, L.R. (1998). Using immersion experiences to shake up preservice teachers' views about cultural differences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 358-365.

Wheatley, M. (2002). *Turning to one another: Simple conversations to restore hope to the future*. San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler Publishers, Inc.

Appendix A

Office for Research

Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

December 9, 2013

Joseph Woodruff
Dept of ELPTS
College of Education
Box 870302

Re: IRB#: 13-OR-378 "Is the Closet Door Still Closed in 2014? (CIPP Program Evaluation of Preservice Teacher Diversity Training Regarding LGBT Issues within a Large University in the Southeastern United States)"

Dear Mr. Woodruff:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Your application will expire on December 8, 2014. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent forms to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.



358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
fax (205) 348-7189
toll free (877) 820-3066

Appendix B

1

AAHRPP DOCUMENT #192
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM

Informed Consent for a Non-Medical Study

Study title: Is the Closet Door Still Closed in 2014? (CIPP Program Evaluation of K-12 Preservice Teacher Diversity Training Regarding LGBT Issues with a Large University in the Southeastern United States)

Investigator's Name, Position, Faculty or Student Status: Joseph Woodruff (primary researcher), Ed.D. doctoral student (Education Administration)

You are being asked to take part in a research study.

This study is called "Is the Closet Door Still Closed in 2014? (CIPP Program Evaluation of K-12 Preservice Teacher Diversity Training Regarding LGBT Issues with a Large University in the Southeastern United States)".

The study is being done by Joseph Woodruff, and I am a graduate student within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at the University of Alabama. I am being supervised by Dr. John Petrovic, who is a professor of Social and Cultural Studies in Education within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at the University of Alabama.

Is the researcher being paid for this study? I, as the researcher, am not being compensated for this study. I am completing this study as a partial fulfillment of my Ed.D. degree within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at the University of Alabama.

This study is paid for by myself. I am not receiving any outside funding.

Is this research developing a product that will be sold, and if so, will the investigator profit from it? No, this research is not being developed as a sellable product. I am completing this study as a partial fulfillment of my Ed.D. degree within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at the University of Alabama.

Does the investigator have any conflict of interest in this study? There is no foreseeable conflict of interest within this study.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 12/9/13
EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2014

What is this study about? What is the investigator trying to learn?

The purpose of this program evaluation is to examine the four components of the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations) in the diversity training program conceptualization and design delivered to college of education K-12 preservice teachers at a large university in the southeastern United States (referred to in this dissertation as University A) as the training relates to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues. This research will focus on each of the four CIPP components through document analysis of targeted courses and qualitative interviews of program stakeholders. This CIPP evaluation model will focus on the formative (Content, Input, and Process) and summative (Product) approaches to improvement of projects, programs, personnel, products, institutions, and systems within the K-12 preservice teachers degree program.

Why is this study important or useful?

This knowledge is important or may prove useful because several past court cases have shown a lack of support for LGBT students within the K-12 setting. *Teachers are entering the workplace without a proper skill set for establishing environments conducive to learning for all students.* Although thousands of educators are prepared annually to go forth and teach, there is an apparent hole in training programs for student teachers. This is supported through the number of articles and court cases evidenced concerning LGBT issues within the K-12 setting.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?

You have been asked to be in this study because you are a stakeholder within the K-12 preservice teacher program at the University of Alabama (UA). You are either a faculty member at UA (program coordinator of or a professor of a course within the Elementary Education/Secondary Education/Multiple Abilities Program/Curriculum & Instruction, and Foundations programs or you are a currently enrolled student within one of the courses leading to degree completion within one of the aforementioned degree programs.

How many people will be in this study?

About eight to ten faculty members (including the program coordinators) would be included in the study as Case One, and 32 to 40 student interview volunteers will be recruited as Case Two. Program coordinators will be solicited and selected based upon their job position and faculty members teaching related courses will be solicited based upon the recommendations of the program coordinators. I, the primary researcher, will visit a class meeting and offer an explanation of the study and will also offer all students within those classes a card asking for their contact information (name, cell phone, and preferred email). I will explain that if selected they will be contacted to establish an interview time. Students selected will receive a \$15.00 VISA gift card for interview completion will be recommended by the program coordinators.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

1. You will be contacted to establish an agreed upon interview meeting time and place.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
 CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 12/9/13
 EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2014

2. You will be given a brief explanation of the study, its purpose, assured anonymity, and storage of results.
3. You will be asked a series of questions concerning your opinions regarding diversity training for K-12 preservice teachers at the University of Alabama as the training relates to LGBT issues faced within a K-12 setting.

How much time will I spend being in this study?

Each interview should take approximately 45 to 60 minutes of your time.

Will being in this study cost me anything?

The only cost to you from this study is 45 to 60 minutes of your time.

Will I be compensated for being in this study?

Program coordinators and faculty members interviewed will not receive compensation for their interview completion. However, in appreciation of their time, participating students will receive a \$15.00 VISA gift card upon completion of the interview.

Can the investigator take me out of this study? I, as the primary researcher, may take you out of the study if I feel that the study is upsetting you or if something happens that means you no longer meet the study requirements. However, this is unlikely once criteria have been met. Any participant, however, has the option of withdrawing themselves from study participation.

What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?

There is little or no foreseen risk to the interviews or interviews are used (particularly since all identities will be kept anonymous). Each participant will be assigned a number (for example, student participant #1, faculty participant #1, etc).

What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?

Your participation in this study will assist in collecting information that may prove useful in enlightening choices for professional development for training at the university level. The research is being conducted as a program evaluation using the CIPP model and by design is limited to a specific programming setting and situation. The research conducted in this study will simply be offered as information for progress for this particular college of education. It is offered as information, and it may simply be used as information to edify and enlighten as well as informing future choices for professional development.

What are the benefits to science or society?

As stated above, the research is being conducted as a program evaluation using the CIPP model and by design is limited to a specific programming setting and situation. The research conducted in this study will simply be offered as information for progress for this particular college of education. It is offered as information, and it may simply be used as information to edify and enlighten as well as informing future choices for professional development.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IGB
 CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 12/9/13
 EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2014

How will my privacy be protected?

Privacy and confidentiality are two different things. Please address them separately in the consent form.

As the primary researcher, I will assure participants that neither their identities nor the information they provide will be revealed to any other parties and their particular information will not be identifiable in the completed study. As previously mentioned, each interviewee will be assigned a pseudonym/number (for example, student #1 or faculty #1).

Additionally, the interview locations and times will be agreed upon with the interview participants. All interviews will be audiotaped to ensure accurate interview transcription. If a possible participant declines an audiotaped interview, he or she will be dropped from the study and another candidate will be chosen from the pool of volunteers.

In addition, all participants will be informed that all audio recordings of interviews will be erased after the transcriptions and member-checking have been completed. Member-checking is the opportunity for the interviewee to see a copy of the written transcript to be given opportunity to verify or refute the transcription. This affords the research data a higher level of accountability and reliability.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

Confidentiality will be safeguarded in two methods. The first will be the limited number of people with access to any collected data. Myself, as the primary researcher, and Dr. Petrovic, as the supervising professor, will be the only ones with access to any recordings or transcripts. All participants will be informed that all audio recordings of interviews as well as written transcriptions will be kept locked within a locking cabinet, which I as the primary researcher will hold the only key.

If you choose to decline to be audio-taped, then you will be dismissed from the study and another volunteer will be solicited. All audio-taped interviews will be transcribed, and your identity will be protected within the transcript.

Video-taping will also be used only as a back-up to the audio-taping. All videos will be erased upon completion of the transcription from the audiotaping.

What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?

The alternative to being in this study is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. There will be no effect on your relations with the University of Alabama.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
 CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 12/9/13
 EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2014

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board ("the IRB") is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study later on, please call Joseph Woodruff, the primary researcher, at (404) 304-1007 or email at icwoodruff@crimson.ua.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in it.

I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 12/9/13
EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2014

Appendix C

Primary research questions (with suggested questioning foci)

1. “What is the local climate as it relates to LGBT issues?” (Context)
 - How do you define the climate surrounding the location of the training program?
 - How do you define the training environment?
1. “What resources/instructional methods/other materials addressing LGBT diversity issues are made available for students?” (Input)
 - What is the students’ existing knowledge?
 - Is the course content clearly defined?
2. “How is diversity training implemented programmatically?” (Process)
 - Are there any problems related to learning?
 - Is knowledge only transferred to students, or do they use and apply it?
3. “What is the perceived impact of the program on preservice teachers?”
(Product)
 - How do students use what they have learned?
 - How was the overall experience for the teachers and for the students?
 - What are the main ‘lessons learned’?

Appendix D

Guided Interview Questions relating to above primary research questions:

1. How would you say the climate of University X influences your training (delivery) in regards to LGBT issues? Why? (Context)
2. What is your understanding of diversity trainings for preservice teachers at University X as they relate/address LGBT issues? (Context)
3. “Do you feel that there is a need for LGBT diversity training within the preservice training program?” (Context)
4. Program coordinators and faculty: “In your role within the training program for preservice teachers as it relates to LGBT issues, what pedagogical methods/special methods/content do you expose your students to?” (Input)

Students: “In your role within the training program for preservice teachers as it relates to LGBT issues, what pedagogical methods/special methods/content do you feel you have been exposed to?” (Input)

5. How are the training needs of preservice teachers examined and exposed? (Input)
6. When needs are addressed, how are these LGBT trainings implemented? (Process)
7. Do you feel that the implementations have been effective? Why or why not? (Process)
8. Program coordinators and faculty: “How do you evaluate the preservice teachers? Does the evaluation address LGBT issues?” (Process)

Students: “How do your teachers evaluate you? Does the evaluation address LGBT issues?” (Process)

9. Do you feel that there are measures in place to evaluate the LGBT training objectives for preservice teachers? (Product)
10. If so, how? If not, what would your suggestions be? (Product)
11. “Have you seen any of the training received/delivered in practice?” (Product)

Appendix E

Contact script for interview solicitation (email or phone)

Good morning (afternoon),

My name is Joseph Woodruff, and I am a doctoral student pursuing an Ed.D. degree within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies. I am being supervised by Dr. John Petrovic, who is a professor of Social and Cultural Studies in Education within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies.

You are being asked to take part in a research study that will examine how K-12 preservice teachers/supervisors perceive their roles and the effectiveness of an undergraduate teacher preparation program. The focus of the program evaluation utilizing the CIPP (Content, Input, Process, and Product) model deals with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) training. The purpose of this program evaluation is to examine the four components of the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations) in the diversity training program conceptualization and design delivered to college of education K-12 preservice teachers at a large university in the southeastern United States (referred to in this dissertation as University X) as the training relates to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues. This research will focus on each of the four CIPP components through document analysis of targeted courses and qualitative interviews of program stakeholders. This CIPP evaluation model will focus on the formative (Content, Input, and Process) and summative (Product) approaches to improvement of projects, programs, personnel, products, institutions, and systems within the K-12 preservice teachers degree program.

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are a stakeholder within the K-12 preservice teacher program at University X. You are either a faculty member or you are a currently enrolled student within one of the courses leading to degree completion within one of the aforementioned degree programs.

This is a request for your voluntary participation in this study. Your responses will remain completely confidential. Involvement in this study will require audiotaped and videotaped interviews. All recordings and transcriptions will be kept securely locked within a locking cabinet. I as the primary researcher will be the only one with key access. There is little or no foreseen risk to you since all identities will be kept anonymous. Each participant will be assigned a number (for example, student participant #1, faculty participant #1).

Each interview should take approximately 45 to 60 minutes of your time. You are free not to answer any questions you find objectionable, and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

I will conduct your interview, and I will be happy to try to work out a time and location that will be convenient and comfortable for you to interview candidly and honestly.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study before the interview or after the interview is completed, you may contact me at (404) 304-1007 or jcwoodruff@crimson.ua.edu or Dr. John Petrovic at (205) 348-0465.

Appendix F

Course Descriptions

2012-2013

Foundations course 1 (3 sem. hrs.)

An examination of the foundations of education in a modern democratic society and the critical project of promoting social justice through schooling. Attention is also paid to how theories of human nature and the social good shape distinctive philosophies of education.

2013-2014

Foundations course 1 (3 sem. hrs.)

An examination of the foundations of education in a modern democratic society and the critical project of promoting social justice through schooling. Attention is also paid to how theories of human nature and the social good shape distinctive philosophies of education.

2012-2013

Foundation course 2 (3 sem. hrs.)

An examination of the foundations of education in a modern democratic society and the critical project of promoting social justice through schooling. Attention is also paid to how theories of human nature and the social good shape distinctive philosophies of education.

2013-2014

Foundation course 2 (3 sem. hrs.)

An examination of the foundations of education in a modern democratic society and the critical project of promoting social justice through schooling. Attention is also paid to how theories of human nature and the social good shape distinctive philosophies of education.

2012-2013

Elementary Education course (1-6 sem. hr.)

This course is designed to teach students the principles and theory of classroom management. Emphasis will be placed on the design and implementation of classroom management methods and techniques.

2013-2014

Elementary Education course (1-6 sem. hr.)

This course is designed to teach students the principles and theory of classroom management. Emphasis will be placed on the design and implementation of classroom management methods and techniques.

2012-2013

Secondary Education course (1-3 sem. hr.)

A reflective teaching model will be used to explore differences in race, class, gender, and academic achievement as they affect classroom interaction and academic success.

2013-2014

Secondary Education course (1-3 sem. hr.)

A reflective teaching model will be used to explore differences in race, class, gender, and academic achievement as they affect classroom interaction and academic success.

Appendix G

Student interview volunteer form

My name is Joseph Woodruff, and I am a doctoral student pursuing an Ed.D. degree within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies. I am being supervised by Dr. John Petrovic, who is a professor of Social and Cultural Studies in Education within the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies.

I am asking you to take part in a research study that will examine how K-12 preservice teachers/supervisors perceive their roles and the effectiveness of an undergraduate teacher preparation program. The focus of the program evaluation utilizing the CIPP (Content, Input, Process, and Product) model deals with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) training. The purpose of this program evaluation is to examine the four components of the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations) in the diversity training program conceptualization and design delivered to college of education K-12 preservice teachers at University X as the training relates to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues. This research will focus on each of the four CIPP components through document analysis of targeted courses and qualitative interviews of program stakeholders.

You are being asked to participate in this study as a stakeholder within one of the undergraduate degree programs in the College of Education. The data gathered from program coordinators and faculty members will be analyzed/coded and treated as Case One, and the data gathered from student interviews will be treated as Case Two. The data from the two cases will be compared and contrasted in the results section. Your identity will be anonymous within the written dissertation.

Students who volunteer to participate in interviewing will be given fifteen dollars as compensation for their time. I would love to schedule an interview with you ASAP. I would need approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour of your time to interview you regarding your perceptions.

Thank you for your consideration. If it is easier to respond to reach you through email, I am happy to correspond this way. You are welcome to send scheduling options through email. However, if it would be better for me to call you to schedule, please indicate that and I will be happy to contact you through a phone call.

Student Name _____

Instructor and course name _____

Email address (please print) _____

Cell phone (optional) _____

Which is your preferred contact? _____