



*The College of Education's*  
*Conceptual Framework*

**Detroit, Michigan**

*Revision as of 1/25/06*

Note: Content of 4.1 and 4.2 were approved by unanimous vote of the College Assembly on 11/9/05; the Goals areas were approved by a unanimous vote of the College Assembly on 1/18/06.

## CONTENTS

4.0 - The Conceptual Framework.....	3
4.1 - The vision and mission of the institution and unit.....	3
4.2 - The unit's philosophy, purposes, and goals.....	11
4.3 - Knowledge bases including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies, that inform the unit's conceptual framework.....	17
A. Content and pedagogical knowledge.....	17
B. Knowledge of human development and learning.....	19
C. Community-school collaboration and experiential factors.....	20
D. Systematic assessment of student learning.....	23
E. Reflective practice.....	24
F. Leadership.....	25
G. Embedded technology.....	27
H. Professional disposition.....	29
4.4 - Candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards.....	31
4.5 - A description of the system by which candidate proficiencies described in 4.4 are regularly assessed.....	36
Conclusion.....	37
References .....	38

# Wayne State University

## College of Education

### *4.0 - The Conceptual Framework*

Dated: 1/25/06

***Precondition #4: The unit has a well developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability.***

#### **4.1 - THE VISION AND MISSION OF THE INSTITUTION AND UNIT.**

##### **Vision**

##### **Wayne State University**

Wayne State University has established as its vision the goal to provide for its students a **“World-Class Education in the Real World.”** This vision embodies the institution’s commitment to excellence in research and teaching, but also to serving the larger metropolitan community as it faces the social, economic, and technological challenges of contemporary life.

##### **College of Education**

Within the context of the University's vision, the College of Education has established as its unique theme the goal of developing **“The Effective Urban Educator: Reflective, Innovative, and Committed to Diversity.”** As such, the College believes that it can best embrace the University’s vision by developing educators as critical, creative thinkers prepared to assume leadership roles in

settings in the real world in which it is located -- a metropolitan environment with people who are diverse. This diversity includes -- but is not limited to -- ethnicity, class, gender, age, beliefs, learning styles, and special needs.

Reflection and innovation are essential, recursive practices that have long been recognized as important and valuable cognitive processes for developing quality teachers (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Schon, 1983). The College's commitment to diversity is the product both of the location of the institution (the opportunity to capitalize on the social and institutional diversity of the Detroit metropolitan area and the varied and unique backgrounds of students who matriculate at Wayne State University), but also the desire to empower educators to enable them to teach in diverse environments and to ground them in principles of social justice. These commitments are equally applicable to faculty as well as students, and are reflected in the degree programs and courses offered by the College of Education.

### **Mission**

The general mission of the University is to "...discover, examine, transmit and apply knowledge that contributes to the positive development and well being of individuals, organizations, and society" (Wayne State University, 2001, p.1). The College theme articulates the ways this broad concept relates to the specific context of the College of Education. The theme serves as a foundation that undergirds the work of the faculty, the design of programs within the College, and the students' professional preparation and growth.

## **Faculty**

Faculty members in the College of Education are expected to conduct research and engage in grant work and scholarly publication in order to advance the professional knowledge base in their various areas of expertise. Reflective practice is essential for success in this area. As active researchers, faculty members are continually involved in the cycle of reflection and development of innovative practice which, in turn, informs one's teaching in College classrooms, and ensures that students experience best practices not only for their benefit but also for the benefit of their pupils (P-12 pupils and other learners in traditional and non-traditional settings) for whom they will eventually be responsible. Substantial support for scholarly endeavors is provided through the College's Office of the Dean and the Office of the Associate Dean for Research. Non-tenured faculty undergo an annual review where their scholarly work is closely monitored; and all faculty are rewarded for scholarly productivity, and quality teaching and service through the University's merit salary system and advancement in rank.

Hiring policies within the University encourage diversity in the faculty, particularly as regards gender and ethnicity (Wayne State University, 1986). The Office of Equal Opportunity, Policy Development and Analysis closely monitors the hiring of all new faculty to ensure diversification of recruitment resources and applicant pools (Wayne State University, 2004).

Within the College itself, the Diversity Committee provides direction to the faculty as regards operational policies and curriculum development and/or

alteration relative to issues of diversity and social justice. Consistent with current perspectives regarding best practices in dealing with issues of diversity, faculty attempt to model dispositions for students that embrace diversity such as open-mindedness, valuing of varied points of view, curiosity involving differences in humans, affirmation of an individual's background knowledge as a valid basis for learning, and a willingness to serve as a change agent (Delpit, 1996; Fordham, 1996; Foster, 1997; Hale, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

### **Program Design**

Through faculty reflection, programs and courses offered to students in the College (undergraduate through doctoral levels) are continually revised and aligned with current research findings, standards developed by professional and specialty area organizations, policies of the Michigan Department of Education, the University and College Strategic Plans (College of Education, 2001), a long history of professional practice, and continued involvement in institutions in a variety of traditional and non-traditional settings where our students are hired. By this process, the programs and courses retain their innovative edge. Programmatic review is completed on an ongoing basis as part of regularly scheduled meetings of the various program area committees within the College. The primary instrument for course review is the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form that all faculty are required to administer to students at the conclusion of each course they teach. Course review is also accomplished when mentor faculty observe new faculty and provide them feedback regarding their teaching.

In designing programs, faculty plan to infuse courses, where appropriate, with strategies for educating diverse populations of students. This commitment to inclusive teaching is consistent with research that indicates that heterogeneous, inclusive instruction improves student outcomes both academically and socially (Baker, Wang, & Walberg, 1994; Carlberg & Kavale, 1980; Cole & Meyer, 1991; Hale, 1982; Hale, 2001; Waldron & McLeskey, 1998). Moreover, faculty incorporate into courses as well issues involving diversity. The intent is to prepare educators who embody three core democratic values: political empowerment, diversity, and social justice. The first of these qualities initially involves helping students value the importance of education to the functioning of a democratic society (Appiah, 2003; Banks, 1990; Gutmann, 1999; Howe, 1997). In turn, it necessitates employing teaching/learning strategies in all courses, thus replicating the democratic process itself and enabling students to participate as equals in that process.

Capitalizing on our diverse student population, professors are encouraged to employ a variety of delivery systems in courses, particularly ones that involve authentic, participatory learning experiences, inquiry, critical and creative thinking, self-evaluation, and small group work that enables students to interact with others who may think and value the world differently. The equalization of educational opportunity requires the utilization of approaches that neither assimilate nor structurally separate students who are diverse based on any personological variable (Deschenes, et al., 2001; Hale, 2001; Larson & Ovando, 2001; McLaren, 1997; Nieto, 2002; Platt, et al., 2003; Sleeter, 1995; Valdez,

2001). The use of such approaches accepts and affirms "... the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers reflect" (Nieto, 2002, p. 29).

The third core democratic value – social justice – involves helping students recognize the potential in education for improving the lives of individuals and communities, and for transforming societal inequities (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Friere, 1998). By helping students develop critical consciousness and raising their awareness of the social, economic, and political issues impacting education today, faculty help them to avoid accepting the world as it is and become agents for social action to improve society, and, in turn, impart these qualities to their pupils.

## **Students**

Students develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to become effective professionals through challenging coursework, which emphasizes reflective practice completed as a necessary part of course assignments and through interaction with peers in individual courses. In the preservice teacher preparation programs, students are organized into cohort groups and experience multiple field placements in schools, clinics, and other community settings where they actively participate in practice teaching. In these settings, students engage in time-tested and innovative practices learned in the college classroom. They then evaluate their teaching based on theory learned in the College classroom, and draw implications from these evaluations for improving their instructional skills.

Within their cohort groups, students are required to reflect on their teaching experiences via small group interaction. They also complete individual reflective journals. As a capstone experience, every preservice student is required to create a portfolio – a reflection on their entire teacher preparation experience – organized around 12 student teacher competencies and based on INTASC standards. Engaging in extensive and ongoing reflection prepares students to improve their own teaching capability, and is consistent with generally acceptable practices for advancing the teaching profession through reflective-innovative practice (Clift, Houston, and Pugach, 1990; Howard, 2003; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Milner, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Schon, 1987).

The Strategic Action Plan for the University 2001-2006 emphasizes the vital impact of the institution's urban setting: "Located in the culturally rich city of Detroit, Wayne State University draws its strength from the rich tapestry of the urban experience. At WSU, education is the fabric from which understanding and respect for the diversity of community, culture, values and life is woven" (Wayne State University, 2001, p. 1). Through the extensive use of cohort groups, small group activity, field placements across the metropolitan area, and the like, the College capitalizes on the diversity of its student population and its location in the Detroit metropolitan area by maximizing in its programs and courses interactive experiences among students and between students and the various individuals populating local P-12 schools, clinics, and institutions.

In addition, it is expected that students will develop greater awareness and sensitivity to diverse populations through the influence of the dispositions

modeled by faculty who embrace diversity. Consistent with current research, direct exposure to people different from oneself and the influence of teachers are two critical factors contributing to preservice teachers' growth in this area (Garmon, 2004; Smith, Moallem, & Sherrill, 1997).

### **Coherence**

The shared vision and mission statements of the University and College serve as the theoretical basis for decisions made throughout the unit regarding the total operation of the College. The College of Education Assembly, whose membership includes faculty, academic staff, and administrators, is the vehicle primarily responsible for coordinating the operation of the College. Specific committees of the Assembly, with representation from all divisions in the College, ensure the cohesion of the operation. For example, the Curriculum Committee reviews proposed additions and alterations to all programs and courses offered college-wide, while the Doctoral Academic Standards Committee oversees the operation of the two doctoral degree programs (Ph.D. and Ed.D.) available in all four academic divisions within the College. Ultimately, any revisions or alterations to programs must be approved by a majority vote of the Assembly, and the business of the College is conducted in accordance with the principles articulated in the Bylaws of the College of Education Assembly (College of Education, 2004). Thus, a structure is in place within the College to ensure operational and programmatic cohesion and accountability throughout the unit.

## 4.2 - THE UNIT'S PHILOSOPHY, PURPOSES, AND GOALS

### Philosophy and Purposes

Programs in the College of Education are organized around the following beliefs regarding learning and teaching:

1. **Effective educators recognize that learning is a continuous, lifelong process and is a social-cognitive phenomenon where, in part, knowledge is discovered and developed through social interactions, critical thinking, and experiential learning.**

Construction of knowledge is facilitated when the learner actively participates in the process (Dewey, 1938). In turn, participatory learning, when combined with continuous reflection, contributes not only to reflective practice, but engenders innovation and greater awareness of and sensitivity to issues of diversity (Banks, 1990; Clift, et al., 1990; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Milner, 2003; Smith, et al., 1997; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

2. **Effective educators examine their beliefs and practice through the use of critical thinking skills and problem solving techniques, and engage in reflection ultimately for the purpose of informing their practice** (Banks, 1990; Clift, et al., 1990; Gay & Kirkland, 2003).

Meaningful reflection is an active process that involves identifying puzzling or perplexing situations, framing and

reframing these problems from multiple points of view, connecting them to experiential, anecdotal evidence, and forming generalizations that align theory with practice (Loughran, 2002; Gay & Kirkland, 2003).

**3. Effective educators understand that the foundation for innovative practice is a sound knowledge base.**

They are knowledgeable in their chosen fields of expertise, in pedagogy (the design, delivery and evaluation of learning experiences), and in matters of human growth and development (Grossman, Schoenfeld, & Lee, 2005; Horowitz, Darling-Hammond, Bransford, Comer, Rosebrock, Austin, & Rust, 2005; Kramer, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Especially in the current age of rapid technological change, effective educators integrate technology in all phases of practice, including collaboration with other educators, design, implementation and evaluation of learning experiences, and maintaining current knowledge (ISTE, 2000). They seek to continually upgrade, add to, and revise their knowledge bases; and they utilize their knowledge to continually design and redesign learning experiences, which meet the ever-changing needs of the individuals they teach.

**4. Effective educators acknowledge the value of theory in designing best practices for learners, and are capable of translating that theory into meaningful practice (Banks, 2004;**

Delpit, 1996; Shulman, 1998).

Beliefs about learning are directly linked with beliefs about teaching. Effective teaching is learner-centered, reflective and empowering for students (Darling-Hammond, Griffin, & Wise, 1992; Gutmann, 1999; Howe, 1997). Effective educators are facilitators of participatory learning, mentors, motivators, innovators, scholars, and agents of change (Dewey, 1938).

**5. Effective educators believe that democracy is grounded in social justice.**

They acknowledge the critical importance of education in the functioning of a democratic society, recognize its potential for improving the lives of individuals and communities, and also for transforming societal inequities (Banks, 1990; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Dewey, 1938; Freire, 1998; Gutmann, 1999; Howe, 1997).

**6. Effective educators value inclusion.**

College programs that prepare effective educators are open to individuals who come from a wide range of social, cultural, economic, and other affiliations; and whose ways of viewing the world and knowing and learning about it differ. This diversity serves as a source for building true learning communities when inclusive teachers provide authentic, differentiated, culturally sensitive instruction to students with a wide range of interests,

needs, and ability levels (Hale, 1992; Peterson & Hittie, 2003).

Educators at all levels of education possess and model for students dispositions that enhance one's awareness of and sensitivity to the varied needs, interests, and desires of the diverse population of students they will teach and serve (Delpit, 1996; Fordham, 1996; Foster, 1997; Garmon, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Smith, et al., 1997; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

College faculty recognize the dual responsibility of both serving diverse post-secondary students and of raising their awareness about -- and increasing their knowledge and skill for being responsive to -- diversity among those they will serve as educators and other school personnel (Anderson, Attwood, & Howard, 2004). They also believe that issues regarding diversity, social justice, and empowerment are dealt with most efficiently and effectively when infused in all courses within a program (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

7. **Effective educators believe that reflection, innovation, and diversity awareness and sensitivity are recursive processes, all of which inform one's practice** (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Smith, et al., 1997).

As faculty espousing the aforementioned beliefs, we understand that we should be highly competent in our areas of expertise, and communicate that competence effectively to our students. It is equally important that we are

reflective, innovative, and sensitive to our students' diverse needs and respect and value their differences (Smith, 1998). Ultimately, our practice in the College classroom should reflect the purposes and beliefs we espouse.

### **Goals**

The following areas serve as a framework for the expected goals and outcomes of the various programs within the College of Education:

- A. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- B. Knowledge of Human Development and Learning
- C. Community-School Based Collaboration and Experiential Factors
- D. Systematic Assessment of Student Learning
- E. Reflective Practice
- F. Leadership
- G. Embedded Technology
- H. Professional Dispositions

Thus, a reflective, innovative educator committed to diversity is one who:

- A. Uses current subject matter, pedagogical and processing knowledge to design, develop, implement, and evaluate individual and group learning.
- B. Understands and applies current, validated principles of human growth and development and the influence of context on the learner to maximize individual, group, and organizational learning.
- C. Utilizes variety of institutional, human, and environmental resources in an urban,

metropolitan community to enhance one's work with diverse groups of learners in schools, agencies, institutions and organizations.

D. Employs a variety of authentic assessment tools and strategies to both measure and evaluate the quality of one's own teaching, as well as students' academic and affective growth and development.

E. Engages in a reflective process for the purpose of self-evaluation of one's teaching, as well as assessment of learners' progress, ultimately to ensure the quality and currency of one's practice.

F. Views oneself as an educational leader in one's own discipline, and as an agent of change in order to improve the organizations in which one works and the quality of the educational programs they deliver.

G. Uses technology as an integral part of one's teaching and learning, and is both a learner and a model for the use of technology in educational settings.

H. Views oneself as a lifelong learner, and espouses a professional disposition consistent with the essence of an effective urban educator who is reflective, innovative, and committed to diversity.

### **4.3 - KNOWLEDGE BASES INCLUDING THEORIES, RESEARCH, THE WISDOM OF PRACTICE, AND EDUCATION POLICIES THAT INFORM THE UNIT'S CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.**

Knowledge Bases and Theories that Inform and Guide our Programs: In this section (4.3), we present a broad outcome statement for each of the goals, A through H. For goal A, for example, a reflective, innovative educator committed to diversity is one who: “uses current subject matter ... and group learning.” Next, in a narrative format, we present knowledge bases, theories, research and wisdom of practice that inform and guide our programs.

We believe these knowledge bases to include the following:

- A. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- B. Knowledge of Human Development and Learning
- C. Community-School Collaboration and Experiential Factors
- D. Systematic Assessment of Student Learning
- E. Reflective Practice
- F. Leadership
- G. Embedded Technology
- H. Professional Disposition

#### A: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Content knowledge is the foundation upon which all College of Education programs are built. Content knowledge includes broad foundational knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and processes of thinking, e.g. the ability to reason, problem-solve, analyze ideas from multiple perspectives, connect ideas across experiential contexts (Bransford, et. al., 2005), and understand that learning is a lifelong process. Such processes of thinking contribute to the development of a candidate’s professional disposition.

The College of Education works in close collaboration with other colleges in which students build foundational content and subject matter knowledge. All teacher preparation candidates are required to have an academic major and an academic minor. These majors and minors are developed in conjunction with content area faculty in the Colleges of Arts and Science and Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts. Course work in the content areas is taught by faculty in these sister colleges. Additionally, teacher candidates must pass state examinations in their major and minor fields to earn a teaching certificate. Although much of the emphasis on content lies in such foundational courses, candidates continue to build and apply content knowledge through methodology, practica, and other courses.

Making content accessible to others involves the realm of pedagogical content knowledge. In the College of Education, constructivist and socio-cultural learning theories inform pedagogical knowledge (Bruner, 2004; Dewey, 1938; Nieto, 2002; Piaget & Inhelder, 1965; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1999). Individual development occurs in the context of social interaction, and is mediated by culture (Bransford, et. al., 2005). Teacher candidates learn to plan instructional environments that capitalize upon the social nature of learning. In these environments, students work in collaborative groups (Johnson & Johnson, 1998), engage in exploratory forms of classroom discourse (Barnes, 1992; Wells, 1999; Wertsch & Toma, 1995), participate actively in experientially-grounded practices, and access the full range of communicative modes (Gardner, 1983), including digital media. Professional educators demonstrate culturally responsive practice (Delpit, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 2002) by capitalizing upon their students' cultural and experiential knowledge, and by involving families and community resources

in educational events (Epstein, 2001; Hale, 2001). Candidates develop strategies to make difficult concepts accessible to learners with diverse backgrounds, needs, and experiences (Grossman, Schoenfield, & Lee, 2005). They design and use a wide range of assessment tools in order to inform their practice. In these ways, candidates become proficient in the content of their subject fields, the processes of learning, and the contexts in which learning takes place (Hammerness, K. & Darling-Hammond, L., 2005).

### B: Knowledge of Human Development and Learning

Throughout the College of Education, faculty members take a wide range of theoretical approaches to guide their thinking about learning and development. Some of the major theoretical perspectives include: cognitive development theories (Piaget, 1965; Piaget & Inhelder, 1969; Vygotsky, 1986), psychosocial and socio-cultural theories (Erikson, 1963; Nieto, 2002; Ogbu, 1992), ecological development theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), moral development theory (Kohlberg, 1976, 1978), behavioral learning theory (Skinner, 1968), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), constructivist learning theories (Bruner, 1966/2004; Marlow & Page, 1998), and information processing theories (Gagne, Yekovich, & Yekovich, 1993).

Ecological human development theories (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) and socio-cultural theories (Delpit, 1996; Gilligan, 1982; Hale, 1982, 2001; Kindlon, Thompson & Barker, 1999; Nieto, 2002) provide important consideration of multiple contexts in which children and adolescents develop. Specifically, they teach about the individual dynamics that influence development, the family, community, and school contexts in which children and adolescents function. These theories also explain the interactions between those and other contexts that indirectly influence child development, and the more global

ideologies and institutions of society that have an impact on human development.

Development is best understood when all of these contexts and levels of the life system are considered simultaneously. The College of Education draws heavily upon ecological/contextual theories as a main foundation for subsequent theoretical, empirical, and applied practice.

Candidates in the College must understand the various perspectives of development to be effective educators. Each perspective has a different focus. The ecological conceptualization, for example, emphasizes the importance of the environmental contexts and culture on individual change and development. Similarly, information processing assures a strong innate component, whereas operant conditioning implies that an individual changes in direct response to the immediate environment. Candidates learn that it is critical to be equipped with knowledge of the range of lenses through which developmental processes are viewed, so that they are able to tailor their efforts to best meet the needs of learners. The ultimate goal in the College of Education is to help future educators realize that all students can learn, and to empower them with the skills necessary to reach all learners.

### C: Community-School Based Collaboration and Experiential Factors

The College of Education programs emphasize several key community factors identified in the professional literature: environmental context of the school; the cultural background of students; caregiver roles and beliefs about education; and the role of community-school collaboration in the educational process (Epstein, 2001; Hale, 2001; Pasch, Pasch, Johnson, Ilmer, Snyder, Stapleton, Hamilton, & Mooradian, 1993; Ilmer, Snyder, Erbaugh & Kurz, 1997).

According to recent research (Ilmer, et al., 1997), experienced teachers believe that environmental context is extremely important for educators to understand. Although teacher candidates may demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge, they may be ineffective teachers because of limited experience with environmental and community factors. As a part of their preparation, education candidates need to participate in special events such as tutoring, nutritional programs, and community-based health projects (Hale, 2001).

Further, experienced educators view diversity of cultural backgrounds in the educational setting as an asset; that is, as an opportunity to provide students with a broader understanding of the world. Opportunities are available in the urban setting for students to learn about individual differences in cultural backgrounds, beliefs, and attitudes. The College provides its students opportunities to learn about environmental factors through class discussions and assignments, as well as practica in community and cultural settings (Pasch, et al., 1993; Ilmer, et al., 1997). Through service learning, both the candidates and members of the community learn from one another, and benefit from respective knowledge and strengths (Boyle-Baise, 2002).

It is important for educators to evaluate the background of individual students in their classrooms and other educational settings. Educators must recognize an individual learner's strengths and weaknesses. Candidates in the College of Education learn to recognize individual differences in learner characteristics and/or special needs and to make accommodations for them (Peterson & Hittie, 2003).

Hale (2001) emphasizes that meeting the needs of diverse learners in urban or rural classrooms involves the school becoming the coordinator of support services in the community, e.g. tutoring and mentoring provided by concerned citizens, service clubs, churches and fraternal organizations. Ilmer, et al. (1997) found that experienced teachers were able to use resources very effectively through a variety of community facilities such as libraries, zoos, and museums, and also by involving caregivers in the educational process. We believe it is important for teacher candidates to know how to access a wide variety of community resources when planning their own instructional programs.

School-community collaboration involves working with stakeholders including caregivers, community agencies, and local businesses (Epstein, 2001). Educators must learn how to include the various stakeholders in their instructional programs. At Wayne State University, education candidates are given opportunities to experience collaborative processes in various school and community settings. For example, caregivers and community volunteers can assist the educator by monitoring education performance and after-school activities (Hale, 2001).

Further, collaboration among stakeholders should also include various national and international groups. At Wayne State University, candidates are given opportunities to engage the multicultural, multi-linguistic immigrant and refugee students and their families in educational activities (Bhavnagri & Vaswami, 1999). Over the last several years, College of Education programs for studying abroad have expanded quite rapidly. New global education initiatives are highly recognized and valued at Wayne State University. The College of Education anticipates continued growth of these activities for interested candidates, and is striving to expand such opportunities.

## D: Systematic Assessment of Student Learning

Throughout their programs of study, candidates develop theoretical knowledge and practical skills related to assessment. Assessment encompasses both formative and summative measures (Shepard, et al, 2005), and addresses the full range of learning and development: cognitive-language, physical-motor, and social-emotional. Formative assessments are process oriented; occurring in the context of learning events and serve to inform instructional decision making. Formative assessment is a form of diagnostic assessment because it assists the educator with planning differentiated instruction for students. Summative assessment is cumulative and evaluative in nature.

To be effective, it is important for teacher candidates to know a wide range of assessment strategies, and to understand their purposes and applications to practice. Some forms of assessment record observations, e.g. anecdotal records, running records, event sampling, time sampling, and checklists; others are forms of self-reports, e.g. journal writing, art, interviews, focus groups, and portfolios. Curriculum-Based Assessment (Gickling & Rosenfeld, 1995) and Curriculum-Based Measurement (Shinn, 1995) are techniques that should also be used in order to help inform instruction.

Monitoring is ongoing and modifications are designed to be in direct response to the assessment results. Candidates realize that when used together, multiple forms of assessment are more effective than when used in isolation. Knowledge of assessment also includes an understanding of large scale assessments, e.g. the construction and interpretation of norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, as well as related research regarding testing effectiveness (Shepard, et al., 2005). In their culminating experience, candidates demonstrate skills related to assessment.

Psychological and socio-cultural factors impact the effective use of assessment. To uncover a student's thinking, conceptual understanding and misconceptions, teacher candidates must be knowledgeable about various theories of cognition and development. Assessment measures involve equity issues as well. These issues include the needs of under-represented groups and at-risk and special needs populations. Educators committed to diversity consider students' cultural knowledge, including patterns of discourse and other modes of expression, as well as personal and community experience, in selecting and using forms of assessment and in interpreting data (Shepard, et al., 2005).

#### E: Reflective Practice

Reflection is a critical strategy for the learning process. Therefore, College of Education faculty examine their practice, and explicitly demonstrate and infuse reflective practice in their teaching. Throughout their programs, candidates internalize reflective perspectives and, ultimately, involve their students in processes of reflection as well.

Reflection is intrinsically tied to assessment, as educators regularly reflect on their practice and make adjustments as supported by the needs, interests, and diverse experiences of learners. Educators should regularly reflect on the dynamics of their practice, and examine the process and content of curriculum. Through a systematic, intentional reflection, educators are able to examine practice from multiple perspectives, e.g. cognitive, socio-cultural, personological, and, thereby, analyze and change plans that might bring about connections for learners with a wide variety of diverse backgrounds (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Delpit, 1996; Hale, 2001; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994). In this way, reflective teacher candidates become more insightful innovators of their own practice, and more committed to capitalizing on the assets of their

diverse populations.

By pinpointing specific events of when to step back and examine their practice, educators gain insights about their own role, as well as the learning process of their students. These observations can lead to an examination of the dynamics of learning, and a critical and supportive examination of one's own practice (Eby, Herrell, & Hicks, 2002; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Zeichner & Liston, 1996).

When educators talk about their own practices and discuss with colleagues their concerns and questions, they are exhibiting a reflective disposition. Schon (1983) discusses "reflection-in-action," when the educator adjusts instruction or tries to solve a problem while in the process of this practice. By listening to others and sharing perspectives, educators gain new insights about the educational process, as well as develop their professional dispositions and reflective practices.

#### F: Leadership

Leadership plays a very important role in the College of Education. It affects many aspects of schools including: overall climate, attitudes of all stakeholders, and the organization and development of curriculum and instruction. Instructional leadership encompasses defining and communicating goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promoting and emphasizing the importance of professional development (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). In their recent research, Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) indicated that effective leadership is positively related to student achievement. Wayne State University is committed to providing education candidates with a broad understanding of school leadership. Candidates in the College develop knowledge in at least three different perspectives of leadership:

teachers/educators as leaders, leaders as change agents, and instructional leadership.

For the first perspective, our teachers/educators must be prepared to serve as leaders. Traditionally, the principal is responsible for school leadership; however, today, teachers and counselors often also function as leaders. College programs prepare our candidates to assume a variety of leadership roles. Two specific examples of leadership assignments are (1) forging alliances between school, home, and community; and (2) establishing goals for the school curriculum. As emphasized by Bolman and Deal (2004), those individuals who are asked to lead must also know how to respond to social, political, economic and legal issues that often affect the educational process.

For the second perspective, our educators in leadership positions serve as change agents. Various school personnel, including building principals, department chairs, and curriculum specialists, usually assume the responsibility for change. Two areas of the school that may require change are developing learning communities and fostering the concept that problems are opportunities for improvement and change (Fullan, 1993). This perspective is very important for our educators to understand. Fostering a positive attitude about change can be very challenging for a group leader since some of the group members may be resistant to change. Strong and charismatic educational leaders can work to rally an organization's members around a sense of shared goals, innovative strategies, tactics, preferred technologies and social structures that pattern how diverse members can and do work together.

We discuss with our students ways that educational leaders artfully act as motivating factors by: (1) framing issues in innovative ways, (2) networking and coalition building, (3) building collective identity about the school, (4) promoting a

positive learning climate, and (5) managing curriculum and instruction (Weber, 1996). In addition to preparing individuals to deal efficiently and effectively with contemporary organizational issues, we also enable them to be flexible so that they can adjust to a changed future state (Bolman & Deal, 2004).

For the third perspective, leadership guides instructional planning and fosters school improvement activities (Elmore, 2000; Reeves, 2004). Our candidates need to know the best practices for instructional planning, and how to apply them in school/community settings (Fullan, 2001; Marzano, et al, 2005). Note that best practices in urban education is an area of strength for the Wayne State University faculty. In addition, several College faculty members are pioneers in the area of school improvement.

As stated in the College's theme, we believe our candidates need to be innovative. Effective leaders must be innovative in order to build strong school/home/community relationships. Specific leadership skills important in this context are communication and flexibility. Leaders communicate with their group about school priorities and guidelines for establishing a desirable school climate. A leader is also flexible when responding to the individual needs of group members. Innovative leaders are good communicators, who are also very flexible in their response to customers.

#### Area G: Embedded Technology

Technology permeates a wide variety of College of Education activities. Faculty, staff and administrators continually strive to infuse and institutionalize technology into the culture of the organization, as well as integrate it into the fibers of our teaching and work environments.

Technology integration in instruction is a broad concept that relates to designing, developing and implementing instructional programs, which combine the strengths of a wide variety of technologies with other teaching resources and strategies to enhance learning and transfer. The rationale for technology integration has theoretical, as well as practical, foundations.

Theoretically, it is an extension of a variety of efforts, such as anchoring instruction in the real world (Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1992, 1993), providing for more student-centered learning environments (Land & Hannafin, 2000), and facilitating distributed learning (Bell & Winn, 2000). These theoretical orientations speak to the importance of context, learner activity and collaboration -- all of which are facilitated through the use of technologically-based instruction. They are put into action through strategies such as problem-based learning (Savery & Duffy, 1995), the use of open-ended learning environments (Land & Hannafin, 1997), and the reflective dialogues that are developed among teacher candidates and with other members of the professional community at large.

Practically, technological tools are used in our instructional practice to facilitate and enhance cognition (Sternberg & Preiss, 2005). Computer-based tools “function as intellectual partners with the learner in order to engage and facilitate critical thinking and higher-order learning” (Jonassen, 1996, p. 9). To this end, many College of Education courses use strategies such as gaming, computer conferencing, and multimedia development. Technology integration in College courses also serves to help teacher candidates and their future students excel in a technology-driven world. Course content and teaching and learning strategies embraced by College of Education faculty are guided

by state and national competency standards to ensure that our teacher candidates enter their classrooms with proficient knowledge and instructional skills for the optimal use of technological resources (Earle, 2000; International Society for Technology in Education, 2002; Office of Professional Preparation Services, 2005). College faculty members and staff continue to explore new ways to demonstrate and model the competencies articulated in the standards in their instructional practice and work environments. Such modeling facilitates technology attitude changes, as well as transfer of students' newly acquired technology skills to their own work environments (Bransford, Brown, Cocking & Donovan, 2000; Ertmer, Addison, Lane, Ross & Woods, 1999; Gagne, 1985). The College's distance and distributed learning experiences are particularly salient examples of this modeling process.

#### H: Professional Dispositions

Although knowledge of content, human development, pedagogical skills, and other components of educational programs may be more easily defined, described, and evaluated, the construct of professional dispositions shares equal importance in the preparation of educators. The College of Education affirms that it is our challenge and responsibility to clearly articulate and demonstrate the personal dispositions we expect candidates to acquire, nurture, and maintain during their programs of study and throughout their professional careers. To this end, the definition of professional dispositions embraced by the College of Education includes personality factors, as well as beliefs and values that influence actions and relationships in educational settings (Katz, 1993; NCATE, 2002; Eastern Kentucky University, 2003).

Personality traits that impact professional demeanor include, but are not limited to, being cooperative, flexible, patient, and empathetic. Educators with positive dispositions are self-assured, confident, and honest with themselves. These qualities are demonstrated through interactions with colleagues, community members, children, and other stakeholders in educational contexts. Opportunities to develop these traits are embedded in courses, practica, and internships. For example, through discussions and activities in their courses, candidates can show empathy when they are able to understand another person's point of view (Eastern Kentucky University, 2003). In classroom settings, educators show flexibility by adjusting teaching strategies to the needs, interests, and diverse backgrounds of the learners. Related to this perspective is the underlying belief that all children can learn.

The diverse backgrounds of school-aged students are addressed through an emphasis on multicultural issues and perspectives (Smith, 1998). All programs provide experiences in a variety of multicultural settings to ensure that our candidates can apply the theoretical and conceptual information that they acquired in their coursework. To this end, competence in this area is specifically named as one of our teaching standards. Likewise, globalism is incorporated into our programs. We offer field placements in numerous countries for teacher candidates at all levels.

Professional dispositions are further demonstrated through such patterns of behavior as holding a high level of integrity and responsibility in working with others, and continuously reflecting on one's actions and quality of interpersonal interactions. Candidates develop an awareness of the relationship between their dispositions and their effectiveness as educators through ongoing self-assessment opportunities within courses

or threaded throughout programs of study. By continually engaging in a cycle of reflection and goal-setting, candidates develop the capacity to demonstrate these qualities in an independent, consistent manner (Katz, 1993).

Although knowledge of content, human development, pedagogical skills, and other components of educational programs may be more easily defined, described, and evaluated, the construct of personal dispositions shares equal importance in the preparation of educators. The College of Education affirms that it is our challenge and responsibility to clearly articulate and demonstrate the personal dispositions we expect candidates to acquire, nurture, and maintain during their programs of study and throughout their professional careers. To this end, the definition of personal dispositions embraced by the College of Education includes personality factors, as well as beliefs and values that influence actions and relationships in educational settings (Katz, 1993; NCATE, 2002; Eastern Kentucky University, 2003).

#### **4.4 - CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES ALIGNED WITH THE EXPECTATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL, STATE, AND INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS.**

Chart I shows the alignment of the teacher education programs standards (Student Teacher Standards), the Michigan Entry Level Standards for beginning teachers, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the Conceptual Framework Goals. The various program specialty areas are using this chart as a framework to align with professional standards.

**Chart I: Alignment of Standards, College of Education, Wayne State University**

Michigan Entry Level Standards for Beginning Teachers	INTASC Standards	Wayne State University College of Education Student Teacher Standards	Conceptual Framework Goals	SPA Standards
<p>[1] An understanding and appreciation of the liberal arts (the humanities, the social sciences, the mathematical and natural sciences, and the arts).</p>	<p>[6] The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom.</p>	<p>WSU/General Education Requirements in the areas of written communication, oral communication, computer literacy, critical and analytic thinking, natural science, physical sciences, life sciences, historical studies, social science, American society and institutions, foreign culture, humanities, visual and performing arts and philosophy and letters.</p> <p>[1] Knows the subject area content and best practices in those areas.</p>	<p>[A] Content and pedagogical knowledge: uses current subject matter, pedagogical and processing knowledge to design, develop, implement, and evaluate individual and group learning.</p>	
<p>[2] A commitment to student learning and achievement.</p>	<p>[2] The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.</p> <p>[3] The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</p>	<p>[6] Demonstrates a commitment to students and their learning.</p> <p>[5] Demonstrates knowledge of human growth and development in planning for students (i.e. mental and physical disabilities, developmental delays, gifted and talented).</p>	<p>[B] Knowledge of human development and learning: understands and applies current, validated principles of human growth and development and the influence of context on the learner to maximize individual, group, and organizational learning.</p>	
<p>[3] Knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy.</p>	<p>[1] The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.</p>	<p>[1] Knows the subject area content and best practices in those areas.</p> <p>[2] Organizes and implements effective instruction including the integration of content areas across curriculum areas.</p>	<p>[A] Content and pedagogical knowledge</p>	

(Continued)	<p>[4] The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.</p> <p>[7] The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals.</p>	<p>[4] Stimulates students to be creative and critical thinkers by using varied dimensions and methods, including the use of technology.</p> <p>[9] Understands and integrates multicultural perspectives to enhance students' awareness and appreciation of diverse populations</p>	<p>[E] Reflective practice: engages in a reflective process for the purpose of self evaluation of one's teaching as well as assessment of learners' progress ultimately to ensure the quality and currency of one's practice.</p> <p>[F] Leadership: Views oneself as an educational leader in one's own discipline, and as an agent of change in order to improve the organizations in which one works and the quality of the educational programs they deliver.</p>	
<p>[4] The ability to manage and monitor student learning.</p> <p>[5] The ability to systematically organize teaching practices and learns from experiences.</p>	<p>[8] The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.</p> <p>[5] The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p>[10] Selects appropriately from a variety of assessment strategies to evaluate student learning and uses this information to improve one's own teaching.</p> <p>[3] Utilizes appropriate classroom organization and management techniques to ensure a safe and orderly environment, which is conducive to learning.</p>	<p>[D] Systematic assessment of student learning: employs a variety of authentic assessment tools and strategies to both measure and evaluate the quality of one's own teaching as well as students' academic and affective growth.</p>	
<p>[6] Commitment and willingness to participate in learning communities.</p>	<p>[9] The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (student, parents and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</p>	<p>[8] Behaves in an ethical, reflective and professional manner.</p>	<p>[E] Reflective practice</p> <p>[H] Professional disposition: views oneself as a lifelong learner and espouses a professional disposition consistent with the essence of an effective urban educator who is reflective, innovative, and committed to diversity.</p>	

(Continued)	[10] The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.	[11] Utilizes resources of the school/district/community in developing curriculum.  [12] Communicates and interacts with parents/guardians/families to enhance student success.	[C] Community-school collaboration and experiential factors: utilizes the variety of, institutional, human, and environmental resources, in an urban, metropolitan community to enhance one's work with diverse groups of learners in schools, agencies, and organizations.  [F] Leadership	
[7] An ability to use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.		[7] Uses communication (listening, talking, reading, writing, viewing, visual representing) and technological skills effectively.	[G] Embedded technology: uses technology as an integral part of one's teaching and learning and is both a learner and a model for the use of technology in educational settings.	

Chart II shows the alignment of one of the “Other Professional Education Personnel” specialty areas with the conceptual framework goals. Other specialty areas are following the same process.

**Chart II: Example of Alignment of Program Area Goals to Conceptual Framework**

<b>Program Area Goals</b> <i>School and Community Psychology Program</i> <i>Our goals are those of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)</i>	<b>Conceptual Framework Goals</b>
NASP Domain 2.9: Research and Program Evaluation. School Psychologists (SPs) evaluate research, translate research into practice, and understand research design and statistics in sufficient depth to plan and conduct investigations and program evaluations for improvement of services.	[A] Content and pedagogical knowledge: uses current subject matter, pedagogical and processing knowledge to design, develop, implement, and evaluate individual and group learning.
NASP Domain 2.4: Socialization and Development of Life Skills. SPs have knowledge of human developmental processes, techniques to assess these processes, and indirect services applicable to the development of behavioral affective, adaptive, and social skills. SPs, in collaboration with others, develop appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. Such interventions include, but are not limited to, consultation, behavioral assessment/intervention, and counseling.	[B] Knowledge of human development and learning: understands and applies current, validated principles of human growth and development and the influence of context on the learner to maximize individual, group, and organizational learning.

<p>NASP Domain 2.7: Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health. SPs have knowledge of human development and psychopathology and of associated biological, cultural, and social influences on human behavior. SPs provide or contribute to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students.</p>	
<p>NASP Domain 2.2: Consultation and Collaboration. SPs have knowledge of behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and methods and of their application to particular situations. SPs collaborate effectively with others in planning and decision-making processes at the individual, group, and systems levels.</p> <p>NASP Domain 2.8: Home/School/Community Collaboration. SPs have knowledge of family systems, including family strengths and influences on student development, learning, and behavior, and of methods to involve families in education and service delivery. SPs work effectively with families, educators, and other in the community to promote and provide comprehensive services to children and families.</p>	<p>[C] Community-school collaboration and experiential factors: utilizes the variety of, institutional, human, and environmental resources, in an urban, metropolitan community to enhance one's work with diverse groups of learners in schools, agencies, and organizations.</p>
<p>NASP Domain 2.3: Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills. SPs have knowledge of human learning processes, techniques to assess these processes, and direct and indirect services applicable to the development of cognitive and academic skills. SPs, in collaboration with others, develop appropriate cognitive and academic goals for students with different abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluation the effectiveness of interventions. Such interventions include, but are not limited to, instructional interventions and consultation.</p>	<p>[D] Systematic assessment of student learning: employs a variety of authentic assessment tools and strategies to both measure and evaluate the quality of one's own teaching as well as students' academic and affective growth.</p>
<p>NASP Domain 2.1: Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability. SPs have knowledge of varied models and methods of assessment that yield information useful in identifying strengths and needs, in understanding problems, and in measuring progress and accomplishments. SPs use such models and methods as part of a systematic process to collect data and other information, translate assessment results into empirically-based decisions about service delivery, and evaluate the outcomes of service. Data-based decision-making permeates every aspect of professional practice. <i>(note: evaluating the outcomes of service and professional accountability via reflection and collecting data to evaluate effectiveness are critical aspects of training)</i></p>	<p>[E] Reflective practice: engages in a reflective process for the purpose of self evaluation of one's teaching as well as assessment of learners' progress ultimately to ensure the quality and currency of one's practice.</p>
<p>NASP Domain 2.10: School Psychology Practice and Development. SPs practice in ways that are consistent with applicable standards, are involved in their profession, and have the knowledge and skills needed to acquire career-long professional development.</p> <p>NASP Domain 2.6. SPs have knowledge of general education, special education, and other educational and related services. They understand schools and other settings as systems. SPs work with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others.</p>	<p>[F] Leadership: Views oneself as an educational leader in one's own discipline, and as an agent of change in order to improve the organizations in which one works and the quality of the educational programs they deliver.</p>

<p>NASP Domain 2.11. Information Technology. SPs have knowledge of information sources and technology relevant to their work. SPs access, evaluate, and utilize information sources and technology in ways that safeguard or enhance the quality of services.</p>	<p>[G] Embedded technology: uses technology as an integral part of one’s teaching and learning and is both a learner and a model for the use of technology in educational settings.</p>
<p>NASP Domain 2.5: Student Diversity in Development and Learning. SPs have knowledge of individual differences, abilities, and disabilities and of the potential influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in development and learning. SPs demonstrate the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristics and to implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristics, strengths, and needs.</p>	<p>[H] Professional disposition: views oneself as a lifelong learner and espouses a professional disposition consistent with the essence of an effective urban educator who is reflective, innovative, and committed to diversity.</p>

**4.5 - A DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM BY WHICH CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES DESCRIBED IN 4.4 ARE REGULARLY ASSESSED.**

The unit’s assessment system incorporates assessment practices specific to all program areas, as well as the overall unit. The following narrative identifies points in the unit-wide assessment system for initial programs of certification and advanced programs. These assessment practices are conducted with all candidates in the unit.

Initial programs for certification candidates include (1) undergraduate programs, (2) post-bachelor programs, and (3) the Master of Arts in Teaching program. All candidates are assessed through a variety of formats at multiple points. Unit-wide assessments are conducted before, during, and after the pre-student teaching and student teaching experiences. These assessments include evaluation of (1) classroom management plans, (2) ) lesson plans, (3) mid-term and final assessments for pre-student teaching and student teaching, (4) observations in pre-student teaching and student teaching, (5) case studies (in pre-student teaching), (6) portfolios (in student teaching), (7) course grades, (8) individual performance on the Michigan Test of Teacher Competency (Content), (9) completion of 90% of the academic major, (10) performance

in methods courses, and (11) signed criminal background check form.

Advanced programs include (1) Master's programs (M.A. and M.Ed.), (2) Education Specialist (Ed.S) programs, and (3) Doctoral programs (Ph.D. and Ed.D.). The terminal project, essay, or thesis is the principal unit-wide assessment for the M.A. or M.Ed. The assessment of Education Specialist candidates is specific to program areas. There are several common assessments for doctoral candidates. These include (1) written qualifying examinations, (2) oral qualifying examinations, (3) approval for candidacy, (4) submission and approval of the dissertation proposal, (5) completion of the dissertation, and (6) the dissertation defense.

## **CONCLUSION**

We value the Conceptual Framework as a way of outlining our beliefs and practices related to the educational process within the College. It was initially developed in preparation for our 1997 NCATE accreditation visit, and has been revised several times over the past years. The Conceptual Framework continues to be a changing document based on discussions, debate and review by faculty members throughout the College. As courses and programs change and new programs and faculty are added, the Conceptual Framework is revised to reflect this growth and development.

Note: The remainder of the documents for the Preconditions will be available by February 15th at the latest.

## References

- Anderson, S., Attwood, P., & Howard, L. (2004). (Eds.). Facing racism in education. Cambridge, MA: *Harvard Educational Review*.
- Appiah, A. (2003). Pluralism, personal identity, and freedom of conscience. In K. McDonough & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities* (pp. 56-74). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Baker, E., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (1994). The effects of inclusion on learning. *Educational Leadership*, 52 (4), 33-35.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J. (1990). Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society. *Social Studies*, 81 (5 ), 210-214.
- Banks, J. (2004). Race, knowledge construction, and education in the United States: Lessons from history. In J. Banks & M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Barnes, D. (1992). *From communication to curriculum* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bhavnagri, N. P. & Vaswani, T. G. (1999). Expanded roles of teachers for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: An Indian context. *Childhood Education*, 75, 297-303.
- Bell, P. & Winn, W. (2000). Distributed cognition, by nature and by design. In D.

H. Jonassen & S.M. Land (Eds.) *Theoretical foundations of learning environments* (pp. 123-145). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (2004). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boyle-Baise, M. (2002). *Multicultural service learning: Educating teachers in diverse communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., Cocking, R., & Donovan, M. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Bransford, J., Derry, S., Berliner, D., & Hammerness, K. (2005). Theories of learning and their roles in teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. (pp. 40-87), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, (July), 513-530.

Bruner, J. (1966/2004). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Carlberg, C. & Kavale, K. (1980). The efficacy of special versus regular class placement for exceptional children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Special Education*, 14(3), 295-309.

Clift, R., Houston, W., & Pugach, M. (1990). *Encouraging reflective practice in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and Knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1992). An anchored instruction

approach to cognitive skills acquisition and intelligent tutoring. In J.W. Regian and V.J. Shu (Eds.) *Cognitive approaches to automated instruction* (pp. 135-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1993). Anchored instruction and situated cognition revisited. *Educational Technology*, 33(3), 52-70.

Cole, D. & Meyer, L. (1991). Social integration and severe disabilities: A longitudinal analysis of child outcomes. *The Journal of Special Education*, 19 (4), 483-492.

College of Education. (2001). *College of education strategic plan*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.

College of Education. (2004). *By-laws of the College of Education Assembly*. Detroit, MI: College of Education, Wayne State University.

Darling-Hammond, L., Griffin, G., & Wise, A. (1992). *Excellence in teacher education: Helping teachers develop learner-centered schools*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2000). (Eds.). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Delpit, L. (1996). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Deschenes, S., Cuban, L., & Tyack, D. (2001). Mismatch: Historical perspectives on schools and students who don't fit them. *Teachers College Record*, 103 (4), 525-547.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Earle, R.S. (Ed.) (2000). *Standards for the accreditation of programs in educational communications and instructional technology*. Bloomington, IN: Association

for Educational Communications and Technology.

Eastern Kentucky University, Proceedings of the 2nd National Symposium on Educator Dispositions, Richmond, KY, November 20-21, 2003.

Eby, J., Herrell, A., & Hicks, J. (2002). *Reflective planning, teaching, and evaluation (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Elmore, R. R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. New York: Albert Shanker Institute.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New York: Norton.

Ertmer, P. A., Addison, P., Lane, M., Ross, E., & Woods, D. (1999). Examining teachers' beliefs about the role of technology in the elementary classroom. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 32(1), 54-72.

Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching*. New York: New Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom, ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gagné, R.M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction (4th Ed.)*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

- Gagne, E. D., Yekovich, C. W., & Yekovich, F. R. (1993). *The cognitive psychology of school learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55 (3), 201-213.
- Gay, G. & Kirkland, K (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice* 42 (3), 181-187.
- Gickling, E. E. & Rosenfield, S. (1995). Curriculum-based assessment. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology III* (pp. 587-596). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Grossman, P., Schoenfeld, A., & Lee, C. (2005). Teaching subject matter. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. (pp. 201-231), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutmann, A.(1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hale, J. (1982). *Black children: Their roots, culture and learning styles*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Revised edition 1986.
- Hale, J. (1992). *Black children: Their roots, culture, and learning styles*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Hale, J. (2001). *Learning while black: Creating educational excellence for*

*African American children.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hammerness, K. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world.* (pp. 390-441), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Horowitz, F. D., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Comer, J., Rosebrock, K., Austin, K., & Rust, F. (2005). Educating teachers for developmentally appropriate practice. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world.* (pp. 201-231), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Howard, T. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, 43 (2), 195-202.

Howe, K. R. (1997). *Understanding equal education opportunity: Social justice, democracy, and schooling.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory research and practice.* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Ilmer, S., Snyder, J., Erbaugh, S., & Kurz, K. (1997). Urban educators' perceptions of successful teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48 (5), 379-384.

International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (2002). *National educational technology standards for teachers: Preparing teachers to use technology.* Eugene, OR: ISTE.

International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (2000). *ISTE National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) and Performance Indicators for Teachers.* Eugene, OR: ISTE.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1998). *Learning together and alone: Cooperation,*

*competition, and individualistic learning.* 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jonassen, D.L. (1996). *Computers in the classroom: Mindtools for critical thinking.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall.

Katz, L.G. (1993). Dispositions: Definitions and implications for early childhood practices. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.

Kindlon, D., Thompson, M., & Barker, T. (1999). *Raising Cain: Protecting the emotional life of boys.* New York: Ballantine Publishing Group.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: theory, research, and social issues.* New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1978). Revisions in the theory and practice of moral development. In W. Damon (Ed.), *New directions for child development: Moral development* (No. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kramer, R. (1991). *Ed school follies: The miseducation of America's teachers.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers.

Land, S. M. & Hannafin, M. J. (1997). Patterns of understanding with open-ended learning environments: A qualitative study. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 45*(2), 47-73.

Land, S. M. & Hannafin, M. J. (2000). Student-centered learning environments. In D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (Eds.) *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*

(pp. 1- 24). Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Larson, C. L., & Ovando, C. J. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in multicultural school communities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Larson, R. (1999). *Who's minding the store: A guide for educators working with school-based enterprises, activities, and strategies for creating and operating innovative and productive learning experiences*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Graduate School of Education, University of California.

Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53 (1), 33-43.

Marlow, B. A. & Page, M. L. (1998). *Creating and sustaining the constructivist classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McLaren, P. (1997). Unthinking whiteness, rethinking democracy: Or farewell to the blond beast; toward a revolutionary multiculturalism. *Educational Foundations*, 11 (2), 5-39.

Milner, R. (2003). Teacher reflection and race in cultural contexts: History, meanings, and methods in teaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 42 (3), 173-180.

NCATE (2002). Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved February 15, 2005 from <http://www.ncate.org/>

Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new*

century. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Office of Professional Preparation Services. (2005): Michigan standards for ensuring excellent educators. Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Education.

Ogbu, J. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Educational Researcher*, 21 (8), 5-14.

Pasch, S., Pasch, M., Johnson, R., Ilmer, S., Snyder, J., Stapleton, E., Hamilton, A. & Mooradian, P. (1993). Reflections of urban education: A tale of three cities. In M. M. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Diversity and teaching: Teacher education yearbook I*, (pp. 9-30). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Peterson, M. & Hattie, M. (2003). *Inclusive teaching: Creating effective schools for all learners*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child* (M. Gabain, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published in 1932)

Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.

Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M. B. (2003). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for Florida's language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37 (1), 105-133.

Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Assessing educational leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

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

- Shepard, L., Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Rust, F. (2005).  
Assessment. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a  
changing world*. (pp. 275-326), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shinn, M. R. (1995). Curriculum-based measurement and its use in a problem-  
solving model. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology  
III* (pp. 547-568). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Shulman, L. S. (1998). Theory, practice, and the education of professionals.  
*Elementary School Journal*, 98 (5), 511-526.
- Skinner, G. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York: Appleton-  
Century-Crofts.
- Sleeter, C. (1995). Reflections on my use of multicultural and critical pedagogy  
when students are white. In C. E. Sleeter & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural  
education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference* (pp. 425-438). Albany, NY:  
State University of New York Press.
- Smith, G. P. (1998) *Common sense about uncommon knowledge: The knowledge  
bases for diversity*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher  
Education.
- Smith, R., Moallem, M., & Sherrill, D. (1997). How preservice teachers think  
about cultural diversity: A closer look at factors which influence their beliefs towards  
equality. *Educational Foundations*, 11 (2), 41-61.
- Sternberg, R.J. & Preiss, D.D. (2005). *Intelligence and technology: The impact of  
tools on the nature and development of human abilities*. Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence  
Earlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Valdez, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53 (1), 20-32.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1934.)
- Waldron, N. & McLeskey, J. (1998). The effects of an inclusive school program on students with mild and severe learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 64 (2), 395-405.
- Wayne State University. (1986). *Non-discrimination affirmative action policy*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.
- Wayne State University. (2001). *A new era of greatness: The strategic action plan for Wayne State University 2001-2002*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.
- Wayne State University. (2004). *Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty hiring plan*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.
- Webb-Johnson, G. & Rochon, R. (2005). Children are a gift-Now, don't leave them behind. *AACTE Briefs-Serving Learners*, Vol. 26 (16), p. 5, 7.
- Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional program. In S. Smith & P. Piele (Eds.), *School Leadership*. (pp. 253-278). Eugene, Oregon: Clearinghouse of Educational Management.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a socio-cultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. & Toma, C. (1995). *Discourse and learning in the classroom: A*

socio-cultural approach. In L. P. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.), *Constructivism in education* (pp. 159-174). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective Teaching: An introduction*. Mahway, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.