

**College of Education  
Conceptual Framework**

~~~~~  
*Teaching Excellence, Active Scholarship, Social Responsibility*  
~~~~~

**Grand Valley State University (MI)**

**Grand Valley State University  
College of Education  
Conceptual Framework**

<b><u>Contents</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Unit and University Vision and Mission</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Philosophy, Purpose and Goals</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Knowledge Base</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Proficiencies Aligned with Standards</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Assessment System</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>13</b>

## 1. Mission and Vision of the University and Unit

Grand Valley State University is a comprehensive, liberal arts public university with an enrollment of over 20,000 students. Programs at the main campus, located near the town of Allendale, provide undergraduate students access to a full range of liberal arts courses as well as science and professional programs. On the Allendale campus the characteristics of a small liberal arts college combine with the resources of a large university. On the Pew campus in downtown Grand Rapids, graduate and upper-division professional programs are offered, research is conducted and economic development services are provided to business, industry and the public sector. Educational centers in Holland, Muskegon, and Traverse City provide a full range of educational opportunities for students in communities along Lake Michigan's eastern shoreline.

Grand Valley State University has long prided itself on being a teaching institution dedicated to providing the highest possible level of quality instruction. Grand Valley is a learning community where close student-faculty interaction enhances both teaching and learning.

Throughout the past decade, despite rapid program expansion and enrollment growth, Grand Valley State University reaffirmed its long-standing role as a teaching institution while also clarifying and expanding the role of scholarship. The university theme defines the relationship: "Teaching Excellence Enhanced by Active Scholarship and Public Service."

### University Mission and Vision

In 2003 the university completed a year-long strategic planning process and review of its vision, mission and values. As these selections from *The University and Its Objectives* convey, the university's mission and vision statements place liberal education at the heart of its endeavors and also note the importance of professional education.

Grand Valley State University is a public institution with a local, regional and state commitment, and a global perspective. We are dedicated to providing our students with the highest quality undergraduate and graduate education.

Our highest priority is to offer outstanding teaching in all of our undergraduate and graduate programs . . . Grand Valley State University is committed to providing each student a broad educational experience that integrates liberal learning with preparation for career or profession . . . Excellence in teaching at the university depends upon active scholarship by faculty members. . . We seek and welcome a diverse group of students, faculty and staff. We value a multiplicity of opinions and backgrounds and seek ways to incorporate the voices and experiences of all into our university.

Grand Valley State University educates students to shape their lives, their professions and their societies. The university contributes to the enrichment of society through excellent teaching, active scholarship and public service.

### **Unit Mission and Vision**

The College of Education's mission and vision mirror those of the larger university. Initial programs integrate liberal arts and professional education; advanced programs integrate foundational knowledge with specialized areas of inquiry and practice. Scholarship is developed through continual learning and testing of new ideas, encouraging students to participate in the professional community and advance existing knowledge. Service is developed by emphasis on research and best practice so that these educators may add to the development of increasingly diverse communities in West Michigan and beyond.

Throughout its forty-year history—first as an Institute, then a School, and now as a College of Education—the unit has maintained a commitment to teaching, specifically, to preparing classroom teachers within a strong practitioner emphasis. With the addition of new programs, this commitment was also extended to the preparation of administrators, counselors, curriculum consultants, technology specialists, policy-makers, and numerous other educators. The following statements reflect the mission, vision and values we share within the unit and across the university.

***Unit Mission:*** We develop quality educators to teach, lead, and serve in local and world communities.

***Unit Vision:*** We envision our future as a community of educators who promote teaching excellence, active scholarship, and social responsibility.

***Unit Values and Dispositions:*** Inquiry, Ethics, Collaboration, Decision Making.

## **2. Unit Philosophy, Purpose and Goals**

### **Philosophical Perspectives**

Education is a complex enterprise requiring a variety of actions and a clear understanding of both the motivation and the outcome of each action. The College of Education must be open not only to suggesting answers but also to posing questions if we are to live our values and fulfill our mission and vision. The broad philosophical foundation of our faculty is well-suited for developing candidate outcomes as we prepare teachers and leaders for increasingly complex professional roles.

No single philosophical stance prevails among faculty colleagues in our unit. Many philosophical orientations are reflected within our programs and among our faculty and

candidates; indeed, we probably represent every direction on the compass of educational philosophies.

Our adherence to a humanistic philosophy is apparent in our concern for student success (both our students and their students). Our humanistic perspectives are born of authentic experience in that Grand Valley is an institution committed to serving the needs of the region. This perspective guides us in keeping the needs of candidates and the education community foremost in our practice. At the same time, behaviorist philosophies are clearly evident, due in part to our history of strong special education programs that bring a solid behaviorist orientation as a basis for student management and instructional progress.

The most prominent philosophical perspectives within our unit are those of constructivism and pragmatism, perspectives which we believe can be complementary. We believe that we must make a commitment to our candidates as active learners who bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to their own education; yet we must also elicit respect for research-based practices that these future professionals will be able to use effectively. We believe that we must tailor our approaches and beliefs to the needs of the primarily conservative communities that we serve; yet we are also committed to preparing our candidates to address the changing dynamics of the wider communities that they serve.

This variety in educational philosophies provides strength to our program while also allowing faculty to model appropriate strategies for instruction and leadership. Similarly, these four philosophical positions serve as the basis from which we determine our programmatic objectives and outcomes.

## **Purpose and Goals**

While philosophical variety can provides candidates with a balanced view of the educational realm, we acknowledge that it can also bring about considerable internal struggle regarding the purpose of education and our role in it. We believe, however, that this struggle is valuable and necessary if we are to realize our vision of ***teaching excellence, active scholarship, and social responsibility***.

We acknowledge that professional education does not occur along a straight line from admission to licensure. Teacher education faculty and candidates contend not only with varying educational philosophies but also with competing theories, knowledge, and best practices. Nor is this preparation accomplished single-handedly; our faculty colleagues across the university, for example, influence our candidates at least as much as we do. Finally, of course, our influence on candidates is not a one-way street. Our candidates teach us at least as much as we teach them.

Indeed, recognizing that we are all colleagues among colleagues is fundamental to achieving our mission of ***preparing quality educators***. Our candidates come to the

university after twelve years of preparation by our public school colleagues, followed by focused study with our university colleagues in the arts and sciences, then clinical experience with our school district colleagues. Soon after licensure, they return to our advanced programs as professional colleagues sharing with us and each other the wisdom and dilemmas of practice. As a College of Education, we not only help develop future educators, but they return as our colleagues to help develop us.

The national debates on educational goals and methods have often divided the nation and educational community, but they have also served to underscore the importance of educators acting together as colleagues who comprise a professional community of experts. We may differ in our beliefs about the means to various educational ends, but we have never been more certain of the need to take firm hold of our profession if we are to have influence as colleagues working toward the same end. In fulfilling our mission to prepare quality educators, then, we are also mindful that we are preparing our own colleagues.

### **Values and Dispositions**

The College of Education has identified four values and dispositions it deems necessary in preparing quality educators: *inquiry, ethics, collaboration, and decision making*. We believe that our faculty and our candidates should value and exemplify these personal and professional characteristics. The description which follows expands on the educational objectives, candidate outcomes, and candidate dispositions that comprise our conceptual framework.

### **3. Knowledge Base**

This review of the professional literature identifies the knowledge bases and research which inform our mission, vision and values.

#### **Quality Educators and Professional Colleagues**

As a College of Education, we approach learning as a socially interactive experience in which students construct meaningful experiences toward a practical end (Dewey, 1916/1944, 1934; Greene, 1988; James, 1906). Students engage in new experiences, which interact with prior knowledge to lead toward new understandings and new solutions to problems and dilemmas in life (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Fraser, 1995; King & Rosenshine, 1993; Markle, Johnson, Geer & Meichtry, 1990). Teachers are called upon to actively engage students in the construction of knowledge (Giroux & McLaren, 1986; hooks, 1994), suggesting a more interactive role for individual learners (Marx & Collopy, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978) where students are seen as active agents rather than simply passive recipients (O'Loughlin, 1992; Powell, 1992). This learning model applies as well to teacher education students as it does to P-12 students.

With this approach in mind, we endeavor to prepare future teachers in a manner which models our assumptions: multiple, intensive field experiences (Andrew, 1990; Ayers, 1989; Cinnamond & Simpher, 1990; Reiman & Parramore, 1993; Thomas, Beacham, & Misulis, 1992); dialogical engagement in class sessions (Fernandez-Balboa & Marshall, 1994; Shor & Freire, 1987; Strike, 1991; Whitehead, 1929); and demonstrations of effective teaching and social responsibility within the context of our courses.

Current education reforms emphasize the importance of working together as colleagues. Popkewitz and Myrdal (1991) refer to the “more elaborate and exciting notion of teaching” that results from professional collaboration. Advanced programs in particular aim to conduct the type of “joint work” acclaimed as the highest form of collegiality. These include creating new programs, agreeing with others to try new ideas, observing one another teach, and talking publicly about what one is learning (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1990). Likewise, collaboration between teacher education faculty and practitioners has been praised for improving professional practice (Sharpe, Lounsbury, & Templin, 1997). Our candidates can affect our own pedagogical practices, leading us away from teacher control and authority toward a “collegiality of voices, rethinking, and interpretations . . . from order and progression to enjoyment of early chaos, contradictions, and alternative solutions” (Haushildt & Wesson, 1999).

### **Inquiry and Active Scholarship**

Inquiry is scholarly, reflective, and research-based. To be an inquiring practitioner, one must know and understand content and pedagogy, be intellectually curious, and be able to test new ideas. Grand Valley candidates must know subject matter depth and understand a broad range of concepts and perspectives. They must be able to use curriculum and technology to help students acquire information, explore ideas, and solve problems (International Society for Technology in Education/National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers).

Their knowledge will include a constructivist view of learning through interaction with others, reflection on ideas, and clarification of these ideas. They must understand how learning occurs, how different approaches bring different results, and that instructional decisions must consider purpose, goal and evaluation (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Inquiring educators possess a repertoire of strategies from which they select suitable ones to teach subjects or concepts (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Shulman, 1987).

Individuals who are inquiring will develop opportunities to test new ideas and evaluate their results. Because action research can provide thorough descriptions of school settings and define problems and constructive responses, Grand Valley candidates should be able to use their own classrooms as research sites (Eisner, 1991; Sprinthall, Reiman, & Sprinthall, 1996). Undergraduate candidates are grounded in school-based inquiry to improve their instruction and student learning. Advanced candidates learn research methods and complete a research-based thesis. The ability and desire to conduct such research characterizes an inquiring candidates and also promotes two other outcomes of the Grand Valley program: professional collaboration and decision-making.

## **Ethics and Social Responsibility**

Ethical behavior is fair, accurate and consistent. Ethical practitioners promote justice, caring and concern for individuals and society. Grand Valley candidates are becoming part of a larger community of professionals and must develop the conduct expected of an educator (National Education Association, 1975). They learn to contextualize their practice in both the local community where they teach and in the professional community of educators (Cummins, 1996; Fenstermacher, 1990; Heath, 1983).

The concept of ethics implies more than just appropriate professional conduct; rather, ethical practitioners act upon their responsibilities to children and the communities where they live. They must prepare students to be active participants in the public life (Palmer, 1998) and contributing members of our democratic society (Gutmann, 1987, 1993). The ethical practitioner must also live this ethic of care so that students learn not just about subject matter content but also how to be caring themselves (Noddings, 1984).

On a larger scale than individual students and teachers, schools themselves should recognize an ethical commitment to address themes of care, justice and equality, empowering all students to be active participants in their own communities (Feinberg, 1990; Fine, 1992; Freire, 1970; Gilligan, et al., 1988; Gutmann, 1987). Grand Valley candidates should respect the potential of teaching as a moral act (Greene, 1978) and the power of education in building an ethical citizenry, responsive to social justice and compassion (Purpel, 1989). They should be able to create caring communities within their own classroom and also enable their students to envision and value a just society (Greene, 1978; Greene, 1988; Noddings, 1984; Purpel, 1989).

While both initial and advanced candidates are supported in their development of a just and caring educational setting, advanced candidates are assisted in recognizing the social and political issues that affect the creation of a more compassionate, just and equitable school for all. Their current and future positions of leadership will allow and require them to see the institutional implications of their professional actions and decisions.

## **Collaboration and Teaching Excellence**

Collaboration is participatory, inclusive and supportive. Collaborative practitioners foster relationships within school, community and profession. When educators create supportive and empowering environments, they enhance the possibility of collaboration to improve learning opportunities for all (Cummins, 1986; Hidalgo, 1995).

Within their classrooms Grand Valley candidates must form bonds with their students in order to motivate them and engage them in higher order learning (Metz, 1993; Sarason, 1982). Within their schools they must work closely with other educators for planning, preparing and teaming of instruction; they should observe one another for purposes of continual learning and support (Little, 1987). They must contribute time and effort

within their community and work closely with their students' caregivers so they too can become active in the learning process. In addition, as advanced candidates continue

their professional development, they should contribute their findings from action research to the development of the education profession (Danielson, 1996). Such development includes improving instructional practice, generating sound, comprehensive theory, and promoting more effective professional organizations.

### **Decision-Making**

Decision-making should be informed, deliberative and effective. Professionals who are decision-makers use knowledge to analyze situations, address problems, and evaluate the outcomes. Informed and intelligent decision-making requires reflection—while developing curriculum, working with children, and working with parents and colleagues (Dewey, 1956). Candidates who are effective decision-makers select and utilize best practice approaches dependent upon the content to be learned, student differences and abilities and preferred learning styles (Zemelman, Daniels & Hyde, 1993). By using knowledge within context, or “knowledge-in-action,” Grand Valley candidates must articulate and reflect on effective practices in order to improve future decisions (Schon, 1983, 1987). They must recognize, however, that critical reflection implies more than mere pragmatic solutions and instrumental competency. Critical reflection must also include moral and ethical considerations within the solution of practical school problems (Zeichner, 1983; Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

In summary then, the knowledge base forms the foundation for both initial and advanced studies. It serves to inform and substantiate the best practice that is encouraged in initial programs, while being the sources of study and reflection for advanced candidates. Our initial programs prepare teachers to begin their professional careers, providing tools that will make them not only effective teachers but teachers who understand the social and ethical implications of the choices they make in regard to school funding, technological resources, and other issues of equity and access. Advanced candidates, who have generally situated their practice within a professional context, build upon these skills to become critically reflective and able to understand the tensions between narrow interests and the role of schools in a democracy (Goodlad, 1990).

#### 4. Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Standards

All programs implement the specialty program standards set forth by their national professional associations or the State of Michigan.

##### Alignment with Specialty Program Standards

College of Education	Program Standards	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Program Standards
Early Childhood Education; Early Childhood Developmental Delay	NAEYC CEC	French German Spanish Latin	ACTFL
Elementary Education	ACEI	English, Language Arts	NCTE
Middle Level Education	NMSA	Mathematics	NCTM
Cognitive Impairment Emotional Impairment Learning Disability Hearing Impairment Special Education Administration	CEC	Integrated Science Biology Chemistry Earth/Space Science Physics	NSTA
Educational Leadership	ELCC	Social Studies History	NCSS
Educational Technology	ISTE	Physical Ed Health Education	AAHPERD
Reading/Language Arts	IRA	Computer Science	ISTE
English as a Second Language	TESOL	Music Education	MDE
School Library Media	ALA	Visual Arts	MDE
School Counseling	MDE	Geography    Economics Sociology    Political Science Psychology	MDE

Programs at both levels share the same unit goals and dispositions outlined earlier, but they have adopted different sets of performance standards. Initial programs are aligned with Danielson's Four Domains (1996) and with the Council of Learned Society in Education's Standards for Foundations of Education (1998). Advanced programs for classroom professionals are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989), Standards for Foundations of Education, and with the College's Standards for Research. All performance goals are cross-referenced with candidate dispositions.

### Alignment of Proficiencies with Professional, State, and Institutional Standards

	<b>Programs Preparing Teacher Candidates</b>	<b>Programs Preparing Other Professional School Personnel</b>			
<b>Alignment with Standards and Dispositions</b>	<b>Initial Standards: Danielson Domains, CLSE</b>  <b>Advanced Standards: NBPTS, CLSE, COE Research</b>	<b>Educational Leadership Standards: (ELCC)</b>	<b>Special Ed Administration Standards: (CEC)</b>	<b>School Counseling Standards: (MDE)</b>	<b>School Library Media Standards (ALA/AASL)</b>
<b>Disposition: Inquiry</b>  INTASC 1-5, 7, 8, 10 MDE 1, 3 NCATE 1.1, 1.3 SPA 1, 2, 3	Domain 1- Planning and Preparation  NBPTS 2-Know Subjects and How to Teach Them	1-Leadership Vision	1-Foundations	1-Guidance Services  4-Counseling Theory and Education	1-Use of Information and Ideas
<b>Disposition: Ethics</b>  INTASC 3, 5, 6 MDE 2, 4 NCATE 1.7 SPA 5	Domain 2- Classroom Environment  NBPTS 1-Commitment to Students and Their Learning	2-Positive Learning Environment  5-Integrity	2-Learners  3-Learner Differences  8-Assessment  9-Professional/ Ethical Practice	2-Human Characteristics  3-Vocational Education  5-Professional, Ethical, Legal Issues	2-Teaching and Learning
<b>Disposition: Decision Making</b>  INTASC 1-8 MDE 5, 7 NCATE 1.4, 1.7 SPA 4, 5	Domain 3- Instruction  NBPTS 3- Managing Student Learning	2-Positive Learning Environment	2-Learners  3-Learner Differences  8-Assessment	2-Human Characteristics  3-Vocational Education	2-Teaching and Learning
<b>Disposition: Collaboration</b>  INTASC 8-10 MDE 6 NCATE 1.4	Domain 4- Professional Responsibility  NBPTS 4- Think Systematically About Practice, Learn from Experience  NBPTS 5- Members of Learning Communities	3- Management  6-Leadership Contexts	7- Instructional Planning  10-Collaboration	6-Evaluation/ Measurement  1-Guidance Services	4-Program Administration  3- Collaboration and Leadership
<b>All Dispositions</b>  <b>All Standards</b>	Domains 1-4: Field, Clinical NBPTS 1-5: Graduate Practicum  CLSE 1-3 Foundational Perspectives  COE 1-4 Research Competence	SPA Standards Internship  Foundational Perspectives  Research Competence	SPA Standards: Practicum  Foundational Perspectives  Research Competence	SPA Standards Practicum  Foundational Perspectives  Research Competence	SPA Standards Practicum  Foundational Perspectives  Research Competence

## 5. Assessment System

**Objectives:** The College of Education has two objectives for its unit-wide assessment system:

***Objective 1: Candidate Assessment.*** The assessment system should enable candidates to assess their knowledge, skills and dispositions at key points in the program and receive valuable feedback from instructors and other evaluators;

***Objective 2: Program Assessment.*** The assessment system should enable the program to assess its expectations for candidates and receive valuable feedback on whether or not the unit is helping candidates fulfill those expectations.

Assessments for candidates include course grades, professional recommendations, essays, projects, tests, reflections, position papers, and observations. Program assessment uses data from traditional methods but also incorporates other methods to examine overall candidate performance and program effectiveness.

**Common Transition Points:** The entire sequence of initial and advanced programs is intended to help students integrate theory, best practice, and current educational trends as they develop as emerging professionals. The College of Education has identified five common transition points for all candidates.

***Level 1: Foundations Courses and Admission to Program.*** Prior to this point Initial candidates complete general education and degree requirements, an in-depth academic major and capstone course, and pre-professional courses in human development and learning, technology, diversity and educational foundations. Advanced programs for practicing educators provide similar experience with foundational perspectives on educational issues. Preparation prior to this level emphasizes content knowledge, understanding, and habits of inquiry and ethics.

***Level 2: Specialty Studies.*** Initial programs for elementary or secondary candidates include courses in classroom management, materials and methods, and the first of two semester-long intensive clinical experiences. Advanced programs proceed with study of a specialized knowledge base. Advanced students, already licensed practitioners with their own classrooms, are able to develop and practice new understandings of their own teaching and share with classroom colleagues from different learning environments. Preparation at this level emphasizes habits of collaboration and further development of ethical judgment and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

***Level 3: Capstone Experiences.*** In the clinical semester, Initial candidates bring together the habits of inquiry, ethics and collaboration to reach effective decisions and begin their membership in a professional community. The final phases of

Advanced programs also emphasize application of professional skills. The semester-long practicum helps candidates connect theory to practice. The research project or thesis provides an opportunity to examine an educational problem in depth from the perspective of professional experts in their field.

***Levels 4 and 5: Program Exit and Follow-Up.*** This level provides candidates the opportunity for internal and external assessment. State competency tests are required for program exit for all Initial candidates and for Advanced candidates seeking additional endorsements. At exit, candidates are also asked to assess their own preparation by the College of Education. After one year, both alumni and their school district employers are asked to evaluate the success of College of Education preparation programs.

**Common Assessment System:** Within the two sets of overall standards for Initial and Advanced programs (Danielson and NBPTS, respectively), each course in a given program has identified a target sub-standard and a common performance assessment.

***Common Standards for Each Course:*** Each course in each program has determined the primary sub-standard it will emphasize. Although every course accomplishes a variety of goals, we have designated a sub-standard for which each course will take primary responsibility.

***Common Assessments for Each Standard:*** For each sub-standard, courses have developed at least one common assessment. Course instructors use a variety of assessments suitable to the course, but they maintain data across programs on the designated common assessments.

***Common Rubrics for Each Assessment:*** Finally, for each common assessment, there is a common rubric to be used by each instructor who teaches that course. Assessments which occur at major transition points will be conducted not just by instructors, but by clinical supervisors and by candidates themselves.

**Common Data:** The goal of any assessment system, of course, is to provide direction for candidate and program improvement. This system allows us to examine final performance data, then work backwards to either strengthen the courses intended to develop that performance area, or strengthen the methods by which we assess those performances. We believe that this provides the College of Education with a robust assessment system to reveal not only end-of-the-line performance patterns but also to identify how and where these performances can be better developed.

## 6. References

### Knowledge Base

- Andrew, M. (1990). Differences between graduates of 4-year and 5-year teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(1), 45-51.
- Ayers, M. (1989). Headaches: On teaching and teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(2), 1-7.
- Berger, B. L. & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of knowledge: A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor.
- Cambourne, B. (1988). *The whole story: Natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom*. Auckland, New Zealand: Scholastic.
- Cinnamond, J., & Zimpher, N. (1990). Reflectivity as a function of community. In R. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs* (pp. 57-72). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, Canada: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6-11.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Dewey, J. (1916/1944). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.

- Feinberg, W. (1990). The moral responsibility of public schools. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder, and K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (p. 155-187). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder, and K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (p. 130-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J.M., & Marshall, J.P. (1994). Dialogical pedagogy in teacher education: Toward an education for democracy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(3), 172-182.
- Fine, M. (1992). "The public" in public schools: The social construction/constriction of moral communities. In M.Fine (Ed.), *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Fraser, B.J. (1996). Student perceptions of classrooms. In L.W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 416-419). Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Tr. Myra Bergman Ramos). New York: Continuum.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for: Working together for your school. Ontario: Ontario Teachers Federation.
- Gilligan, C., Ward, J. M., Taylor, J. M. (Eds.). (1988). *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Giroux, H.A. (1993). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In H.S.Shapiro & D.E. Purpel (Eds.), *Critical social issues in American education: Toward the twenty-first century* (pp. 272-277). New York: Longman.
- Giroux, H.A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213-238.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greene, M. (1978). Wide-awakeness and the moral life. In M. Greene, *Landscapes of learning* (p. 42-52). New York: Teachers College.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Gutmann, A. (1993). The challenge of multiculturalism in political ethics. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 22(3), 171-206.
- Haushildt, P., & Wesson, L. (Spring/Summer, 1999). When postmodern thinking becomes pedagogical practice. *Teaching Education*, 10(2), 23.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hidalgo, N.M. et al. (1995). Research on families, schools, and communities: A multicultural approach, in J. Banks and C. McGee Banks (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 498-524), New York: Macmillan.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Houston, W. R. (Ed.) (1990). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- James, W. (1906). *Talks to teachers on psychology: And to students on some of life's ideas*. New York: Holt.
- King, A., & Rosenshine, B. (1993). Effects of guided cooperative questioning on children's knowledge construction. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 61(2), 127-148.
- Little, J.W. (1990, Summer). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 508-536.
- Little, J. W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Markle, G., Johnson, J.H., Geer, C., & Meichtry, Y. (1990). Teaching for understanding. *Middle School Journal*, 22(2), 53-57.
- Marx, R.W., & Collopy, R.M.B. (1995). Student influences on teaching. In L.W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 413-416). Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.
- Metz, M. H. (1983). Teachers' ultimate dependence on their students. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- National Education Association (1977-78). *NEA handbook, 1977-78*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1992). Engaging teachers in emancipatory knowledge construction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(5), 336-346.
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Popkewitz, T. S. & Myrdal, S. (1991, June). *Case studies of the Urban Mathematics Collaborative Project: A report to the Ford Foundation*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, ED 343810.
- Powell, R.R. (1992). The influence of prior experiences on pedagogical constructs of traditional and nontraditional preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(3), 225-238.
- Purpel, D. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Reiman, A.J., & Parramore, B.M. (1993). Promoting preservice teacher development through extended field experience. In M.J. O'Hair & S.J. Odell (Eds.), *Diversity and teaching: Teacher education yearbook I* (pp. 111-121). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarason, S. B. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). What is the "dialogical method" of teaching? *Journal of Education*, 167(3), 11-31.
- Sharpe, T., Lounsbury, M., & Templin, T. (May, 1997). Cooperation, collegiality, and collaboration: Reinforcing the scholar-practitioner model. *Quest*, 49, 24.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 1-22.

- Sikula, J., Buttery, T., & Guyton, E. (Eds.) (1996). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sprinthall, N.A., Reiman, A.J., and Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). Teacher professional development. In J. Sikula (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 666-703). New York: Macmillan.
- Strike, K.A. (1991). The moral role of schooling in a liberal democratic society. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of research in education*, 17, 413-483.
- Thomas, S., Beacham, B., & Misulis, K. (1992). A university and public school collaborative approach to preparing elementary teachers. *Teacher Educator*, 28(2), 46-51.
- Vygotsky, L.(1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: Macmillan.
- Zeichner, K.M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34.
- Zeichner, K.M. and D.P. Liston (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 23-48.
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (1993). *Best practices: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools*. Portsmouth: NH: Heinemann.

### **Support Documents**

- Council of Learned Societies in Education (1996). *Standards for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies*.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Grand Rapids Public Schools (1997). *Teacher specifications*. Grand Rapids, MI
- International Society for Technology in Education/National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers (ISTE/NETS-T)[http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t\\_stands.html](http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_stands.html)
- Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development*.

Michigan Department of Education. Lansing, MI.

*Administrative rules governing the certification of Michigan teachers* (2003).

*Administrative rules for special education* (2004).

*Entry-level standards for Michigan teachers and related proficiencies* (2002).

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2002).

*Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges and departments of education.*

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Reports (NBPTS) (1989). *What*

*teachers should know and be able to do.*