

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY: A Journal of the NNER

Volume Five, October 2013

List of articles/authors below

Viewing Democracy in 3-D: Using the Past to Examine Schooling for Democracy
Edward A. Janak

Moving Beyond Knowledge and Awareness in Diversity Education: Back and Forth Process
Jenna M. Shim, Chad S. Gibbs, Ronald K. Morgan, and Adam K. Schaefer

Authentic to Transformative Learning: Building Global Competence
Stephanie K. Davis and Roxanne S. DuVivier

Nurturing the NNER Agenda: Preparing for the "CAEP Crusader"
Dennis Potthoff

The Beat of a Steady Drummer: The Influence of John Goodlad on a University-School Partnership
Paul Wangemann

Problematizing the Role of Phonemic Awareness in Early Literacy Development of English Language Learners: Toward More Equitable Educational Practices
Jenna M. Shim

Living Democracy in the Classroom: Changing the Approach
Karen Rowe, Elizabeth Urban, and Shannon Canfield

Co-Teaching with Professional Interns: A Collaborative Approach to Improving Student Learning
Katie A. Hendrickson, John E. Henning, and Athena Spinell

Joining Forces to Advance Teaching and Learning of 21st Century Skills: Idaho School Leaders' Perspectives
Penny Tenuto, John Cannon, and Allen Kitchel

Building Citizenship by Becoming an "E.A.G.L.E."
Paul Wangemann, Jennifer Roskelley, and Kimberly Foy

Understanding and Confronting Policy and Corporate Pressure in the Current Era: Implications for the Agenda for Education in a Democracy
Tina Jacobowitz, Michelle Kovacs, and Nick Michelli

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY: A Journal of the NNER • Volume Five, October 2013

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY: A Journal of the NNER



National Network for Educational Renewal **NNER**

Co-Editors

Jennie F. Rakestraw, *Winthrop University*
Lisa E. Johnson, *Winthrop University*

Volume Five, October 2013



2013 Editorial Board

Audrey Allan, *York School District One*

Beth G. Costner, *Winthrop University*

Caroline Everington, *Winthrop University*

Lisa E. Johnson, *Winthrop University (Co-Editor)*

Carolyn Jordan, *Lancaster School District*

Stephanie Milling, *Winthrop University*

Jennie F. Rakestraw, *Winthrop University (Co-Editor)*

Editorial Assistant

Foster Hays, *Winthrop University*

2013 Review Board

Brian Boyd, *Wright State University*

Elizabeth Evans, *Winthrop University*

Colleen Finegan, *Wright State University*

Ron McDermott, *Wright State University*

Molly Munson-Dryer, *Illinois State University*

Diana Murdock, *Winthrop University*

Cindy Onore, *Montclair State University*

Robert Prickett, *Winthrop University*

Jim Tomlin, *Wright State University*

Jonatha Vare, *Winthrop University*

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY:
A Journal of the **NNER**

National Network for Educational Renewal **NNER**

Co-Editors

Jennie F. Rakestraw, *Winthrop University*

Lisa E. Johnson, *Winthrop University*

Volume Five, October 2013

To access this journal online, visit
<http://www.units.muohio.edu/nnerjournal/index.html>

Table of Contents

Viewing Democracy in 3-D: Using the Past to Examine Schooling for Democracy Edward A. Janak	5
Moving Beyond Knowledge and Awareness in Diversity Education: Back and Forth Process Jenna M. Shim, Chad S. Gibbs, Ronald K. Morgan, and Adam K. Schaefer	20
Authentic to Transformative Learning: Building Global Competence Stephanie K. Davis and Roxanne S. DuVivier	36
Nurturing the NNER Agenda: Preparing for the “CAEP Crusader” Dennis Potthoff	50
The Beat of a Steady Drummer: The Influence of John Goodlad on a University-School Partnership Paul Wangemann	73
Problematizing the Role of Phonemic Awareness in Early Literacy Development of English Language Learners: Toward More Equitable Educational Practices Jenna M. Shim	85
Living Democracy in the Classroom: Changing the Approach Karen Rowe, Elizabeth Urban, and Shannon Canfield	104
Co-Teaching with Professional Interns: A Collaborative Approach to Improving Student Learning Katie A. Hendrickson, John E. Henning, and Athena Spinell	126
Joining Forces to Advance Teaching and Learning of 21st Century Skills: Idaho School Leaders’ Perspectives Penny Tenuto, John Cannon, and Allen Kitchel	141
Building Citizenship by Becoming an “E.A.G.L.E.” Paul Wangemann, Jennifer Roskelley, and Kimberly Foy	159
Understanding and Confronting Policy and Corporate Pressure in the Current Era: Implications for the Agenda for Education in a Democracy Tina Jacobowitz, Michelle Kovacs, and Nick Michelli	167

Viewing Democracy in 3-D: Using the Past to Examine Schooling for Democracy

Edward A. Janak
University of Wyoming

This paper presents teaching for democracy in “3-D”: past, present, and future, first by using a pseudo-historiographical approach to examine schooling for democracy both as a means of creating and preserving the democratic republic and teaching democratic values. Next, it examines the constriction of teaching for democracy that emerged with neoliberal reforms after 1983. It concludes by presenting a set of specific steps first set forth back in 1939 that every teacher can do—and thus every teacher educator can instill in their preservice teachers to do—to produce good democratic citizens.

KEYWORDS: History of education, schooling for democracy, preservice teacher education

It is curious and troubling that while global conversations surround the spreading of democracy across the world, national conversations about reinforcing domestic democracy are nearly nonexistent. This is particularly true about schooling; while we are quite comfortable discussing the spread of democratic values from Tunis to Cairo, we are strangely silent about the same discussion from Bangor, Maine to San Diego, California. Contemporary discussions surrounding school reform rather shortsightedly revolve around two issues: how do we make our students test better and how do we use our schools to make the economy stronger. These two views miss one significant point: neither should be ranked with higher importance than preparing preservice teachers to school for democracy.

When sharing the results of his 1945 “Design for America” project, Theodore Brameld cautioned that educators on all levels “seem to have forgotten that time consists of *three* dimensions rather than two” (p. 2). At that time it was the future that was lost; however, in today’s world we are so busy looking to the future we have lost sight of yesterday’s habits and practices. This paper remedies this oversight by presenting teaching for democracy in “3-D”: past, present, and future. First, this paper uses a pseudo-historiographical approach to examine schooling for democracy, as first defined as a means of creating and preserving the democratic republic that is the United States and later the progressive expansion of this notion into teaching democratic values. Next, it examines the constriction of teaching for democracy that emerged with neoliberal reforms launched by *A Nation at Risk* through *No Child Left Behind*. It concludes by presenting a set of specific steps, first set forth back in 1939, that every teacher can do—and thus every teacher educator can instill in their preservice teachers to do—to produce good democratic citizens.

Schooling to Preserve the Democratic Republic

Before exploring how to prepare teachers to school for democracy, there should be an understanding of what this relationship has historically meant. Almost as long as the United States has existed as a nation, there has been a link between its public schools and the perpetuation of the democratic republic. For example, of all the founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson was the most adamant about the belief that the public schools were essential to the formation of the new nation. While George Washington was urging the development of a national university, the anti-federalist Jefferson was fighting to establish public schools on a state level proposing his “Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge” to the Virginia State Legislature. While the bill was killed three times, it provided the blueprint for public schooling

as we know it—school districts, a 12-year program of study, even high stakes assessment. However, it was in his reasoning for the bill that is most relevant to the purpose of this work (Conant, 1962).

Jefferson was keenly aware that prevention of tyranny was essential to the new nation, and the best way to do such was to educate the populace as a whole:

The most effectual means of preventing this [tyranny] would be, to illuminate, as far as practicable, the minds of the people at large, and more especially to give them knowledge of those facts, which history exhibiteth, that, possessed thereby of the experience of other ages and countries, they may be enabled to know ambition under all its shapes, and prompt to exert their natural powers to defeat its purposes; and whereas it is generally true that people will be happiest whose laws are best, and are best administered, and that laws will be wisely formed, and honestly administered, in proportion as those who form and administer them are wise and honest. (Jefferson, as cited in Conant, 1962, p. 88)

The best people to promote “the public happiness” are, according to Jefferson, “those persons, whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue... without regard to wealth, birth or other accidental condition or circumstance” (Jefferson, as cited in Conant, 1962, p. 88). However, Jefferson knew that for many of the best and brightest, “the indigence of the greater number disabling them from so educating, at their own expense, those of their children whom nature hath fitly formed and disposed to become useful instruments for the public,” and therefore “it is better that such should be sought for and educated at the common expense of all, than that the happiness of all should be confined to the weak or wicked” (Jefferson, as cited in Conant, 1962, p. 88). To Jefferson the very future of the democratic republic lies in its public schools educating all citizens regardless of wealth.

One of Jefferson’s contemporaries, Noah Webster, took this belief a step further. Soon after beginning his practice of law, Webster realized it was not his calling and opened a series of schools before moving to New York City and becoming the most prolific writer of his generation, producing political treatises, pamphlets, and textbooks. Webster was the most outspoken in recognizing that the emerging public schools of the nation could be integral in the nation’s development. To this end, Webster wrote a series of textbooks—a speller, grammar, and reader—that served not only to educate children in the rudiments of language but also to formulate and perpetuate an American culture. Webster argued that American culture could be superior to that of European cultures, and he wanted to spread the word throughout the youth of the new nation. It

was this distinction that caused Webster to gradually introduce new spellings and pronunciations of words, to craft a language that was distinctly American in dialect, the same impetus that caused him to write *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (Kendall, 2010).

Prior to Webster's speller, as reminded by historian Clifton Johnson (1963), spelling "in different text-books had been far from uniform; and in letters, records, and other manuscripts of the time there was a curious variety in word construction" (p. xx). When reading correspondence of the period, even the most highly educated citizens "often spelled the same word in several different ways" (p. 170). Webster created "the American standard and brought order out of chaos" (p. 170). While admittedly he "did not accomplish all that he at first planned in the way of reform, but some of his innovations...found permanent acceptance, and he did very effective work in counteracting vulgarisms in pronunciation" (p.170).

There was the establishment of a national language and the beginning of a national culture, but the nation did not have any kind of systematized public schooling to spread these. Enter Horace Mann, father of the Common School movement. Similar to Webster, Mann began his career as a lawyer. Due to his desire to improve society and his genuine belief that education was the key to such improvement, Mann served as secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education from 1837 to 1848. The annual reports and *Common School Journal* he edited while in office served as the map for the nation's evolving public school system. For example, in the "Conclusion of Introduction" in the January 1841 *Common School Journal*, he explained:

...the common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man...Let the Common School be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of the crime in the penal code would become obsolete; the long catalog of human ills would be abridged; men would walk more safely by day; every pillow would be more inviolable by night; property, life, and character held by a stronger tenure; all rational hopes respecting the future brightened. (p. 15)

To this rather messianic end, Mann wanted the nation to develop a system of common schools which would rely on taxpayer support; use a common pedagogy, taught to teachers in the emerging normal schools; use common textbooks to standardize learning; and focus on a common political creed for all students, which would lead to less political violence and revolutionary tendencies amongst the ever more diverse population. Thanks to the concomitant popularity of the *McGuffey Readers*, Mann and his ilk were successful in creating a standardized political creed that

greatly still dominates contemporary conversations surrounding democracy.

Schooling to Teach Democratic Values

With the concomitant growth of a public school system and public support of education, many thinkers of the mid to late 1800s began to philosophically contemplate the overall purpose and potential of the burgeoning institution. To such thinkers as Ralph Waldo Emerson, it was the duty of scholars to share their opinions on “the objects of study and thought, and advice on the choice, use, and limitations of books” (Emerson, 1921, p. 535), a duty that Emerson frequently performed in a four-year career as a teacher, many additional years serving on school committees, and as a frequent speaker in school addresses. Emerson additionally went on to serve on the Board of Overseers at Harvard University. It was thinkers such as Emerson who began to shift thinking on the purpose of schooling for democracy away from the somewhat literal, concrete interpretation of preserving the Republic towards a more abstract concept.

In “Education,” an essay based on a series of college addresses delivered in Waterville College, Maine; Dartmouth College, New Hampshire; and Middlebury College, Vermont, the poet and essayist argues for two specific abstractions of schooling for democracy. First, Emerson (1921) argued schools should encourage all citizens to live up to their individual potential in scope and purpose, arguing that “[e]ducation should be as broad as man. Whatever elements are in him that should foster and demonstrate” (p. 134). Arguing that every student has a specific, individual skill set, Emerson believed it was up to the school to bring it out:

If he be dexterous, his tuition should make it appear; if he be capable of dividing men by the trenchant sword of his thought, education should unsheathe and sharpen it; if he is one to cement society by his all-reconciling affinities, oh! Hasten their action! If he is jovial, if he is mercurial, if he is great-hearted, a cunning artificer, a strong commander, a potent ally, ingenious, useful, elegant, witty, prophet, diviner—society has need of all these. (p. 134)

Second, Emerson argued that the ultimate purpose of humanity is to work for the common good: “A man is a little thing whilst he works by and for himself,” he argued, but “when he gives voice to the rules of love and justice, is godlike” (p. 135). To Emerson, such striving for such admirable qualities will ultimately lead to higher international esteem, as a man working for love and justice’s “word is current in all countries; and all men, though his enemies, are made his friends and obey it as their

own” (p. 135). This “moral nature of man is the predominant element and should therefore be mainly consulted in the arrangements of a school” (p. 135). Clearly, both sets of virtues—tapping into every individual’s skill set to better society and fostering their belief in love and justice—are schooling for democracy.

As the schools of the United States grew, so too did their problems. The progressive education movement in all of its iterations attempted to remedy many of the ills that had befallen the public schools. The father of the movement, John Dewey, started his career as a political philosopher; to Dewey, the entire purpose of schooling was to better democracy, as exemplified in his 1916 book, *Democracy and Education*. In it, Dewey argued that our democratic society had an obligation to “see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability” (p. 102). If not, due to the fluid nature of democracy, its citizens would “be overwhelmed by the changes in which they are caught and whose significance or connections they do not perceive,” the end result being “a confusion in which a few will appropriate to themselves the results of the blind and externally directed activities of others” (pp. 101-102).

Dewey’s efforts were put into practice in the 1918 report from the U.S. Bureau of Education, commonly known as the *Cardinal Principles Report* (Kliebard, 2004, pp. 95-97). The Chair of the Commission was Clarence D. Kingsley, state high school supervisor of Massachusetts. Among the members-at-large and chairs were university faculty and administrators, elected officials and political appointees, and public school principals and teachers. The diverse nature of the authorial body made for a much broader conception of the purposes of schooling than had hitherto been elaborated, particularly in regards to schooling for democracy. While previous curricular efforts were devoted to the perpetuation of the Republic, the *Cardinal Principles* explicitly defined democracy as a concept and codified the role of the public school in perpetuating it in Section II of the report, entitled “The Goal of Education in a Democracy.” To the authors, the ideal of democracy is “that the individual and society may find fulfillment each in the other” meaning that neither should society exploit any individual nor should any individual repress a “disregard of the interests of society” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 9). In brief, democracy is “so to organize society that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well-being of his fellow members of society as a whole” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 9). Therefore, “education in a democracy, both within and without the school, should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and the society toward even nobler ends” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 9).

The report argued that secondary education should have seven main aims: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. The fifth purpose, civic education, reverted to and embraced a more traditional view of schooling for democracy in terms of producing good citizens to further the republic, or as expressed by the authors, to “develop in the individual those qualities whereby he will act and well his part as a member of the neighborhood, town or city, State, and Nation, and give him a basis for understanding international problems” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 13). A good citizen possesses all of the following traits:

A many-sided interest in the welfare of communities to which one belongs; loyalty to the ideals of civic righteousness; practical knowledge of social agencies and institutions; good judgment as a means and methods that will promote one social end without defeating others; and as putting all these into effect, habits of cordial cooperation in social undertakings. (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 13)

To achieve these noble ends, all facets of schooling must be involved in “developing attitudes and habits important in a democracy” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 14). Pedagogically, all teachers should engage in cooperative learning, and curricularly, there should be an emphasis within social studies (teaching democracy and Republicanism), English (sharing readings that further insight into society and its problems), and civic education (as its own field of study).

However, while many contemporary civics classes simply deal with local and national issues, the *Cardinal Principles* emphasized knowledge in a global context for two specific purposes. First, unless students understand other nations, they will never be able to understand immigrants from those nations who arrive in the United States. Second, students must learn that every nation “has something of worth to contribute to civilization and that humanity would be incomplete without that contribution” by studying the “achievements and possibilities, not ignoring their limitations” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 14) of other nations. The hope of the authors is for students to appreciate “the ideal of human brotherhood” and “help to establish a genuine internationalism, free from sentimentality, founded on fact, and actually operative of the affairs of nations” (Bureau of Education, 1918, p. 15).

Much to Dewey’s chagrin, much of this explicitly pro-democracy purpose to schooling was lost in child-centered efforts to improve curriculum and in administrative efforts to reorganize school governance. However, one of Dewey’s contemporaries, George Counts, offered a series of reminders that it was fundamental to schooling to better our

democracy. Beginning with his 1932 speech before the Progressive Education Association, then titled “Dare Progressive Education Truly Be Progressive” but later published under the title *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (1978), Counts urged the audience to take a more radical stance in their teaching:

If America should lose her honest devotion to democracy, or if she should lose her revolutionary temper, she will no longer be America...If America is not to be false to the promise of her youth, she must do more than simply perpetuate the democratic ideal of human relationships: she must make an intelligent and determined effort to fulfill it. The democracy of the past was the chance fruit of a strange conjunction of forces on the new continent; the democracy of the future can only be the intended offspring of the union of human reason, purpose, and will. The conscious and deliberate achievement of democracy under novel circumstances is the task of our generation. (p. 37)

Counts would expand on this notion in much more length in his books *The Prospects of American Democracy* (1938) and *The Schools Can Teach Democracy* (1939).

To many Americans, the advent of World War II saw the immediate needs of the war effort to supersede notions of teaching for democracy. To thinkers influenced by Dewey and Counts, such as Theodore Brameld, there was no more critical time for ensuring American schools were teaching for democracy. *Design for America* (1945) detailed a study conducted by Brameld in the small town of Floodwood, Minnesota in which he implemented a program that taught students how to be good citizens, from motivation to action. Knowing that the public schools were “one important means through which the people of a democratic order progress” (p. 13), Brameld (1945) and his collaborators argued that the time had come “when the future of American and world society is in desperate need of concentrated planning” (p.13) and that the only way education could “contribute at all effectively is by a universal concern everywhere that public education exists” (p. 13).

Sadly, thinkers such as Counts and Brameld got lost in the McCarthy-era red scares and the notion of teaching for democracy was buried in Cold War rhetoric of American supremacy; however, by the 1960s there emerged a renewed call for embracing democracy. Leading the charge was (familiar to most readers of this journal) John Goodlad, author of *A Place Called School* (1984). In it, Goodlad sets forth four sets of goals for schooling in the U.S. which echo those set forth under the *Cardinal Principles*: academic goals; vocational goals; social, civic and cultural goals; and personal goals. One subset of the social, civic, and cultural goals pertains to citizenship participation—schooling for

democracy in terms of government and civic involvement. Beside the basics (knowledge of how government works and willingness to actively participate), Goodlad also argued schools should “5.4 Develop a commitment to the values of liberty, governed by consent of the governed, representational government, and one’s responsibility for the welfare of all” and “5.6 Exercise the democratic right to dissent in accordance with personal conscience” (p. 53).

Goodlad went on to become the pioneer behind the Institute for Educational Inquiry and its offshoot, the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). Those organizations have made schooling for democracy integral to their greater school renewal movements, getting educators involved on every level—teachers, administrators, and university faculty. As summarized by Nicholas Michelli and David Lee Keiser (2005), public schools should have four purposes:

1. Preparing students to be active, involved participants in a democracy;
2. Preparing students to have access to knowledge and critical thinking within the disciplines;
3. Preparing students to lead rich and rewarding personal lives, and to be responsible and responsive community members; and
4. Preparing students to assume their highest possible place in the economy (p. xviii).

Amongst the many characteristics of teacher education programs fostered by the NNER, specific pro-democracy characteristics include:

- Structures and policies to allow deep collaboration must be present, and appropriate connections within communities must be nurtured.
- ...a clear, unambiguous shared vision that addresses the four enduring purposes of education.
- We need to organize and join advocates for teaching for democracy and social justice at the federal, state, and local levels to support and defend public schools, teachers, and excellent teacher education programs. (Michelli & Keiser, 2005, p. xx)

Neoliberal Reforms and the Loss of Teaching for Democracy

In the 1980s, however, Goodlad’s pro-democracy rhetoric was overshadowed by the greater calls for reforms across the nation. Emblematic of this was the report issued by the federal government *A Nation at Risk* (1984). This report, which captured the nation’s attention, fundamentally altered the national conversation regarding schooling in

two substantive ways. First, it was the first expression of American lost faith in its public schools. If they were the “greatest invention ever” (p. 15), according to Horace Mann (1841), now they were a source of national shame. The report once again linked educational success with national success, this time in militaristic terms. Its opening paragraph reads, in part:

Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world...the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people...If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it an act of war. As it stands we have allowed this to happen to ourselves...We have in effect been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p.1)

With rhetoric like that ringing in their ears, most Americans were all too happy to put aside any conversation regarding any esoteric purpose of schooling, including schooling as a means of perpetuating and preserving the republic, let alone building good citizens to improve society.

The second way this report fundamentally altered the national conversation was by ushering in a neoliberal period of educational control. More and more the American public was calling for federal oversight of its schools. This led to a series of progressively more intrusive acts, beginning with *America 2000* and *Goals 2000* and ultimately leading up to the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Gone was any vestige of schooling for democracy or producing good citizens. Section 1001 of the Act provides the “Statement of Purpose,” which reads, “The purpose of this title is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments” (*No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, Section 1101, p. 1). The entire purpose of the over 600 page long law is to make students pass tests. That same section elaborates twelve means by which the law intends to achieve this goal, while words such as “accountability systems” and “assessment instruments” are featured prominently and often. Not once are words such as democracy, citizenship, or international awareness mentioned.

As summarized by Richard Lakes and Patricia Carter (2011), the side effects of neoliberalism’s impact on public schooling are dangerous, with some researchers claiming:

...the ultimate goal of neoliberal reformers is to convert educational systems into markets, and as much as possible privatize educational services. Others note that this development is already well underway in the form of publicly-supported vouchers for private school tuition, high-stakes standardized testing, public and private charters, single-sex schooling, scripted curricula, the deskilling of teachers, alternative teacher training, outsourcing of tutoring, the elimination of teacher unions, and, in general, the underfunding of public education. (p. 108)

What these neoliberal reform movements bring in zeal to the cause, they lack in any kind of foresight. Sadly, more and more American teachers, including preservice teachers, are getting caught up in the mindset that better test scores mean a better America and in the process are losing sight of the purposes of and methods to creating democratic classrooms. Or, as explained by Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, and Goodlad in the book *Education for Everyone* (2004), “too many of us occupying this richly endowed part of the world have assumed that the work-in-progress we call democracy will take care of us. This is a dangerous assumption. Things thought not to need our caring attention deteriorate” (p. ix).

Next Steps: The Schools Can Teach Democracy

Everyone involved in education must work towards actively avoiding such deterioration. One means for doing so was actually presented close to seventy years ago. The United States of 1939 was very similar to the U.S. of 2011 socially, politically, and economically. The nation was still in recovery from the Great Depression, and government-sponsored programs to help improve the economy were highly controversial, particularly those representing big businesses. There was an emerging global threat of fascism spreading across the world, and the U.S. was debating its role on the international stage. Against the backdrop of these rising threats came the social reconstructionist educator George Counts (1939) who wanted to both preserve and improve a democratic way of life in the United States, writing:

For us in America the present is an age of reckoning. We are being challenged to honor our promises, to make good our professions, to practice in an increasingly hostile world the faith which animated our fathers and which for generations made our country significant...We are being summoned before the bar of history to prove that we are the true sons and daughters of those countless men and women of diverse race, creed, and nationality who through the centuries have painfully and hopefully built the

great human heritage of popular justice and freedom. We are being invited to guard and nurture this heritage during the great crisis which is already enveloping the earth. (p. 5)

To Counts (1939), the answer was to make the United States the best nation it could be by launching a “bold and vigorous program of action” that would lead it to “new ventures and conquests” (p. 11). Fundamental to this program was making it attractive to American youth; fundamental to that program, as recognized by thinkers such as Jefferson, Webster, and Mann before him, were the schools. Counts argued that in “the achievement of any program for the defense and advance of democracy, the school and particularly the public school, must play an important role” (p. 14). To accomplish those goals, “the school program designed to support the cause of American democracy today should be directed primarily toward the realization of two major sets of purposes: the one having to do with habits, dispositions, and loyalties to be developed, the other with knowledge and insights to be acquired” (p. 16). To fulfill these two purposes, Counts argued that teachers should focus their efforts in seven essential steps that are as relevant today as they were back in 1939. These steps, obligations of democratic education as detailed by Counts, are:

- “Develop in the individual feelings of competence and adequacy—allow every child to grow to their full physical, intellectual, and moral stature” (p. 17).

Every child in the U.S. should be taught excellence in all content areas; the best way to encourage a child to grow is to teach them how to be successful by preparing all children, regardless of social identity, to be academically prepared to face the challenges of the 21st. century global village.

- “Develop in the individual a profound allegiance to the principle of human equality, brotherhood, dignity, and worth” (p. 18).

We must move beyond teaching tolerance in our classrooms into areas of actively teaching for social justice.

- “Arouse in the coming generation a deep loyalty to free discussion, criticism, and group decision, providing continual opportunities for participating in the process; acquiring the necessary skills, knowledges, and dispositions; not tolerating the appeal to prestige or position; not exercising arbitrary power” (pp. 18-19).

Preservice teachers must be prepared to be questioning, independent thinking individuals who pass these qualities along to their students. This is particularly challenging in today’s neoliberal world of

proscriptive curricula and high stakes testing; however, today that becomes a duty.

- Develop “a mentality marked by fair mindedness, integrity, and scientific spirit” (p. 19).

Presently there exists a distinct anti-science undercurrent, such as the insistence on teaching intelligent design or the refutation of all evidence of climate change. Thus, fostering a sense of the value in respecting scientific opinion is invaluable.

- Foster “respect for and appreciation of ability, training, and character” in citizens to form a “natural aristocracy...placing in the appropriate positions of trust and responsibility persons of talent, virtue, and training” (p. 20).

There is a distinct link between race, poverty, and education in the United States. The time has come to finally tap into the potential of our public school system, argued since Mann’s time, and make our schools the great equalizer in society. The time has come for our teachers to begin the quest for philosopher kings anew, instilling in every child in America not only the belief that they can succeed but also the skills and desire necessary to do such.

- “Propagate systematically the idea that every person of sound mind and body is obliged to engage in some sort of socially useful labor” as well express gratitude toward those who do the particularly “hard, unpleasant, dangerous, and monotonous work” to make the idea of “social parasitism, whether of individuals or classes...utterly repugnant” to citizens (pp. 20-21).

At present there exists a belief that to be successful, every child must go to university. We must re-instill in our youth the desire to make a living in honest work and separate out class distinctions. Just as we are encouraging every student that they can grow up to become president, so too must we be willing to de-stigmatize blue collar work and let them know that every child can grow up to be an electrician or mechanic.

- “Promote an enlightened devotion to the common good” and teach “patriotism in its most enlightened and human form—the rearing of a generation eager to serve community, nation, and mankind in times of peace—able, fearless, and incorruptible” (pp. 21-22).

Preservice teachers must be encouraged to develop these traits in their classroom practice, whether via service learning projects or other means.

In order to achieve these seven goals, Counts (1939) further argued that the schools must infuse throughout their curriculum seven specific items: the story of American democracy, from European origins to the present form; the rise of industrial society; a critical analysis of present

American society; “contradictions and conflicts which grow out of the maladjustments in the culture and the social structure” such as negative economic downturns and militarism/ nationalism; a critical analysis of the “social ideas, philosophies, and programs which are competing for survival and mastery in the world”; the various forms of propaganda, government and media; and socially curative organizations, such as labor unions (pp. 23-29). Preservice teachers must be prepared to infuse these curricular items in all levels of public schooling, early childhood through secondary. By doing so, and striving to fulfill Counts’ seven goals in grade- and content-appropriate means, preservice teachers can once again move beyond neoliberal definitions of what is important in education, test scores and accountability measure, to what is really meaningful--preparing citizens to create the best United States that can exist.

References

- Brameld, T. (1945). *Design for America: An educational exploration of the future of democracy*. New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge.
- Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. (1918). *Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education, appointed by the National Education Association*. (Bulletin No. 35). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Conant, J. B. (1962). *Thomas Jefferson and the development of American public education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Counts, G. (1939). *The schools can teach democracy*. New York, NY: The John Day Company.
- Counts, G. (1978). *Dare the school build a new social order?* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: MacMillan Press.
- Emerson, R. W. (1921). Education. In *Centenary edition: The complete works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (pp. 125-159). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Press.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. J. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, C. (1963). *Old time schools and school-books*. New York, NY: Dover.

- Kendall, J. (2010). *The forgotten founding father: Noah Webster's obsession and the creation of an American culture*. New York, NY: Berkeley Publishing.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Lakes, R. D., & Carter, P. A. (2011, March-April). Neoliberalism and education: An introduction. *Educational Studies*, 47(2), 107-111.
- Mann, H. (1841, January). Introduction. *Common School Journal*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Michelli, N. M., & Keiser, D. L. (2005). Introduction: Teacher education for democracy and social justice. In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. xii-xxv). New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). *A nation at risk: A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Public Law No. 107-110, § 115 1425, 20 U.S.C. 6301 (2001). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>

Edward A. Janak, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Edward A. Janak, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071. E-mail: ejanak@uwyo.edu

Moving Beyond Knowledge and Awareness in Diversity Education: Back and Forth Process

Jenna M. Shim
University of Wyoming

Chad S. Gibbs
University of Wyoming

Ronald K. Morgan
University of Wyoming

Adam K. Schaefer
University of Wyoming

In this paper, the authors report their findings from a yearlong self-reflexive practice that allowed them to explore how they think about issues related to racial diversity. The participants in this study are three white male preservice teachers and one Asian American female teacher educator. The authors investigated ways to expand reflection beyond conscious knowledge and awareness about race, racism, and radicalization and begin making changes in how one thinks. The assumption guiding this process was that being self-reflexive and investigating how one thinks is a prerequisite for changing thinking processes. The findings of this study suggest that engaging in self-reflexivity in regards to racial diversity is non-linear and involves a back and forth process.

KEYWORDS: self-reflexivity, race, racism, equitable educational practices

The imbalance between the number of white teachers and the ever-increasing number of students from diverse backgrounds accurately describes the current situation in many educational settings in the world (Bergh, Denessen, Hornsta, Voeten, & Holland, 2010; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Not surprisingly, the sharp contrast between student demographics and that of teachers demands teacher education programs to nurture in these educators intercultural competence so that they can better assist students who are from racial and cultural backgrounds different from their own. Doing so requires educators to become aware of their own cultural assumptions and openness toward differences (Nagata, 2005). However, research suggests that teacher preparation programs have historically valued and placed emphasis on teaching the fundamentals of content-area methods, assessment strategies, and classroom management. In other words, teacher preparation programs often fail to provide appropriate support to preservice teachers that would enable them to think deeply about how they would provide effective instruction to students from racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Huerta & Flemmer, 2005). On the other hand, research also indicates that preservice teachers must explore and understand their own views, beliefs, and assumptions concerning race, culture, and language in order to develop intercultural competence and effective pedagogies for their students from diverse backgrounds (Gay, 2010; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008).

In this regard, Gloria Ladson-Billings (2006) asserts that “the first problem teachers confront is believing that successful teaching” is primarily about “what to do” when in fact “the problem is rooted in *how we think* (emphasis added) about the social context, about the students . . . ” (p. 30). In other words, supporting the development of inter-culturally competent teachers who are responsive to their students from diverse backgrounds requires something beyond traditional forms of professional knowledge. This becomes particularly pertinent in an age in which racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity, as well as multiculturalism, are increasingly prominent features of the schools and society, both of which continue to fail to serve all students equally (Gorski, 2006, 2008). In this paper, we first discuss the importance of teacher beliefs and equitable classroom practice by reviewing existing research. Then, we discuss what we learned during a yearlong self-reflexive project on teaching thinking about racial diversity. Results of our study suggest that changing how one thinks is not a linear process and it involves a continual effort. Moving on to self-reflexivity and changing how one thinks about racial diversity is necessary if one is to move toward more just classrooms, schools, and society.

Literature Review

Teacher beliefs have been important concepts in education research for some time (Gay 2010, Silverman, 2010; Song, 2006; Tatto, 1996). Various researchers have used many different terms, such as “attitudes, values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understanding, and social strategy” (Pajares, 1992, p. 309) to define this important aspect of educator disposition exhibited in the classroom. The fact that such a long list of terms has been used to explore teachers’ thinking reflects both the importance and the complexity of teachers’ thought processes (Pajares, 1992) as well as their key place in education. Jesse Goodman’s (1988) insistence on *beliefs* as predilections that act as filters for preservice teachers’ ideas about teaching confirms the importance of attending to teacher beliefs. This idea is supported by other researchers as well (Cotton, 2006; Fang, 1996; Love & Kruger, 2005).

The rise in cultural, ethnic, racial, social, and linguistic diversity has become a defining feature of American schools. During the shift to more diverse classrooms, researchers have studied both preservice and in-service teachers’ social attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives toward other people, their cultures, and other issues (Bergh et al., 2010; Bakari, 2003; Chizhik & Chizhik, 2002; Dee & Henkin; 2002; Gere, Buehler, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Lewis, Ketter, & Fabos, 2001; McDonough, 2009). For example, Gere et al. (2009) demonstrated how prospective secondary school teachers encounter and interpret culturally responsive pedagogy very differently. According to these researchers, the various positions taken by prospective teachers are largely shaped by their race consciousness and racial beliefs; these, in turn, influence their classroom practice. Similarly, Bergh et al. (2010) showed that teachers’ implicit prejudiced attitudes that are historically constituted affected their expectation of their students’ ability. These expectations influenced students’ academic achievement. Hence, the teachers’ (sometimes misplaced) beliefs with respect to a certain race or culture, for instance, impinge upon their curricular practices, even if they may not be aware of it. Such beliefs exert powerful and consequential effects on the teachers’ instructional practices in ways that can hinder equitable and just education. Following a study on this issue, Lewis et al. (2001) concluded that how teachers interpreted multicultural literature as well as how they interacted with colleagues of different racial backgrounds were largely impacted by their values and beliefs--products of their own social and political backgrounds. In other words, these educators’ beliefs--

constitutive of their social and political locations and not immediately visible to them as impacting forces--filtered their understanding of multicultural literature. Moreover, the beliefs that act as a filter through which these educators interpreted the materials and the behaviors of others whom they encountered have been internalized through early socialization histories, without implicit instructions.

Although the different research studies hold different objectives, all emphasize the importance of educators' awareness of their own beliefs. Furthermore, teachers' social, cultural, historical, and educational backgrounds intimately link to the teachers' beliefs that shape their acceptance or rejection of diverse students' cultural practices and beliefs as well as the ways teachers evaluate student achievement. These research studies also illuminate difficulties involved in shifting one's ways of thinking since thinking dispositions are not consciously mastered, but rather deeply internalized through everyday practices (Bourdieu, 1990). Hence, people's beliefs often falsely appear to be self-evident and objective. Nevertheless, as our nation simultaneously experiences increasingly complex and diverse human conditions combined with more racial segregation than ever (Kozol, 2005), we feel that no matter how massive the world may seem, it is still constituted by individuals. Participating in change efforts must first begin with changing ourselves and how we think.

Methods

Goals and Objectives

In January 2011, three preservice teachers and one teacher educator began an exploration into examining and changing how we think—namely, our views, beliefs, and assumptions about the issues related to racial diversity in our everyday lives. Many research studies demonstrate how white teachers and preservice teachers reproduce the dominant system (King, 1991; McIntyre, 1977; Thompson, 2003), from which we read and learned. In this project, however, we became much more interested in investigating ways to go beyond analyzing how dominant systems are reproduced and thus began searching for ways to actually make changes in how we think. Building on and extending the insights offered by existing research studies, we committed ourselves to exploring how one could use the knowledge and awareness to bring about changes in thought processes related the issues related to racial diversity through ongoing self-reflexivity.

The assumption was that, even though inequality stems from systemic social conditions, change is also dependent on how individuals think and act (or don't think and act) in their everyday practices. We

also assumed that how an individual teacher thinks affects the manner in which he or she interacts with students from racially diverse backgrounds and their learning. The goal of the journey, therefore, was to start taking very small steps toward equality by engaging in a collaborative self-reflexivity in considering and changing racial beliefs that may be counterproductive in working with students from racially diverse backgrounds. We believed that being self-reflexive and investigating what we think is a prerequisite for changing how we think.

The three broad questions that guided our journey throughout the year were:

1. What negative thoughts or judgments occur to each of us when coming across a situation that involves people from racially diverse backgrounds?
2. Once we recognize such negative thoughts or judgments, given our commitment to change how we think, what happens when coming across similar situations next time? Do similar kinds of thoughts and judgments occur again or not?
3. How many of our negative thoughts and judgments are really about a particular person from a racially diverse background?

Context and Participants

All of us first met each other in an undergraduate course titled *Diversity and the Politics of Schooling* in 2010. The course is required for all students in the teacher education program at an institution where this study takes place, and it is in a rural state populated predominantly by European Americans. Some of the content covered in this course includes, but is not limited to, discussions on race, racism, white privilege, marginalization, and structural inequality. The course also emphasizes the importance of reflexive practice. During the particular semester of this study, students were highly engaged in the course content, always asking important questions and going beyond the minimum requirements. They wanted to learn more about the topics typically considered controversial. For example, while often students will shy away from and feel uncomfortable with openly discussing white privileges, these students wanted to know more and think deeply into such topics. Three of these enthusiastic students ended up participating in this project and authoring this paper with the instructor of the course.

The three participating preservice teachers are male, white, secondary education majors from ages 22 to 30. The teacher educator and the instructor of *Diversity and the Politics of Schooling* is an Asian American in her forties and she began teaching at the institution in 2010.

Prior to starting the project in 2011, all three preservice teachers indicated a commitment to working with students from racially diverse backgrounds. As a group, we expressed our commitment in working against inequality linked to racial diversity that we recognize to persist in the current educational system and society.

Data Collection and Analysis

We met one to two times per month for twelve months starting in January 2011. We had ongoing discussions on our observations of our own judgments against, and thoughts about, others who are from racially diverse backgrounds. Our data collection was informed by Bell Hook's (1994) idea that "to engage in dialogue is one of the simplest ways we can begin as teachers, scholars . . . to cross boundaries" and "disrupt the seemingly fixed (yet often unstated) assumptions" (p. 130). We also adopted Spivak's (2003) concept of "othering ourselves" in an attempt to make the familiar aspects of how we think become unfamiliar. In each meeting, we shared the experience of *othering* ourselves through ongoing self-observation of ourselves. Each meeting was very loosely organized in order to avoid imposing one person's thinking on others.

Data sources for this study are each of our contributions made in all the meetings and the notes taken by the senior author. Each meeting was 75 to 100 minutes long, and all the meetings were tape-recorded, which were then transcribed. The notes were compared with the transcribed data to check for consistency and/or contradictions. Ongoing open coding strategy of grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was used to identify and analyze the patterns and themes within and across our discussions in the meetings. As in all analyses, we brought particular perspectives and views to the analysis that shaped what we were able and unable to see in terms of data categories. Moreover, considering the discussions in this study pertain to our own unique experiences in this journey, we recognize the experiences cannot be generalized. However, we felt that the findings from our journey could illuminate the general process involved in self-reflexivity with a goal of changing how we think about racial diversity.

Although we did not change our guiding questions throughout our project, our focus and understanding of the themes evolved as we moved across the twelve months of data collections and analysis. In other words, as we engaged in ongoing open coding during the year, we saw patterns in the data around the themes that are more directly relevant to self-reflexivity that relate to our guiding questions. Hence, although we initially focused on the whys and hows of our thinking related to racial diversity, as shown below in the findings section, we learned much more about what it means to engage in an on-going self-reflexivity in relations

to racial thinking. Because we believe that being self-reflexive and investigating how we think is a prerequisite for changing how we think, understanding what may be involved in self-reflexivity becomes a requisite step in diversity teacher education.

Findings: Our Stories and What We Learned

The four themes that emerged as we engaged in ongoing open coding during and across our project were: (1) self-reflexivity as a non-linear process, (2) self-reflexivity as a way to identify our own misconceptions, (3) self-reflexivity as a slow but productive process, and (4) self-reflexivity as a journey with a long lasting effect. As aforementioned, even though we did not change the guiding questions for our meetings and discussions, we identified the patterns around the themes that are more directly relevant to what it means to engage in self-reflexivity in terms of racial diversity which do relate to our guiding questions. The discussion of each theme below includes examples of statements made by each project participant.

Self-Reflexivity as a Non-linear Process

Our data consistently showed that transforming how one thinks is not a linear or one-time process that can be easily and immediately achieved through one's commitment or will to change. Instead, we discovered that, just when one thinks improvement is being made, one can easily slip back into the old ways of thinking. In this regard, Ron states,

For me, this process has to be worked on daily. What I improve on one week can be lost in a single unthinking moment. Habits of thinking have to change. I am changing some; however, other habits are more deeply rooted.

Here, Adam also notes the importance of continuous and constant self-reflection:

For weeks, it seemed like things were going great. No comments or thoughts have come to my attention along racist or stereotypical lines. But, just like turning on a light, I then catch myself out of the blue thinking something random about an individual that is not appropriate.

Not surprisingly, all project participants also agreed that the process of engaging in self-reflexivity in shifting one's ways of thinking about racial diversity often feels discouraging and exhausting. The data reflected that we all, at some point, experienced frustration, anxiety, and even anger, and sometimes the self-reflexivity did not feel empowering at all. Chad notes,

The constant attempt to improve seems the hardest for me. It isn't always easy to monitor what you are doing or saying.

Sometimes the process of attempting to improve becomes so exhausting that being in a room filled only with other White men would be easier. There is a relaxing comfort in that horrible thought. It simply reappears when I realize how much work and how many habits are still left to improve.

Adam also mentions, “For the longest time it seemed that I would not be able to shift from constant negative thoughts about others. This struggle often caused problems because at times I just want to stop and not change anything.”

Self-Reflexivity as a Way to Identify Our Own Misconceptions

Another theme that emerged when looking across our data had to do with an identification and understanding of our own misconceptions. More specifically, in the process of walking down the road of a yearlong collaborative self-reflexivity, which involved many challenges and difficulties, we identified two major misconceptions. First, our shared experiences reflect that the belief that the difficulties and problems in crossing cultural and racial boundaries stem entirely from the lack of knowledge about people from different cultural and racial backgrounds is counterproductive. While knowledge about different cultures is important, we found that often it is our interpretations and assumptions about the differences that cause problems in working across boundaries. Ron states, “A cultural misunderstanding about a person’s beliefs or thoughts on something is often what is causing me to shut down and think negatively toward that individual which makes working with him that much more difficult.”

Chad also claims,

We have ideas of how other groups live, work and act, but for the most part, we don’t know anything about them. I live in a rural state. Most racial or ethnic groups are as foreign to me as the dark side of the moon. One step toward progress was simply recognizing that I don’t know anything about other groups. What you think you know will most certainly affect your opinions and actions. *This* is where prejudice comes from.

Adam likewise comments, “Our preconceived notions, whether correct or incorrect, do affect how we interact with others.” These stories reveal the importance of exploring our role in what we do and how we interact with people from different racial backgrounds rather than quickly locating the difficulties in external values such as knowledge about different cultures. Having stated that, our stories show the necessity for all educators to be more responsible by engaging in self-reflexivity.

The second misconception we identified was the belief that thinking anything is okay as long as one does not act upon it does not promote a

positive change in *how we think* about racial others. We believe that it is common for some people to accept that what one thinks does not matter as long as one does not act on it in public. However, through our continual self-observation, we found the perception that thoughts do not lead to action is far from the truth. In this regard, Ron comments, “I feel that change will come about once the negative thoughts are eliminated.” Chad also states,

Our thoughts are step one of our actions. If we allow the thought process to remain unchanged, our actions will continue to remain unchanged. The almost unconscious everyday mistakes that one author has called ‘micro-aggressions’ have to stem from an unchanged thought process. Micro-aggressions are the failures of a person who remains mentally unchanged but has told himself that they will clean up their act. They continue to fail because they are not realizing that their actions come from what they continue to allow their internal voice to say. I must however admit that this idiotic point of view is where I first started out. Realizing that I once held this view is what makes me hate it so much today.

Self-Reflexivity as a Slow but Productive Process

Despite all the difficulties and challenges expressed by each of us, the data also revealed that we did make some progress in terms of how we think during a yearlong collaborative self-reflexivity. For instance, we found that ongoing self-reflexivity opens a door towards becoming much more acute in noticing how we and others think even though a change is not immediately possible. In other words, one looks for the assumptions underneath the statements of self and others that may seem simple on the surface but carry misconceptions that are both false and inhibit open relationships with racial others. Adam notes, “I am finding myself trying to get to the bottom of how and why we think, act, or do things—at least in reference to the behavior we have been focusing on with this study.” Ron found that transforming how one thinks is not a linear or one-time process that can be easily and immediately achieved through one’s commitment and will to change. He comments,

I do see a great deal of my own personal progress. I have the better ability to see the underlying assumptions in what I and others say. I may not realize a mistake before I say it, but at least I am seeing the fuller picture even if it is sometimes after the fact. When a friend makes a comment with racist undertones, I don’t miss that any more. The next and often hardest step is to challenge their comment. I have to admit that I cannot always do that. I am still proud of the fact that I

constantly try to see the truth underneath the thoughts and actions around me.

Concurrently, we felt that we also made progress in our understanding that one is much more compelled to encourage others to self-examine their viewpoints on diversity as a result of participating in a yearlong journey of self-reflexivity. However, some group members found it very difficult to challenge others' 'plain wrong' thinking. Other group members said that prompting more people to reflect on their viewpoints is the only way to move toward a more equitable society. Chad mentions,

I am compelled to have the conversation, but I am not always compelled to correct their failures. In certain situations, it is not easy to point out the bias and mistakes of others. Honestly, the courage just isn't always there. And that doesn't even begin to take into account the exhaustion of trying to improve personally and the social aspect of that. I've spoken many times about how I have friends who refuse to change. They now know that they hold opinions that offend me and that much I have made clear.

Similarly, Ron states, "Knowing and catching one's own actions and thoughts makes it easier to catch them in others. The difficulty is in how to approach them about it. It is especially difficult if it's family or a close friend." However, despite the challenges, Adam addressed the importance of engaging in a collective effort in transforming negative racial perspectives to promote a more just society. He notes, "I am very interested in encouraging others to examine their viewpoints on diversity. I think that is the only way we will see a more accepting society."

Self-Reflexivity as a Journey with a Long Lasting Effect

Lastly, our data showed that engaging in self-reflexivity and dialogue for a prolonged period has a long-lasting effect. In other words, what we have discussed as a group remains in each of our minds even after concluding our regular meetings. Adam comments,

I hang out with another participant in this journey quite a bit. It doesn't matter if we are at a bar and a few drinks in. We recognize when some part of our discussions has just come up. If we hear an off-color joke or a racist comment, we look at each other and thoughts of the group come up. We are trying and we at least never shut that off.

Chad stated, "After our meetings, it is difficult to not think about what we have discussed. Every thought or action is looked at. Was it a positive or negative thought? If so, why and how do I do better?" Ron also notes, "I have personally been exploring the motivating factors

behind prejudices and have been attempting to find answers to big picture questions.” These stories illuminate that, however slow and difficult the progress may be, engaging in self-reflexivity does bring about a change in how we think and act.

Discussion and Afterthoughts

As a result of following the guiding questions during our collaborative self-reflexive project, we learned a great deal about what is involved in practicing self-reflexivity about racial thinking. To reiterate the guiding questions, they were:

1. What negative thoughts or judgments occur to each of us when coming across a situation that involves people from racially diverse backgrounds?
2. Once we recognize such negative thoughts or judgments, given our commitment to change how we think, what happens when coming across similar situations next time? Do similar kinds of thoughts and judgments occur again or not?
3. How many of our negative thoughts and judgments are really about a particular person from a racially diverse background?

Although the findings reported in this study do not directly answer the guiding questions, the themes that we identified do illuminate the answers to the questions the following ways. We do possess negative thoughts and judgments about people from racially diverse backgrounds which we cannot immediately eradicate just because we have the will or knowledge to do so. Therefore, when we come across similar situations in which we are interacting with people from racially diverse backgrounds, we may still repeat the same mistake of thinking unjustified thoughts about others. By identifying the misconceptions we often hold, we learned that the difficulties that we have in working across racial differences do not stem from the lack of knowledge about people from diverse backgrounds alone, but these obstacles are also founded in the erroneous beliefs we hold toward others.

In the literature review section, we showed the importance of teacher beliefs and views regarding influence on student learning. In this study, we also learned that we continue to hold unfair and unjustified views about people from racially diverse backgrounds that, if left unnoticed, would limit the ways in which we can assist our students from diverse backgrounds. This means that engaging in self-reflexivity to change how we think about racial diversity is not only helpful but necessary. Throughout our journey, we felt that we were making the kind of progress that would not have been possible had we not engaged in this

project-however difficult, slow, and ambivalent the journey proved to be. Moreover, the four of us now agree that ongoing self-reflexivity and analysis is the only way to imagine truly making changes in how we think. Now, more than three years have passed since the three preservice teachers walked into the *Diversity and the Politics of Schooling* class. More than two years have passed since the four of us began our exploration. We cannot say that we made a huge step forward in changing how we think, but we each took the beginning steps. *Such progress* matters because it is a necessary in shifting how we think and thus changing the impact on student learning. Below are some broad guidelines that each of us will remember as we continue this journey individually. It is our hope that the stories we share here can serve as a beneficial resource for those who are also committed to moving a step closer to a more just world.

We discussed in our findings that the process of transforming how we think involves a non-linear process, and we must continue to remind ourselves that attempting to change how one thinks involves a back and forth movement. It is almost inevitable that each of us at times will inadvertently continue to make false assumptions and judgments about others from diverse backgrounds. We may not always catch ourselves before we make mistakes. However, continuous engagement with self-reflexivity in an effort to change how one thinks will allow each of us to recognize our mistakes, rather than remaining blind to them. Through continual self-examination, one can realize and likely be disappointed with the observed behavior. Such realizations, in turn, will motivate us to continue struggling with how we think. In addition, as shown in the findings, the continuous engagement with self-reflexivity in regards to race and racism helped us identify as false the beliefs that we held to be true for so long. Those misconceptions, if unnoticed, can limit the way we interact with students from diverse backgrounds.

We must remember that changing how one thinks is not possible without struggles and pain and, in fact, only through struggles and pain can one grow. As discussed in the findings, each step of self-reflexivity in how we think about race and racism has proved both difficult and at times frustrating. However, considering how each of us has undergone years of societal influence that imprint us with specific beliefs and biases, changing these sediments from our personal histories necessarily involves struggles. Nevertheless, facing the challenges of self-reflexivity stimulated progress; therefore, the inevitable pain and struggles must be viewed as a generative space for growth.

Keeping the conversation alive is also important. Shor and Freire (1987) defined empowerment *not* as “private notions of getting ahead” (p. 23) but rather as a person’s ability to use what one knows to help

others. Although the four of us may never actually reach the goal of entirely shifting how we think, each of us feels that, as we continue to stride down this road of self-reflexivity, encouraging others to do the same, the endeavor itself enhances the possibility of a more equitable society. As we found in this study, engaging in self-reflexivity has a long-lasting effect beyond our meetings, and we are much more inclined to support others to engage in the same reflexive practice. At the beginning of this essay, we stated that the ultimate goal in changing how one thinks is to effect social change. Although major instances of inhumanity as a result of diversity are mostly historical, social, and systemic, we still believe that an individual's continuous effort in shifting how people think will have a long-term social effect. Therefore, the more individuals there are in our society who are committed to changing how they think about people from racially diverse backgrounds, the more chance we have in moving toward equality and equity. In his book, *Privilege, Power, and Difference*, Allan Johnson (2001) notes,

Gandhi once said nothing we do as individuals matters, but that it's vitally important to do it anyway. Imagine, for example, that social systems are trees and we are the leaves. No individual leaf on the tree matters; whether it lives or dies has no effect on much of anything. But collectively, the leaves are essential to the whole tree because they photosynthesize the sugar that feeds it. Without leaves, the tree dies. So leaves matter and they don't, just as we matter and we don't. (p. 146)

We believe that facing the challenges within ourselves is an absolute requirement because those very challenges, if gone unnoticed, marginalize the students of diverse racial backgrounds. As we have stated earlier, we recognize that inequality and oppression are effects of systemic social conditions. However, we feel that if change is going to occur in schools and society, it will largely depend on how individuals think and act in relation to each other and how much we are willing to look into ourselves by engaging in self-reflexivity.

References

- Bakari, R. (2003). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward teaching African American students. *Urban Education, 38*(6), 640-654.
- Bergh, L., Denessen, E., Hornstra, L., Voeten, M., & Holland, R. W. (2010). The implicit prejudiced attitudes of teachers: Relations to teacher expectations and the ethnic achievement gap. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(2), 497-527.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Chizhik, E. W., & Chizhik, A. W. (2002). A path to social change: Examining students' responsibility, opportunity, and emotion toward social justice. *Education and Urban Society, 34*(3), 283-297.
- Cotton, D. R. E. (2006). Implementing curriculum guidance on environmental education: The importance of teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 38*(1), 67-83.
- Dee, J. R., & Henkin, A. B. (2002). Assessing dispositions toward cultural diversity among preservice teachers. *Urban Education, 37*(1), 22-40.
- DeJaeghere, J. G., & Zhang, Y. (2008). Development of intercultural competence among US American teachers: Professional development factors that enhance competence. *Intercultural Education, 19*(3), 255-268.
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65.
- Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 143-152.
- Gere, A. R., Buehler, J., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). A visibility project: Learning to see how preservice teachers take up culturally responsive pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(3), 816-852.
- Goodman, J. (1988). Constructing a practical philosophy of teaching: A study of preservice teachers' professional perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(2), 121-137.
- Gorski, P.C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 17*(2), 163-77.
- Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not good enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*(6), 515-25.
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Huerta, G., & Flemmer, L. (2005). Identity, beliefs and community: Preservice secondary teacher views about diversity. *Intercultural Education, 16*(1), 1-14.
- Johnson, A. (2001). *Privilege, power, and difference*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York, NY: Crown.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). Yes, but how do we do it?: Practicing culturally relevant pedagogy. In J. Landsman & C. W. Lewis (Eds.), *White teachers/diverse classrooms* (pp. 29-42). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Lewis, C., Ketter, J., & Fabos, B. (2001). Reading race in a rural context. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(3), 317-350.
- Love, A., & Kruger, A. C. (2005). Teacher beliefs and student achievement in urban schools serving African American students. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(2), 87-98.
- McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 3-24.
- McDonough, K. (2009). Pathways to critical consciousness: A first-year teacher's engagement with issues of race and equity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 528-537.
- McIntyre, A. (2002). Exploring whiteness and multicultural education with prospective teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(1), 31-49.
- Nagato, A. L. (2005). Promoting self-reflexivity in intercultural education. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 8*, 139-167.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). What is the "dialogical method" of teaching? *Journal of Education, 169*(3), 11-31.
- Silverman, S. K. (2010). What is diversity?: An inquiry into preservice teacher beliefs. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(2), 292-329.
- Song, K. H. (2006). Urban teachers' beliefs on teaching, learning, and students: A pilot study in the United States of America. *Education and Urban Society, 38*(4), 481-499.
- Spivak, G. C. (2003). A conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Politics and the imagination, interview by Jenny Sharpe. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28*(2), 609-24.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tatto, M.T. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students: Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(2), 155-180.
- Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 7-29.
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' characteristics: Research on the demographic profile. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner

Moving Beyond Knowledge and Awareness

(Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 111-156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jenna M. Shim, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming; Chad S. Gibbs, University of Wyoming; Ronald K. Morgan, University of Wyoming; Adam K. Schaefer, University of Wyoming.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jenna M. Shim, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071. E-mail: jshim@uwyo.edu.

Authentic to Transformative Learning: Building Global Competence

Stephanie K. Davis
Wright State University

Roxanne S. DuVivier
Wright State University

Access to worldwide employment opportunities and the need for portable skills and interdisciplinary perspectives require institutions of higher education to enhance students' global competence. In this paper, two learning theories are highlighted: authentic learning and transformative learning. Authentic learning focuses on real-world problems and solutions, involves collaboration and reflection, and builds relationships for student success. Transformative learning extends learners' cognitive structure and results in multiple perspectives, new habits of mind, and an expanded sense of global fitness. Used in tandem, the two theories provide opportunities to broaden students' knowledge, skills, and perspectives of relationships and the world in which they live, learn, and work.

KEYWORDS: authentic learning, transformative learning, global competence, cognitive disequilibrium, disorienting dilemma, critical reflection, critical dialectical discourse

Democracy depends on high quality effective public education to reach its citizenry so that students may become independent, creative, and collaborative members of their communities. As high-tech practices replace communication and work options, traditional teaching practices may no longer be effective. Students now have hybrid identities, yet there is an increased need for high touch and building relationships. Society has also become more pluralistic, hence the demand to foster new understandings concerning the work environment and work communities. The need to acquire new knowledge and apply it in a more efficient, exciting way to form global connections that result in deeper, more personal connections necessitates innovative approaches and higher levels of problem solving.

In this paper, two learning theories that promote learner-centered teaching and global competence are discussed: authentic learning and transformative learning. Authentic learning focuses on real-world problems and solutions and involves collaboration and reflection while transformative learning extends learners' cognitive structures and results in multiple perspectives, new habits of mind, and an expanded sense of global fitness. Used in tandem, the two theories provide opportunities to broaden students' knowledge, skills, and perspectives of the world in which they live, learn, and work.

Why Apply Authentic and Transformative Learning Theories?

Educators often cite lack of student engagement, cross-cultural knowledge, familiarity with global issues, and direct exposure to other cultures as contributing to their sense of professional inadequacy and limitations of their practice (Cornelius-White & Harbaugh, 2010). For these reasons, it is no longer useful to view the world through one principle, familiar lens. The cultural lens offered by our families of origin cannot provide the robust understanding needed to function in today's world. For students to be able to relate to others effectively, we must offer environmental experiences that teach students to consider not only their own perspectives but also those of others. In addition, we must intentionally broaden their views so students' responses are flexible and based on meaningful learning experiences gained at home and at school (Slavkin, 2004). So, how do we teach students to acquire new knowledge, engage in learning, become emotionally connected to learning, and make the connection between theory and practice *and* perspective and action? How do we increase students' motivation, involvement, and feelings of empowerment as they are learning?

Slavkin (2004) theorized that student learning occurs when role models create an environment that exposes them to real-world complex problems and solutions that challenge their growth and development and

involves collaboration and reflection. *Authentic learning* occurs when constructivism, student-centered practices, and student choice are incorporated and result in real-world relevance. Learning environments are interdisciplinary and invite “multiple perspectives, ways of working, habits of mind, and community” (Lombardi, 2007, p. 3). When students are able to understand what they are investigating and to apply it in daily life—that is the power of authentic learning (Doyle, 2011). Meaningful learning occurs when students are taught with innovative teaching strategies that include problem-based, technology-enriched learning environments (Herrington & Herrington, 2006). Because of authentic practices, an environmental foundation emerges; learning becomes meaningful and interesting, and students are able to reflect upon their school community and improve their citizenry.

Transformative learning theory incorporates authentic learning and advances authentic pedagogy by helping students to make sense of circumstances that influence perspective. Through transformative learning experiences, students acquire cognitive skills to successfully live in increasingly complex societies. Transformative learning addresses the dynamic relationship between people and events, and illustrates how actions are shaped by context and assumptions. The need to view circumstances through multiple lenses in an increasingly multicultural world gives transformative learning theory increased relevance. Both authentic and transformative pedagogical practices create real world learning opportunities to heighten student engagement. Career readiness skills developed through authentic learning may be broadened by incorporating transformative learning practices.

Two Theories: Authentic Learning and Transformative Learning

Authentic Learning

“Authentic learning is a pedagogical approach that allows students to explore, discuss, and meaningfully construct concepts and relationships in context that involve real-world problems and projects that are relevant to the learner” (Mims, 2003, p. 1). The phrase has often been associated with educational jargon such as *real learning* (Mims, 2003), *experiential learning* (Council for Exceptional Children, 2011), *learning-by-doing* (Lombardi, 2007), and *learning beyond classrooms* (Herrington, Specht, Brickell, & Harper, 2009). Authentic learning occurs when educators incorporate projects in curricula that help students understand what they are expected to learn and be able to do in the real world (Herrington et al., 2009). Today, due to a highly mobile and tech savvy workforce, authentic learning theory should also align with *global competence*—being able to investigate the world beyond the immediate environment,

recognizing others' perspectives, communicating ideas with diverse audiences, and taking action to improve conditions (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011) if the goal is to provide real-world relevance. In the authentic learning educational environment, when teachers incorporate circumstances that are similar to real life application into the learning environment, the acquisition of knowledge is optimized (Herrington & Herrington, 2006); however, what does that mean, exactly? How should teachers go about creating an environment conducive to the authentic learning environment?

In 2004, Slavkin presented the idea that best practice or *authentic pedagogy* was needed in order to motivate students to learn effectively. He posited that students who lacked authentic learning opportunities in their formative years were likely to become disinterested in learning, lack social and behavioral skills to pursue more information, and lack interest in the world around them. He further theorized that educators could motivate students by creating learning environments that exposed children to a diversity of experiences and developing assignments that helped students make connections between what is being learned in the classroom and how such learning influences the community environment. Slavkin was an advocate of nurtured reflective practice—helping students to think in ways that provide flexibility of thought that is critical in the 21st century world.

Herrington & Herrington (2006) offered broad suggestions for “teachers wishing to break away from traditional, teacher-centered approaches in higher education, and...willing to create learning environments where students are motivated to learn in rich, relevant and real-world contexts” (p. 1). They referred to transformative learning theory as a way to enhance collaborative partnerships, develop leadership, and as Laiken (2006) added, to foster “rich resources for learning” (p. 15) rather than managing challenges. By presenting students with problems that surpass their comfort zone, candid dialog occurs and opposing ideas surface, causing students to examine and assess conventions, thus moving them toward the exploration of new meaning and perspectives. Personal transformations in values, attitudes, and behavior often occur, and reflection and critical thinking are encouraged throughout the development of this community of practice.

While there is no set formula for designing authentic learning environments, seven common characteristics based on a review of literature include:

1. A learner-centered environment that *lets students do the work* through incorporation of technology where students may review course material, post questions, concerns and

- relevant topics, obtain feedback from peers and the instructor, and individualize their experiences (Doyle, 2011);
2. An inquiry-based environment that encourages students to think through problems based on their choice and interest (Slavkin, 2004) in a sustained investigation since problems cannot always be resolved within a particular time frame (Lombardi, 2007);
 3. Relevant, realistic real-world activities that connect the classroom with the surrounding environment (Slavkin, 2004) and encourage students to apply in daily life what they are learning in school (Doyle, 2011);
 4. An emotional connection so that material relates to personal lives (Slavkin, 2004), unique and difficult environmental experiences so that students may find multiple meaning (Slavkin, 2004), and multiple sources of perspectives that require students “to distinguish relevant from irrelevant information” (Lombardi, 2007, p. 3);
 5. Opportunities for collaboration (Lombardi, 2007), interaction, questioning and dialog of topics of interest to students (Slavkin, 2004) so that interpersonal relationships are enhanced and positive emotional and behavioral outcomes result (Cornelius-White & Harbaugh, 2010);
 6. Reflection of learning - individual and as a group - so that learners may reflect on their own learning as well as learn new perspectives from other members of a group (Lombardi, 2007); and
 7. Continuous, formative assessment (Lombardi, 2007) of key points so that practice of material is ongoing and recall is immediate (Doyle, 2011).

For authentic learning to occur, a culture that links content and activities with the world of work must exist along with a collaborative learning environment that helps students to discuss, question, reflect and link ideas to their own experiences.

Benefits gained from an authentic learning environment include enhanced academic performance (Doyle, 2011), increased awareness of accountability of their work products, and cultivation of portable skills (Lombardi, 2007). As Lombardi emphasizes,

Authentic learning may be more important than ever in a rapidly changing world where...individuals can expect to progress through multiple careers. To be competitive in a global job market, today's students must become comfortable with the complexities of ill-defined real-world problems. (p. 10)

Learners must have confidence, which is developed through increased exposure to and participation in a community of authentic practice.

Transformative Learning

Transformative learning expands authentic learning practice by including the deep learning needed to develop globally competent dispositions. Transformative learning theory offers principles for viewing the evolution of perspective development in students (Stevens, Gerber, & Hendra, 2010) and helps students become aware of their preconceived views and unexamined assumptions so that they become mindful of the methods they use to acquire knowledge. According to Mezirow (1997), transformative learning results in meaningful change in how students see themselves and how they view and interact with the world around them. Through transformative learning opportunities, students gain greater control of their lives and become more socially responsible decision makers. They learn to construct and act upon their own values, feelings, and meanings (Stevens et al., 2010) and are able to respond to others from an informed and responsive position.

Culturally competent students are open-minded regarding the views, perspectives, and realities of others. Transformative education aids the development of cognitive and emotional openness through the expansion and refinement of standards or *frames of reference*. These frames or mental structures drive thoughts, responses, and behaviors. Mezirow's theory of transformative learning contributes to the discussion on global competence by providing a set of principles to guide efforts to achieve global awareness, multicultural appreciation, and inclusivity.

Four Broad Themes

Transformative learning theory encompasses four broad themes through which perspectives become transformed (Mezirow, 2009). The first is the disorienting dilemma, a learning experience that takes an individual beyond a personally defined comfort zone. The disorienting dilemma results in a state of cognitive disequilibrium when old perspectives are juxtaposed with new ones. Courses that challenge students to go beyond their comfort zones may use the disorienting dilemma as a catalyst for students to acquire new learning.

The second theme involves critical reflection of the content, process, and premise underlying an experience in order to create meaning from it. Premise reflection fosters the examination of viewpoints and the critique of assumptions. Courses that encourage premise reflection and examining problems from multiple perspectives establish the conditions for new mental structures to emerge.

The third theme involves engagement in rational discourse where the questioning of premises, identification of disparities, and reasoned reframing occurs. Educational encounters where diverse representations of experience are shared or debated use rational discourse to shape new learning.

The fourth theme involves a reintegration of new perspectives to form a self-determined mental architecture for viewing the world. This process results in the formation of new ways of knowing and new ways of responding to people and circumstances. According to transformative theory, new learning associated with perspective change occurs in transformative stages through which meaning is clarified. The process unfolds in phases that ordinarily occur sequentially, with some person-specific level of variation (Mezirow, 2000).

The Disorienting Dilemma

The notion of creating or capturing less comfortable conditions to raise awareness and foster growth is described by numerous theorists and researchers. Vygotsky's seminal theory of intellectual development acknowledges the dynamic interplay between the comfort of one's psychological state and the demands of present and future experience and learning (Levykh, 2008). In examining cognitive and attitudinal change, Boler (2004) suggested a need for discomfort, describing its usefulness in disrupting cognitive equilibrium. To Boler, shattering a student's worldview is necessary in order to foster re-evaluation of rigidly held notions and is needed in order to support movement from comfortable conditions to uncharted territory. The process of negotiating new minefields of contradiction and ambiguity is necessary for students to emerge with productive replacements for previously held assertions.

Similarly, Che, Spearman, and Manizade (2009) examined what they called *constructive disequilibrium* in the context of multicultural learning. They reported that cognitive and emotional learning occurs in social situations where discomfort is experienced and support for learning provided. Che et al. suggested that the dissonant experiences of less familiar destinations amplified learning when students were concurrently provided support and affirmation. Under these conditions, students felt safe to address the challenges of dissonance and found resolution through new meanings of experience.

Disequilibrium can be incremental or dramatic. Brock's (2010) research with 256 undergraduate business students provided support for the assertion that a disorienting dilemma surrounding social roles provides impetus for transformative learning to occur, and some form of disorienting dilemma creates conditions of cognitive disequilibrium. Lack of certainty of assumptions and the dissonance experienced creates

learning opportunities and results in individuals' ability to transform perspectives (Festinger, 1962).

In 2011, Trilokekar and Kukar conducted qualitative research that provided a context for meaning-making in the world. While the sample size was small, their study of nine York University students studying abroad revealed numerous disorienting experiences including discrimination, perceived racial dynamics, experienced outsider status, and experimentation with new identities. Participants reported varied opportunities to engage in reflection yet limited opportunity to relate study abroad experiences to revise frames of reference.

D'Amato and Krasny (2012) added to the body of research on disorienting dilemma by utilizing transformative learning principles when researching 23 former Outdoor Adventure Education participants at Brown University. They included retrospective, pre-post and reflective interviews to gain insight into students' learning experiences. Four findings emerged from the data. First, participants reported a disorienting dilemma as a result of living in a pristine natural environment and experiencing a different lifestyle. A tight-knit supportive community aided in negotiating the disorienting dilemma. Second, participants engaged in critical self-reflection. Third, they reported increased competence built through negotiating their disorienting dilemma and engaging in self-reflective practice. It is useful to note that participants attributed their degree of growth to involvement in intense, challenging experiences.

Critical Reflection of Perspectives

According to Dewey (1933), critical reflection involves the justification of actions through rational assessment of one's beliefs. The perspectives that students hold guide response style, are formed through experience, have been developed over time, and may be re-examined by critical self-reflection. Perspectives are either culturally assimilated or intentionally acquired - they help students interpret the world around them. Critical reflection enables students to correct any distortions inherent in their reasoning processes so they may take objective, informed action.

According to Mezirow (2009), individuals change their frames of reference through a process of critical reflection. During the reflective process, they examine assumptions that serve as a basis for their interpretations, beliefs, habits of mind, and resulting points of view. To make sense of an experience and to learn from it, individuals must critically reflect upon that experience and explore the assumptions held in association with it, either directly or tangentially. For learning to be transformative, it must incorporate the process of critical self-reflection.

To Mezirow (1997), this reflective process involves engaging in an objective critique of the suppositions on which one's core beliefs are held.

Studies of the critical reflection process illustrate its role in transformative learning. Stevens et al. (2010) examined the degree to which UMass Amherst's University Without Walls approach to assessment of learning contributed to transformative learning in adults. The researchers examined transformation by focusing on one aspect of Mezirow's ten phases of transformative learning: the change in roles and responsibilities. Forty-five alumni and current students participated in the research project that involved writing critical reflections. Patterns and relationships were examined, along with knowing and meaning-making. Eighty-seven percent of the participants reported improved confidence and writing ability. Sixty-four percent reported a positive change in self-valuation. Thirty-one percent reported positive change in their perceptions of themselves in their roles as learners. The researchers reported participant change in transformative learning as a secondary outcome of the portfolio assessment process.

Hale, Snow-Gerono, and Morales (2008) studied transformative education through culturally diverse learning using narrative and ethnographic writing methods in their work. They examined seven graduate students studying bilingual education and their responses to engaging in narrative autobiographical writing and an ethnographic method of discovering culture. The study reported effects of the reflective process on students in three areas: awareness of self and others, consciousness of educational issues and their implications, and transformative action and advocacy. The study supports the notion that teacher self-awareness of beliefs and values is important in establishing a multiculturally open, democratic learning environment.

Kose and Lim (2011) compared two models of professional learning using a quantitative design in 25 small urban elementary schools in the Midwest. They examined the impact of professional learning on teacher beliefs on diversity, on teacher transformative expertise and on transformative teaching. Results showed a low to moderate amount of variance for transformative teaching beliefs, expertise, and practices. Time spent in classes addressing reform-based multicultural content was found to have little effect on transformative teaching. This suggests that transformative professional development may be necessary to create the deep multicultural learning needed to train transformative teachers.

Engagement in Rational Discourse

A society that is intrinsically educative expands opportunities and encourages direct participation. We form values, mold attitudes, and

shape behavior in direct relation to understanding of ourselves and others. We learn about the societal challenges and opportunities and form our place in those conversations through dialogue. It is through engaging in dialogue that we learn to understand group interests and learn to flexibly adjust our thinking to adapt to new understandings. Dialogue helps us develop a capacity to understand and act on behalf of others for the common good (Idowu & Filho, 2009).

To Mezirow (2009), dialogue and rational discourse provide a forum to argue perspectives and weigh alternatives. This interactive process offers a means to identify any disconnect between long-held premises and newly-observed environmental realities. Dialogue creates recognition of these misalignments and serves to raise awareness of the need to alter a premise in support of new interpretations. Engaging in challenging and supportive dialogue provides the impetus to reframe thinking and negotiate change.

Reintegration of New Perspectives

Kegan and Lahey (2002) asserted the importance of transforming our epistemologies to grow mental capacity to meet the demands of complex roles, which inevitably influenced Mezirow's thinking. They developed a theory of psychological evolution of meaning-systems and referred to a person's fully functioning level of consciousness as a "self-transforming mind." As a result of manifold authentic and transformative experiences, the mind becomes capable of nurturing relationships and fostering affiliation.

In addition to improved cognitive fluency, individuals are able to see beyond themselves, recognizing and appreciating how all people live and interconnect. Transformation occurs when experiences modify how we think and what we know. In support of this point, Hutchison and Rea (2011) analyzed reflective journals and interviewed 25 preservice teachers that visited schools in the West African country of Gambia. Participants expressed changes in their previously held values and reported becoming more permeable thinkers. They reported adopting less materialistic views, embracing new perspectives on Western culture, and developing an appreciation for what could be taught without resources.

The result of transformative learning is the creation of critical, independently functioning, responsible thinkers with improved capacity to function in a diverse, complex and challenging world (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). Individuals who engage in transformative learning become self-transforming, capable of creating deep meaning through their experiences and equipped with a capacity to self-recreate (Tennant, 2012).

Conclusion

Slavkin's authentic pedagogy has morphed into an emerging trend that is now referred to as transformative learning, yet this is not a new idea. Transformative learning dates back to the early 1990s when theories of how adults learn best were interwoven with helping adults find meaning in what they are learning. Mezirow's (1990) research on transformative learning conveyed the importance of meaningful experience, blending content with experiences so that adults may participate in, ponder, make sense of, critically reflect, and transform meaning and future perspectives. Renewed interest in Mezirow's transformative learning theory is possibly due to a need for relevance in the business world. As Aakar (2012) noted in a May commentary for *Harvard Business Review*, "Relevance dominates" (p. 1). Aakar's strategies for helping companies stay relevant include parity, transformational innovation, repositioning, and creating brand energy. To accomplish this in business, he postured two approaches in particular that may also be applied to education: *transformational innovation*, linking new ideas with interests and monitoring what is occurring through active forums, and *modify and reposition*, content should be relevant to the interests of clients but also provide benefits in the form of varied experiences that result in different perspectives.

In addition to what we know about authentic learning, today's emerging education model should include *cognitive disequilibrium* – experiences that remove students from their comfort zones so that they explore new roles and walk away with new perspectives that enhance their global competence. Knowing how to engage students in learning, to extend past active engagement and interaction with the outside world that is inherent in authentic learning theory, and to move toward transformational learning would contribute to the body of research that seeks to bridge the gap between the theory and practice of relevance in learning.

References

- Aaker, D. (2012, May 11). Four strategies for staying relevant (Web log post). Retrieved from http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2012/05/four_strategies_for_staying_re.html
- Boix Mansilla, V., & Jackson, A. (2011). *Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world*. New York, NY: Asia Society Partnership for Global Learning.
- Boler, M. (2004). Teaching for hope: The ethics of shattering worldviews. In D. Liston & J. Garrison (Eds.), *Teaching, learning and loving: Reclaiming passion in educational practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Brock, S. (2010). Measuring the importance of precursor steps to transformative learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 60(2), 122-142.
- Che, S.M., Spearman, M., & Manizade, A. (2009). Constructive disequilibrium: Cognitive and emotional development through dissonant experiences in less familiar destinations. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 99-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cornelius-White, J. H., & Harbaugh, A. P. (2010). *Learner-centered instruction: Building relationships for student success*. Charlotte, NC: Sage. Council for Exceptional Children. (2011). *Authentic learning*. Retrieved from http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Experiential_Learning&Template=/TaggedPage/TaggedPageDisplay.cfm&TPLID=24&ContentID=4697
- D'Amato, L., & Krasny, M. (2012). Outdoor adventure education: Applying transformative learning theory to understanding instrumental learning and personal growth in environmental education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 42 (4), 237-254.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process* (Rev. ed.). Boston, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Doyle, T. (2011). *Learner-centered teaching: Putting the research on learning into practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Festinger, L. (1962) *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hale, A., Snow-Geron, J., & Morales, F. (2008). Transformative education for culturally diverse learners through narrative and ethnography. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1413-1425.
- Herrington, A., & Herrington, J. (2006). What is an authentic learning environment? In A. Herrington & J. Herrington (Eds.), *Authentic learning environments in higher education* (pp. 1-13). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Herrington, J., Specht, M., Brickell, G., & Harper, B. (2009). Supporting authentic learning contexts beyond classroom walls. In R. Koper (Ed.), *Learning network services for professional development* (pp. 273-288). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Hutchison, A., & Rea, T. (2011). Transformative learning and identity formation on the 'smiling coast' of West Africa. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 27, 552-559.
- Idowu, S. O., & Filho, W. L. (Eds.). (2009). *Global practices of corporate social responsibility*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2002). *How the way we talk can change the way we work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kose, B., & Lim, E. (2011). Transformative professional learning within schools: Relationship to teachers' beliefs, expertise and teaching. *Urban Review*, 43, 196-216.
- Laiken, M. (2006). Authentic graduate education for personal and workplace transformation. In T. Herrington & J. Herrington (Eds.), *Authentic learning environments in higher education* (pp. 15-33). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Levykh, M. G. (2008). The affective establishment and maintenance of Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. *Educational Theory*, 58(1), 83-101.
- Lombardi, M. M. (2007, May). *Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview*. (D. G. Oblinger, Ed.). Retrieved from Educause Learning Initiative website: <http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/authentic-learning-21st-century-overview>
- Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates, *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education* (pp. 5-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learn to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformational learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates, *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2009). Transformative learning theory. In J. Mezirow & E. W. Taylor (Eds.), *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education* (pp. 18-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mims, C. (2003, Winter). Authentic learning: A practical introduction & guide for implementation. *Meridian: A Middle School Computer Technologies Journal*, 6(1). Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/meridian/win2003/authentic_learning/
- Slavkin, M. L. (2004). *Authentic learning: How learning about the brain can shape the development of students*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Stevens, K., Gerber, D., & Hendra, R. (2010). Transformational learning through prior learning assessment. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 60(4), 377-404. doi:10.1177/0741713609358451

- Taylor, E. W., & Cranton, P. (2012). *The handbook of transformative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tennant, M. (2012). *The learning self: Understanding the potential for transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trilokekar, R., & Kukar, P. (2011). Disorienting experiences during study abroad: Reflections of preservice teacher candidates. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 27, 1141-1150.

Stephanie K. Davis, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University; Roxanne S. DuVivier, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Stephanie K. Davis, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435. E-mail: stephanie.davis@wright.edu.

Nurturing the NNER Agenda: Preparing for the “CAEP Crusader”

Dennis Potthoff
University of Nebraska Kearney

For more than 25 years, the National Network of Educational Renewal (NNER) has provided a vision for excellence in educator preparation. NNER settings have routinely melded a commitment to the NNER Agenda with state and/or national level accreditation expectations. The recent arrival of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) morphs the landscape. With CAEP poised as the sole accrediting agency for teacher preparation, this manuscript critically examines the CAEP/NNER interface. Beliefs shared by CAEP and the NNER are noted; both organizations highly value clinical experiences, encourage collaboration, and express the desire to confront inequalities. Areas of dissonance issues are also discussed; CAEP and NNER articulate distinctly different visions with regard to the key purposes for schooling, the proper locus of control for schooling, and the most appropriate processes and criteria for assessing the quality of teacher preparation programs. The NNER and its individual settings are encouraged to proactively work to establish an open relationship with CAEP and are also challenged to engage in a self-renewal which results in making appropriate changes to NNER policies and practices when warranted.

KEYWORDS: accreditation, CAEP, education preparation programs, purposes for schools in a democratic society

For more than 25 years, the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) has worked to “improve simultaneously the quality of education for thoughtful participation in a democracy and the quality of the preparation of educators” (NNER, n.d.). Committed to excellence, NNER settings have consistently met state level accreditation guidelines and most have also committed to meeting national level accreditation guidelines set by discipline specific SPAs, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and/or the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Ostensibly, the NNER and entities charged with accrediting educator preparation programs are like-minded; excellence in educator preparation is the goal.

Nonetheless, implementing key premises of the NNER Agenda while also satisfying accreditation expectations is challenging. It may get tougher; national level accreditation expectations are poised for change. Two significant accreditation-related developments have occurred. In “Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning” (NCATE, 2010), NCATE declared a need for “turning teacher preparation upside down.” The new vision, framed around ten recommendations, calls for a more clinical (field-based) preparation model. Then, with the ink of the Blue Ribbon Report barely dry, the two national level accrediting bodies, NCATE and TEAC, announced a merger. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was born. On the surface, given its declared mission serving “as the single accreditor for reform, innovation, and research in educator preparation” (CAEP, n.d.), CAEP is powerfully positioned. CAEP’s rhetoric foreshadows bold change; the pledge is to implement a set of “fewer, clearer, and higher common standards that ensure accreditation decisions will reach the same result based on similar evidence” (CAEP, n.d.). Midway through 2013, the magnitude of change required is uncertain. The final version of the CAEP standards has yet to be ratified.

Regardless, the emergence of CAEP commands attention. The purpose for this manuscript is to examine the following two related questions:

1. How will the transition to CAEP impact NNER settings that are nationally accredited?
2. Will CAEP’s accreditation model improve or diminish the potential for NNER settings to simultaneously embrace the NNER Agenda and also meet accreditation expectations?

CAEP insights were drawn from five primary sources. In addition to using materials posted on the CAEP website (<http://www.caepsite.org/>), evidence was also gleaned from the following documents that were

prominently referenced by CAEP: (a) the 2010 *NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report* (2010); (b) the National Research Council Report (National Academy of Science, n.d.); (c) the McKinsey Corporation (2007); and (d) the State Common Core Standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). NNER insights were also drawn from multiple sources. In addition to using materials published on the NNER website (<http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/about/mission.htm>), three additional publications, closely aligned with the NNER Agenda, were consulted: (a) *Education for Everyone* (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004); (b) *Educational Renewal* (Goodlad, 1994); and (c) *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching* (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990).

Methodology

Qualitative methodology was used. The research questions provided a critical beginning point (Janesick, 1994) with three specific comparisons made. The words that comprised the respective mission/vision statements of CAEP and NNER were compared. The current (June, 2013) iteration of CAEP Standards (five standards supported by thirty sub-standards) were compared and contrasted with the twenty postulates of the NNER. Finally, illuminating quotations from the aforementioned CAEP and NNER sources were identified and compared.

This study utilized documents as the sole sources of evidence. Documents were defined as materials or data in existence prior to the initiation of the research (Merriam, 1988). The decision to utilize documents was made, in part, because it seemed reasonable to assume that documents would yield more, better, and cheaper data than other data collection options (Dexter, 1970). The reliance on documents was also predicated upon the supposition that the available documents would yield material evidence relevant to the research questions, provide relatively more objective data that was less obtrusive to gather (Webb, 1966), and would also help to establish a historical context (Hodder, 1994). Constant comparative methodology was utilized for data analysis. The specific data analysis strategies used included frequency counts and thematic coding.

Limitations associated with utilizing a document-based data collection plan were recognized: (a) documents not developed for research purposes are not always ideal for scholarly study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967); (b) document-derived data may not be fully understood (Riley, 1963); and (c) authenticity and accuracy are potential problems associated with the use of documentary materials (Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1959).

Presentation of the Data

Comparison #1: Mission/Vision Statements

Word frequency counts were conducted of the CAEP (849 words) and NNER (824 words) mission/vision statements, including a brief elaboration from the book *Education for Everyone* (Goodlad et al., 2004). Three specific word comparisons were completed. The first comparison identified and studied the words used most frequently in the mission/vision statements as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: *Comparison of CAEP and NNER Mission/Vision Statements: Word Count Frequency*

Key Terms	Word Frequency (% of Total Word Count)	
	NNER	CAEP
Accreditation, Assessment, Standards	0 (0%)	20 (2.4%)
Learn-Learning	3 (0.4%)	18 (2.1%)
Content, Know-Knowing-Knowledge	6 (0.7%)	16 (1.9%)
Education-Educational	16 (1.9%)	2 (0.2%)
Evidence-Data	0 (0%)	12 (1.4%)
Effective-Effectively	0 (0.0%)	7 (0.8%)
All Students-All Learners-All Children	2 (0.2%)	6 (0.7%)
Democracy-Democratic	6 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Quality, Inequality	5 (0.6%)	5 (0.6%)
Moral	5 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Community-Communities, Families	4 (0.5%)	4 (0.5%)

With regard to the CAEP statement, three related terms--*accreditation*, *standards*, and *assessment*--were the most frequently used (N=20). Webster's definition of accreditation is "to recognize (an educational institution) as maintaining standards that qualify the graduates for admission to higher or more specialized institutions or for professional practice." The words *education* and *educational* were most frequently used in the NNER mission/vision statement (N=16). According to Webster, education is "the field of study that deals mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools." The contrast in key words was illuminating; by definition, the meanings ascribed to the key CAEP and NNER terms are distinctly different.

The second comparison identified areas of word congruence. Words that appeared most frequently in both the NNER and CAEP mission/vision statements were noted. Two word sets, *quality-inequality* (N = 5 in the CAEP and NNER statements) and *community-communities-families* (N = 4 in the CAEP and NNER statements), were equally used.

The third comparison sought to discover key areas of difference in terminology. Words that were used frequently in one mission/vision statement but were entirely absent from the other statement were identified. One term that frequently appeared in the CAEP statement, *evidence-data* (N = 12), was not found in the NNER document. Conversely, two terms used repeatedly in the NNER statement, *democracy-democratic* (N = 6) and *moral* (N = 5), were entirely absent from the CAEP mission statement.

This comparative word analysis of the CAEP and NNER mission/vision statements yielded interesting insights. Broadly conceived, the CAEP and NNER organizations share a strong commitment to fostering excellence in education/educator preparation. However, with a few notable exceptions (i.e. commitment to equality and community/family), the indicators of excellence are remarkably different. The CAEP vision for judging excellence is based on evidence/data. The CAEP system hinges on the assessment of (candidate) learning and (content) knowing. Conversely, the NNER vision of excellence is predicated upon the degree to which programs foster a valuing of education, particularly a moral commitment to providing educational opportunity for all learners within the context of a democratic society.

Comparison #2: CAEP Standards/Sub-standards versus the NNER Postulates

A comparison and contrast was conducted of the current iteration of CAEP standards content (five standards supported by thirty sub-standards) and the twenty long-standing postulates of the NNER,

documents deemed central to the respective CAEP and NNER agendas. Whereas broad understanding of the term “standards” is shared throughout the educational community, the term “postulates” is less frequently used. Goodlad et al. (2004) defined a postulate as a “carefully reasoned argument or set of presuppositions deemed necessary for establishing a healthy program for the education of educators” (p. 69). The process of aligning these two lists revealed a clear and substantial difference in focus, as evidenced by the language used. The NNER postulates declare twenty characteristics of a high quality educator preparation program; the focus is on actions taken by programs and by the individuals working in the programs. The CAEP standards, by comparison, provide a formula for determining program quality that is primarily based upon an assessment of the performance of candidates enrolled in the preparation program and the performance of the candidates in their early years of full-time teaching. Specifically, CAEP is focused on ascertaining the candidates’ impact on the learning of P-12 students. Even given the distinct difference in overall focus, alignment of the NNER postulates with the CAEP standards, on the basis of specific issues (e.g. candidate selection) featured in the various postulates and standards, was possible. Due to spacing, an alignment table is presented as the Appendix.

What are the best fits of CAEP standards and NNER postulates? Five commonalities were particularly evident. Both the CAEP standards and NNER postulates:

- Mandate institutional support; both the postulates and standards declare that educator preparation programs should be well supported and adequately funded;
- Acknowledge the importance of selecting highly qualified candidates;
- Expect teacher candidates to demonstrate the ability to reflect/inquire about their work;
- Assert that programs and teacher candidates should commit to providing all youngsters with an equitable opportunity to learn; and
- Specify that educator preparation programs provide high quality and varied clinical field experiences that are collaboratively planned by institutions of higher education (IHEs) and P-12 personnel.

Conversely, for what issues was the goodness of fit of the NNER postulates and the CAEP standards the most tenuous? Review of the described purpose for educator preparation programs (and for P-12 schooling) yielded distinctly different perspectives. The CAEP standards were mute as compared to the NNER’s very specific expectation that

faculty members should possess a comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and a solid awareness of the role of schools in United States society. Related to this, the words used to describe teacher professionalism were distinctly different; the language of NNER maintained that candidates should demonstrate an initial commitment to moral, ethical, and enculturation responsibilities whereas the CAEP standards emphasized the importance of candidates being knowledgeable about the codes of ethics, professional standards, and relevant laws and policies.

A few issues highlighted in the CAEP standards were not explicitly stated in the NNER postulates. For example, CAEP's expectation that candidates utilize appropriate technology was not evidenced in the postulates. A fundamental difference regarding how to assess the quality of educator preparation programs was also noted. The NNER postulates, as compared to the CAEP standards, were far less oriented to the strategy of basing program quality upon the performance of program candidates and completers--especially including the often-cited CAEP stipulation that the quality of candidate performance should be based upon the candidates' impact on P-12 student learning. Similarly, the NNER postulates provided scant detail with regard to how the performance of program completers should be used when judging program quality. By comparison, the CAEP standards emphasized that the impact of program completers on P-12 student learning should be a primary indicator of program quality.

Comparison #3: CAEP and NNER -- Illuminating Quotes

The third comparison and contrast aligned key quotations from the CAEP and NNER previously noted theory bases related to specific issues (See Appendix B and C for direct quotations). CAEP/NNER congruity was evidenced for several crucial points as seen in Appendix B. Visions of effective teacher preparation comfortably aligned especially with regard to the need for teachers/schools to promote and protect equality and justice for all learners. The decisive role of teachers in student learning; the need for limited, careful selection of teaching candidates; teacher's content knowledge; and the importance of providing teaching candidates with rich, varied clinical experiences that are fostered through effective school/university collaboration also proved to maintain consistency between CAEP and NNER.

Dissonance areas (Appendix C) were also noted, such as the purposes for schooling. The literature cited by CAEP consistently emphasized that the purpose for schooling is preparation of youngsters for career and/or college readiness whereas the NNER literature consistently advocated that schools be charged with preparing the young

for active participation in a democratic society. Study of quotes that addressed the appropriate locus of control for educator preparation programs also yielded distinct variation in position. CAEP's bold commitment to national control of teacher preparation program accreditation collided with NNER's deeply held faith in the decision-making capacity of local contexts. The lens used by CAEP and NNER to judge the quality of educator preparation programs was remarkably different. CAEP articulated a strong commitment to using candidate impact on the learning of P-12 students as the key factor in judging program quality. The NNER maintains that high quality programs produce teachers who demonstrate a professional commitment to behaviors necessary for preparing youngsters for engaged participation in a democratic society. Included on the list are qualities such as trust, openness, self-reflection, and collaboration.

Recommendations

The two related questions posed near the outset of this manuscript prompted this comparison and contrast of the NNER Agenda with the still emerging CAEP plan for accrediting institutions that prepare educators. The goal for the first question was to gain a better understanding of the unfolding transition to CAEP accreditation and how this impending change might impact nationally-accredited NNER settings. The intent for the second question was somewhat deeper; answering the question necessitated a deeper review of how CAEP's belief statements and declared processes aligned with NNER beliefs and practices. At some level, the jury regarding both of these questions is still out. It will be a few years before a sizeable number of institutions experience a full-blown CAEP accreditation. Still, given that the preparation of future P-12 educators (and the subsequent preparation of their P-12 students) for engaged citizenship is central to the NNER Agenda, engagement in a systematic study of the unfolding transition was well-advised and productive. The insights collected from the data that was gathered and analyzed provide a rationale for the following two key recommendations.

First, analysis of the data suggested that the NNER should proactively work to establish and maintain a transparent, ongoing, and civil relationship with CAEP—especially during the crucial transitional years when revisions and modifications are expected. The next few years are not a time to sit back and wait; the potential for significant forced change is sufficiently possible to demand immediate attention. Also, and more promising, the data revealed elements of the alignment of the NNER and CAEP visions that create a promising window of opportunity. Identifying and sharing with CAEP key issues of

congruence is a recommended first step for increasing CAEP's awareness of and also familiarity with the NNER Agenda. The identification of the following areas of common ground was one outcome of the analysis process. Statements in key NNER and CAEP documents suggest that conditions are favorable for the NNER to pursue initiatives that seek to elevate the status of teachers and the teaching profession. Both CAEP and the NNER identify teachers as a key component in effective schools; the selection of promising candidates who are subsequently immersed in a high quality preparatory experience is a noted requisite for P-12 student learning. Well aligned with this, the NNER postulates and CAEP standards mandate that universities provide sufficient support and funding for educator preparation programs. Given the consistent emphasis upon bolstering teachers' content knowledge, conditions are also favorable for pushing ahead with initiatives that increase candidates' content knowledge through the expanded use of instructional models that integrate content and pedagogical expertise in both theoretical coursework and in P-12 based clinical environments. Both NNER and CAEP documents also express strong commitment for strengthening school/university partnerships and for ensuring that highly qualified teacher candidates are selected, encouraged to hone their self-reflection skills, and demonstrate a strong commitment to providing all youngsters with equitable learning opportunities. The importance assigned to effectively teaching all of the youngsters who attend school aligns nicely with NNER's commitment to promoting the democratic ideals of equality and justice.

While celebrating and building upon areas of like-mindedness is a legitimate strategy, it is not enough. It is also essential that NNER's efforts to build a strong relationship with CAEP foster thoughtful discussion regarding key issues of disagreement. The words most frequently used in the NNER vision/mission statement and in key NNER quotes communicate NNER's steadfast commitment to viewing schooling as a moral endeavor; the ultimate goal is to prepare the young for engaged citizenship in a democratic society. The words expressed in CAEP documents suggest a vision for schools/schooling that is primarily oriented toward preparing students for the world of work/career. This difference in purpose creates a potentially large gap in how schools are structured and in what is taught. The NNER should boldly argue the merits of its alternative position. Another crucial area of dissonance is the stated visions for assessing the quality of educator preparation programs. The depth and breadth of the NNER vision regarding the purposes for schooling do not comfortably align with CAEP's commitment primarily utilizing candidate impact on P-12 student performance data as the best measure of educator preparation program

quality—especially given that P-12 student performance is derived via standardized testing.

Second, the NNER, both as a national organization and also as individual settings that operate in unique contexts, should more fully recognize that CAEP's emergence provides a valuable opportunity for engaging in its own organizational renewal. CAEP poses a challenge to the status quo. The NNER should thoughtfully consider CAEP's expectations and commit to modifying NNER beliefs and practices when the evidence indicates that change is warranted. This study of key quotes and documents yielded evidence that suggest a few reasonable change possibilities. For example, analysis of key NNER documents revealed that scant attention is given to technology. The NNER should consider modifying its documents to reflect a commitment to the use of technology tools at a level expected in the 21st century schooling context. This commitment should be evidence-based. NNER should commit to studying the research base and to conducting its own research, which investigates the impact of cutting edge technology tools on teacher candidate growth and P-12 student growth. The use of tools proven to foster higher levels of student learning should be promoted. The evidence also suggests that it is time for the NNER to carefully review and perhaps reconsider its understanding of how the quality of 21st century educator preparation programs should be assessed. Especially given the frequency with which terms such as education and learning appear in NNER documents, it is hard for the NNER to argue that student learning should not be an important factor in judging the quality of teachers and in judging the quality of educator preparation programs. The pressure to consider the most appropriate ways to integrate student learning into program assessment models is certain to be intense, especially given that CAEP's commitment to considering teacher impact on student learning closely aligns with the emerging models for judging the quality of P-12 teachers and schools. No doubt, the line to be walked is a fine one. The intent is not abandonment of deeply held principles. Rather, the goal is to ensure that the NNER remains a relevant and legitimate voice. Fully engaging in this very difficult and contentious conversation is the best course of action, and the potential for improving the overall quality of educator preparation programs is a reasonable outcome. It is easy to visualize, for example, that settings will embark upon renewal initiatives that ultimately enhance teacher candidates' understanding of the P-12 context and will also prepare them for more successfully navigating an environment that is standards-based and accountability driven.

Conclusion

In the early decades of the 21st century, educational institutions at all levels (PK-16+) are operating in high accountability environments. Given the centrality of educators to what happens in P-12 schools, it is entirely appropriate that the quality of educator preparation programs should be thoughtfully assessed. National level consolidation of the accreditation process under a single umbrella (CAEP) represents a potentially significant change in context. As a like-minded organization that shares CAEP's commitment to excellence in educator preparation, the NNER is obliged to thoughtfully consider the potential impact of this transition. Successful navigation of a new accreditation reality will be enhanced by a decision to proactively work to establish an open and respectful relationship with CAEP that celebrates areas of congruence but also addresses areas of difference. Clearly, being a part of the conversation is far superior to being left out of the conversation. Even as it builds a relationship with CAEP, the NNER should also model its own expressed commitment to self-renewal. As a part of the transition to CAEP, NNER settings should individually and collectively challenge themselves to reflect about the status of the current Agenda and to embrace changes to the Agenda when warranted.

Will CAEP ultimately prove to be a new force that is worthy of being granted crusader status? Will the emergence of CAEP result in a series of major battles with organizations such as the NNER that are equally dedicated to promoting excellence in educator preparation? At this juncture, it is too early to tell. However, the educator preparation programs throughout the United States dedicated to the Agenda of the NNER are well prepared for the impending challenges. Indeed, one might reasonably argue that the NNER is the real crusader in this story. For more than 25 years, the NNER has provided an alternative narrative regarding educator preparation and the role of schools and schooling in a democratic society. The NNER has faithfully advocated for a certain kind of education—an education that prepares individuals for engaged citizenship. This narrative is timeless and is surely as important as it has ever been.

References

- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.caepsite.org/>
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (Eds.). 1990. *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 393-402). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Janesick, V. J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Academy of Science. (n.d.) *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12882
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010, November). *Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships for improved student learning: Transforming teacher education through clinical practice -- A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3d&tabid=715>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2010, June 2). *The common core state standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org>
- National Network for Educational Renewal. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://nnerpartnerships.org/>
- Riley, M. W. (1963). *Sociological research: A case approach* (Vol. 1). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. (1959). *Research methods in social relations*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- The McKinsey Corporation. (2007, September). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. Retrieved from <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/07/how-the-worlds-best-performing-school-systems-come-out-on-top-sept-072.pdf>
- Webb, E. T. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures*. Stokie, IL: Rand McNally.

Appendix A

Alignment of the Twenty NNER Postulates and the Thirty CAEP Sub-Standards (June 2013)

NNER Postulates	CAEP Standards
<p>NNER Postulate One. Programs for the education of the nation's educators must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution's top leadership.</p>	<p>5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. The system generates outcomes data that are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.</p> <p>5.6 The provider assures continuing quality of curricula; educators; facilities, equipment, and supplies; fiscal and administrative capacity; student support services; recruiting and admissions practices; academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising; measures of program length and objectives; and student complaints.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Two. Programs for the education of educators enjoy parity with other professional education programs, full institutional commitment, and rewards for faculty geared to the nature of the field.</p>	
<p>NNER Postulate Three. Programs for the education of educators must be autonomous and secure in their borders, with clear organizational identity, constancy of budget and personnel, and decision-making authority similar to that enjoyed by the major professional schools.</p>	
<p>NNER Postulate Four. There must exist a clearly identifiable group of academic and clinical faculty members for whom teacher education is the top</p>	<p>3.1 The provider presents plans and goals for strategic and recruitment outreach to recruit high quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations.</p>

<p>priority. The group must be responsible for selecting diverse groups of students and monitoring their progress, planning and maintaining full scope and sequence of the curriculum, continuously evaluating and improving programs, and facilitating the entry of graduates into teaching careers.</p>	<p>3.2 The provider documents goals, efforts and results for the admitted pool of candidates that demonstrate the diversity of America’s P-12 students.</p> <p>3.3 The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, or regional or local needs for hard to staff schools and shortage fields, including STEM, English language learning, and students with disabilities.</p> <p>4.1. The provider documents, using value-added measures where available, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures constructed by the provider, that program completers contribute to an expected level of P-12 student growth.</p> <p>5.1. The provider’s quality assurance system demonstrates capacity to address all CAEP standards and investigates the relationship between program elements and candidate outcomes to improve graduates’ impact on P-12 student learning.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Five. The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members described above must have a comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and the role of schools in our society and be fully committed to selecting and preparing teachers to assume the full range of educational responsibilities required.</p>	
<p>NNER Postulate Six. The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members must seek out and select for a predetermined number of student places in the program those candidates who reveal an initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed, and make clear to them that preparing for these responsibilities is central to this program.</p>	<p>3.5 Provider preparation programs establish and monitor attributes beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors deemed important in the selection process and for development during preparation, predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.</p>

	<p>3.8 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Seven. Programs for educating educators, whether elementary or secondary, must carry the responsibility to ensure that all candidates progressing through them possess or acquire the literacy and critical-thinking abilities associated with the concept of an educated person.</p>	<p>3.4 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average GPA of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0 and a group average performance in the top third of those who pass a nationally normed admissions assessment such as ACT, SAT or GRE. The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and evidence sources. If a program has a model that predicts effective teaching in reliable and valid ways, the cohort group floor must be above the mean of the predicted measure.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Eight. Programs for educating educators must provide extensive opportunities for future teachers to move beyond being students of organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and its teaching.</p>	<p>1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the critical concepts and principles in their discipline, including college and career-readiness expectations, and of the pedagogical content knowledge necessary to engage students’ learning of concepts and principles in the discipline. 3.6 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college and career ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content and pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skills, including effective use of technology. 3.7 Before the provider recommends any candidate for licensure/certification, it</p>

	documents the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts P-12 student learning.
<p>NNER Postulate Nine. Programs for educating educators must be characterized by a socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupations to become more other-oriented in the culture of teaching.</p>	<p>1.9 Candidates reflect on their personal biases and access resources that deepen their own understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, language, and learning differences to build stronger relationships and to adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Ten. Programs for educating educators must be characterized in all respects by the conditions for learning that future teachers are to establish in their own schools and classrooms.</p>	<p>1.4 Candidates engage students in reasoning and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local, state, national, and global issues, incorporating new technologies and instructional tools appropriate to such tasks.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Eleven. Programs for educating educators must be conducted in such a way that teachers inquire into the nature of teaching and schooling and assume that they will do so as a natural aspect of their careers.</p>	<p>1.3 Candidates design, adapt, and select a variety of valid and reliable assessments (e.g., formative and summative measures or indicators of growth and proficiency) and employ analytical skills necessary to inform ongoing planning and instruction, as well as to understand, and help students understand their own, progress and growth.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Twelve. Programs for educating educators must involve future teachers in the issues and dilemmas that emerge out of the never-ending tension between the rights and interests of individual parents and interest groups and the role of schools in transcending parochialism and advancing community in a democratic society.</p>	<p>1.7 Candidates work with P-12 students and families to create classroom cultures that support individual and collaborative learning and encourage positive social interaction, engagement in learning, and independence. 1.8 Candidates build strong relationships with students, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members, so that all are communicating effectively and collaborating for student growth, development, and well-being.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Thirteen. Programs educating educators must be infused with understanding of and commitment to the moral obligation of teachers to ensure</p>	<p>1.5 Candidates use research and evidence to continually evaluate and improve their practice, particularly the effects of their choices and actions on others, and they adapt their teaching to meet the needs of each learner.</p>

<p>equitable access to and engagement in the best possible K-12 education for <u>all</u> children and youths.</p>	<p>1.6 Candidates design and implement appropriate and challenging learning experiences, based on an understanding of how children learn and develop. They ensure inclusive learning environments that encourage and help <u>all</u> P-12 students reach their full potential across a range of learner goals.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Fourteen. Programs for educating educators must involve future teachers not only in understanding schools as they are but in alternatives, the assumptions underlying alternatives, and how to effect needed changes in school organization, pupil grouping, curriculum, and more.</p>	
<p>NNER Postulate Fifteen. Programs for educating educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences.</p>	<p>1.2 Candidates create and implement learning experiences that motivate P-12 students, establish a positive learning environment, and support P-12 students’ understanding of the central concepts and principles in the content discipline. Candidates support learners’ development of deep understanding within and across content areas, building skills to access and apply what students have learned.</p> <p>2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations, and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.</p> <p>2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high quality clinical</p>

	<p>educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.</p> <p>2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning. Clinical experiences, including technology-based applications, are structured to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are associated with a positive impact on P-12 student learning.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Sixteen. Programs for educating educators must engage future teachers in the problems and dilemmas arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities between what is perceived to work in practice and the research/theory supporting other options.</p>	
<p>NNER Postulate Seventeen. Programs for educating educators must establish linkages with graduates for purposes of both evaluating and revising these programs and easing the critical early years of transition into teaching.</p>	<p>4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.</p> <p>4.3 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.</p>

	<p>4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation was relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that the preparation was effective.</p> <p>5.3 The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements and the provider’s operational effectiveness. These include measures of program outcomes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completer or graduation rates, ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state accreditation requirements, ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared, and student loan default rates. <p>5.4 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. Available evidence on academic achievement of completers’ P-12 students is reported, analyzed, and used to improve programs and candidate performance. Leadership at all levels is committed to evidence-based continuous improvement.</p> <p>5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.</p>
<p>NNER Postulate Eighteen. Programs for educating educators require a regulatory context with respect to licensing, certifying, and accrediting that ensures at all times the presence of the</p>	

necessary conditions embraced by the seventeen preceding postulates.	
NNER Postulate Nineteen. Programs for educating educators must compete in an arena that rewards efforts to continuously improve on the conditions embedded in all of the postulates and tolerates no shortcuts intended to ensure a supply of teachers.	
NNER Postulate Twenty. Those institutions and organizations that prepare the nation's teachers, authorize their right to teach, and employ them must fine-tune their individual and collaborative roles to support and sustain lifelong teaching careers characterized by professional growth, service, and satisfaction.	

Appendix B

Teacher Education Preparation Issues:
CAEP and NNER Quotes that Align

<p>Issue: Impact/Importance of Teachers</p> <p><u>CAEP</u>: “While family and poverty deeply affect student performance, research over the past decade indicates that no <i>in-school</i> intervention has a greater impact on student learning than an effective teacher.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 9)</p> <p><u>NNER</u>: “When asked if they could change just one thing about American education, what would it be, time and again audiences across the country have overwhelmingly responded that they would see to it that every classroom had in it a well-trained, competent, caring teacher.” (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004, pp. 98-99)</p>
<p>Issue: Teacher Education Candidate Selection/Selectivity</p> <p>CAEP: “The top performing systems consistently attract more able people into the teaching profession, leading to better student outcomes. They do this by making entry into the teaching profession highly selective, developing effective processes for selecting the right applicants to become teachers, and paying good</p>

(but not great) starting compensation.” (McKinsey & Company, 2007, p. 19)

NNER: “The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members must seek out and select for a predetermined number of student places in the program those candidates who reveal an initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed, and make clear to them that preparing for these responsibilities is central to this program.”
(<http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/>)

Issue: Characteristics of Effective Preparation Programs for Educators

CAEP: (CAEP) will “ensure that programs prepare future teachers to know the content of the subject(s) they will teach, know how to teach that content effectively to students from diverse groups and demonstrate their positive impact on P-12 student learning in diverse school settings.”
(<http://www.caepsite.org/documents.htm>)

NNER: “Some state agencies are getting into the silliness domain by proposing to translate legislated policies into procedures for approving teacher education programs based on the degree to which graduates produce stated outcomes in students of the K-12 system.” (Goodlad, 1994, p. 152)

CAEP: “CAEP is also focused on the recommendations of the National Research Council (2010). Content, clinical experiences, and quality of candidates are three key areas of (teacher) preparation in need of intense focus; these areas could be leveraged to lead to improved student achievement.”
(<http://www.caepsite.org/documents.htm>)

NNER: “The measure of an effective teacher education program lies not in classroom competence but in the development of a professional commitment . . . Five major elements: (a) Motivation/desire to deliver an account to colleagues and clients; (b) sense of the importance of creating trust in one’s own professional behavior and an understanding (this) must be stimulated in preservice students; (c) training in negotiating skills with clients, particularly parents, as part of the equipment of the caring, accountable professional; (d) sense of openness to criticism of one’s own performance and the stimulation of the central habits of reflective practice; (e) sense of the significance of the professional partnership across the profession and beyond it to its multiple constituencies.” (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990, pgs. 244-245)

CAEP: “Preparation providers will be working in partnership with school districts and states to build and test prototypes of clinically-based models and will develop an iterative set of best practices based on the results. Preparation will feature strong partnerships with P-12 schools and districts to address urgent P-12 needs.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 8)

NNER: “Tripartite collaboration refers to schools, colleges and schools of

education, and colleges and departments in the arts and sciences; the groups that share responsibility for providing quality education to currently enrolled P-12 students and future educators.” (<http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/>)

CAEP: “Clinical preparation is integrated throughout every facet of teacher education in a dynamic way.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 13)

NNER. “Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences.” (<http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/>)

CAEP: “Programs prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach it and are also innovators, collaborators and problem solvers.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 14)

NNER: “Participants must agree that the purpose of their partnership work is in part to challenge long-held beliefs and assumptions about teaching and learning, need to agree that it is everyone’s responsibility to raise even the most basic questions about theory and practice, and need to agree to work together and be willing to try new ideas.” (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004, p. 122)

CAEP: “Technology applications foster high-impact preparation.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 14)

Appendix C

Teacher Education Preparation Issues: CAEP and NNER Quotes that are Dissonant

Issue: Purpose(s) for Education/Schooling

CAEP: “But to help the nation compete in the global economy, today’s teachers will have to educate all students – including those from increasingly diverse economic, racial, linguistic, and academic backgrounds – to the same high learning outcomes. They must ensure that all children master rigorous course content, be able to apply what they learn to think critically and solve problems, and complete high school ‘college- and workforce-ready’.” (NCATE, 2010, p. 1)

NNER: “Although all schools strive to produce literate, socially, and vocationally competent people, in a democracy schools must also enculturate the young into a unique social and political environment—the idea being to develop in individuals what we call democratic character.” (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004, pp. 82-83)

CAEP: “Teacher candidates and completers nurture the academic and social development of all students through professional dispositions such as caring, fairness and the belief that all students can learn.”
(<http://www.caepsite.org/documents.htm>)

NNER: “We have created a monstrous gap between the haves and have nots that is both economic and political . . . Yet ours is a nation that boasts of having gained the moral high ground with respect to fairness and equity. This situation cannot help but have a significant impact on our schools.” (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004, pp. 90-91)

Issue: Locus of Control

CAEP: “One of the initial goals for CAEP was to enable the education profession to speak with a single voice about the preparation of teachers, administrators and other P-12 professional educators.”
(<http://www.caepsite.org/documents.htm>)

NNER: “Key policies are now set at a great distance from the communities served and highly unlikely, therefore, to be accountable to the particular people most affected by the quality of public education: the families of school-aged children.” (<http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/>), pg. 71)

Dennis Potthoff, College of Education, University of Nebraska Kearney.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dennis Potthoff, College of Education, University of Nebraska Kearney, Kearney, NE 68849. E-mail: potthoffd@unk.edu

The Beat of a Steady Drummer: The Influence of John Goodlad on a University-School Partnership

*Paul Wangemann
Brigham Young University*

John Goodlad's leadership has been a significant influence for the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership. Dr. Goodlad was instrumental in the Partnership's initial creation and continuously played an active role in its development. His leadership contribution is best recognized in the lasting impact of several seminal ideas he advanced. The three ideas emphasized in this paper are teaching as a moral endeavor, purposes of public education in a democratic society, and renewal as simultaneous process.

KEYWORDS: partnership, renewal, leadership, moral, collaboration

John Goodlad's career as an educator, researcher, scholar, and reformer spans over seven decades (Sirotnik & Soder, 1999; Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley & Goodlad, 2004). His work has focused primarily on educational change, particularly the simultaneous improvement of both teacher education and public schooling. Kenneth Sirotnik and Roger Soder, co-founders with Goodlad of an initiative to engage universities and public schools in such simultaneous change, edited a volume honoring Goodlad and his work which they titled *The Beat of a Different Drummer* (Sirotnik & Soder, 1999). While Goodlad's ideas may have been different from those expressed in many mainstream reform proposals, being different was not what attracted the leaders of the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP). Rather, it was the constancy among key ideas supported by both a philosophical and a research base that provided the attraction. This paper examines three seminal ideas advocated by John Goodlad that have been foundational for this partnership of a private university and five public school districts, functioning uninterrupted since 1984. The three ideas are teaching as a moral endeavor, purposes of public education in our democratic society, and renewal as simultaneous process.

Image of the Steady Drummer

Goodlad himself invoked the power of the phrase "marching to the beat of a different drummer" when he wrote, "There must be a compelling, different drummer whose drumbeat somehow is picked up by the school's antenna. The sounds must be intriguing, challenging, countervailing, perhaps disturbing, but most of all they must be difficult to ignore" (Goodlad, 1975, p. 178; Sirotnik & Soder, 1999, p. 15). Goodlad's intent seems not to be to spark rejection of all earlier ideas and practices-- merely to promote change. He clarified, "Not only must the alternative drummer be perceived as salient, there must be a perception, also, of longevity. A temporary, waxing and waning drumbeat will not suffice" (Goodlad, 1975, p. 178). A clear and recognizable drumbeat is necessary for sustaining attention and movement. Key to sustaining conversation in the BYU-PSP has been a focus on "salient" ideas with constancy over time, sufficient time to allow the attention and consideration these ideas require.

Goodlad's ideas and his vision for public education are well documented through numerous publications over many years-- dozens of books and book chapters, along with hundreds of journal articles, technical papers, and occasional reports (Sirotnik, 2001). Goodlad has been a frequent presenter or discussant at professional conferences, and he has frequently visited school and university sites both to learn what educators are doing and to engage them in conversations about what

educators could or should be doing. For the BYU-PSP, his site visits, local conferences, and personal communications have been as influential as his writings. In fact, Goodlad's personal involvement in 1984 helped produce the first formal partnership arrangement between BYU and the five participating school districts. Ray Whittenberg, one of the five district superintendents present at the founding of the Partnership, recalls Goodlad's visit:

The initial meeting occurred at a local hotel. John was at the blackboard as a great teacher would be. He began to lay out the concepts we needed to consider as we looked at a way to come together. One of the things that was talked about in that process was that a partnership provides opportunities for people to come together to do things that each organization could not do for itself. John was the catalyst in starting our Partnership. He was the foundation for the thought process. He helped establish parameters and set reasonable expectations for our Partnership. (Wangemann, Black, & Baugh, 2006, p. 21)

Opportunities to Extend Ideas

The critical ideas advanced by Goodlad and his colleagues over the years have been the basis for conversations and prompts to action in the BYU-PSP. Opportunities for conversations have been formalized through yearly ongoing professional development programs, known as Associates, involving members of the university, the public schools, the State Office of Education, district school boards, and other members of the community. Partners come together in sustained conversations based on a set of key ideas and the desire for continuous improvement. Additional programs based on this model exist at the district and school level.

The Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES), a research and professional development center housed within the David O. McKay School of Education at BYU, has the primary responsibility for developing and executing these programs. Representatives from the partner groups form a planning committee that determines both theme and topics for each meeting. An underlying goal for each session is to generate learning through access to ideas that can be extended in conversation. In this way members of the Partnership are able to draw from a larger "pool of common meaning" and extend individuals' understanding (Senge, 1990, pp. 340-341). The emphasis remains on promoting among individuals with a common agenda an exchange that can guide collaboration or reinforce a culture of collaboration (Rosenberg, 2006).

Teaching as a Moral Endeavor

For our Partnership no single idea has had more power in linking individual purpose and motivation to the effort required to prepare and improve educators' skills and knowledge of teaching than the perception of teaching as a moral endeavor. Teachers want to make a positive difference with their students, and many state this as their primary motivation for entering the teaching profession (Bullough & Hall-Kenyon, 2011; Serow, 1994). In partnership conversations a question often discussed has been, "How does making a difference for students relate to education being a moral endeavor?"

John Dewey (1916) stressed that the aims and values which are desirable in education are themselves moral. Education, particularly in its explicit forms such as public schooling, is value driven. Educational aims, purposes, and values impinge on the welfare of students, necessitating moral considerations. Educators are aware of some human potentialities and unaware of others, but this does not excuse them from making and acting on choices. By the very nature of educational processes, teachers and administrators play an active role in moral education (Fullan, 2003; Noddings, 2002).

Fenstermacher (1990) stated that teaching is a moral activity because it is a "human action undertaken in regard to other human beings" (p. 133). Williams (2006) expanded this view:

Teaching and, more broadly, education are moral activities because other people are involved. However, since many human actions involve other human beings (such as cutting hair, waiting tables, and repairing automobiles) but do not seem to be "moral" in any important sense, we need to push our analysis a bit deeper to uncover the more fundamental source of the morality of human action. Any human act is moral if it makes a "significant difference" to another human being. (p. 120)

Goodlad referred to the responsibility of teachers in making decisions that "maximize the education of all children and youth" as the "burden of judgment" (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990, p. 4). Moral imperatives arise from this unique relationship between teacher and students. This burden of judgment is a "moral burden" because actions taken or not taken enrich or diminish lives.

Morality must be more than guidelines for human comportment. Teachers want to make a positive difference for their students and with their students. Many feel the "call to teach" as a call to serve. For this reason Palmer (1998) claimed that a teacher's sense of personal identity and integrity are more fundamental to good teaching than technique.

In every class I teach, my ability to connect with my students, and to connect them with the subject, depends less on the

methods I use than on the degree to which I know and trust my selfhood—and am willing to make it available and vulnerable in the service of learning. (p. 10)

From John Goodlad (1997) we get a clearer view of how he sees the relationship between morality and teaching. Out of the several volumes written from his extensive study of how educators are prepared for teaching, Goodlad concluded that the book *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching* “probably had—and continues to have—the deepest and widest impact” (Goodlad et al., 2004, p. 150). For him,

Choices involve placing one set of beliefs or preferences over another. The choices are moral, reflecting a present state of wisdom. Education—the cultivation of wisdom in the cultural context—is a moral undertaking. It follows that teaching the young in schools, in homes, and in the marketplace, and educating teachers for so doing are moral enterprises. (p. 10-11)

Given the frequent challenges to his use of the term *moral*, Goodlad added,

We are reaffirming a position taken by many others: Selfhood is shaped in a context. It matures, for better or worse, through choosing (or being forced to choose) among alternatives. These alternatives are value-laden; one identifies with some and rejects others. The choices are moral ones. (p. 11)

When this perspective was applied to a large research base of data collected while conducting two major studies, his Study of Schooling (Goodlad, 1984) and the Study of the Education of Educators (Goodlad, 1994), the work culminated in the grounding for the collaborative work of universities and schools in education. Four morally based dimensions were identified.

These moral imperatives arise out of the school’s responsibility for enculturating the young, the necessity for and challenge of providing access to knowledge for all students, the unique relationship between the teacher and the taught in the context of compulsory schooling, and the role of teachers in renewing school settings. (Goodlad *et al.*, 1990, p. 19)

These four “moral dimensions,” as he called them, grounded the renewal effort in a “four-part mission of schooling” (Goodlad *et al.*, 2004, p. 28) for university-school partnerships. An even later development was the creation of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy (Fenstermacher, 1999; Goodlad, 1997), which combined the four-part mission with the change strategy of simultaneous renewal applied to problems or conditions on which to focus renewal efforts (Sirotnik, 2001).

The Agenda for Education in a Democracy (AED), with its four moral dimensions identifying the primary purposes for schooling, has

guided the thinking and action of the BYU-PSP for the majority of its 29+ years of existence. Over the years the Partnership has examined and experimented with the claim that education is a moral endeavor. The result has been a heightened sensitivity to the moral obligation of partnership participants as citizens of our nation and members of communities and family units to prepare the young to actively participate in and contribute to these same settings. Education--in particular, education made intentional through schooling--carries with it moral obligations and consequences because it does make meaningful differences in the lives of those so engaged.

Purposes of Public Education in a Democratic Society

The year the BYU-PSP was formally created Goodlad published *A Place Called School* (1984), based on data collected on the conditions and practices of K-12 schools across the nation. In the chapter titled "We Want It All," he identified 12 goals typically associated with public schools, addressing the academic, social, civic, vocational, and personal development needs of all students. The title of the chapter emerged from asking parents, teachers, and students which of these goals were more important to them and receiving responses indicating that they were all important. Thus, Goodlad concluded that "most parents want their children to have it all" (p. 39). Even when he asked respondents to select a single most preferred choice, no single category was mentioned by over 50%. From his analysis he reasoned, "We are not without goals for schooling. But we are lacking an articulation of them and commitment to them" (p. 56).

One challenge facing public schools has been the ever-increasing expectation to address more and more needs of students without receiving commensurate increases in resources. The broader the range of responsibilities expected of our schools by the public, the greater the confusion about the roles schools should assume in educating our children. One of the dangers when public purposes are poorly served is the increase in justification for public schools to serve more narrow private interests. The public becomes more conflicted over the multiple purposes of schools, and then public confidence suffers when schools do not perform to the level some expect. Clearly, public schools simply cannot meet all the expectations of members of the public for schools to serve their private ends.

Just as parents want their children to be educated, all societies want to have educated citizens. Goodlad began emphasizing the unique relationship between education and the way of life in a democracy. Because of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship in a democratic society, schools have been viewed as necessary for helping

all youth gain the requisite skills, dispositions, and habits of intellect required for a free people. No one is born with these capabilities developed, and schools have seemed the likely place for youth to gain and practice the skills of citizenship. As Goodlad stated,

Public schooling is the essential starting point for addressing the well-being of democracy. It embraces a large majority of the young; it surpasses all other institutions in its commitment to and accountability for education; and its rhetoric of mission embraces the personal, social, vocational, and intellectual development of children and youth. What better place might we turn to for advancing the public purpose of ensuring a democratic people? (Goodlad, Soder, & McDaniel, 2008, p. 19)

As one of the four moral dimensions, “enculturating the young in a social and political democracy” has been foundational to the partnership. In 1948 Herskovits used the term *enculturate* to mean “the process of learning about and becoming competent in one’s own culture” (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 28). We apply the term to the unique culture of democracy. A distinction is made between a social democracy and a political democracy in the purpose statement. Democracy may be seen both as a form of civic life and as a political system with parties, officials, and institutions. Social democracy refers to civic life-- the shared life of citizens that is concerned with common affairs and mutual interests in communities and in the nation. Democracy as a form of government requires a democratic social fabric. In the mid-1990s references to the Agenda for Education in a Democracy (AED) began to be used to convey the integrated four-part mission of the university-public school partnership while “reasserting the centrality of preparation for democratic citizenship as the foremost mission of public schooling” (Goodlad et al., 2004). The AED included a four-part mission, a change strategy of simultaneous renewal, and conditions for the success of universities and public schools working in collaboration to improve schools along with educator preparation. With its enhanced articulation of these points, the AED became a more powerful force for change in our partnership.

Educational Change through Simultaneous Renewal

Goodlad has consistently drawn a distinction between educational renewal and educational reform. *Reform* has been characterized as change mandated by external sources, usually short term, but viewed as a comprehensive solution applicable to all situations (Goodlad, 1984). *Renewal*, in contrast, is generated from within and can be recognized by its outcomes; it “prevents present conditions from deteriorating while

addressing problems that arise,” and it brings about changes and “sustains those changes that prove desirable” (Goodlad, 1984, p. 102).

Renewal is achieved through ample and consistent dialogue among members of the organization. In a partnership, individuals at all levels need to be actively engaged and collaboratively involved in creating a shared partnership vision and then be willing to act upon it. The BYU-PSP involves five public school districts, the school of education and eight arts and sciences colleges at the university. The quality and number of conversations are important, but perhaps more significant are the efforts made to ensure that conversations among the partners lead to renewal that is simultaneous for both individuals and their organizations. The change process, which consists of conversing, making decisions, acting, and reflecting, transforms the individuals involved and leads to re-creations of their institutions. Renewal manifests itself in both individual and organizational change.

Goodlad often drew attention to the difficulty of changing existing school cultures: i.e., the prevalent value and belief systems which identify the boundaries of acceptable behavior for an institution. More challenging to change are what Paul Heckman (1987) called the “regularities” of schooling: “Teachers in most schools remain isolated from one another. They do not discuss significant classroom problems and seek collegial solutions to them. They spend little time talking substantively to one another about what they do in their classrooms” (p. 69). Channels of communication must be established among the partners and kept open. A university-public school partnership increases significantly the number of individuals available to participate in the conversations. Expanding the opportunities for collaboration also increases the need for trust among the partners. A former school of education associate dean, Marie Tuttle, reflected on the importance of collaboration in our Partnership:

The Partnership’s significance is captured in the notion of simultaneous renewal. I think in our Partnership you can legitimately see simultaneous renewal in action. I know school teachers make a concerted effort to model the practices they know we are teaching on campus, and I know that people on campus listen when associates and others tell them about needs in the schools and issues of concern. We value the wisdom of practice in the schools. (Wangemann et al., 2006, p. 27)

One of the past weaknesses in the BYU-PSP had been the minimal participation of the colleges of the arts and sciences across the university campus. As at many universities, the arts and sciences colleges were contributing to the subject area knowledge required of teachers for certification, but they were not working closely with the school of

education or the school district partners in the certification process. The Partnership was represented as a tripartite relationship including the school districts, the school of education, and the Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES). With the encouragement of Goodlad, efforts were made to reach out to the deans and chairs of the arts and sciences. Their voices had been largely absent from our critical conversations regarding the preparation of educators and efforts to help all students learn.

This change occurred in the late 1990s, and the Partnership was able to expand its focus on simultaneous renewal when this third entity responsible for change became involved in its deliberations. During this time a number of advisory committees were established at various levels including the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE); advisory committees for elementary education (EEPAC), for secondary education (SEPAC), and for special education (SPEDPAC); and a Professional Development Coordinating Council (PDCC). These committees provided times and places for partners to meet, processes for collaboration, and opportunities for all voices to be heard and considered. Much needed improvement occurred.

The spirit of renewal has been evident in the work and accomplishments of the Partnership. R. Carl Harris, a former university professor and early champion of the Partnership, captured the prevalent spirit that has prevailed when he wrote:

I think the greatest legacy of the Partnership is the institutionalization of change. Twenty years of partnering has legitimized innovation. Not only has it legitimized innovation, but it has provided an ethic, a way of life that expects innovation, that expects renewal. The ethos that exists because of the Partnership continues to support self-examination, progress, and the drive to reach beyond one's own small domain. (Wangemann et al., 2006, p. 27)

Goodlad was instrumental in formalizing relationships between Brigham Young University and five public school districts in 1984. He set out to create a national network of university-public school partnerships, which became the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). One of his motivations for forming this collaborative organization was his conviction that schools and universities need to be brought together to generate critical inquiry (Goodlad et al., 2004, p. 111). Goodlad liked to refer to the university-school partnerships as "proofing sites"-- places where ideas and initiatives could be experimented upon in a "long-term commitment to renew both schools and teacher education programs" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 13). When we look back on the accomplishments of our Partnership, the spirit of renewal is

apparent in the university programs that prepare professional educators, in the schools where those professionals work with our children and youth, and in each participant's life.

The BYU-PSP has been collaboratively successful for a number of reasons. Its strength and longevity can be attributed to capable leadership, strong and consistent commitment to focusing on the shared interests of the partners, adequate shared resources, and a high degree of trust in relationships among the partners. The Partnership has not brought about change solely for the sake of change, a survival mechanism, or even worse, as merely an accommodation to the currents that surround us. The Partnership's process of change has been guided by ideas that have consequences sufficiently compelling and consistent to engage all the partners. John Goodlad has been a critical contributor and voice to many of these ideas.

John Goodlad has been a lifelong advocate and champion in exploring (1) the nature of educational and organizational change and (2) the purposes of public education in a democracy (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 13). The BYU-PSP has benefited from his guidance and ideas on both accounts. We agree with his close colleague Ken Sirotnik, who stated that one of Goodlad's primary contributions has been his focus on "the moral commitments to equity and excellence in education as foundational building blocks for a healthy, democratic society" (Sirotnik & Soder, 1999, p. 6). These same ideas can be found in the current guiding documents of the BYU-PSP:

We believe our Partnership exists to simultaneously and interactively renew public schools and educator preparation. We consider education to be a public imperative, a moral endeavor, and a shared responsibility for all members of society. In our Partnership this is accomplished through consistent collaborative inquiry, mutual reflection and conversations, and inquiry involving both the university and the public schools. (Wangemann, 2011, pp. 16-17)

In these messages we have received consistently from Goodlad and his colleagues, we have found the drumbeats, the rhythm, and the resonance of the sound to be appropriate and effective for university-public school work.

References

- Bullough, R. V., & Hall-Kenyon, K. M. (2011). The call to teach and teacher hopefulness. *Teacher Development*, 15(2), 127-140.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 130-154). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1999). Agenda for education in a democracy. In W. F. Smith & G. D. Fenstermacher (Eds.), *Leadership for educational renewal: Developing a cadre of leaders* (pp. 3-28). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1975). *The dynamics of educational change*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1997). *In praise of education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. J. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & McDaniel, B. (2008). *Education and the making of a democratic people*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heckman, P. (1987). Understanding school culture. In J. I. Goodlad (Ed.), *Eighty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Pt. 1. The ecology of school renewal* (p. 69). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosenberg, J. R. (2006). Cervantes' inn: Literacy, conversation and stewardship of the mind. In P. Wangemann, S. Black, & S. Baugh (Eds.), *The spirit of renewal: A celebration of the moral dimensions of teaching*. Provo, UT: ProLogic Press.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Serow, R. C. (1994). Called to teach: A study of highly motivated preservice teachers. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 27(2), 65-72.

- Sirotnik, K. A. (2001). *Renewing schools & teacher education: An odyssey in educational change*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Sirotnik K. A., & Soder, R. (1999). *The beat of a different drummer: Essays on educational renewal in honor of John I. Goodlad*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Wangemann, P. (2011). *Annual review: Ensuring that every student learns*. Provo, UT: North Star Press.
- Wangemann, P., Black, S., & Baugh, S. (2006). *The spirit of renewal: A celebration of the moral dimensions of teaching*. Provo, UT: ProLogic Press.
- Williams, R. N. (2006). The grounding of educational renewal: Moral dimensions and moral foundations. In P. Wangemann, S. Black, & S. Baugh (Eds.), *The spirit of renewal: A celebration of the moral dimensions of teaching*. Provo, UT: ProLogic Press.

Paul Wangemann, Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, Brigham Young University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paul Wangemann, Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. E-mail: paul_wangemann@byu.edu

Problematizing the Role of Phonemic Awareness in Early Literacy Development of English Language Learners: Toward More Equitable Educational Practices

Jenna M. Shim
University of Wyoming

Through a synthesis of research studies on phonemic awareness, literacy acquisition/development, and bilingual literacy acquisition/development, this essay demonstrates how phonemic awareness and literacy development may develop very differently in children for whom English is not their first language. Motivated by an assumption that success in early literacy acquisition has a significant impact on students' later academic performance, the author of this essay argues that a commonly and widely accepted belief that phonemic awareness and literacy development are positively correlated can exclude many English language learners (ELLs) from learning opportunities and thus from later academic success.

KEYWORDS: phonemic awareness, early literacy development, English language learners (ELLs)

The danger of universalizing cultures, practices, and beliefs of people from different backgrounds has long been firmly established across various disciplines (Rosaldo, 1993; Bourdieu, 1998). In education, most educators agree with the importance of respecting and embracing cultural and language differences to provide inclusive education for *all* students, and this importance is emphasized increasingly in an era of rapidly changing demographics. Globally, we live in a world in which all of us are constantly crisscrossing cultural and language boundaries in and through virtual and/or real space and time (Ang, 2003; Papastergiadis, 2000). Nationally, we live in a country that is becoming more diverse every year. Over the past 15 years, the number of English language learners (ELLs) has nearly doubled to about 5 million, which makes them the fastest growing population in U.S. public schools. By 2015, ELL enrollment in U.S. schools will reach 10 million, and by 2025, nearly one out of every four public school students will be an English language learner (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition [NCELA], 2007).

Consequently, many researchers, scholars, and practitioners have been relentlessly working to find ways to (re)structure schools and society to provide equal learning opportunities to students from diverse linguistic backgrounds. Despite the efforts, however, 41 U.S. states reported that only 18.7% of ELLs exceeded the state norm on reading assessment tests (Kindler, 2002), and dropout rates for ELLs are significantly higher than those reported for non-ELLs (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2006). While the ELL status is highly correlated with other relevant statistics, such as low income and parents' education levels, rates can also be seen as an indicator of a mismatch between the needs of ELLs and the instruction actually provided for them (August & Hakuta, 1997; Rothenberg & Fisher, 2007).

Having stated such, the broader goal of this essay is to contribute productively to research and practice in the education for ELLs. Given that there are approximately 5 million English language learners enrolled in the nation's preK-12 grade schools (NCELA, 2007), the issues related to ELLs pertain to *all* educators. More specifically, this essay focuses on the issues that ELLs are facing when beginning formal reading instruction in school by re-visiting the role of phonemic awareness in early literacy development among ELLs.

The writing of this essay is motivated by the assumption that success in early literacy acquisition is the foundation for learning and has a significant impact on students' later academic achievement (National Reading Panel [NRP], 2000). Thus, it is important to understand as accurately as possible the factors that promote early literacy acquisition and development among *all* children, including those for whom English

is not their dominant language. This essay is also motivated by the current widely-accepted understanding that phonemic awareness is a strong predictor of success in learning to read; children who experience reading difficulty typically lack phonemic awareness (NRP, 2000). Finally, this essay aims to demonstrate that widely accepted ideas can often be extended to universally accepted norms. In other words, unconditionally assuming phonemic awareness as a strong predictor for early literacy development inevitably marginalizes ELLs whose home language may not share the same structure as that of English; therefore, this essay argues that to provide more equitable instruction for early literacy development of ELLs, educators must scrutinize the role of phonemic awareness.

The understanding that phonemic awareness is central for early reading and writing achievement must be debated because state, national, and international testing agencies create assessments of early reading that emphasize the skills related to phonemic awareness and teachers are required to teach those skills explicitly. If the competency in phonemic awareness is *not* necessarily a strong indicator of early literacy development for some students whose home language is not English, we would want to know that, especially if we are serious about translating our commitment in providing *equal* learning opportunities to *all* students to providing more effective early reading and writing instruction to *all* students.

The remainder of this essay is organized as follows. A brief overview of research is provided on phonemic awareness, mostly among English-speaking monolingual children. The factors that promote phonemic awareness and the necessary factors for early literacy acquisition among English-speaking monolingual children are then discussed. In the two subsequent sections, a discussion follows as to how these factors may be different for children for whom their dominant language is not English, with the suggestion that the two share no commonalities. This essay concludes with implications for further research and practice for more democratic educational practices for ELLs.

A Brief Overview of Research on Phonological Awareness among English-speaking Monolingual Children

A large body of research indicates that phonemic awareness is highly correlated with children's success in early reading, and children who experience early reading difficulty typically lack phonological awareness when compared to those who are more successful readers (National Early Literacy Panel [NELP], 2008; Slaviero, 2000; Strickland & Schickedanz, 2004). A report of the National Early Literacy Panel

(NELP, 2008) concludes that skills related to decoding print are the best predictors of reading achievement; therefore, children who lack these skills are the most appropriate candidates for early intervention. The findings of numerous research studies have highlighted the benefit of phonemic awareness and its link to decoding or word recognition in reading (Ehri, Nunes, Stahl, & Willows, 2001; Perfetti & Zhang, 1991), and have implied that phonemic awareness is one of the best predictors of reading achievement. Many have also argued that phonemic awareness is one of the most appropriate indicators of the need for early intervention.

Although the effects of phonemic awareness have been studied through writing process outcomes, most studies have used methods that assessed the participant's reading aptitude (Scarborough & Dobrich, 1994). Several research studies have shown the link between phonemic awareness and decoding or word recognition in reading (Ehri *et al.*, 2001; Perfetti & Zhang, 1991). These studies have shown that children who have developed phonemic awareness are able to understand how alphabet letters (graphemes) function in printed words and appreciate that graphemes represent individual sounds in the spoken word counterpart. Several authors that have studied the effect of the knowledge of phonemic awareness through writing process outcomes report that children who have developed phonemic awareness are able to understand that the spoken form of the word is represented by graphemes (Ball & Blachman, 1991; Besse, 1996; Sulzby, 1989). The insight is that the symbols used in printed words represent sounds in spoken words at a specific level, the phoneme, and this understanding benefits the children in both reading (decoding—going from graphemes to the sounds they represent, to the actual spoken word) and in creating them (spelling them, even if not conventionally at first). An extensive literature review on the subject has revealed the commonality between the studies conducted in reading literacy contexts and writing literacy contexts, in that they all indicate that phonemic awareness is an important foundation for children's early literacy development (NELP, 2008).

Similarly, the National Reading Panel Report (2000) recommends phonemic awareness instruction as a part of early reading instruction and mentions that phonemic awareness promotes reading achievement among ELLs. However, researchers who have extensively studied bilingualism and second language acquisition report that phonemic awareness training results in improved performance on phonemic awareness tests but not necessarily in reading comprehension (Krashen, 2001, 2002, 2004). The same view is taken in this essay.

Factors that Promote the Development of Phonemic Awareness in Monolingual English-speaking Children

The term ‘phonemes’ refers to the smallest units of sound that make up the speech stream (Finegan, 1999). English consists of about 41 phonemes, and they combine to form syllables and words (NRP, 2000). Phonemic awareness includes the ability to recognize that words are made up of a discrete set of sounds and the ability to manipulate and distinguish phonemes in spoken words (Goswami & Bryant, 1990). Although there are several components of phonemic awareness (e.g. rhyming, blending, phoneme counting), children who can segment sounds in words and who can say either just the first sound or all three separate sounds (e.g., sounds they hear in the word *cat*) are usually regarded as having developed phonemic awareness (Cunningham, 2005).

Based on several research studies, many factors that promote the development of phonemic awareness among children can be identified. First, many researchers have shown that alphabet knowledge and print-rich environments within which children can engage promote phonemic awareness (Bowey, 2002; Cunningham, 2005; NRP, 2000; Stahl & Muray, 1994). Similarly, some researchers have suggested that engaging children in language activities that focus on both the form and the content of spoken and written language encourages the development of phonemic awareness (Routman, 2000; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). It is also known that parental teaching related to literacy development contributes to phonemic awareness ability (Routman, 2000). Others have also suggested that children’s engagement in writing activities promotes the development of phonemic/phonological awareness (Cunningham, 2005; Richgels, Poremba, & McGee, 1996; Scanlon & Vellutino, 1997). Finally, competence with oral language, and thus the familiarity of the sounds in that language, is known to be important in supporting phonemic awareness (Adams, 1990; Johnston, Anderson, & Holligan, 1996). While a thorough review of these studies is outside the scope of this essay, an understanding of the major factors that promote phonemic awareness serves as a necessary foundation for further discussion, as each factor will be revisited below in relation to children whose home language is not English.

Factors Necessary for the Acquisition of Literacy among Monolingual Children

Many educators now agree that the development of literacy is about an ongoing meaning-making process that commences long before children start formal instruction in elementary school (Allington & Cunningham, 1996; Clay, 1991; Schickedanz, 1986; Smith & Elley, 1997). From a sociocultural perspective, reading, writing, and literacy

are defined as constructs that convey a much broader meaning that is being constantly (re)negotiated due to the changes in the learning environment (Gee, 2004). While firmly situated within such an understanding of the development of literacy, this essay takes a limited view on the development and acquisition of literacy within the time frame of children learning to read and write printed text.

Many researchers have suggested that the three factors necessary for the development of literacy are (a) oral language proficiency, (b) metalinguistic awareness, and (c) understanding of the symbolic nature of print (Adams, 1990; Bialystok, 2007; Bialystok & Martin, 2003; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1985; Koda, 2007; Morrow, 1989). Here, oral proficiency refers to children's well-developed oral language abilities and familiarity with the sound of spoken language. Different theories exist as to how children acquire oral language (e.g. behaviorist, nativist, cognitive development, and basic learning theories). However, the key commonality among the different explanations is that most children develop language abilities in a series of different stages. Moreover, the development of oral proficiency is not gained through explicit instruction, but rather in environments where individuals interact with each other through language. When children are learning to read printed text, their reading builds on making connections between oral language and its writing system. Similarly, when children are learning to write, they reconstruct meaning of oral language by constructing texts.

Metalinguistic awareness refers to children's knowledge and understanding of language and its structure. Snow, Burns, & Griffin (1998) define metalinguistic knowledge as children's language or thought about language. For example, being able to distinguish that the word "snake" refers to a long skinny thing all in one piece, but that the word itself is neither long nor skinny and has four parts when spoken and five parts when written is metalinguistic knowledge (Snow et al., 1998). In languages based on alphabetic orthographies, the metalinguistic concepts involve children's ability to segment words into their phonemic units. Thus, phonological awareness is the metalinguistic concept, often known to most directly promote reading and early literacy acquisition (Adams, 1990). Children gain metalinguistic knowledge through interacting with literate individuals and by becoming more conscious of what they know about language and its structure. Many scholars have suggested that book reading provides a valuable context in which literate adults can discuss language (Snow & Ninio, 1986).

Finally, understanding of the symbolic nature of print refers to children's understanding that the print notations signify meaning, and this knowledge develops long before children are able to read independently. Moreover, knowledge of the symbolic nature of print

includes children's understanding that the letters signify sounds, the writing system is made up of letters, and the print on the page encodes meaning (Bialystok, 2007). Becoming familiar with the print forms and what they represent is crucial in children's early literacy acquisition because "children who do not understand the symbolic function of the letters they are learning cannot use those letters as the constituents of reading" (Bialystok & Martin, 2003, p. 224).

Relevance of the Factors that Promote Phonemic Awareness for Children for Whom the Home Language is not English

Understanding the factors that promote phonemic awareness among monolingual children has important implications for ELLs. Phonemic awareness, once developed in one language, is known to transfer to other languages (Koda, 1998; Bialystok, 2007); therefore, the discussion in this section focuses on children whose home language and its writing system is based on non-alphabetic orthographies that do not use phonemic representations (e.g., Chinese). Briefly, revisiting the factors that promote the development of phonemic awareness listed above, many hypotheses can be drawn with respect to different factors that promote literacy acquisition. It can be stated that literacy acquisition abilities may develop: (1) if children are surrounded by environmental print that is not based on an alphabetic representational system; (2) if children's parental teaching and involvement in reading and writing development is not in English and does not necessarily reinforce skills involving phoneme segmenting; (3) if emergent writing activities in which children engage at home are not in an alphabetic writing system; and (4) if the strong language of children who are learning to read and write in English is not English. Lipson and Wixon (2009) argue, "the language that children hear is the language that they learn . . . children raised in homes where family members say 'pahk the cah,' learn to say that" (p. 263). That stated, recognizing that what children hear, learn, and experience in their homes impacts what children know about language and its structure seems not only reasonable, but also necessary to determine the kinds of instructional assistance they need at school. In addition, the skills that transfer across the languages are dependent on children's first language and its structure. Hence, literacy instruction needs to take into account children's primary language and its similarities and differences to the second language if we, as educators, are committed to providing more equitable learning opportunities for ELLs.

In fact, many research studies have shown that children's development of phonological awareness is responsive to the structure of an individual language (Bialystok & Martin, 2003). For example, several studies of children learning two alphabetic systems suggest the

presence of positive transfer of phonological/phonemic concepts and skills across language for bilinguals (Geva & Siegel, 2000; Gholamain & Geva, 1999; Wade-Woolley & Geva, 2000). There are also other studies that demonstrate correlations between phonological/phonemic awareness in English and either Spanish (Lindsey, Manis, & Bailey, 2003) or French (Comeau, Cormier, Grandmaison, & Lacroix, 1999) for bilingual children. These studies also show significant influences between phonological awareness in one of these languages and word recognition in the other if the two languages share a similar writing system.

However, the research studies conducted among bilinguals whose first language is not based on phonological representations and/or alphabetic orthographies are less abundant, and the ones that exist typically yield mixed and contrasting results. For example, Cheung (1999) showed no correlation between phonological awareness transfer in reading in Korean and English after controlling for the variance of nonverbal reasoning skills and working memory. Other studies reported a similar result that showed no correlation from a study conducted among children whose first language is Chinese (Bialystok, McBride-Chang, & Luk, 2005; Grabe, 1991; Huang & Hanley, 1994; Luk & Bialystok, 2008). On the other hand, Gottardo, Yan, Siegel, and Wade-Woolley (2001) reported contrasting findings, whereby the hierarchical regression analyses conducted in their study indicated that Chinese rhyme detection predicted English reading beyond the variance accounted for by English phoneme deletion. Gottardo *et al.* concluded that “phonological processing skills in children’s L1 can influence reading performance in an alphabetic orthography, regardless of the orthography used to represent in the child’s L1” (p. 540). In other words, even if a child’s first language does not use an alphabetic orthography, the child’s phonological processing skills developed in the first language influences performance in English. However, as rhyme awareness was the only measure of phonological awareness assessment in this study, these results may not extend to other dimensions of complex linguistic concepts that influence children’s reading comprehension and performance.

While recognizing that the literature briefly reviewed here does not allow any generalizations, it seems reasonable to state that the development and transferability of phonological/ phonemic awareness concepts and skills is not the same across all languages. The extent to which children transfer their knowledge in one language to a second language in reading depends on the similarity of the systems—for example, phonemic/phonological structure, orthographic representation, and/or reading/writing structure. For Spanish-English bilinguals, the languages are similar, and both are written alphabetically in a Roman

script and use phonemic representation. In contrast, for Chinese-English bilinguals, the languages and the writing systems share no resemblance, and character awareness is the foundation for Chinese reading development, which is not the case in English. For Hebrew-English bilinguals, the languages are different and use different scripts, even though both are written alphabetically. Some studies have shown that children who speak non-alphabetic languages do develop phonemic awareness, and that those children who need it and are provided phonemic awareness training in a second language can acquire phonemic awareness and decoding skills (Koda, 1994). However, decoding skills and phonemic awareness do not automatically translate to promoting reading comprehension (Bialystok, 2007; Bialystok, Luk, & Kwan, 2005; Cummins, 2001, 2003).

Relevance of the Factors that Determine the Acquisition of Literacy for Children for Whom the Home Language is Not English

Many researchers have suggested that the factors that determine children's ability to acquire literacy is different between children who speak more than one language and children who speak one language (Koda, 1994, 2005, 2007; Bialystok, Luk, & Kwan, 2005; Bialystok, McBride-Chang, & Luk, 2005; Bialystok, 2007). Drawing on several research studies, the focus of this essay will now turn to examine how the development of literacy in a language that is *not* children's home/dominant language may be different, considering the three aforementioned factors that influence monolingual children's literacy acquisition and development.

To begin with oral language proficiency, if children are learning to read and write in a language that is different from that spoken at home, it seems obvious that the acquisition of literacy in the second language is more difficult than the acquisition of literacy in the first language. If it is true that children who are competent in their oral proficiency and children who possess more elaborate vocabulary do better in reading comprehension than those who do not (Adams, 1990; Anderson & Freebody, 1983; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Samuels, 2002; Snow et al., 1998; Strickland & Morrow, 1988), and if it is true that bilingualism depresses the size of vocabulary in a weaker language (Bialystok, 1988), it would also be true that the acquisition of literacy is compromised for children who are learning to read and write in a second language.

Given that metalinguistic awareness refers to children's understanding of language and its structure and that metalinguistic knowledge most often develops in the context of interacting with literate adults (through book reading, for instance), it seems reasonable to state

that children who speak and are surrounded by different languages develop different knowledge about language and its structure. Consequently, the knowledge children use to read and write in a second language may be very different from that used by monolingual children—a point which is particularly convincing if we consider that bilingual children inevitably transfer the concepts and skills acquired in one language to reading and writing in the other (Lado, 1957; Nagy, McClure, & Mir, 1997; Koda, 2007). Although some studies have shown that phonemic awareness correlates with reading ability among children who speak non-alphabetic languages (Hu & Catts, 1998), many studies have shown that speakers of languages that have different orthographies and writing systems from those of English use different reading strategies than English-speaking monolinguals do. For instance, while phoneme segmentation is known for use in reading in an alphabetic language, a more holistic approach is known to be used for reading by speakers of a morphosyllabic language, such as Chinese (Luk & Bialystok, 2008). Luk and Bialystok (2008) argue that, if children are learning to read in a language system that records oral language at the level of phonemes, competence with the detection of phonemes is fundamental. However, if children are learning to read in a language that uses a different principle and records oral language at the level of morphemes, the skills foundational to literacy acquisition may not necessarily involve the manipulation of phonemes. This is an important point when considering the significant number of bilingual children in our country who at the time they begin reading and writing in schools are expected to acquire this skill in their home language as well as in English (Cheung, Chen, Lai, Wong, & Hills, 2001).

Research studies have shown that the development of phonological awareness depends on the language the child speaks and the structure of specific language determines phoneme sensitivity (Koda, 2005). Children who speak a language that is more phonologically transparent or shallow, such as Italian, show higher levels of competence in phonological awareness than that of English (less transparent or deep)-speaking children (Bialystok, 2007). In their study of the development of phonological awareness tasks among children who are English monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, and Chinese-English bilinguals, Bialystok, Majumder, and Martin (2003) showed that Chinese-English bilinguals scored the lowest and Spanish-English bilinguals scored the highest. In other words, children who speak a more phonologically transparent language scored higher on development of phonological awareness tasks than children who speak a phonologically irregular language, but these children scored higher than other children who speak a language *not* based on phonological representation. The

factors that contribute to children's metalinguistic awareness may vary. However, given that several studies that have shown that the development of phonemic awareness among children who speak non-alphabetic languages may be compromised (Koda, 1998) and that word identification in any language requires some form of phonological analysis because print records spoken language (Perfetti, 2003), specific experiences in different languages largely determine different understandings about language and its structure. In other words, this knowledge of phonological analysis is *not* universal across all languages.

Finally, the elements that constitute notations that comprise the writing systems are not universal across all languages. Understanding of the symbolic nature of print implies the appreciation that the letters signify sounds and that the writing system is comprised of letters among children who speak a language based on alphabetic orthographies. Nevertheless, different principles may apply to children who speak non-alphabetic language. In other words, although children must understand the general principles that print represents meaning to acquire literacy, the constituents of those principles are not universal. Furthermore, considering that children's understanding of the symbolic nature of print develops long before formal, school-based reading and writing instruction, and if children's home language is different from the language of school, it seems obvious that the concepts of print that children have developed are those pertaining to their home language. Many studies have shown that, if children's first language is not English but, instead, is based on alphabetic orthographies, they are able to discover the relations between the two languages and their structures and transfer the skills demanded by their first language literacy to those demanded by their second language (Koda, 1998, 2007). However, if children's first language is not English and it is *not* based on alphabetic orthographies, the concept of print that those children use to read may be very different from those used by children who speak alphabetic orthographic languages (Bialystok, 1997, 2007). Therefore, the structure of individual language pairs (first and second language) must be considered when attempting to assess bilingual children's concepts of print and their instructional needs.

Conclusions and Implications

This essay reviews the factors generally understood to promote phonemic awareness and literacy acquisition of monolingual English-speaking children and their relevance to ELLs. In doing so, it suggests there is an urgent need for further research that investigates the factors that promote literacy development for ELLs for whom the first language is based on a system that shares no commonalities with the English

language system. If we continue to disregard this issue, educators may unintentionally further marginalize ELLs and their educational opportunities by implementing phonemic awareness training that may not be beneficial to them.

Through a synthesis of and insights gained from studies on phonemic awareness, literacy acquisition/development, and bilingual literacy acquisition/development, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Children whose home language is not English are attuned to hearing and producing sounds different to those of English, and they may initially face challenges in distinguishing phonemes in English language. This does not indicate children's *inability* to segment stream of sounds but an *ability* to hear and produce different kinds of sounds.
2. Children whose home language is not English, when beginning formal literacy instruction in school, may bring competence in language systems that rely on different foundations and assumptions from English—oral proficiency, metalinguistic knowledge, and the concept of print—the factors necessary for literacy acquisition that are often specific to their home language.
3. Thus, different languages demand different skills for literacy acquisition and development, and children whose home language is based on non-alphabetic orthographies that do not rely on phonemic representations may not demand phonemic sensitivity and decoding skills for literacy acquisition and development.
4. Even if phonemic awareness does develop among children who speak non-alphabetic language, the relationship between phonemic awareness and literacy acquisition depends on the demands created by individual writing systems. Therefore, if children's first language demands a more holistic approach to reading, they may be more accustomed and inclined to take a more holistic approach to reading English.
5. The relationship between phonemic awareness and literacy acquisition is *not* universal.

Assuming that phonological awareness is a predictor of success in literacy acquisition and that lack of phonological awareness is a precursor of reading failure for *all* children seems to be a mistake. This assumption is flawed because it leads to providing children with phonemic awareness training that may be meaningless to them. Furthermore, by assuming that the correlation between phonemic awareness and literacy acquisition is universal, phonemic awareness is

deemed essential in how all ELLs learn to read and write. This, in turn, perpetuates the existing inequality in the current educational system and denies efforts to achieve democratic educational contexts that promote learning for all students.

Re-invoking what has been aforementioned, the existing research studies conducted between two languages represented by the same writing systems suggest a strong correlation between reading comprehension ability and phonemic awareness. However, studies conducted between two languages represented by different writing systems suggest conflicting results with respect to correlation between reading comprehension ability and phonemic awareness. This contrast makes evident the necessity of further research based on the languages that have no commonalities with the English writing system.

Allington (1997) is right in saying that the “argument isn’t that helping children develop effective and efficient decoding strategies is unimportant” (p. 15). What need questioning are statements such as, “the crucial role of phonemic awareness in children’s literacy acquisition is now more or less *universally* [emphasis added] accepted” (Hulme, 2002, p. 63). Just as the development of literacy varies among individual English-speaking children, it also varies among ELLs. Such an assumption, even with good intentions, can exclude many children who are learning to read and write in English as a second language from literacy acquisition and later learning. If we are committed to inclusive education for *all* students, we cannot assume that all ELLs have the same needs in early literacy acquisition instruction. Equally, we cannot provide the same instruction for all students, whether English is their dominant language or not. To do otherwise is to exclude, discriminate, and marginalize ELLs, especially the ones whose first language system bears no resemblance to that of English.

In closing, all educators should ask themselves these questions: For whom are we still insisting that phonemic awareness is a universal strategy for all children learning to read and write? Whose interests are served by insisting that phonemic awareness is a key predictor for early literacy acquisition for all students? The concept of “strategic essentialism” introduced by Spivak (1990), a postcolonial scholar, in relation to discussing the dominants’ representational practices of subalterns seems to resonate powerfully here. From a vantage point of factors that promote early literacy acquisition involving something other than phonemic awareness, what might training for reading comprehension look like? All educators must investigate ways to develop literacy skills for ELLs in ways that truly serve their best interests. The differences in factors that promote early literacy acquisition should not be viewed as something ELLs need to overcome;

but rather, this knowledge can be used as a foundation for learning that can expand our preconceptions about early literacy acquisition and reading comprehension. Doing so will not only help us work “together-in-difference,” but will also help ELLs become more active and successful participants in schools and society in the long run.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Allington, R. L. (1997). Overselling phonics. *Reading Today*, 15(1), 15-16.
- Allington, R. L., & Cunningham, P. (1996). *Schools that work: Where all children can read and write*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Anderson, R.C., & Freebody, P. (1983). Reading comprehension and the assessment and acquisition of word knowledge. In B. Hutson (Ed.), *Advances in reading/language research* (pp.231-256). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ang, I. (2003). Together-in-difference: Beyond diaspora, into hybridity. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(2), 141-154.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ball, E. W., & Blachman, B. A. (1991). Does phonemic awareness in kindergarten make a difference in early word recognition and developmental spelling? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26(1), 49-66.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Besse, J. M. (1996). An approach to writing in kindergarten. In C. Pontecorvo, M. Orsolini, B. Burge, & L. Resnick (Eds.), *Children's early text construction* (pp. 127-144). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bialystok, E. (1988). Levels of bilingualism and levels of linguistic awareness. *Developmental Psychology*, 2(4), 560-567.
- Bialystok, E. (1997). Effects of bilingualism and biliteracy on children's emerging concepts of print. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(3), 429-440.
- Bialystok, E. (2007). Acquisition of literacy in bilingual children: A framework for research. *Language Learning*, 57(1), 45-77.
- Bialystok, E., Luk, G., & Kwan, E. (2005). Bilingualism, biliteracy, and learning to read: Interactions among languages and writing systems. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9(1), 43-61.

- Bialystok, E., Majumder, S., & Martin, M. M. (2003). Developing phonological awareness: Is there a bilingual advantage? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24(1), 27-44.
- Bialystok, E., & Martin, M. (2003). Notations to symbol: Development in children's understanding of print. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 86(3), 223-243.
- Bialystok, E., McBride-Chang, C., & Luk, G. (2005). Bilingualism, language proficiency, and learning to read in two writing systems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(4), 580-590.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bowey, J. A. (2002). Reflections on onset-rime and phoneme sensitivity as predictors of beginning word reading. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 82(1), 29-40.
- Cheung, H. (1999). Improving phonological awareness and word reading in a later learned alphabetic script. *Cognition*, 70(1), 1-26.
- Cheung, H., Chen, H. C., Lai, C. Y., Wong, O. C., & Hills, M. (2001). The development of phonological awareness: Effects of spoken language experience and orthography. *Cognition*, 81(3), 227-241.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinmann.
- Comeau, L., Cormier, P., Grandmaison, E., & Lacroix, D. (1999). A longitudinal study of phonological processing skills in children learning to read in a second language. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(1), 29-43.
- Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum*, 19, 15-20.
- Cummins, J. (2003). Bilingual education. In J. Bourne & E. Reid (Eds.), *World yearbook of education: Language education* (pp. 3-20). London: Kogan Page.
- Cunningham, P. M. (2005). *Phonics they use: Words for reading and writing*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Ehri, L.C., Nunes, S., Stahl, S., & Willows, D. (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(3), 393-411.
- Ferreiro, E., & Teberosky, A. (1985). *Literacy before schooling*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Finegan, E. (1999). *Language: Its structure and use*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Gee, J.P. (2004). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. In R. Ruddell & N. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models*

- and processes of reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Geva, E., & Siegel L. (2000). Orthographic and cognitive factors in the concurrent development of basic reading skills in two languages. *Reading and Writing, 12*(1), 1-30.
- Gholamain, M., & Geva, E. (1999). Orthographic and cognitive factors in the concurrent development of basic reading skills in English and Persian. *Language Learning, 49*(2), 183-217.
- Goswami, U., & Bryant, P. (1990). *Phonological skills and learning to read*. London, UK: Erlbaum.
- Gottardo, A., Yan, B., Siegel, L. S., & Wade-Woolley, L. (2001). Factors related to English reading performance in children with Chinese as a first language: More evidence of cross-language transfer of phonological processing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(3), 530-542.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *Tesol Quarterly, 25*(3), 375-406.
- Hu, C., & Catts, H. W. (1998). The role of phonological processing in early reading ability: What we can learn from Chinese. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 2*(1), 55-79.
- Huang, H. S., & Hanley, J. R. (1994). Phonological awareness and visual skills in learning to read Chinese. *Cognition, 54*(1), 73-98.
- Hulme, C. (2002). Phonemes, rimes, and the mechanisms of early reading development. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 82*(1), 58-64.
- Johnston, R. S., Anderson, M., & Holligan, C. (1996). Knowledge of the alphabet and explicit awareness of phonemes in pre-readers: The nature of the relationship. *Reading and Writing, 8*(3), 217-234.
- Kindler, A. L. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services: 2000–2001 summary report*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Koda, K. (1994). Second language reading research: Problems and possibilities. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 15*(1), 1-28.
- Koda, K. (1998). The role of phonemic awareness in second language reading. *Second Language Research, 14*(2), 194-215.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koda, K. (2007). Reading and language learning: Crosslinguistic constraints on second language reading development. *Language Learning, 57*(1), 1-44.

- Krashen, S. D. (2001). More smoke and mirrors: A critique of the National Reading Panel report on fluency. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(2), 119-123.
- Krashen, S. D. (2002). The NRP comparison of whole language and phonics: Ignoring the crucial variable in reading. *Talking Points*, 13(3), 22-28.
- Krashen, S. D. (2004). False claims about literacy development. *Educational Leadership*, 61(6), 18-21.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lindsey, K. A., Manis, F. R., & Bailey, C. E. (2003). Prediction of first-grade reading in Spanish-speaking English-language learners. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(3), 482-494.
- Lipson, M. Y., & Wixon, K. K. (2009). *Assessment & instruction of reading and writing difficulties: An interactive approach*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Luk, G., & Bialystok, E. (2008). Common and distinct cognitive bases for reading in English-Cantonese bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 29, 269-289.
- Morrow, L. M. (1989). *Literacy development in the early years: Helping children read and write*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nagy, W., McClure, E., & Mir, M. (1997). Linguistic transfer and the use of context by Spanish-English bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 18, 431-452.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2006). Retrieved from http://www.ets.org/Media/Conferences_and_Events/pdf/ELLSymposium/ELL_factsheet.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2007). *The growing numbers of limited English proficient students: 1995/96–2005/06*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2005LEP/GrowingLEP_0506.pdf
- National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups* (National Institute of Health Pub. No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2000). *The turbulence of migration*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

- Perfetti, C. A. (2003). The universal grammar of reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 7(1), 3-24.
- Perfetti, C. A., & Zhang, S. (1991). Phonological processes in reading Chinese characters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 17(4), 633-643.
- Richgels, D., Poremba, K. J., & McGee, L. M. (1996). Kindergartners talk about print: Phonemic awareness in meaningful contexts. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(8), 632-642.
- Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Rothenberg, C., & Fisher, D. (2007). *Teaching English language learners: A differentiated approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Routman, R. (2000). *Conversations: Strategies for teaching, learning and evaluating*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Samuels, S. J. (2002). Reading fluency: Its development and assessment. In Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (Eds.), *Reading on fluency for "a focus on fluency forum."* Honolulu, HI: PREL.
- Scanlon, D. M., & Vellutino, F. R. (1997). A comparison of the instructional backgrounds and cognitive profiles of poor, average, and good readers who were initially identified as at risk for reading failure. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 1(3), 191-215.
- Scarborough, H.S., & Dobrich, W. (1994). On the efficacy of reading to preschoolers. *Developmental Review*, 14, 245-302.
- Schickedanz, J. A. (1986). *More than the ABCs: The early stages of reading and writing*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Slaviero, R. (2000). Development of phonemic awareness skills in the acquisition of reading. *Post-Script*, 1(1), 56-78.
- Smith, J., & Elley, W. (1997). *How children learn to read*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Snow, C. E., & Ninio, A. (1986). The contracts of literacy: What children learn from learning to read books. In W. H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), *Emergent literacy: Writing and reading* (pp. 116-138). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Spivak, G. (1990). Gayatri Spivak on the politics of the subaltern, interview by H. Winant. *Socialist Review*, 20(3), 81-97.
- Stahl, S. A., & Murray, B. A. (1994). Defining phonological awareness and its relationship to reading, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(2), 221-234.

- Strickland, D. S., & Morrow, L. M. (1988). Creating a print rich environment. *The Reading Teacher*, 42(2), 156-157.
- Strickland, D. & Schickedanz, J. (2004). *Learning about print in preschool: Working with letters, words, and beginning links with phonemic awareness*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Sulzby, E. (1989). Assessment of emergent writing and children's language while writing. In L. Morrow & J. Smith (Eds.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 83-109). New York, NY: Longman.
- Wade-Woolley, L., & Geva, E. (2000). Processing novel phonemic contrasts in the acquisition of L2 word reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 4(4), 295-311.

Jenna M. Shim, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jenna M. Shim, Department of Educational Studies, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071. E-mail: jshim@uwyo.edu

Living Democracy in the Classroom: Changing the Approach

Karen Rowe
Colorado State University

Elizabeth Urban
Colorado State University

Shannon Canfield
Liberty Common School

The authors share work accomplished over the past five years at Colorado State University in the Master's of Educational Leadership, Renewal and Change Program. This licensure program has, as its foundation, the four-part mission of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy. The work focuses on the ideals of democracy, social justice and equity as the center of lesson planning and teacher preparation. It began with the students' writing of daily democracy objectives as well as daily content and literacy objectives. Revised unit and lesson planning templates emerged that frame the experience of learning in a democratic setting. One co-author, a former student, shares her work as an example of the changing approach. This approach is a practical way of living democracy and learning 21st century skills.

KEYWORDS: Democratic skills, democratic dispositions, 21st century skills, lesson planning, social justice, equity

For approximately twenty years, Richard DuFour and Robert Eaker have led educators in a new direction of school reform and renewal. In their creation of Professional Learning Communities (1998), they asked educators to ask themselves, individually and collaboratively, three questions. These three questions changed not only the thinking about teaching and learning, but the process itself, along with a discerning examination of the role and responsibility of every teacher.

1. What do students need to learn and be able to do?
2. How do we know if they have learned?
3. What do we do when they have not?

This kind of questioning promoted in all educators the understanding that simply “covering the content” does not meet the purpose of schooling or the responsibility of teachers. In terms of looking at content knowledge and the acquisition of skills, these three questions changed everything. The change was a shift from focusing solely on teaching to focusing on student learning. Students and teachers, in this new paradigm, became partners in a process where academic achievement for all students was the goal. Through learning communities, educators accepted this challenge of shared responsibility for learning with regard to academic content.

In this article we present an additional challenge, to extend and expand Eaker and DuFour’s questions to include the teaching of democracy. Similar to the thinking that “covering content” does not meet the purpose of schooling, we acknowledge that simply talking about democracy does not meet the mission of schooling in the United States. We share a changing approach that requires educators to apply Eaker and DuFour’s three questions as purposefully to the teaching, learning, and assessing of the skills and dispositions needed by citizens of our democracy.

The Masters of Educational Leadership, Renewal and Change Program at Colorado State University has always had as its foundation the four-part mission of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy: Equal Access to Knowledge, Enculturation into our Political and Social Democracy, Nurturing Pedagogy, and Stewardship. The thread that ties all of the work together is the belief that to accomplish any one of these goals, students must have the skills to participate and the awareness of the value of their participation.

During the five years of existence of this graduate program, the curriculum has grown and deepened. It began with the understanding of the purpose of schooling to be the education of citizens who will contribute to the well-being of our democratic society. The curriculum has developed to include the writing of clear, measurable democracy objectives; well-aligned learning experiences; and meaningful

assessment strategies. This article focuses on looking at the acquisition of the knowledge and skills for democratic participation and the assessment of democracy objectives. Extending the thinking of DuFour and Eaker, the following questions emerged from our ongoing dialogue with students: What do students need to learn and be able to do as citizens in a democracy? How will we and they know they have learned these? What will we and they do if they have not? These three questions have guided our work this year, in the teaching of democracy, and equally important, they have re-positioned the students as partners in the process, with respect to living democracy in the classroom. An example of the ongoing progress in this direction is from one former student and co-author's work. She has taken the challenge of teaching and assessing democratic skills to the center of her study, research, and practice.

Significant to the work we do, we are pleased to point out that the work presented exemplifies the dialogical pedagogy, which is at the heart of our program, and therefore a reason to include Shannon Canfield as a co-author. As we enter into dialogue with our students, it becomes apparent that education must be a shared endeavor, a conversation between students and teachers where the learning is ongoing and reciprocal. This student's voice has been not only heard in our year-long program, but it has continued to develop and to influence the learning of all members of the cohort as well as the faculty at the partner school. We acknowledge that this kind of teaching and learning is the best experience for all, an experience that should be shared by all students in schools in a democracy (Dewey, 1916). The instructors are truly the facilitators, "guides on the side," in a process where students grapple with important knowledge. Teachers must step to the side and allow students to apply and evaluate that knowledge, and then, to continue to create new meanings and new knowledge for themselves and with their colleagues. Students are doing the authentic work as they become contributors to the body of knowledge. This process empowers them to transform and re-create their reality as they want it to be, not as it is, but as it should be for the betterment of all (Freire, 1970). This is the process that we teach, model, and enjoy in all courses and practicum experiences. Highlighting the work of one student is an example of the shared power of the process in which we all learn and we all teach.

Context

The Master's Program and Framework for Teaching Democracy

The over-arching goal of the Master's Program has been to deepen the understanding and enhance the implementation of the mission of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy. The instructors in the program

support the belief that the process of teaching and learning democracy is the primary purpose of schooling and the essence of teacher training. The effort is to realize the moral obligation of bringing the well-being of democracy and the acquisition of skills for participation to the forefront of planning and teaching. For the past five years, the work has been a collaborative effort among students and instructors in a cohort-based professional development school in partnership with Fossil Ridge High School in Fort Collins, Colorado.

Theory to Practice

The practice of planning lessons designed around creating democratic environments and writing objectives to achieve the mission has made possible the realization of the Agenda in American classrooms. The practice, itself, is one of change and renewal. The re-formatted lesson plan template (see Appendix A) places democracy and 21st century skills at the top of the page, equal in importance to content knowledge and skills, literacy, and numeracy. It transforms the traditional, teacher-centered classroom where covering as much content as possible is viewed as efficient and beneficial. It re-creates the classroom into an inclusive and safe place where all students experience nurturing pedagogy and enculturation into their democratic society as well as equal access to the knowledge that they acquire and help to create. Students are empowered by finding their voices and participating as stewards of their education as well as the education of others. These changes are all possible because teachers are writing lesson plans that are the framework for these greater goals.

In the modified template shown in Appendix A, preservice teachers are required to include objectives and strategies to teach democracy in their daily planning. During this past year, the newest requirement has been to include daily assessments of those skills for democratic participation. It has taken the teaching of democracy to the next level by having to answer Eaker and DuFour's second question, "How do we know if they have learned?" This new requirement also serves to meet the recently revised expectations of the Colorado Department of Education.

Connection to Colorado Department of Education – New Standards

Recently, the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has revised not only the content standards for each content area (Colorado Academic Standards, CAS), but also the standards for teacher preparation programs and teacher licensure. These standards have been shared with all educators in Colorado public schools (and those in higher education) as the new requirements. The standards addressing postsecondary and

workforce readiness skills are in the form of a “21st Century Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Description.” We interpret these standards as the skills and knowledge that we required our students to include in their instruction as democracy objectives for the past four years. The alignment between CDE standards and the mission of the Agenda becomes apparent as one works with both. The standards include:

- I. Content Knowledge: Literacy; Mathematical Sciences; Science; Social Studies and Social Sciences; and The Arts and Humanities
- II. Learning and Behavior Skills: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; Information Technology; Creativity and Innovation; Global and Cultural Awareness; Civic Responsibility; Work Ethic; Personal Responsibility; Communication; and Collaboration

Each of these subsections has bulleted subtopics found on the CDE Website (www.cde.state.co.us).

In this past year, CDE has further required that 21st century and workforce readiness skills need assessment just as content, literacy, and numeracy standards do. As indicated earlier, we initiated this paradigm shift at the inception of the Master’s Program. This requirement represents a shift away from the simple teaching or “covering” of these skills. Students acquire subject matter/content within a framework or setting that replicates democratic living and necessitates democratic participation. The students and teachers together become responsible for knowing if they are indeed working together in ways expected in our society in this 21st century.

In our program, we have focused on the creation of democratic settings for four years. During the past two years, we continue the work of creating meaningful and measurable assessments of those skills and dispositions. As we realized the challenge of assessing these skills and dispositions, tough questions surfaced from discussion with our students. How do we assess collaboration, respectful participation, responsibility, and active stewardship? How do we evaluate the attitudes of cooperation, civility, global awareness, self-awareness, intrinsic motivation and kindness? How do we align lesson standards, objectives, activities and assessments that concern the well-being of our democracy and the continuation of American ideals? What evidence will there be that students are thinking critically, analyzing and evaluating information, and finally creating, together and for themselves, new meanings and knowledge? These were the questions we were ready to ask and explore through dialogue with our graduate students. We all agreed that if these were essential goals for schooling in the United

States, then the answers for assessing them would not only be possible, but necessary.

The answers to these questions, the new ways of thinking about assessment, developed and became visible once again in the work done by our candidates in their student teaching experience. All that they had learned and considered theoretically came to fruition in the units and lessons they prepared and the realities they created. The following is a close look at Shannon's work.

Action Research on Unit and Lesson Planning

All graduate students in the program are required to develop and conduct an action research study on an educational issue of their choice. This project is assigned during the fall semester of the year-long program, following four foundational education classes taken during the summer preceding. The summer courses include the study of educational philosophy, history and law, models of teaching and classroom environment, curriculum development and teaching diverse populations. After the introductory courses, candidates begin an action research course in the fall as they enter their partner school classrooms. It is during this research class that they are asked to choose a topic of interest to study within the context of the high school classroom. Students are to complete the project in one semester with the expectation of implementing at least some of the findings during student teaching the following spring semester. The purpose of this assignment is to teach students the process and the value of implementing action research in their future classrooms. Canfield (2012) chose to look at group work and collaborative learning through a project entitled *Group Selection as it relates to Content Retention*. The purpose of her study was to determine if group selection has an effect on how well students perform on tests assessing the group-studied information. In her introduction Shannon writes,

It is the educators' role to figure out how to create effective groups in the classroom that drive the desired workplace skill of collaboration while at the same time ensuring that all students are performing at their highest potential. It is for this reason that the role of group selection in the students' ability to gain content knowledge during collaborative learning is being studied. (Canfield, 2012, p. 3)

Canfield, a teacher candidate in chemistry, was interested and motivated to incorporate democratic skills in her classes. Learning these skills held equal importance, from her perspective, as the learning of science content. Embedded in her research was the overall goal of creating nurturing environments where all students would learn. She

further stated in her rationale for the study:

In addition to on-task time, small groups have “also been widely recommended as a means to achieve equity” in the classroom (Cohen, 1994, p.1). The equity described even stretched to “interracial relations...as a result of cooperative learning” (Cohen, 1994, p.2). Creating equity in the classroom also helps to create equity in society by providing education to all. (Canfield, 2012, p.6)

Lesson Planning, Implementation, and Results

One of the most surprising results from the data Shannon gathered in the fall semester was that more important than the actual group selection process was the “teacher affect.” Classroom students in her study responded that the teacher who portrays leadership and is a strong proponent of group work will have the greatest affect on students’ participation and learning. Having gained new insights through this research, Shannon knew that she wanted to implement what she had learned into her student teaching experience in the spring semester. Shannon was fortunate that she was able to continue in the same department with the same cooperating teacher both fall and spring semesters. Therefore, she was able to continue her research in the same setting and context. She discussed her plan to incorporate group work, group selection, and the various roles of students in groups with her cooperating teacher and the chemistry department as a whole during her first week of student teaching. She reflected after making that decision:

The best part so far was that the chemistry teachers as a whole are using an idea I came up with for working as groups this semester. They (the students) will focus on a specific role in their group and perform that role for a two-week period. The idea is for them to get into the role and really get a feel for how that role works. They will then provide feedback to their group members and a self-reflection of that role. At the end of eight weeks, when they have experienced all the roles, they will write a reflection paper using the feedback they received and their own reflection. For this reason, I am leaving my 21st Century Skills standard, objective and vocabulary the same for the first two weeks. I am continually coming back to the students asking them to reflect on their role at the end of each class. I had them turn in a sheet with ‘thumbs up or down’ which they had to circle for their evaluation of their work in the role and a few sentences of why they chose the one they chose. They took the time to reflect and the feedback was good. (Shannon, Week 1, Semester 2 Reflection, 1/13/13)

Canfield's Three-Week Unit Plan

Shannon's three-week unit plan (Appendix B) illustrates how she includes the learning and assessing of democracy skills and knowledge daily. Her essential learning concerns the skill and value of collaboration. In order to study and experience this skill, she focuses on the "sub-skills" that are listed in the Colorado Department of Education Workforce Readiness Document as bulleted aspects of collaboration. The learning and assessing of this knowledge and these skills are apparent throughout the unit plan--in the standards, essential understandings and questions; knowledge and skills to be acquired; and assessment evidence. The content standards and objectives are embedded in the framework of the democratic interaction and environment. All are assessed, having equal value. The teaching of the 21st century skills is not a hidden agenda on the side, but becomes the way students work and are together (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley & Goodlad, 2004). It is the experience of democracy that they live, not simply hear about. They live democracy and name the roles they experience. Two weeks into the unit, Shannon again reflected on 21st century skills:

We just finished a two-week session last week on Common Purpose with Collaboration. The students did a nice job of defining a common purpose in their final group session and how they contributed to it, in a 'ticket out the door'. For the next two weeks, I am having students reflect on their own teamwork and leadership skills and how those contribute to collaboration. (Shannon, Week 4, Semester 2, Reflection)

As Shannon planned the completion of this unit, she reflected on where she was in the learning and understanding of collaboration:

These next two weeks, I am going to work on having them see the value of authority in collaboration. That will finish the four bullets under "Collaboration" on the 21st century skills. Then, for the two weeks after that, I am going to try and bring it all together. Not sure how that will go exactly but will try. As discussed with my supervisor, in a post observation conference, I need to frame the authority piece for them, and have them realize it isn't about taking orders, but about someone keeping the vision in mind so we can get to the goal. (Shannon, Week 4, Semester 2, Reflection)

As we, the instructors, talked with Shannon while she and her students progressed in the unit, it became evident in her daily planning and classroom instruction that her teaching and assessing of democracy were as well planned and purposefully presented as the content of chemistry. This emerged as an approach that was changing. We

acknowledge that it is in the experience of living democracy in the classroom that students will learn what it means to succeed in a democratic society.

Shannon's Lesson Plan

Appendix C represents one of the daily lesson plans prepared by Shannon as a part of this unit plan. As did all of Shannon's lessons for this unit, this lesson plan included standards for content, literacy, and democracy. Beginning with the standards, in a backward planning design, Shannon developed strategies for learning and for assessing all standards. As one examines the lesson, it is clear that each standard is purposefully taught with a planned, measurable assessment. By writing lesson plans that include the assessment of all standards, teachers can, in fact, know when students have learned the skills being taught, including those for democratic participation. The addition of self and peer assessment of standards further allows the students to be active participants in the process of their learning. The lesson is complete and aligned with evidence of all standards included in each section of the lesson: objectives, key vocabulary, higher-order questions and assessments. Students are held accountable for the language of the content and the language of democratic participation--collaboration, common purpose, teamwork, leadership and personal mastery. Students grapple with higher-order questions around the need for collaboration and the meaning of personal mastery and are required to apply such skills to real-life work as well as their understanding of why it is important to them and their world.

Conclusion and Future Work

It is reassuring and reaffirming to examine the work of a preservice teacher and to see that the mission of the Agenda, democratic participation and responsibility, and 21st Century Workforce Readiness Skills can and should be included in planning, instruction, and assessment. Our direction to impact this change has been constant for five years. It is apparent that the change is happening, that the essence of teacher training in our society demands much more than acquiring skills to transmit content, facts, and figures to students. The moral dimensions of the profession ask for far greater understanding of the role of the teacher and the responsibilities of school. It is not easy. Progress may be slow, and yet, we believe, as Linda Darling Hammond (1997) said, that it is not simply a good thing to do, but it is our obligation to create schools not only for democracy, but also as democracy. So, our work continues with the hope that this kind of planning and teaching will become the expectation in all schools in our nation for all students every

day. Our future work entails continuous training of preservice teachers in this new paradigm and providing professional development to experienced teachers through simultaneous renewal in our partner schools. Our work will also involve ongoing dialogue with educators across the nation, colleagues in the NNER, in order to move this changing approach forward.

References

- Canfield, S. (2012). *Group selection as it relates to content retention*. Master's in Educational Leadership, Renewal and Change Program, unpublished Action Research. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Colorado Department of Education (n.d.). Retrieved from www.cde.state.co.us
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Education, equity and the right to learn. In J. Goodlad & T. McMannon (Eds.), *The public purpose of education and schooling* (pp. 41-54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: MacMillan Company.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work :Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IA: National Education Service.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2006). *Administrators' resource guide for the SIOP model*. Glenview, IL: Pearson Achievement Solutions, a division of Pearson Education, Inc.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing.
- Goodlad, J., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- State Board of Education and Colorado Commission on Higher Education. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.cde.state.co.us
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by Design*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Appendix A
Lesson Plan Template
Modified SIOP (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2006)

Name:

Topic:

Class:

Date:

PLANNING THE LESSON	
Standards: Content Literacy 21 st Century Skills	Democracy Objectives:
Content Objectives:	Language Objectives:
Key Vocabulary: Content Literacy 21 st Century Skills	Materials: <i>Modifications/Accommodations</i>
Higher Order Questions:	Assessments: Content Literacy 21 st Century Skills

Anticipatory Set and Purpose

Warm -up Activity

Pre Assessment

<u>Time:</u>	<u>Building Background</u>
	Links to Experience: “Yesterday/in the last unit you studied or learned . . .”
	Links to Learning: “Today you are going to learn (see objectives) what it means...”
	Key Vocabulary: “You are also going to learn some new words that will help you...” (listed on first page)

Instructional Input

Time:	<u>Scaffolding the Lesson/Learning Activities</u>
	<p>Teaching/Modeling (I do, we do, you do) & Checking for Understanding (Check those that apply)</p> <p>Grouping: whole class__ small group__</p> <p>Processes: reading__ writing__ listening__ speaking__</p> <p>SIOP teaching techniques: Direct Instruction_____</p> <p>“Watch me or listen to me as I solve systems of equations using graphing techniques.”</p>
	<p>Guided Practice (We do): (Check those that apply)</p> <p>Grouping: whole class__ small group__</p> <p>Processes: reading__ writing__ listening__ speaking__</p> <p>“Now let’s try this together.”</p>
	<p>Independent Practice (You do): (Check those that apply)</p> <p>Grouping: small group__ partners__ individual__</p> <p>Processes: reading__ writing__ listening__ speaking__</p> <p>SIOP teaching techniques: _____</p> <p>“Now, let’s try this on your own.”</p>
	<p>Review and Assessment: (Check those that apply)</p> <p>Grouping: individual__ group__</p> <p>“Tell your partner what you learned and practiced today.”</p>

	<p>“This assessment will help you know what you learned/understood today.”</p> <p>Post Assessment</p> <p>Closure</p>
	<p>Next steps:</p>

Appendix B
Canfield’s Three-Week Unit Plan

Title of Unit	Stoichiometry – Science and Stewardship	Grade Level	High School
Curriculum Area	Science Chemistry	Time Frame	Three-week unit
Developed By	Shannon Canfield		
Identify Desired Results (Stage 1)			
Content Standards			
<p>CO Science (Physical): Apply an understanding of atomic and molecular structure to explain the properties of matter, and predict outcomes of chemical and nuclear reactions.</p> <p>Literacy: Use theoretical principles within a scientific field and relevant empirical evidence to make and draw conclusions.</p> <p>21st Century Skills: Collaboration</p>			
Understandings		Essential Questions	
Overarching Understanding		Overarching	Topical
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantities of reactant(s) present in a chemical reaction will determine the amount of product(s) produced. The concepts of moles will be rolled into the ability to determine how much of a product is produced. Collaboration is not merely working with others around, but rather involves many facets including common purpose, authority, direction, and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the amount of reactants present in a reaction determine the amount of products? Why is collaboration critical to future successes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why do some reactants limit the overall reaction? Why don’t reactions produce 100% yield? How do molar ratios contribute quantifying reactants and

<p>teamwork and leadership skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are responsible for not only ourselves, but others and must consider others when making decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are we called to be globally aware? 	<p>products?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we look beyond the percent yield and look at the bigger picture to see how our decisions affect the community and our earth? 	
Related Misconceptions			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration of products and reactants are equal. • Improper use of moles versus molecules/atoms/formula units • Authority is bad • Collaboration is just working with others in a group • We are only responsible for ourselves and our decisions don't affect others 			
<p>Knowledge Students will know...</p>		<p>Skills Students will be able to...</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to find the theoretical amount of products produced or reactants from a reaction • Why reactions do not yield 100% • Why there is a limiting reagent • How to determine which reagent is the limiting • How the theoretical principle of moles helps to determine the amount of products produced or the required amount of reactants needed to produce a specific amount of product • How working effectively with others, finding a common purpose, recognizing your own leadership and teamwork skills, acknowledging authority and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply balancing reactions in order to calculate the theoretical quantity of moles of reactants needed/or products produced by using mole ratios and dimensional analysis • Calculate the theoretical mass or volume (gases at STP) of products from reactants by balancing the chemical reaction to determine proper mole ratios, and then using the amount of reactants to calculate products • Determine the limiting reagent and excess reagent for a reaction by calculating the products produced for each reactant and comparing the results • Evaluate how collaboration is 		

<p>taking direction improves collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How collaboration and its facet will impact their future successes • How to look beyond the numbers and think about how things will impact the world and others in it 	<p>influenced by common purpose, leadership and teamwork skills, and authority through a written paper and self evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how collaboration will affect the student’s success in the future • Analyze the information presented and relate it to the importance of being globally aware by presenting to the class
Assessment Evidence (Stage 2)	
Performance Task Description	
Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will be able determine the products, theoretical yield, the limiting reactants, and the amount of products when provided a percent yield when given the reactants and the amount of reactants. • Students will use the concepts of stoichiometry and collaboration to solve a murder mystery. • Student will be able to analyze the purpose of collaboration.
Role	Scientists
Audience	Students
Situation	Students must perform the calculations on a written exam, collaborate on a group exam, and write a short paper.
Product/ Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written exam given only the reactants and amounts of each to determine the information set forth in the goal. • A written group test where students use collaboration and stoichiometry to solve a murder mystery. • A short essay analyzing the purpose of collaboration.
Standards	<p>CO Science (Physical): Apply an understanding of atomic and molecular structure to explain the properties of matter, and predict outcomes of chemical and nuclear reactions.</p> <p>Literacy: Use theoretical principles within a scientific field and relevant empirical evidence to make and draw conclusions.</p>

21st Century Skills: Collaboration	
Other Evidence	
See individual lesson plans.	
Learning Plan (Stage 3)	
Where are your students headed? Where have they been? How will you make sure the students know where they are going?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are going to be able to use the reactants and their amounts to determine products, the amount of products, the limiting reactant, and how to find percent yield. • Students have already learned about the five major types of reactions that will help them to determine what the products are. Students have also learned about the mole and how to convert from mass, volume, and particles to moles. This information will be used to determine amounts of products. • Students will know where they are going by providing the big idea and objectives at the beginning of the unit.
How will you <u>hook</u> students at the beginning of the unit?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show a video about why it is important to know about chemical reactions and how they work and how much of the reactants result in the intensity of the reaction (the products). • The following video depicts one of the largest American refining disasters due to the excess amount of liquid levels (reactants) in a tank. This shows the students the importance of knowing how much is safe and how much causes a reaction and then how much products are produced. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9d3H-9ZRRUs
What events will help students <u>experience and explore</u> the big idea and questions in the unit? How will you equip them with needed skills and knowledge?	After the students have the basic concepts for the unit, they will be allowed to explore the concepts of refining crude oil into gasoline. Students will look at how the stoichiometry of this process, along with the products that are produced, will have an environmental impact. This will link back to the initial hook in this unit.

<p>How will you cause students to <u>reflect and rethink</u>? How will you guide them in rehearsing, revising, and refining their work?</p>	<p>Students will reflect daily in closing activities. Students will reflect on their answers and those of their peers and then rethink where necessary. I will help the students to look at their thinking by discussing the concepts as a group and in small groups and pushing questions back to them so that they have the ability to rethink their concepts.</p>
<p>How will you help students to <u>exhibit and self-evaluate</u> their growing skills, knowledge, and understanding throughout the unit?</p>	<p>Formative assessments, including ticket-out-the-door, clicker quizzes, and on your own practice. In class practice on white boards, including presenting to the class. Students will also have computerized practice on a system that requires them to practice topics until they are mastered.</p>
<p>How will you <u>tailor and otherwise</u> personalize the learning plan to optimize the engagement and effectiveness of ALL students, without compromising the goals of the unit?</p>	<p>These lessons are student driven, so that the students will be engaged. I will be monitoring students as I move around the room to see if they are on task and help them get back on task where necessary. Students have spent 6-8 weeks focusing on different aspects of collaboration and filling their group roles. Student roles, when done properly, help them to stay engaged by requiring different responsibilities. Student engagement will be optimized by varying the type instructional delivery, including Text as Expert, Demonstration, Discovery Learning, GIST, and Drill and Practice.</p>
<p>How will you <u>organize and sequence</u> the learning activities to optimize the engagement and achievement of ALL students?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic Stoichiometry 2. Practice Basic Stoichiometry 3. Salt-Is-Us Lab 4. Introduction to Limiting Reactants 5. Limiting and Excess Reactants 6. Refinery Stoichiometry 7. Stoichiometry Murder Mystery 8. Practice Unit Exam

Note. Template adapted from Wiggins and McTighe (1998).

Appendix C
Daily Lesson Plan

Name: Canfield

Topic: Salt-Is-Us: Real World Application of Stoichiometry

Class: Advanced Chemistry

Date:

PLANNING THE LESSON	
<p>Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE Physical Science HS #4: <i>Apply an understanding of atomic and molecular structure to explain the properties of matter, and predict outcomes of chemical and nuclear reactions.</i> • Literacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use theoretical principles within a scientific field and relevant empirical evidence to make and draw conclusions.</i> • 21st Century Skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Collaboration</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Common purpose</i> ○ <i>Authority</i> ○ <i>Direction</i> ○ <i>Teamwork and leadership skills</i> 	<p>Democracy Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will be able to examine the many facets of group work including common purpose, authority, direction, and teamwork and leadership skills for the purpose of collaboration by examining the idea of individual expertise and how that will improve collaboration in determining whether or not to recommend a production process change at the Salt-Is-Us company. <p>Language Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will be able to use the principles of stoichiometry in order to consider whether or not Salt-Is-Us will make a change in their production of sodium chloride by completing a micro lab analysis.
<p>Content Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solve a real world production problem involving sodium 	<p>Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salt-Is-Us Laboratory • Chemicals and laboratory equipment

<p>chloride by employing stoichiometry and using a micro scale lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the information ascertained from the lab to determine if the company Salt-Is-Us should proceed with a change in production. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Na_2CO_3 3M HCl Watch glass Evaporating dish Stirring rod Heating plate Tongs
<p>Key Vocabulary:</p> <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stoichiometry Molar ratio Reactant Product Percent yield Theoretical yield Actual yield <p>21st Century Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration Authority Direction Common purpose Teamwork and leadership skills 	<p>Assessments:</p> <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will complete lab to determine if the amount of salt created meets the requirement set forth by the upper management of Salt-Is-Us. Students will write a lab report summarizing their lab and giving their recommendation for whether or not to change the production process for sodium chloride. <p>Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will write the reaction between sodium carbonate and hydrochloric acid and determine the theoretical amount of sodium chloride product produced by using stoichiometry including molar ratio and dimensional analysis. <p>21st Century Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will be asked to answer how collaboration may happen between themselves (chemical
<p>Higher Order Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the amount of reactants present in a reaction determine the amount of products? Why is collaboration critical to future successes? 	<p>Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will write the reaction between sodium carbonate and hydrochloric acid and determine the theoretical amount of sodium chloride product produced by using stoichiometry including molar ratio and dimensional analysis. <p>21st Century Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will be asked to answer how collaboration may happen between themselves (chemical

	engineers), the environment engineers, the process engineers, and a representative from the board of directors.
--	---

Anticipatory Set and Purpose

Warm-up Activity

- Students will be apprised of the dangers of this lab and the importance of collaboration and safety. (5 minutes)

<u>Time:</u>	<u>Building Background</u>
5 minutes	<p><u>Links to Learning:</u> Recall that at the beginning of this unit we saw the production of gasoline and other hydrocarbons from crude oil. By not obeying the recommendations from chemical engineers, the equipment was operated out of spec and resulted in a true disaster. While you are going through this lab, think about if this process was taken commercial, what potential issues could you see and should the community be advised if this change was to take place?</p> <p><i>The idea here is that there would have to be huge vats of hydrochloric acid in order to complete this reaction, which is highly dangerous not only to those working around it, but if a tank leaked, would pollute the water and ground. In addition, one by-product of this reaction is carbon dioxide, a known offender for climate change. Don't tell the students this at the beginning. Just plant the seed for them to think about this as they move into the lab.</i></p>
10 minutes	<p><u>Objectives/Key Vocabulary:</u> Today's objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Solve a real world production problem involving sodium chloride by employing stoichiometry and using a micro scale lab. ○ Evaluate the information ascertained from the lab to determine if the company Salt-Is-U should proceed with a change in production.

	<p>Some key terms we are going to learn today are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stoichiometry • Molar ratio • Reactant • Product • Percent yield • Theoretical yield • Actual yield • Collaboration • Authority • Direction • Common purpose • Teamwork and leadership skills
--	---

Instructional Input

Time:	Scaffolding the Lesson/Learning Activities
55 minutes	<p>Guided/On Your Own (We do/You do)</p> <p>Grouping: whole class___ small group <u>X</u></p> <p>Processes: reading <u>X</u> writing <u>X</u> listening <u>X</u> speaking <u>X</u></p> <p>SIOP teaching techniques: Discovery Learning <i>Students will work in their small groups to discover if a new way of producing sodium chloride will be viable for the theoretical company Salt-Is-Us.</i></p> <p><i>Students will write a lab report that outlines their lab results including their recommendation for whether or not Salt-Is-Us should change their production process for sodium chloride.</i></p>
15 minutes	<p>Closure:</p> <p>Grouping: individual___ small group <u>X</u></p> <p><i>Students will complete an analysis on why collaboration would cause a better decision than just looking at the lab results.</i></p>

	Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited Reactants Modeling Kit• Limiting Reactants POGIL notes
--	--

Karen Rowe, Educational Leadership, Renewal and Change Program, Colorado State University; Elizabeth Urban, Educational Leadership, Renewal and Change Program, Colorado State University; Shannon Canfield, Liberty Common School.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Karen Rowe, School of Teacher Education and Principal Preparation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523. E-mail: karen.rowe@colostate.edu

Co-Teaching with Professional Interns: A Collaborative Approach to Improving Student Learning

Katie A. Hendrickson
Ohio University

John E. Henning
Ohio University

Athena Spinell
Ohio University

The purpose of this article is to describe how co-teaching arrangements can be strategically implemented to systematically improve student learning and teacher preparation. The findings are based on a case study investigation of a professional internship that enabled a gradual transition of classroom leadership through engagement with a progression of co-teaching strategies beginning in the following order: one teach, one observe; one teach, one assist; and alternative teaching. At this point, the mentor teacher and professional intern reversed roles, and the professional intern led as the pair implemented parallel teaching, station teaching, and team teaching.

KEYWORDS: student teaching, co-teaching, clinical experience

Student teaching has been an invaluable part of preservice teacher preparation since the advent of normal schools in the 19th century (Cook, 2007; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Koerner, 1992; Manning, 1977; Smagorinsky, Sanford, & Konopak, 2006). Originally limited to laboratory schools and university campuses, the experience was extended to include public school partners after the Second World War (Fraser, 2007). Today, some type of student teaching experience is required by teacher preparation programs around the globe, ranging in requirements from a minimum three-week experience in Japan to 48 weeks in the Netherlands. In the United States, student teaching is usually a semester long experience, varying in length from 12 to 15 weeks (Ronfeldt & Reininger, 2012; Wang, Coleman, Coley, & Phelps, 2003).

The broad adoption of student teaching as a capstone experience in teacher education is consistent with a global trend toward expanding clinical experiences. The benefits of a practice-based approach to teacher preparation have been widely advocated by a variety of scholars (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Korthagen, 2010; Ball and Forzani, 2009) and recently endorsed by the call to place “practice at the center of teaching preparation” from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2010, p. 3). As a result, moving to a clinically-based approach to teacher preparation has become a national goal.

Despite the promising direction for teacher education, the current environment poses two significant threats to student teaching and other clinical experiences. First, there are limited monetary incentives to offer cooperating teachers for additional mentoring. Second, there is increasing accountability pressure on teachers, often in the form of raising their students’ standardized achievement scores. For example, the state of Ohio has recently moved to base half of a teacher’s annual evaluation on standardized achievement scores. Fearful of poor evaluations, some teachers are refusing to accept student teachers. Others are refusing in protest against unjust assessment practices (Lieszkovszky, 2013).

The increasing reluctance on the part of teachers to turn over their classrooms to student teachers is understandable. However, it is rooted in a traditional understanding of the student teaching experience. Historically, student teachers have been encouraged to replace the cooperating teacher by taking sole control of the classroom. Challenging student teachers in such a way is intended to give them the freedom to develop their own teaching identity and the opportunity to demonstrate their autonomy. Unfortunately, such experiences are often enacted under circumstances that are not favorable to K-12 student

learning, such as taking over another teacher's class midyear – a potentially challenging scenario even for veteran teachers.

A fundamental change in this traditional model is possible through an instructional approach known as co-teaching. Initially established as a collaborative teaching approach between credentialed general and special educators, co-teaching has been widely embraced since its inception (Murawski & Swanson, 2001) and is still considered the primary means for providing instruction in inclusive classrooms (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007). Studies have established a number of benefits for co-teaching, including professional growth for teachers, increased cooperation among non-disabled students, and increased attention to all students. Its effectiveness has led to the introduction of other types of teaching partnerships, such as pairings between general educators and a technology specialist, a speech or language pathologist, a literacy specialist, a gifted specialist, or even a paraeducator (Benninghof, 2012). Co-teaching between a cooperating teacher and a student teacher can be included among these new possibilities.

Co-teaching offers a new approach to student teaching, one that continues to enhance and refine John Goodlad's (1994) original conception of simultaneous school renewal. This approach is distinctly different from the traditional model of student teaching, so much so that our university has changed its terminology from "student teacher" to "professional intern" and from "cooperating teacher" to "mentor teacher," terms that we will continue to use throughout the remainder of the article. During co-teaching, both the mentor teacher and the professional intern are simultaneously present and sharing joint responsibility for the classroom, including assessing student needs, planning and implementing instruction, and evaluating student performance. Even after the professional intern assumes leadership in the classroom, the mentor teacher does not leave. Instead, both work in partnership, their instructional strategies and decisions guided by their mutual interest in promoting student learning.

Co-teaching between a mentor teacher and a professional intern offers several benefits, including student exposure to two styles of teaching, fewer classroom disruptions, and improved student behavior. In addition, more instructional strategies become possible as their experience with each other becomes greater and their relationship deepens (McCormick, Noonan, Ogata, & Heck, 2001). For example, the presence of a professional intern can greatly facilitate the potential for differentiated instruction – led by either the mentor teacher or the professional intern. The result is increased K-12 student learning and a clear implication that two teachers in the room are better than one, even

if one is a novice (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010). By positively affecting student learning, professional interns can serve as a valuable resource to the school and simultaneously alleviate teacher concerns about their evaluations.

Despite increasing evidence to the effectiveness of co-teaching during the professional internship, little has been written on how co-teaching strategies can be introduced to increase both the effectiveness of the teacher candidate and the learning of K-12 students. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to describe how co-teaching arrangements can be strategically selected and implemented to expose teacher candidates to increasingly complex teaching situations. Our description of the process will be based on a case study investigation of a professional internship that enabled a gradual transition of the classroom leadership from the mentor teacher to the professional intern. The research question for this study is: How can co-teaching structures be utilized to foster the development of teacher candidates?

Methodology

This is a single case study of a teacher and a professional intern involved in a co-teaching pilot project organized by a university. The term “professional intern” is used in substitution for “student teacher” to distinguish between two very different experiences. Student teacher refers to a previous model of the culminating clinical experience in teacher preparation. In this model, the cooperating teacher leaves the student teacher alone in the classroom with the students. In contrast, professional internship refers to a collaborative teaching experience. The mentor teacher gradually relinquishes the lead teacher role to the professional intern but remains in the classroom to take advantage of co-teaching opportunities and to maximize the benefits of having two educators in the room simultaneously.

Participants

This study included two participants. The first was Katie, a fourth-year teacher of middle school mathematics with a licensure in secondary mathematics. During the year of the study, she taught four sections of 7th grade honors pre-algebra and two sections of 7th grade pre-algebra in a rural Ohio middle school. At the time of the study, the state had adopted its own set of standards and 7th grade students took a standardized achievement test at the end of the year. The middle school had been rated “Effective” by the state during the year of the study. Although student achievement was not included as part of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System at the time of the study, it has since been added.

In the past, Katie had hosted one full-time intern and several teacher candidates for short field experiences. While taking graduate courses at the university, she became interested in teacher development and mentoring. When she heard about the co-teaching project, she was eager to see how research could be put into practice. She was excited to participate as both a mentor teacher and as a doctoral student researcher. Co-teaching seemed to be an opportunity to develop a more collaborative relationship with the professional intern. Although optimistic that she would feel more involved in the classroom, she was also nervous about negotiating teaching responsibilities.

Katie had enjoyed sharing her classroom with professional interns on several previous occasions but was hoping for a more collaborative experience this quarter. She had found it difficult give up control of the classroom to her previous professional intern, and she also felt very tentative about interjecting or participating in the classroom while the intern was teaching. Despite her excited anticipation, she was also nervous about how well it would work. She believed co-teaching would be better for her students, but she was not certain that it would be better for her. First, she was accustomed to being the sole adult in the classroom and was not sure how sharing control would feel. Second, her previous experiences with collaborative lesson planning had been very positive, but also very time consuming. Ultimately, she decided to participate because she believed it would be better for her students and because she was convinced that having two teachers in the classroom would be a positive experience.

The second participant was Athena, a professional intern in her fourth year of undergraduate preparation. She was working towards a licensure for middle childhood in language arts and mathematics. Prior to volunteering for the co-teaching experience, Athena had successfully completed field experiences in two different classrooms. One of those was part of a 160-hour experience as part of a middle school partnership. Athena was confident she would have a positive experience, was excited to begin the co-teaching program, and felt somewhat honored that she had been invited to participate.

Co-Teaching Strategies

Before the project began, the teachers and interns in the co-teaching program received two 2-hour professional development sessions in co-teaching. Katie and Athena attended the sessions together, which focused on building relationships, effective collaboration, and co-teaching strategies. Although numerous strategies for co-teaching exist, the ones emphasized in this pilot were based on Cook & Friend's (1995) approach to co-teaching between a general and a special educator. They

include one teach, one observe; one teach, one assist; alternative teaching; parallel teaching; station teaching; and team teaching. These models for co-teaching require different levels of involvement by each teacher; therefore, they provide an opportunity for gradually increasing the responsibility of the teacher candidates.

Data Collection and Analysis

The experience in this study lasted over a period of twenty weeks. During the first ten weeks, the intern took a regular course load at the university in addition to spending ten hours each week observing in the mentor teacher's classroom. During the next ten weeks, the intern was in the classroom full-time for her professional internship, teaching alongside the mentor teacher. The mentor and the intern each completed weekly reflective journals throughout the twenty-week program, including an entry prior to the start of the experience and one at the end of the experience. The primary purpose for analyzing the journals was to construct a developmental sequence of co-teaching strategies that could be used as a tool for enhancing future professional development opportunities. Data was coded into three categories: 1) Co-Teaching Strategies, 2) Engagement, and 3) Benefits. These findings were used to construct a description of each co-teaching strategy as it occurred during the study and to develop a timeline for when each occurred. Quotations from the journals are used to supplement these descriptions.

Agreement on the coding was reached through discussion. During discussions, new topics regarding struggles or methods often emerged. The meetings and discussions were an essential part of synthesizing the experience for Katie and Athena.

Results: Evolution of Co-Teaching Strategies

Katie and Athena's use of co-teaching strategies evolved gradually over the course of the professional internship. Their use of each strategy is presented in the sections below in the order they occurred. Each section describes the co-teaching arrangement, the time during the internship that it was introduced, how the pair used the strategy, how it contributed to Athena's development as a teacher, and how it furthered the co-teaching relationship between Katie and Athena.

The Cooperating Teacher Leads Instruction

One teach, one observe. One teach, one observe was used at the very start of the internship to ease Athena into the classroom. Allowing a professional intern an opportunity to observe is a common starting point for many professional internships. When employing this strategy,

co-teachers decide to collect specific types of observational information, agree on a method for gathering data, and then analyze the data together. For example, Athena tracked student participation during discussions and shared the results with Katie afterwards, thus providing Katie with information she did not have previously and leading to insights about student relationships, behavior, and thinking.

One teach, one observe also gave Athena a chance to become accustomed to the classroom while being introduced to formative assessment. Athena had a chance to learn student names, learn classroom procedures, and adjust to the classroom climate. Before each lesson, Katie shared with Athena her lesson plans and described her planning process for the lesson, including objectives, pacing, and questions she planned to ask students. After the lesson, Athena asked questions and Katie explained how she was adapting the lesson to student needs.

One teach, one observe was a good way to begin Katie and Athena's collaboration. It provided time for Katie and Athena to become acquainted by discussing Katie's lessons. It also afforded Katie a chance to focus on Athena's professionalism by observing her attire, her attendance, and her interactions with Katie and other colleagues. In turn, Athena learned about Katie's style of teaching.

One teach, one assist. Shortly after beginning one teach, one observe and very early in the internship, Katie and Athena began using the co-teaching strategy known as one teach, one assist. When using this strategy, one co-teacher maintains primary responsibility for teaching while the other professional circulates through the room providing unobtrusive assistance to students as needed. Initially, Katie led the classroom while Athena walked around the room answering questions, monitoring behavior, and handling interruptions.

This strategy gave Athena a chance to take attendance, pass back student work, provide individual assistance to absent or struggling students, design short activities for individuals, and build relationships with students. Athena became involved with the students right away, answering questions, helping with the instruction, and managing student behavior. Katie wrote in her journal:

I like that Athena is already familiar with my classes and procedures, because she can just jump right in. The small things are nice- if I'm making copies and the bell rings, I don't have to run right back. She is in charge of the computer, so she has been taking attendance and reading announcements in the morning, freeing up some time for me.

Moving to this strategy helped Athena feel more included in the class. After recording data that Katie was generating with the class, Athena wrote, “I felt more involved today” and commented, “the students seemed to ask for my help equally as much as Katie’s, if not more.” In one case, a student came in during a different period to get extra help on a particular unit. Athena was able to help him without Katie needing to stop the class, which would have been impossible with only one teacher in the room.

Working only with individual students allowed Athena an opportunity to focus on the conceptual understanding of students without worrying about classroom management. Thus, she could focus her observations on student understanding and intervene when necessary. It also helped foster Katie and Athena’s collaborative relationship. They had time to get to know one another, to adjust to one another’s personal styles, and to begin working collaboratively during class time to implement lessons. Katie observed Athena’s commitment to students and her interactions with them. For Athena’s part, she was anxious to assume more responsibility. She wrote in her journal, “Today was a little boring as well, just for the fact that I do feel ready to teach and I am very anxious to get started.”

Alternative teaching. Alternative teaching was also introduced near the beginning of the internship and continued to be used frequently as the occasion warranted. During alternative teaching, one teacher takes responsibility for the large group while the other works with a smaller group. At the start of the internship, Katie managed the large group while Athena worked with the small group. This strategy was used to provide intervention to small groups of students, often at the beginning of class while the rest of the students engaged in review or graded the previous night’s homework. Alternative teaching was used for going over sections of a quiz or test with students who needed extra assistance, quickly re-teaching the previous day’s lesson for students returning from an absence, working with students who struggled with the previous day’s homework or lesson, or pre-teaching the day’s lesson.

This approach allowed Athena to practice her instructional and classroom management techniques at a low level of risk. She gained experience developing instructional materials, determining the essential parts of a lesson, and thinking on her feet. She was able to lead short lessons and adapt her strategies when students struggled. She also became practiced at keeping students on task. Katie and Athena were comfortable using alternative teaching frequently and in unplanned circumstances when it was appropriate to meet the needs of students. Katie felt comfortable sharing control of the classroom because Athena

demonstrated her understanding of the long-term goals and the essential parts of each lesson.

Parallel teaching. Katie and Athena began parallel teaching several weeks into the internship. When Athena was ready to lead an entire lesson, they decided to split the class in half and assign each group to work with one teacher. Katie described the process in her journal, “We have been splitting the most difficult period in two groups and taking half to one room while keeping the other half in the classroom.” Generally, Katie and Athena taught the same lesson but occasionally provided targeted interventions, such as providing manipulatives to one of the groups or allowing the groups to read at different levels of difficulty.

During parallel teaching, students benefited from a decreased student-teacher ratio; in fact, the two co-teachers often worked more like tutors rather than lecturers. The grouping of students was changed frequently, and the group that traveled to another room rotated daily. Katie wrote the following:

It has made classroom procedures a little more difficult (passing back homework in particular), but I think the students can focus better and are doing better work. One day, we split the students based on who did and did not complete the homework. That way, one group was able to grade and discuss, and the other group worked on getting caught up- something that I would never be able to take full advantage of by myself.

After using this method for one day, Athena wrote the following in her journal, “Today I felt much more involved and respected as a teacher because the students had many questions while making this graph.” She was the sole teacher in the room to answer those questions. She was also able to make decisions based on the best interest of her group and adapt the day’s lesson to her teaching style.

At the time they implemented parallel teaching, Katie and Athena were both comfortable assuming various roles in the classroom. They typically used parallel teaching with the second class of the day after having taught the first class together. This made it easy to trust that their co-planned lessons would be taught similarly while in different rooms. After they finished each day’s lesson, both Katie and Athena had equal input into the planning of the next lesson, allowing them to begin practicing more genuine co-planning.

The Professional Intern Takes the Lead

A few weeks into the internship, Katie and Athena switched roles completely. Athena took on the role of teacher for the strategies of one

teach, one observe; one teach, one assist; and alternative teaching. Katie shifted into the role of observer and assistant during Athena's unit. She provided individual help to students when needed, provided interventions for small groups of students, and took over some of the classroom management duties.

At first, the transition was gradual. Athena began by leading the warm-up every day. The next week, she served as assistant for the first four periods before taking over as the primary instructor for two of the class periods. Co-planning helped Athena understand the goals and pacing of each lesson. Eventually, Athena planned her own unit and made the major decisions about objectives, pacing, and assessment. She led the classroom during those lessons and provided the majority of the feedback to students.

Because she was already familiar with assisting the students, it was easy for Athena to make the transition to the role of the teacher. She was able to assume responsibility for the class because of her previous co-teaching experiences and because Katie was still available to provide support if needed. Athena wrote in her journal at this time, "I felt like it was my own classroom." Similarly, Katie wrote in her journal, "Athena is completely comfortable with the students and in front of the room." Katie also expressed the ease of the transition when she wrote, "I'm not feeling like I need to back off and let her experiment. I feel like I'm involved, too."

At this point in the professional internship, Katie was beginning to feel comfortable with the balance of control and authority they shared in the classroom. Katie wrote, "It has given me time to get ahead on a few things. I will walk around and look at student work and answer questions, but for most of the lesson, we don't really need two teachers [leading the lesson]." In a short while, Athena's skills with the class had developed to the point that Katie no longer needed to assist with the lesson.

Station teaching. After Athena had taken the co-teaching lead, station teaching was introduced. When station teaching, each person teaches different content to one group and subsequently repeats the instruction for the other group. This strategy can also allow for multiple stations per teacher, or two teacher-led stations plus a station where students work independently.

When Katie and Athena used station teaching, they first spent some time co-planning and brainstorming ideas for the various stations. They started by determining the goals of the lesson, then worked individually to seek resources, generate lesson ideas, and think further about the lesson objectives. They met a second time to discuss their ideas, decide

on the topics for four stations, and split the work so that each planned and created her given stations. During the lesson, students rotated through the stations in small groups, while Katie and Athena provided assistance at their stations. Another version of station teaching was used to instruct two lessons that overlapped. Athena led students in creating a summary for a project concluding in the computer lab, and as the students returned one by one to the classroom, Katie helped them start on a new project. In this case, Athena took the lead on the first project, and Katie was the expert on the second project.

This was an appropriate time in the internship for Athena to demonstrate her ability to create learning centers, plan and deliver a lesson for a small group, create a checklist and other formative assessments, and gain confidence in her ability to manage the entire class as they worked in small groups. She took the lead at the start and end of the class, giving directions to the entire class at the start of the period and regaining attention near the end of the class period. At this point in the internship, Katie and Athena trusted one another's lessons plans, making it possible for Katie and Athena to produce and implement complex projects and hands-on lessons more frequently. In her journal, Katie wrote, "I don't feel like I need to be 100% paying attention to what she's doing. I already trust her." She was able to focus her attention on her stations in the classroom instead of worrying about Athena's stations. Athena said in her journal one week, "the students are starting to view me as another teacher and respecting that my knowledge is just as great as [Katie's]."

Team teaching. When team teaching, both teachers share delivery of the same instruction to a whole student group. Some teachers refer to this as having "one brain in two bodies." Others call it "tag team teaching." Most co-teachers consider team teaching the most complex but satisfying of the co-teaching approaches. Katie and Athena became comfortable with this strategy near the end of the internship after they had become very familiar and comfortable with each other's teaching styles.

Katie and Athena planned for team teaching by giving each other equivalent roles. They decided who would lead each section of the lesson and who would provide support as needed. Throughout the lesson, either teacher might make a clarifying comment to the students, as suggested by Katie's comment below.

We're getting better at handing things off and taking turns with different parts of the lesson. Athena will do the warm up and the homework, and I will do the lesson, or vice versa. And we will

jump in for one another if the period is winding down and the one 'leading' is busy- the other will lead the wrap up.

By the end of the professional internship, Katie and Athena worked very comfortably together. During planning, they decided on the main goals of the lesson and divided the work between them. While teaching, they were able to seamlessly take turns leading various activities, managing classroom discipline, and interacting with individual students. Having two teachers in the classroom also enabled them to switch into and out of the roles of leader, assistant, or intervention provider. They also felt comfortable with improvising. For example, when Katie noticed a student who needed additional help, she was able to switch to alternative teaching, and Athena took over Katie's responsibilities. This transition was enacted very smoothly because Katie and Athena were comfortable with each other's skills.

By the end of the experience, Katie was confident in Athena's ability to plan and lead whole-class lessons:

I feel a lot more comfortable planning lessons—I don't feel nervous and out of control like I did last year with my professional intern. I know that I can jump in when necessary, and I feel more comfortable giving advice and changing lessons. I feel like I'm still part of the classroom whereas towards the end of last year [with a previous intern], I felt like I wasn't.

Discussion

In this single case study, a mentor teacher and a professional intern re-conceptualized the traditional student teaching experience by implementing a sequence of co-teaching strategies. Katie and Athena began with three co-teaching strategies: one teach, one observe; one teach, one assist; and alternative teaching. These initial three co-teaching approaches afforded Athena an opportunity to work with individuals or small groups of students. Later, Athena and Katie reversed roles: Athena led as the pair implemented parallel teaching and station teaching. After they attained a high level of trust and confidence, they tried team teaching, which incorporated a number of both planned and improvised co-teaching strategies.

Katie and Athena's progression through the co-teaching strategies was reflective of their increasing trust in and comfort with one another's abilities. The development of a strong working relationship is helpful in the traditional model of student teaching; it is essential for co-teaching during the professional internship. Early in the experience, strategies like one teach, one assist and one teach, one observe were low risk situations for both Katie and Athena. Athena did not feel intimidated by her duties, while Katie was comfortable with sharing control of the

classroom with Athena. The two were able to jointly create thoughtful, well-planned lessons for the class and differentiated instruction for individual students. Co-planning fostered Athena's ability to plan independently, and as her comfort level increased, the pair was able to engage in more collaborative methods of co-teaching, such as alternative teaching, parallel teaching, and station teaching. The final strategy, team teaching, was not used until Katie and Athena had developed mutual trust and understanding.

As they progressed through the strategies, the benefits to students increased. Students received more individual attention and feedback; two teachers were available to walk around and answer questions during activities or daily work, and this increased as the strategies increased the responsibilities of the second teacher. Their different strengths led to deeper relationships with individual students, enabling them to motivate more students than either one of them could do alone. They were also able to increase their use of formative assessment because they could each focus on fewer students or different aspects of student performance.

Limitations and Future Directions

The findings from this single case study are not intended to provide a definitive account of a professional intern's progression through a co-teaching internship. This study was limited to a single mentor teacher and her professional intern in a middle school classroom. A variety of factors could influence the progression of such a developmental sequence, such as the ability of the professional intern, the experience of the mentor teacher, and the classroom setting, including the course content, the grade level, the physical environment, and the group dynamics of the students.

Future studies should explore the process of co-teaching in different classroom contexts. Such studies could provide some insight into the development of a progression of co-teaching activities over an entire year of teacher preparation and perhaps even follow the professional intern into her first year as a teacher. Phasing in co-teaching strategies can enable a systematic approach to fostering student learning while providing increasingly more complex teaching opportunities for professional interns.

Additional studies might examine the impact of co-teaching on student learning or teacher preparation. For example, does co-teaching improve student learning enough to alleviate mentor teachers' anxieties about accepting professional interns, particularly in areas where teacher evaluations are tied to student test scores? Or does co-teaching better prepare a beginning teacher for induction than a traditional approach? Though we are currently lacking these answers, the potential for

improving both student learning and teacher preparation makes co-teaching an area deserving of exploration and further study.

References

- Bacharach, N., Heck, T.W., & Dahlberg, K. (2010). Changing the face of student teaching through co-teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(1), 3-14.
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511.
- Beninghof, A. M. (2012). *Co-teaching that works: Structures and strategies that maximize student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cook, L. (2007). When in Rome: Influences on special education student teachers' teaching. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22(3), 119-130.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 28(3), 1-16.
- Fraser, J. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(5), 51-55.
- Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participant in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1) 46-56.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). Situated learning theory and the pedagogy of teacher education: Towards an integrated view of teacher behavior and teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 98-106.
- Korthagen, F. A. J., & Kessels, J. P. A. M. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(4), 4-17.
- Lieszkovszky, I. (2013, February 18). How Ohio's new teacher evaluations will change student teaching. *State Impact Ohio*. Retrieved from <http://stateimpact.npr.org/ohio/2013/02/18how-ohios-new-teacher-evaluations-will-change-student-teaching/>
- Manning, D. T. (1977). The influence of key individuals on student teachers in urban and suburban settings. *Teacher Educator*, 12(3), 2-8.
- McCormick, L., Noonan, M. J., Ogata, V., & Heck, R. (2001). Co-teacher relationship and program quality: Implications for preparing

- teachers for inclusive preschool settings. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 16(2), 119-132.
- Murawski, W. W., & Swanson, H. L. (2001). A meta-analysis of co-teaching research: Where are the data? *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(5), 258-267.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Report of blue ribbon panel on clinical preparation and partnerships for improved student learning. Washington, DC: NCATE.
- Ronfeldt, M., & Reininger, M. (2012). More or better student teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 1090–1106.
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.
- Smagorinsky, P., Sanford, A. D., & Konopak. B. (2006). Functional literacy in a constructivist key: A nontraditional student teacher's apprenticeship in a rural elementary school. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 93-110.
- Wang, A. H., Coleman, A. B., Coley, R. J., & Phelps, R. P. (2003). *Preparing teachers around the world*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
-

Katie A. Hendrickson, Ohio University; John E. Henning, Teacher Education Department, Ohio University; Athena Spinell, Ohio University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to John E. Henning, Teacher Education Department, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701. E-mail: henningj@ohio.edu

Joining Forces to Advance Teaching and Learning of 21st Century Skills: Idaho School Leaders' Perspectives

Penny Tenuto
University of Idaho – Boise

John Cannon
University of Idaho – Boise

Allen Kitchel
University of Idaho – Moscow

Despite a wealth of literature for improving education in America, few empirical studies discuss the prospect for teachers of core academic subjects and career and technical education (CTE) joining forces in simultaneous renewal to advance teaching and learning of 21st century skills. This study contributes to a growing body of literature regarding school administrators' perspectives of integrating STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) curriculum with skills requisite for today's workforce. Forty-five percent (n = 206) of the state's secondary public school administrators responded to an online survey instrument asking for their perspectives about teacher preparedness and integrating components of STEM education and CTE curriculum at the secondary level. Results indicate administrators' perspectives of integrating core and CTE curriculum as important, yet emergent in practice.

KEYWORDS: integrating curriculum, STEM, 21st century skills, CTE teachers

To remain solvent in a competitive, global market, U.S. businesses are focused on maximizing efficiency and tightening budgets (Bevins, Carter, Jones, Moye & Ritz, 2012). Workplace trends indicate future employers will expect individuals to enter the workforce with a more inclusive dossier of 21st century skills. “Businesses are and will continue to struggle in this new economy. To survive, they will demand a more capable worker, but will be less apt to provide the resources to create this worker” (DiMattina & Ferris, 2013, p. 18). In response to demands of a changing world market, President Obama’s administration requested increased diligence in teaching science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education as part of the Race to the Top program (U.S. Department of Education, 2009) and the Educate to Innovate campaign (White House, n.d.). In a national reform effort, industry leaders, policymakers, and researchers are calling for enhanced student knowledge of core subjects and technology, and a broader spectrum of transferable trades also referred to as 21st century skills.

Characterizing the difference between reform and renewal, Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, and Goodlad (2004) explained, “Whereas school reform attempts to include in daily educational fare something that presumably was not there before, school renewal creates an environment—a whole culture—that routinely conducts diagnoses to determine what is going well and what is not” (pp. 156-157). Teachers, school leaders, and representatives of higher education can achieve simultaneous renewal of education (Goodlad et al., 2004) by joining forces concurrently to improve education and prepare students for a global society.

Teachers in the field of career and technical education (CTE) already assist students in developing a supportable balance of (1) job-specific, (2) transferable, and (3) employability skills. Job-specific skills are specialized tasks relating to a particular job, which may require passing a test or obtaining a certificate to verify performance. Bookkeepers, network administrators, forklift operators, and electricians are a few examples of occupations that require job-specific skills. The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (n.d.) describes transferable skills as including creativity, innovation, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and collaboration. Transferable skills are proficiencies learned in life or previous work experiences that can be applied to a new career. Supervising personnel, coordinating events, and using technology are examples of skills that may be applied or adapted to a variety of occupations. Employability skills are more inherent than job-specific skills and centered on abilities that make an individual more employable. Teamwork, punctuality, and professionalism are examples of employability skills, which may also be transferable or applied to various

workplace environments. Joining forces with teachers of core academic subjects to integrate STEM components may advance CTE teachers' efforts to reinforce 21st century knowledge and skills that students need to be successful in a global society.

The amount of extant literature that supports integrating curriculum to advance the efforts of school improvement has increased measurably in recent years. For example, Stone, Alfeld, and Pearson (2008) conducted an empirical study wherein they asked CTE teachers to enhance their curricula by increasing application of math concepts through occupational contexts. Stone et al. found students' performances to be significantly improved on traditional and college-placement math examinations without reducing students' content knowledge and skill level in occupational areas.

CTE courses have a history of providing a means for otherwise disinterested students to stay engaged in high school (Stone & Lewis, 2012). While some students enroll in CTE programs to prepare for future careers, others take these courses as a way to explore their interests and take part in activities that are meaningful to them. Whether they are guiding students toward career success or facilitating learning that is interesting and hands-on, teachers need current training and quality professional development to strengthen their own skills. In Sturko and Gregson's study (2009), CTE teachers participated in a collaborative form of professional development where they learned strategies for integrating reading, writing, and mathematics into their lessons and activities. Sturko and Gregson stated, "In the process of learning by doing and reflecting, the teachers developed more confidence in their abilities to design and deliver integrated lesson plans" (p. 48). While studies about integrating STEM components into the CTE curriculum (Stone et al., 2008) and CTE teachers' views of improving practices in teaching and learning are emerging (Cannon, Kitchel, & Duncan, 2010; Kitchel, Cannon, & Duncan, 2009; Duncan, Ricketts, Peake & Uessler, 2006), less has been written from a leadership perspective for integrating STEM curriculum and reinforcing 21st century skills.

The purpose of this study was to investigate Idaho school administrators' perspectives of teacher preparedness for emphasizing STEM curriculum, including reinforcing knowledge and skills linked to CTE programs. The premise being that an examination of school leaders' perspectives can provide a unique glimpse into the school environment and serve as a review of educators' efforts to advance teaching and learning of 21st century skills. This article investigates CTE program teachers, core subject teachers, school administrators, and representatives of higher education joining forces to emphasize STEM

curriculum and to reinforce learning of knowledge and skills typically associated with CTE programs.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study assumes principles of planning, professional development, and collaboration found in literary writings and in practice to emphasize STEM components and prepare students for a 21st century workforce. Teaching and learning can be improved through purposeful planning of instruction (Danielson, 2007; Marzano, 2007; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) and meaningful engagement in professional development (Desimone, 2009; Firestone, Mangin, Martinez, & Polovsky, 2005; Gregson & Sturko, 2007; Stone et al., 2008; Whitcomb, Borko & Liston, 2009; Youngs & King, 2002). School leaders can influence a collaborative school environment of improvement and renewal by genuinely empowering teachers and helping them to build capacity as teacher leaders and status as teaching professionals (Crowther, Ferguson, & Hann, 2009; Hallinger, 2011; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Furthermore, educators collaborating within professional communities is essential to improving student learning (DuFour, Dufour, Eaker, & Karhanek, 2004; Eaker, DuFour, & DuFour, 2002; Fullan, 2001, 2003; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Sturko & Gregson, 2009). In most of the literature, no distinction is made between teachers of academic core subjects and teachers of career and technical education (CTE) programs; therefore, it is assumed the literature is inclusive of all teachers.

Researchers (Fullan, 2001, 2003; Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009; Hallinger, 2011; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Reeves, 2006) expounded the idea of drawing on school leaders' abilities to establish a climate of trust and to facilitate a school environment conducive to bringing requisite improvement. One of the first steps for school leaders is to establish a school environment conducive to sharing student achievement results and outcomes related to their teaching, and holding meaningful conversations for improvement. At first, teachers may find it uncomfortable to share results they may perceive as indicative of their teaching or to risk having their practices scrutinized by others. Wheatley (2002) observed, "It takes courage to start a conversation. But if we don't start talking to one another, nothing will change. Conversation is the way we discover how to transform our world, together" (p. 27). Findings from this study may encourage teachers and administrators to reevaluate practices for working together to improve student achievement and help prepare students to work in a global society.

Literature supports the notion that educators can advance teaching and learning by examining available data to inform decisions and by

employing research-based principles to improve their professional practices. Endorsing practices that involve interpreting student achievement results, visiting other teachers' classrooms, and creating opportunities for students to be involved in the feedback process (Bauer & Brazer, 2012; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler, & Stone, 2012; Goldring & Berends, 2009), school administrators can promote a favorable environment for meaningful sharing of subject-matter expertise and integration of curriculum.

Federal measures to support integration of workplace skills into the academic curriculum are included in Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (National Education Foundation, 2006). Part C of Perkins IV requires states to ensure the provision of adequate professional development to teachers at the postsecondary and secondary levels. The Perkins Act promotes the advancement of technical knowledge and teaching in an integrated setting, ensuring that teachers working in the CTE areas remain current with industry standards.

Since CTE programs are intended to prepare students for careers in a global, competitive workforce, CTE teachers must demonstrate expertise in teaching knowledge and skills that meet specific, current business and industry standards (Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone, 2003; Bevins et al., 2012; Clark, 2009; Hayes, 2013; Hyslop, 2008; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007). To better meet these goals, CTE programs are designed differently from traditional academic programs. To successfully lead improvement in these areas, administrators should recognize three important components of CTE programs: (1) effective management of CTE programs, (2) teaching as a professional practice, and (3) instructor training for specialized skills to meet industry standards.

Teachers of STEM curriculum may also benefit from current training and quality professional development. Kirchoff and Lawrenz (2011) indicated, "The field of science is constantly changing, which exerts pressure on teachers to maintain up-to-date content knowledge and have access to advances in their fields" (p. 247). Both core subject teachers and CTE teachers may need support from their administrators and peers to obtain the level of in-service training or professional development necessary to integrate and teach these concepts. Participating in school-university partnerships or engaging in conversations with representatives of higher education (Goodlad et al., 2004) may help P-12 teachers and school leaders to generate ideas for integrating curricula and innovating practices.

Active and collaborative learning is essential as students prepare to participate in a global workforce and society. Teaching practices that

endorse passive or detached learning are no longer effective, as Christen (2009) indicated, “Today’s students live in a highly connected, interactive environment that they typically leave behind when they enter the classroom” (p. 29). Some of the recommended strategies for active, collaborative learning include registered apprenticeships (Stoner, Bird, & Gaal, 2011), self-directed learning (DiMattina & Ferris, 2013), problem-based scenarios (Bevins et al., 2012), and students maintaining electronic portfolios to document their experiences (Clark, 2009). Combining ideas and expertise, core subject teachers, CTE teachers, school leaders, and higher education representatives can help to create and support an active, collaborative learning environment conducive to reinforcing requisite 21st century skills.

Purpose and Objectives

This study provides exploration into Idaho school leaders’ assessment of preparedness for integrating teaching and learning in their schools. More specifically, school leaders’ perspectives of collaboration between core subject teachers and career and technical education (CTE) teachers for emphasis of STEM curriculum and reinforcement of 21st century skills were studied. Furthermore, it is asserted that school administrators’ perspectives regarding school environment and current practice should be considered as an integral part of the discussion for improving student achievement. A sizeable body of research recognizes a strategic, shared approach to school leadership as essential to advancing teaching and learning, but the connection between CTE programs and system-wide improvement at the secondary level is vastly understudied (Castellano et al., 2003).

This study of school leaders’ perspectives of school-wide collaboration represents a subset of a larger study that describes the educational needs of career and technical educators (authors’ unpublished manuscript). The specific objective of this study was to describe Idaho school administrators’ perspectives of school-wide collaboration to advance teaching and learning of 21st century skills.

Methods

This study used a descriptive research design with a census survey method. Data were collected during the 2011 spring semester from Idaho public school superintendents and secondary school principals ($N = 455$; principals = 304, superintendents = 151) as identified by the Idaho Department of Education. Because a census survey method was utilized, no sampling methods were used. Consequently, those from the population who participated in the study represent a form of a convenience sample. To understand better the extent to which the

findings are generalizable to the population, nonresponse bias was examined. A discussion of the nonresponse analysis is provided toward the conclusion of this section.

The data represented participants' perspectives of topics pertaining to emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) curriculum and reinforcement of knowledge and skills associated with CTE programs. A descriptive online survey was developed after a thorough review of the relevant literature. The survey instrument was reviewed for content validity, clarity, and usability by a panel of experts consisting of two CTE researchers, two educational leadership researchers, and two retired public school administrators. Survey procedures suggested by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) were followed.

The data were collected by using one section of an instrument that was part of a larger survey of professional development needs of CTE teachers. The larger survey was developed from previous research on the professional development needs of secondary CTE and agricultural education teachers (Cannon et al., 2010; Duncan et al., 2006). School leaders were asked to provide demographic information and characteristics pertaining to their school districts. The section of the survey instrument utilized for this article contained 24 variables related to STEM curriculum, supervised student work experience, and student leadership. The instrument allowed administrators to rate the items on a 4-point Likert-type scale in which a 1 indicated *Strongly Disagree* and a 4 indicated *Strongly Agree*.

Researchers used an online delivery of the survey instrument because of time, cost, accuracy, and efficiency advantages over other forms of data collection (Puig, 2002; Shannon, Johnson, Searcy, & Lott, 2002; Topp & Pawloski, 2002; Wright, 2005). Dillman et al.'s (2009) procedures for online surveys were followed for the implementation of the instrument. An initial invitation to participate was sent via email to 455 district level and building level administrators identified by the Idaho Department of Education. Follow-up prompts for participation were delivered after two and four weeks of initial implementation.

Analysis of nonresponse bias is important in determining a sample's representativeness of the population from which it was drawn. According to Miller and Smith (1983), nonrespondents are similar to late respondents in responding to surveys. Lindner, Murphy, and Briers (2001) concluded "both early/late comparison and follow-up with nonrespondents are defensible and generally accepted procedures for handling nonresponse error as a threat to external validity of research findings" (p. 51). Radhakrishna and Doamekpor (2008) determined that, if no significant difference is found between early and late

respondents, the findings from the sample may be representative of the population.

For this study, early and late respondents were compared through a visual interpretation of relevant charts and plots and then examined statistically with independent sample *t* tests. A bivariate chart showed a random association between the individual responses and the time at which the responses occurred. There is no apparent linear or systematic relationship between the variables of score and time when examined across all responses. A comparison by week using box plots of the average aggregate response across survey items revealed minor differences among the weeks. Based on the response scale provided within the survey, aggregate scores had the potential to range between 1 and 4 on a continuous scale. Independent sample *t* tests indicate no difference exists in the aggregate scores between early and late respondents.

The researchers used MS Excel and SPSS software to analyze the data. Mean and standard deviation were calculated for each of the 24 items to determine school administrators' perceived level of item importance. The importance scores contribute to the identification of priority areas concerning integration of STEM curriculum, supervised student work experience, and student leadership.

Findings

Of the 455 public school administrators invited to participate in the study, 45% ($n = 206$) completed the online survey. The school leaders participating in this study were secondary school administrators ($n = 128$) and superintendents ($n = 78$). Eighty percent of those who responded to the survey were male ($n = 165$), and 20% ($n = 41$) were female. The average number of female respondents in this study is lower than the reported 30% of females who hold high school principalships in Idaho (Stoddard, 2011) and the 24% average reported by three additional states (American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations [AFL-CIO], 2010, p. 3). The vast majority of respondents in this study were over the age of 35, with individuals in the 45 to 54 year old age range being the largest group ($f = 44$). Approximately 10% ($f = 19$) of the 206 respondents had previously served as CTE teachers, and the majority (70%) were 45 years of age or older. About 80% of the administrators surveyed had more than five years of school administrative experience; 52% of them had more than 10 years of experience.

Table 1 reports mean and standard deviation for each of the 24 variables measured in the study. The five items with the highest mean scores depict administrators' perspectives of the importance of providing

opportunities for helping students develop leadership abilities and acquire proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards. “It is important that students in our school be provided leadership development opportunities.” ($M = 3.68, SD = 0.58$), “Student government is an important aspect of leadership development for our students.” ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.79$), “CTE student organizations (i.e., BPA, DECA, FCCLA, FFA, HOSA, TSA, and SkillsUSA) in our school are an important aspect of leadership development for our students.” ($M = 3.25, SD = 0.98$), “CTE teachers in our school value CTE students attaining proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards.” ($M = 3.21, SD = 0.79$), “Administrators in our school value CTE students attaining proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards.” ($M = 3.21, SD = 0.79$).

The five items with the lowest mean scores depict administrators’ perspectives of the effectiveness of emphasizing STEM curriculum in their CTE and traditional academic programs. “In our school, CTE teachers and STEM teachers work collaboratively to integrate subject matter between academic and CTE subject areas.” ($M = 2.22, SD = 0.93$), “Administrators within our district regularly meet with business and industry stakeholders who support CTE programs in our school.” ($M = 2.26, SD = 0.88$), “Currently our school’s CTE teachers effectively integrate STEM learning objectives into the CTE curriculum.” ($M = 2.36, SD = 0.84$), “Administrators in our school are familiar with a variety of strategies used to integrate STEM learning objectives within CTE curriculum.” ($M = 2.38, SD = 0.82$), and “Our school successfully integrates ‘Science’ curriculum within existing CTE curriculum and programs.” ($M = 2.5, SD = 0.87$).

Table 1: *School Leaders’ Ratings for School-wide Collaboration to Reinforce 21st Century Skills*

Item	M	SD
In our school, CTE teachers and STEM teachers work collaboratively to integrate subject matter between academic and CTE subject areas.	2.22	0.93
Administrators within our district regularly meet with business and industry stakeholders who support CTE programs in our school.	2.26	0.88
Currently, our school’s CTE teachers effectively integrate STEM learning objectives into the CTE curriculum.	2.36	0.84

Tenuto et al.

Administrators in our school are familiar with a variety of strategies used to integrate STEM learning objectives within CTE curriculum.	2.38	0.82
Our school successfully integrates “Science” curriculum within existing CTE curriculum and programs.	2.50	0.87
Increased state graduation requirements for Mathematics and Science credit will reduce the number of CTE courses offered in our school.	2.54	1.04
In our school, CTE teachers secure work experience placements for students that allow them to apply their knowledge of core academic subjects.	2.56	0.92
Our school successfully integrates “Mathematics” curriculum within existing CTE curriculum and programs.	2.63	0.83
Teachers (of subjects other than CTE) in our school help students make connections to what they learn from their CTE experiences.	2.67	0.85
Teachers (of subjects other than CTE) in our school support CTE students attaining proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards.	2.89	0.82
In our school, CTE program completers will graduate ready to enter today’s workforce.	2.90	0.88
The STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) initiative is an important component of our school curriculum and learning goals.	2.92	0.85
Administrators in our school regularly mentor or advise teachers with activities and programs where student leadership is being practice or taught.	2.93	0.84
Teachers in our CTE programs encourage students to apply what they learn in their regular academic courses.	3.10	0.76
Athletic programs in our school are an important aspect of leadership development for our students.	3.10	0.95

Joining Forces to Advance Teaching and Learning

CTE programs in our school effectively develop quality leadership skills for our students.	3.12	0.87
In our school, CTE program completers will graduate ready for additional post-secondary education or training, if needed.	3.12	0.85
It is important that CTE teachers integrate STEM learning objectives into their curriculum.	3.18	0.70
Teachers in our school regularly mentor or advise students with activities and programs where student leadership is being practiced or taught.	3.20	0.75
Administrators in our school value CTE students attaining proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards.	3.21	0.79
CTE teachers in our school value CTE students attaining proficient levels of technical skills that meet industry standards.	3.21	0.79
CTE student organizations (i.e., BPA, DECA, FCCLA, FFA, HOSA, TSA, and SkillsUSA) in our school are an important aspect of leadership development for our students.	3.25	0.98
Student government is an important aspect of leadership development for our students.	3.39	0.79
It is important that students in our schools be provided leadership development opportunities.	3.68	0.58

Discussion

Findings from this study depicted Idaho district and building level administrators as placing high importance on the development of student leadership skills and the acquisition of technical skills that meet industry standards. At the same time, administrators in this study reported perceived lower occurrences of teachers integrating curriculum between CTE programs and traditional academic programs that emphasize STEM subject areas and reinforce necessary workplace skills associated with CTE programs. Professional development can provide opportunities for

teachers to mutually create integrated lessons and activities (Sturko & Gregson, 2009), and school leaders can foster a school environment that supports implementation of a plan for improvement (Fullan, 2001, 2003; Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009; Hallinger, 2011; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Reeves, 2006). Teachers and administrators partnering with a local college or university (Goodlad et al., 2004) may provide a shared foundation on which to emphasize STEM education, technology, and transferable skills within an integrated curriculum.

Additional quantitative and qualitative studies are still needed to reveal factors that may be causing the discrepancy between levels of perceived importance for students to acquire 21st century workplace skills and actual practices for integrating and reinforcing these competencies. Approximately 10% of the school leaders who participated in the study had previously served as CTE teachers, which leaves the remaining 90% as having evolved from different teaching backgrounds. As a result, the majority of participating administrators may possess varying degrees of knowledge and understanding pertaining to managing CTE programs, emphasizing STEM curriculum, and reinforcing 21st century skills. Further studies on this topic are essential for helping school leaders to better understand the purpose and design of CTE programs, so they may help generate new ideas for professional growth.

Administrators should not assume that teachers have full responsibility for integrating curriculum, and teachers should not assume administrators are solely responsible for improving academic programs. Designing integrated activities and supporting collaborative instructional strategies school-wide hold promise for reinforcing student learning of advanced workplace skills, and neither administrators nor teachers should complete these processes in isolation. When assessing overall school collaboration, educators should consider the roles of everyone sharing expertise, integrating curriculum, and reinforcing skills to advance students' preparedness for careers and post-secondary experiences.

Study Limitations

Since findings in this study are representative of a predominantly rural population, replication in diverse settings is recommended. While this inquiry did not include teachers' perspectives on this topic, more can be learned by further analyzing and comparing core subject teachers' and CTE teachers' viewpoints. Further research is also needed to explore possible differences between administrators' and teachers' perspectives of emphasizing and integrating STEM components and 21st century skills. School leaders and teachers who are successful in collegially

discussing their own practices may provide a stronger foundation for professional growth and development.

Significance of the Study

This study adds to an emerging body of literature that suggests school leaders do value curriculum integration and school-wide systems of support for emphasizing knowledge and skills associated with CTE programs. Few existing empirical studies address the perspectives of district and building level administrators regarding the perceived level of collaboration between teachers of CTE programs and traditional academic programs, and the perceived usefulness of knowledge and skills traditionally supported through CTE programs. Findings from this study may provide additional insights for not only P-12 educators, but also for faculty and administrators who work in teacher and school leader preparation programs and in collaboration with public schools. Through the unique lens of school administrators, much can be learned about the perceived condition of school environments, including educators' capacity for joining forces to emphasize STEM curriculum and reinforce 21st century skills.

Findings from this study provide a baseline for future research on integration efforts of CTE teachers, core subject teachers, and school administrators. Future studies are needed to investigate how educators work together to advance teaching and learning of knowledge and skills necessary for success in today's workforce. School leaders and teachers sharing information about their professional practices may provide a foundation for professional growth and improvement. Although findings from this study in a rural state may not be generalizable to populations in an urban setting, researchers can use the framework from this study as a foundation for future research. Duplication of this study and similar research over time can serve to identify national trends and inform the commitment of resources to priority areas.

The focus of this study was to explore school leaders' perspectives of school environments and to establish a foundation of awareness between teachers and administrators to begin requisite conversations for improvement. School leaders have the capability to influence change (Payne & Wolfson, 2000; Youngs & King, 2002) that may improve collaboration within the school environment and advance the quality of teaching and learning. For this reason, administrators' perspectives regarding teacher preparedness are vital to the process for change. Findings from this study may help P-12 teachers, school administrators, and higher education representatives to begin necessary discourses and collaboration to bring simultaneous renewal (Goodlad et al., 2004) and sustainable school improvement.

School leaders, CTE teachers, and core subject teachers may discover new processes and uncover new ideas as they work together to integrate STEM education into the curriculum and share expertise with colleagues from a multitude of content areas. Furthermore, participating in varied professional communities may inspire teachers themselves to foster collaborative and democratic practices in their classrooms (Goodlad et al., 2004). Joining forces to emphasize STEM curriculum and to reinforce knowledge and skills associated with CTE programs is key to advancing teaching and learning of 21st century skills.

References

- American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations/Department for Professional Employees. (2010). *School administrators: Just the facts*. Washington, DC; Department of Professional Employees Research Department. Retrieved from http://www.dpeaflcio.org/programs/factsheets/fs_2010_school_administrators.pdf
- Bauer, S. C., & Brazer, S. D. (2012). Using research to lead school improvement: Turning evidence into action. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bevins, P. S., Carter, K., Jones, V., Moye, J., & Ritz, J. (2012, November). The technology and engineering educator's role in producing a 21st century workforce. *Technology and Engineering Teacher*, 72(3), 8-12.
- Cannon, J. G., Kitchel, A., & Duncan, D. W. (2010). Identifying perceived professional development needs of Idaho secondary CTE teachers: Program management needs of skilled and technical science teachers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 47(1), 43-70.
- Cannon, J. G., Kitchel, A., Tenuto, P. L., & Joki, R. A. (2012, November). *School administrators' perceptions of secondary CTE teachers' teaching and learning professional development needs*. Paper presented at the 2012 CTE Research and Professional Development Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R., III. (2003). Secondary career and technical education and comprehensive school reform: Implications for research and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(2), 231-272. doi: 10.3102/003465543073002231
- Christen, A. (2009, January). Transforming the classroom for collaborative learning in the 21st century. *Techniques*, 84(1), 28-31. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ829507.pdf>
- Clark, T. (2009, September). 21st century scholars. *Educational Leadership*, 67(1), 66-70.

Joining Forces to Advance Teaching and Learning

- Crowther, F., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2009). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dean, C. B., Hubbell, E. R., Pitler, H., & Stone, B. (2012). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- DiMattina, C., & Ferris, L. A. (2013, March). Taking charge of your career path: A future trend of the workforce. *Techniques*, (88)3, 16-19.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2004). *Whatever it takes: How professional learning communities respond when kids don't learn*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Duncan, D. W., Ricketts, J. C., Peake, J. B., & Uessler, J. (2006). Teacher preparation and in service needs of Georgia agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 47(2), 24-35.
- Eaker, R., DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2002). *Getting started: Reculturing schools to become professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Firestone, W., Mangin, M., Martinez, M., & Polovsky, T. (2005). Leading coherent professional development: A comparison of three districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 413-448. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04269605
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Glatthorn, A., & Jailall, J. (2009). *The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goldring, E., & Berends, M. (2009). *Leading with data: Pathways to improve your school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Goodlad, J., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gregson, J., & Sturko, P. (2007). Teachers as adult learners: Re-conceptualizing professional development. *MPAEA Journal of Adult Education*, 36(1), 1-18.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hayes, K. (2013, February). Teaching marketable skills with 21st-century materials. *Techniques*, 88(2), 52-55.
- Hyslop, A. (2008, September). CTE's role in workforce readiness credentialing. *Techniques*, 83(6), 40-43. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ809549.pdf>
- Kirchhoff, A., & Lawrenz, F. (2011). The use of grounded theory to investigate the role of teacher education on STEM teachers' career paths in high-need schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(3), 246-259.
- Kitchel, A., Cannon, J. G., & Duncan, D. W. (2009). Program management educational needs of Idaho business and marketing teachers. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 34(3), 175-189.
- Lawless, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2007). Professional development in integrating technology into teaching and learning: Knowns, unknowns, and ways to pursue better questions and answers. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 575-614. doi: 10.3102/0034654307309921
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. (1983). Handling non-response issues. *Journal of Extension*, 21(5), 45-50.
- National Education Foundation, (2006). *U.S. Department of Education's Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*. Retrieved from <http://perkins4.org/>
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (n.d.). *Framework for 21st century learning*. Retrieved from <http://p21.org>

- Payne, D., & Wolfson, T. (2000). Teacher professional development: The principal's critical role. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(13), doi: 10.1177/019263650008461803
- Puig, M. (2002). *Advantages and disadvantages of online research*. Retrieved from <http://www.sysurvey.com/tips/goodbadugly.htm>
- Radhakrishna, R., & Doamekpor, P. (2008). Strategies for generalizing findings in survey research. *Journal of Extension*, 46(2).
- Reeves, D. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schmoker, M. (2006). *Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Shannon, D. M., Johnson, T. E., Searcy, S., & Lott, A. (2002). Using electronic surveys: Advice from survey professionals. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 8(1).
- Stoddard, R. (2011). A brief statistical snapshot of Idaho school principals. *The Idaho Librarian: A Publication of the Idaho Library Association*, 61(1). Retrieved from <http://www.idaholibraries.org/idlibrarian/index.php/idaho-librarian/article/view/69/182>
- Stone, J. R., III, Alfeld, C., & Pearson, D. (2008). Rigor and relevance: Enhancing high school students' math skills through career and technical education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 767-795. doi: 10.3102/0002831208317460
- Stone, J. R., III, & Lewis, M. V. (2012). *College and career readiness in the 21st century: Making high school matter*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stoner, G., Bird B., & Gaal, J. (2011, March). 21st century apprenticeships: Embracing nontraditional partnerships and technologies. *Techniques*, 86(3), 27-31.
- Sturko, P. A., & Gregson, J. A. (2009). Learning and collaboration in professional development for career and technical education teachers: A qualitative multi-case study. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 45(3), 34-60.
- Topp, N. W., & Pawloski, B. (2002). Online data collection. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 11(2), 173-178.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the Top Program executive summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetotheTOP/executive-summary.pdf>
- Wheatley, M. J. (2002). *Turning to one another: Simple conversations to restore hope to the future*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

- Whitcomb, J., Borko, H., & Liston, D. (2009). Growing talent: Promising professional development models and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 207-212.
- White House. (n.d.). *Educate to innovate*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/educate-innovate>
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3), article 11. Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue3/wright.html>
- Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643-670. doi: 10.1177/0013161X02239642

Penny Tenuto, Department of Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Leadership, University of Idaho, Boise; John Cannon, Career and Technical Education Program, University of Idaho, Boise; Allen Kitchel, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Idaho, Moscow.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Penny Tenuto, Department of Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Leadership, University of Idaho, Boise, ID 83702. E-mail: ptenuto@uidaho.edu

Building Citizenship by Becoming an “E.A.G.L.E.”

Paul Wangemann
Brigham Young University

Jennifer Roskelley
Heber Valley Elementary School

Kimberly Foy
Heber Valley Elementary School

Public schools are one of our most important institutions in preparing youth for democratic citizenship. Deliberate attention and planning in schools can provide opportunities for students to develop and apply democratic principles and practices and a supportive culture that honors student choice. This article focuses on the year-long efforts of an elementary school to promote citizenship skills and responsibilities using the letters of the school mascot’s name “Eagle” to represent five essential attributes or qualities expected of good citizens in the school. Becoming effective citizens within the school community prepares students to become effective citizens in their larger communities and nation.

KEYWORDS: school citizenship, democracy in schools, partnerships, school culture

Antonio Muñoz Molina (2013), a Spanish intellectual and writer, recently reflected on the state of democratic education in his own country. He said, “During thirty some odd years of democracy and after forty of dictatorship, no one has designed a democratic pedagogy. Democracy must be taught, because it is not natural, because it is contrary to deeply rooted human inclinations” (p. 102). The idea that citizens are made, not born, requires deliberate efforts to prepare youth to participate in a democratic society, an ongoing responsibility of each generation (Goodlad, Soder, & McDaniel, 2008; Levine, 2007). Muñoz Molina emphasized the strength of conviction necessary for a society to fulfill the responsibility of civic preparation, pointing out that, “the tendency of children and adolescents to place their own desires about everything, without reflecting on the consequences this might have for others, is so powerful that many years of education are necessary to correct it” (p. 102).

Muñoz Molina (2013) further warned that “if democracy is not taught with patience and dedication and if it is not learned through daily practice, its great principles become hollow or act as a screen for corruption and demagoguery” (p. 102). This warning speaks to one of the perpetual challenges of democratic life: that individualism (concern for self-interests) may and often does conflict with the collective welfare of the society—the public good. Many of the conflicts we experience in our communities involve this balancing of private interests and the public good. How do our young people learn to see beyond their narrow interests and concerns? Where do they develop the skills and gain the knowledge to function in a society where joint decisions must be made, compromises achieved, and positive ways of living together successfully worked out? Molina’s conclusion is that “the only way to teach democracy is by example” (p. 103).

This article reports on the efforts of an elementary school to develop the skills and dispositions of democratic citizens through deliberate practice, reflection, choice, and example. A year-long initiative was created to help each student learn to be a good citizen by becoming an “E.A.G.L.E.” The faculty used the letters of the school mascot, “Eagle,” to represent five essential attributes or qualities of good citizens in their school, community, and nation.

The E.A.G.L.E. Program

The letters in E.A.G.L.E. stand for the following:

- *E* is for *embrace diversity*, treating ourselves and others with respect;
- *A* is for *academic excellence*, which comes by responsibility and good work habits;

Building Citizenship by Becoming an “E.A.G.L.E.”

- *G* is for *goal setting*, which helps us reach our academic and personal goals;
- *L* is for *leadership*, which teaches us to manage conflict, solve problems, and keep everyone safe from bullying and other dangers at school; and
- *E* is for *effort*, putting all we can into all we learn in order to do our best work and to manage stress.

Hallway bulletin boards, classroom displays, daily school cheers, assemblies, and many other means were used to familiarize and remind all citizens of Heber Valley Elementary that they were indeed EAGLES.

The impetus for creating a school-wide initiative was the result of a Counseling Needs Assessment Survey (CNAS) administered to students’ parents at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. At that time Heber Valley Elementary School had approximately 600 students in grades PK-4. The majority of students (74%) are Caucasian and the balance (24%) are Hispanic. Each student’s family was mailed a survey in either English or Spanish with their child’s registration packet.

The results of the needs assessment survey indicated the direction for action. Parents were asked to prioritize possible student needs. From the parents who responded (57%), the following needs were identified (in order of importance):

1. Learning responsibilities and good work habits (64%)
2. Learning respect for self and others (62%)
3. Learning problem-solving skills (61%)
4. Learning how to keep oneself safe, including on the Internet (60%)
5. Learning to handle conflict (58.5%)
6. Learning consequences of good and bad behavior (55%)
7. Learning how to handle a bully (54%)
8. Learning study and test-taking strategies (50%)
9. Learning how to set and achieve goals (48%)
10. Learning how to handle stress (45.5%)

As each need was analyzed, certain themes emerged that were captured by the letters making up the name of the school’s mascot, the eagle. This seemed to be a useful association, building on the school tradition and symbol, thus making the new program memorable and meaningful to the students. The purpose of the program was to help students develop skills they needed to progress in their academic pursuits as well as strengthen the culture of the school and enhance their relationships and responsibilities as citizens of their school and community.

The Year-Long Sequence

With buy-in from the entire school faculty, Heber Valley Elementary School's principal and school counselor began the new school year by visiting each classroom and discussing with the students what it meant to be an E.A.G.L.E, introducing them to the meaning chosen for each letter. Every month new bulletin boards would be created to illustrate and emphasize the meaning of one of the letters and remind students of its importance to the school community. Every morning after announcements and the pledge of allegiance, a student would also lead a cheer in which children throughout the school would shout, "I am an EAGLE." Classes developed hand motions to help them remember what each letter stood for. But, the most important aspect was planned monthly activities to engage the students in learning by doing; and because these efforts were being made school-wide, everyone was aware and supportive of each other's efforts. School culture was being shaped by these activities. The following describes how the school applied the principles month by month.

October

Embrace diversity was the theme for the month, represented by the letter *E*. The aspect of diversity that was stressed was "treating ourselves and others with respect." The faculty decided that the golden rule ("Do unto others as you would have them do unto you") captured this idea well, and they used it throughout the school. The school counselor held discussions with each class about the golden rule, and ideas were shared on how to translate this idea into action within the school. Then everyone was to look for good examples of the golden rule in action during the school day.

November

Academic excellence was represented with the letter *A*. Teachers reviewed the homework policy of the school to strengthen the connection between students' learning at school and the need for practice and mastery through homework. Students recommitted to completing their homework assignments, and each week that they did so, they received a "guinea pig ticket." On this ticket each student could suggest a name for the new school pet, a guinea pig. More important, students received daily tips on how to improve their learning and how to evaluate their efforts so that they were striving for academic excellence both at school and at home.

In addition to the efforts in the specific school, a new partnership mentoring program was created with the adjacent Rocky Mountain Middle School. At-risk elementary students were paired with selected 7th

and 8th grade students who could serve as positive role models for them. A screening device called the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders had identified over 100 of the elementary students as being at risk. The Mentor Club met twice a month and participated in activities related to the E.A.G.L.E. theme, including service, social skills, homework help, reading, crafts, and test preparation. Positive bonds were created as the elementary and middle school students experienced a larger common community.

December

The concept of the golden rule was broadened to include the idea of "social capital"-- that social relationships have value and that norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness arise from these relationships (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). Activities were designed around school-wide service, compassion, and concern for others. The school newsletter asked that families in the community needing some help around Christmas time be identified. Ten families requested assistance. Over a period of two weeks, students brought in their "spare change," raising over \$1,200 in coins to help these needy families. The family names were kept confidential, but students knew they were helping members of their community.

January

The theme for the letter *G* was goal setting. Teachers had students set personal goals for the remaining weeks of the semester and then prepare goals that could be shared with their teachers and parents during upcoming parent-teacher conferences. Teachers then met by grade level and set goals for improving student test scores: the percentage of students reading on grade level and other significant markers of improvement. In addition, the principal challenged each class to set a goal to demonstrate excellent hallway, bathroom, playground, and lunchroom behavior. When any behaviors related to these improvement goals were exhibited, an "eagle eye" magnet was awarded. Individual classes could use these eagle eyes to purchase miniature car parts in order to build a derby car. At the end of January, all the classes entered their derby cars in a school-wide competition that was held to celebrate students reaching both individual and school-wide goals.

February

Citizenship building activities continued in February, although they were not tightly connected to a letter. Initiatives related to "gaining access to learning" and "keeping our bodies safe" resulted from needs expressed on the parent survey. A guest speaker from a local non-profit

organization, Peace House Utah, provided age-appropriate classroom presentations teaching students about child abuse, including how to listen to their bodies as warnings about unsafe situations and how to get out of uncomfortable situations. This training was a prelude to the beginning of an after-school program, called the Extended Learning Program, which provided a safe place for students with access to a variety of learning activities on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Open to all students, the program provided activities in subjects such as Spanish, science, technology, cooking, and basketball.

March

Although March may have come in like a lion (in weather, at least), the *L* stood for leadership. Classroom discussions were held school-wide regarding the importance of every student being a leader. Leadership applies to all students because each can “stand up” for what he or she knows is right. Students were taught how to identify a bully or notice bullying tactics and how to “stand up and stand out” for victims or affected bystanders. Student council members exhibited leadership by conducting a fundraiser, called “Pennies for Patients,” sponsored by the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society to directly benefited children with cancer. Posters and descriptions of individual patients were posted around the school so students could see who would benefit from their efforts and contributions. Each day a different child with cancer was spotlighted on the morning announcements, which made the fundraising efforts very personal. Students identified specific individuals from the pictures that they wanted to dedicate their efforts to help. Each student was given a coin collecting box. As an added incentive, the school counselor and student council advisor agreed to paint themselves green if the school goal of \$2,000 was reached. Yes, the students did exceed their goal, and the faculty members did paint themselves green.

April

The final letter *E* represented effort. The quality being taught was for students to always give their best effort, even when doing so might be difficult. This same quality has been referred to in the Code of the West as “grit, guts, and heart” (Owen & Stoecklein, 2012). Daily study tips were given to students to help them with test taking, relaxation, focus, and positive thinking (Tough, 2012). A bookmark with each of these tips was provided for students as they prepared for core testing. A parent newsletter was sent home with specific ideas for parents to help their children show their best efforts.

End of the Year

As the school year came to a close, all students understood what it meant to be an EAGLE, and the entire school had been energized by the monthly activities. The time had come for the students to “show what they know.” During core testing in May, each morning students were given motivational energizers by the school’s physical education instructor to warm up their minds and bodies. “Smart charts” were placed in each classroom and eagle eye stickers were awarded when students demonstrated qualities they had learned throughout the year. Classes that completed their smart charts were able to go to a local recreational center for a day of activities. Students were also provided opportunities to volunteer during lunchtime and be recognized for their efforts.

Creating and Strengthening Democratic Communities

Public schools are in themselves communities as well as members of larger communities in which they are located. Schools have an important role in the development, well-being, and success of our youth in these various communities. Public schools contribute to the development of informed and productive citizens (Damon, 2011; Wangemann, 2012). From Thomas Jefferson to Antonio Muñoz Molina, we have been reminded that democracy is not a natural state for children, so they must be deliberately taught and helped to participate in democratic ways.

To be successful, students must perceive themselves to be members of communities and feel some responsibility for what happens in them. This is best accomplished if they are active participants and are able to engage as agents (Damon, 2011). The school principal at Heber Valley Elementary School shared her approach to developing citizens at her school when summarizing her perspective on their year-long efforts:

I love being an eagle and I think it’s important for each student to know what that means. When they do, then it’s all about their choosing to be eagles. They must choose to honor diversity, pursue academic excellence, set and achieve goals, provide leadership in all situations by doing what’s right, and putting forth their best effort. It comes down to choice, and that is how it is in a democratic society. They must make their choices on their own. (personal communication, October, 2012)

For Heber Valley Elementary School, “eagle pride” soared each day as the students said in unison, “I am an eagle” at the conclusion of the morning announcements. The students understood what the E.A.G.L.E. symbol meant and felt like they belonged to this important community. They put those ideas into action and that became part of the school’s

culture. They were preparing to be citizens of a larger community and nation.

References

- Damon, W. (2011). *Failing liberty 101: How we are leaving young Americans unprepared for citizenship in a free society*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & McDaniel, B. (2008). *Education and the making of a democratic people*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Levine, P. (2007). *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens*. Lebanon, NH: Tufts University Press.
- Muñoz Molina, A. (2013). *Todo lo que era sólido*. (J. R. Rosenberg, Trans.). Barcelona: Seix Barral.
- Owen, J. P., & Stoecklein, D. R. (2012). *Cowboy ethics: What Wall Street can learn from the code of the west*. Ketchum, ID: Stoecklein Publishing.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Tough, P. (2012). *How children succeed*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wangemann, P. (2012). *CITES annual review: Commitments to our future*. Provo, UT: North Star Press.

Paul Wangemann, Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, Brigham Young University; Jennifer Roskelley, Heber Valley Elementary School; Kimberly Foy, Heber Valley Elementary School.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paul Wangemann, Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. E-mail: paul_wangemann@byu.edu

Understanding and Confronting Policy and Corporate Pressure in the Current Era: Implications for the Agenda for Education in a Democracy

Tina Jacobowitz
Montclair State University

Michelle Kovacs
Montclair State University

Nick Michelli
The City University of New York

In this article we provide an overview of trends in policy and corporate investment and influences affecting K-12 and teacher education and a framework for examining them. The overview includes the American Legislative Exchange Council, Investment in Charter Schools, Race to the Top and the Higher Education Act, the National Council for Teacher Quality, Teacher Performance Assessment, and StudentsFirst. Inconsistencies exist between these trends and the mission and goals of the National Network for Educational Renewal. We suggest implications for and actions that might be taken by the Network and others who believe that schools exist for purposes other than those measured by standardized tests.

KEYWORDS: teacher education, education policy, corporate influence

The purpose of this article is to provide an overview of the current and emerging policy issues and practices confronting teacher education programs. We are in what is perhaps the most difficult policy environment for our work since the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) was founded, and perhaps even since we began our careers. This is of particular relevance to those of us who are members of the NNER because we ascribe to a set of tenets that are extremely vulnerable to current thinking by policy makers about what is important in preparing and assessing teachers and educating students. This is especially true if we hold that education has multiple purposes beyond access to knowledge, one of which is to prepare students to be active and successful participants in a democracy. A major challenge is that, as institutions, teacher education and education in general serve many “masters.” Within our institutions, there are provosts and other administrators who have input into our programs and who must understand our mission. Outside the institution there are policy makers who set expectations for public schools and teacher education—often with an emphasis on standardized tests as the primary, if not the only, measure of success. Finally, the corporate sector has discovered that education—and teacher education in particular—is big business (Michelli & Earley, 2011). Without understanding this, trying to understand policy is exasperating because its rationality depends on the worldview (Lakoff, 2002) that the proponents and makers of policy bring to bear on the process. What data do they use? Where does it come from? How can we influence policy? What other factors beyond policy affect teacher education? In addition, perhaps most importantly, how these policy makers answer the question, “Why do we educate in a democracy?”

Current research shows that attempting to understand policy simply in terms of rationality is fruitless. In one study, Charles Manski (2010) notes that one cannot understand the rational basis for policy making because it is not a rational process. To the contrary, policy making has more to do with meeting a variety of interests than with what we would consider careful analysis. The title of one of his recent works, *Policy Analysis with Incredible Certitude* (Manski, 2010), captures part of the problem. When policy makers are finished, they have certainty about their work and its outcomes—incredible certitude—that is difficult to challenge. Furthermore, providing research is not likely to change policy perspectives. Rather, it is local experiences and stories that seem to have the greatest impact (Nelson, Leffler, & Hansen, 2009).

Purposes of Education – Worldviews

Because policy makers may see the world differently, and therefore answer the question “why do we educate in a democracy?” differently

than we do, we often encounter disagreements based on different worldviews. This leads to conflict that cannot be resolved without trying to understand these worldviews. Frederick Hess, a leading conservative commentator, has observed the bitterness and the questioning of the intentions of those with different worldviews. He argues that the different sides need to acknowledge the good intentions of those with whom they disagree so that they can work as allies and partners rather than opponents. He writes:

It is not merely that swapping epithets is aesthetically unpleasing. The larger point is that the vitriol tends to both stifle problem-solving and to be self-perpetuating. It shuts the door on fruitful debate and influences the rising generation of advocates, thinkers, and practitioners. We create guarded camps that jeer at one another across the divide. In the end, this is neither democratic policy discourse nor even a thinking community; it is tribal politics. And it's not good for any of us. So, as the teacher policy debates set forth on a new decade and we leave behind the "highly qualified teacher" and the debates of the NCLB era, it's time to make a choice. Will the next decade be another decade of line-in-the-sand declarations and dueling bouts of moral posturing, or will it be about how we use the mundane tools of data, termination, evaluation, markets, professional norms, training, and the rest to finally make teaching start to look like a profession in the modern era? (Hess, 2011, pp. 21-22)

While the issues Hess lists above may be obvious ones that need to be addressed, his characterization of them as mundane masks the controversies they have spawned. For example, the recent conflict between the United Federation of Teachers and the Mayor's office in New York City over the proportion of student test data to use in evaluating teachers led to a conflict that caused the state to threaten withholding millions of dollars in aid to schools (Kaplan, 2013). Efforts to weaken or remove tenure in many states (USA Today, 2012) as well as the ongoing disputes about the nature of teacher education (Hess calls it training) are hardly mundane. To label them as such minimizes the intensity of the importance that educators ascribe to these areas.

If we were to negotiate common worldviews, where would we start? As we have suggested, the central question underlying our understanding of policy and worldview, is "Why do we educate in a democracy?" The answer to that question often reveals worldview, at least on education policy, and can be a vehicle for understanding policy differences. So, how do we answer the question? Do we educate to increase our economic status in the world? To assure good jobs? To improve the quality of life broadly defined? To enhance the quality of our

democracy? To assure a wide distribution of social justice? To be certain that the curriculum goes beyond the Common Core Standards' focus on college and career readiness? All of these?

One useful way of talking about worldview is provided by linguist George Lakoff (2002) in *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Lakoff proposes the metaphor of the family; on one side, a nurturing mother who will respond to needs as they arise and reflect with empathy and concern, and on the other side, a strict father who uses punishment and expects high attainment in life. Simplistic perhaps, but it does present the basic differences. One can see how different answers to the basic question of why we educate will dictate vastly different policy decisions. No Child Left Behind, which punishes failing schools, is a conservative "strict father" perspective. However, many of the modifications to NCLB (e.g., allowing waivers for states and limiting closure of schools not making adequate yearly progress) fit the "nurturing mother" perspective. Using Lakoff's metaphor, we believe that the NNER's four point mission—Access to Knowledge, Preparing Students to Live and Contribute to a Democratic Society, Nurturing Pedagogy, and Stewardship of Best Practices—characterizes our philosophy of the purposes of education and the education of educators as a "nurturing mother."

When a bottom-line business perspective limits the view of those seeking to influence education, as it does for most corporations, one's worldview invariably takes on a strict father perspective. Workers who are not efficient or whose work is not seen as adding to a profit are likely to be terminated. Decisions are made based on whether or not they will yield profits. This plays out in a variety of ways that are antithetical to our views in the NNER. The practice of using a value-added model as the primary way to assess teachers and principals (and making it easier to terminate educators) is congruent with the strict father view. Arguing for preparing students for a democracy detracts, in the eyes of some, from the mission of college or career readiness. Adding elements to education such as fostering democratic practice or social justice—elements that nurture the best qualities of individuals—in our experience, are seen as too expensive and not reflected in what is measured. Using qualitative measures is not as easy as looking at quantitative scores and takes time, and therefore money, to accomplish. This is part of the contrast between an educational view from a strict father perspective versus that of a nurturing mother.

Public and Private Influences on Education

The American Legislative Exchange Commission

In addition to a “bottom line” mentality, another factor important to understanding policy is the issue of corporate influences on education and the growing pressure to privatize it. One example is The American Legislative Exchange Commission (ALEC). While the majority of ALEC’s members are state legislators, funding comes primarily from corporations who put forth their legislative and policy goals. Legislators are provided with “model legislation” that can be introduced in their own states. The ALEC website (www.alec.org) provides a great deal of insight into these machinations. For example, under the Education Task Force (headed, as all are, by both a public and private chair) one can find eight current templates for education bills. Legislators can adopt any of these bills by simply dropping in the name of their state.

ALEC’s latest analysis of education (Ladner & Myslinski, 2012) concludes in part that unions have lost while reformers have gained by promoting charter schools and value-added measurement of teacher effectiveness in raising student test scores. Florida is noted as the continuing leader for below-the-national-average per pupil spending while leading the nation in academic achievement. Of course, how one defines academic achievement and claims of victory depends on their worldview of education.

Charter School Investments

While ALEC is working on increasing corporate influence on education legislation, certain philanthropic organizations are bringing a bottom-line perspective to the funding of new educational initiatives. Here, education is viewed as a business venture and charitable organizations become “investors.” In 2011, the Walton Family Foundation “invested” \$159 million in K-12 educational reform, including \$15 million to the California Charter Schools Association and another \$25.5 million to the KIPP charter school network. While KIPP and other charters may be doing some good work with students, at least as measured by standardized test scores, research reveals a body of evidence indicating that the differences among charter and regular public schools vary widely in their impacts on achievement growth. This research finds that, on the whole, there is usually not much difference between them, and when there are differences, they tend to be very modest (Di Carlo, 2011). It may be wise to question the reasoning behind creating an expanding private network of schools in which success is measured strictly by standardized achievement scores and that have been found to be responsible for some of the re-segregation of

American schools (Miron, Urschel, Mathis, & Tornquist, 2010). The Broad Foundation, another organization that funds aggressive education reform and places a strong emphasis on school accountability (the “strict father” worldview), is working directly with several large urban school districts including New York City, Los Angeles, Houston, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Chicago, Denver, Newark, New Orleans, Prince George County (Maryland), Seattle, and Washington, D.C. to redesign these districts into “high-performing organizations” (Broad Foundation, 2012).

The Broad Foundation leaves no doubt about their business-oriented approach to educational reform. The organization states, “We don’t simply write checks to charities. Instead we practice ‘venture philanthropy.’ And we expect a return on our investment” (Broad Foundation, 2012). The Walton Family Foundation also has a corporate mentality when it comes to shaping public policy on schools. The foundation funds initiatives that create “competition” between schools in the K-12 “market” and increase parental options for school choice (Walton Family Foundation, 2012). This is not an issue if you believe in widening access to charter schools and vouchers or other means of school choice. However, if you see this as an effort to privatize education, it is an extremely problematic issue. Charters may well have a place, but the factors leading to success that can be applied to other public schools are hard to isolate and may lie largely in the extraordinary private funding that allows some to expand school time. In one study, Kipp schools, in 2007-2008, had combined public and private sources of revenue, on average \$18,491 per pupil, \$6,500 more than comparison public-funded schools (Miron, Urschel, & Saxton, 2011, p. ii.).

What worldview is being promoted in schools funded by organizations like the Broad and Walton foundations? Is it one of democracy, social justice, and critical thinking or is it more closely tied to the result-oriented “bottom-line” mentality these philanthropic organizations openly espouse? For-profit investments in education are growing significantly, and investors, in particular the venture capital organizations, are being urged to increase their investments. In a publication of the American Enterprise Institute, Tom Vander Ark (2009), former director of the Gates Foundation, argued that there is very little investment in education. For example, in 2009 when the report was published, education represented 6% of the gross domestic product—in excess of \$900 billion in the United States alone—while the energy industry only amounted to 1% of the GDP. However, investment of venture capital funds in education amounted to less than 1% of the total while investment in energy amounted to 7% of the total investment. Vander Ark goes on to suggest access points for private investment in education including supplemental education. His work includes a useful

review of for-profit education, including charter management groups, which he sees in a positive light (Vander Ark, 2009).

To get a comprehensive sense of the zeal with which entrepreneurs are being encouraged to pursue business and profit in education, we recommend downloading *American Revolution 2.0: How Education Innovation is Going to Revitalize America and Transform the U.S. Economy* (Moe, 2012) published on July 4, 2012 by GSV Capital, Inc., which is described as a publically-traded business development company. GSVC makes the disclaimer that while they have invested in some of the education and technology companies discussed in the document, only public data is used and they are not marketing their products. That disclaimer is misleading. Moe's report contains 32 references to profit-generating charter schools. Chapter titles include "Weapons of Mass Education," "Modern Weaponry," "Time to Fight," and "Investing in the Revolution." These chapters are organized into sections on people, product, potential, and predictability. They focus on Teach for America as part of the solution—showing a *Business Week* listing of "best places to begin a career" that includes Microsoft, KPMG, General Electric, Philip Morris, and Teach for America, among others. Rather than viewing teaching as a calling to educate, care about and nurture young people, he seems to portray Teach for America as a stepping-stone to a more lucrative career. The book ends with a new "declaration of independence," in part independence from whatever is the status quo (Moe, 2012).

Race to the Top

The Obama administration's centerpiece for education reform, at the state level and now at the district level, promotes two major changes, both controversial. The first is the use of value-added measures (VAM) in the assessment of teachers. These methods supposedly measure the "value" teachers add to student achievement (expressed in standardized test score gains) over a given period of time—usually one year. There is, however, a growing amount of increasingly convincing evidence that these methods are not reliable. One such study is a report from The Maryland Assessment Research Center for Success (funded by the Maryland Department of Education). This report concludes:

We cannot at this time encourage anyone to use VAM in a high stakes endeavor. If one has to use VAM, then we suggest a two-step process to initially use statistical models to identify outliers (e.g., low-performing teachers) and then to verify these results with additional data. Using independent information that can confirm or disconfirm is helpful in many contexts. The value of

this use of evaluative change results could be explored in further research efforts...." (Schafer et al., 2012, p. 18)

The use of value-added measures not only serves to focus and narrow the curriculum, but it creates climates of fear. In New York City, for example, principals know that a failure to move up in value-added evidence of student learning for two successive years is likely to cost them their jobs. That leads to pressure on teachers, and in turn, pressure on students. We must be clear, as we note in our conclusions, we are not against accountability or assessment. There may even be a place for value-added data if it is aggregated and not used to assess an individual teacher. Of course, we would argue for multiple measures that include qualitative means of assessing the success of teacher education programs, with a broad view of what education in a democracy should be.

Race to the Top's (RTT) second major change is the encouragement of the preparation of educators completely outside the purview of colleges and universities. To some extent, in our view, the residency model began this trend, enabled by colleges giving away the instructional responsibilities to districts and providing credits and grades, but not instruction. Now, through organizations such as The Relay Graduate School of Education, established in New York and spreading to other states, a private group of charter schools provides the selection and instruction of future teachers and, in New York, the Board of Regents grants the Master's degree (Green, 2011). Relay will have to be accredited nationally by NCATE/CAEP in order to continue to operate in New York. It is scheduled for review fall 2013, and the impact of that process on accreditation standards may be seen shortly.

Changes in Title II of the Higher Education Act

Currently, anticipated changes to this act requiring that the success or failure of teacher education programs be reported to the U.S. Secretary of Education are under revision. Since 1998, during the first Bush administration when the Act was amended, the measure of success has been the percentage of graduates who pass the content knowledge test required in a given state for certification, with 80% being the minimum acceptable pass rate. Institutions report the pass rates disaggregated by subject area. However, comparisons across states are impossible because different tests have been used in different states (e.g. Praxis and the Pearson iteration of the National Evaluation System Tests). Furthermore, some institutions have used tests for admission to teacher education programs that measure essentially the same skills and content as the certification tests. Only students who pass are admitted, thus yielding an almost uniform 100%, or at least more than 80%, pass rate. By requiring the reporting on all enrolled in programs, this problem has

lessened, but institutions that require passing of a comparable test for admission to teacher education while they are enrolled as an undeclared student or in another major can enhance the programs' pass rates by not admitting students who fail.

How do the policy makers envision raising the standards to have the assessment differentiate more clearly the quality among colleges and university programs? One proposal that is in the revisions in the Higher Education Act is to gather data on the value-added effect of graduates of each program. The question is, "to what extent did teachers who graduated from your program add value to the education of their students in K-12 settings as measured by gains in the standardized test scores?" This is yet another example of reliance on a value-added measure for a high-stakes outcome. Value-added systems require the use of sophisticated databases that are expensive to build and maintain. Currently, such databases are under development in many states (all of which have "Race to the Top" funding) and are already present in a few states including Florida and Georgia. One good source on the questions about using VAM as a high stakes measure is *Problems with the Use of Student Test Scores to Evaluate Teachers* (Baker et al., 2010). This study, featuring many experts on education, summarizes the concerns about these measures and cites other studies reporting similar outcomes.

Private Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

The evaluation of university-based teacher education programs by private, highly publicized organizations, notably the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ), is underway with the first full report issued in June 2013 (Greenberg, McKee, & Walsh, 2013). In a joint project undertaken by *US News and World Report* and NCTQ, NCTQ has ranked teacher education programs using data provided by some institutions as well as public documents for other institutions. It is important to note that many institutions refused to supply data because NCTQ would not reveal how the data would be analyzed. Unlike our first two examples, NCTQ focuses more on inputs than outcomes, claiming that most programs do not have outcome data (Greenberg et al., 2013). One gets a sense of the direction NCTQ is headed toward in reading the reports issued so far. Claims like,

The need for the study is great; traditional education schools are under fire, more than ever, for failing to adequately prepare new teachers for the challenges of today's classrooms. So, not surprisingly, most of the programs we reviewed fail to meet all of NCTQs standards. (National Council on Teacher Quality [NCTQ], 2012, p. 15)

What are the motivations of NCTQ and its organizers? In an interesting side note, the founder of NCTQ, Kate Walsh, is the former chair of the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE, n.d.a), an organization seeking to convince states that the only important requirements for future teachers should be a content knowledge test and a brief field experience. ABCTE runs an alternate route teaching program that promises state certification to individuals with no previous teaching experience in as little as six months to a year – all for the low fee of \$1,995 (financing is available). In effect, the nearly \$2,000 fee allows applicants to study for and take the ABCTE-generated test, making it a significant business that can be likened to corporate organizations seeking to influence education. Several states, including Florida, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, Nevada, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Utah, provide certification to ABCTE-trained teachers (ABCTE, n.d.b). So, by asserting that teacher education programs have failed or were found deficient, NCTQ provides “evidence” to support the alternative of ABCTE or some other non-university approach for the preparation of educators. Whether or not that is the intent, our guess is that it will be the effect on policymakers with a conservative worldview who favor less government. Privatizing teacher education programs could save public funds by potentially eliminating teacher education programs at university-based schools, departments, or colleges of teacher education.

Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA)

edTPA is beginning to find wide use as a tool for the certification of teachers. The system, developed at Stanford University under the leadership of Ray Pechione and Linda Darling Hammond, is an outgrowth of the measure in use in California, the PACT—that is, the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (University of Wisconsin-Madison, n.d.). As edTPA, supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), became more widely used, it was clear that some large-scale provider would have to collect and manage the data and train the key assessors. This system depends on student teachers providing video taped segments of their teaching during internships along with samples of their students’ work, lesson plans, and reflections. These artifacts are then evaluated by external reviewers. The provider, Pearson, recruited 1,200 educators to score candidate portfolios as of 2011 (Pearson, 2011). These reviewers are trained in an attempt to assure that the results will be reliable and valid.

In our view, moving student teacher evaluations outside teacher preparation programs calls into question the validity of this procedure

since it is done out of context. This assumes the “contexts,” such as our NNER settings, have a particular perspective on why we educate in a democracy and should inform the evaluation of candidates. Pearson, a for-profit company and the world’s largest education publisher, was chosen to duplicate the role they played in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, overseeing the selection and training of the evaluators. Darling-Hammond recognizes that some characterize edTPA as the corporatization of teacher education, but says:

Nothing could be further from the truth. Like the National Board portfolio, edTPA was not developed, nor is it owned, by Pearson. Like assessments in other professions, it was developed—and is guided—by a consortium of professional educators. These individuals make decisions about designing the scoring process and the qualifications of those asked to score (accomplished teachers and teacher educators). Instructors and supervisors continue to teach, observe, support and evaluate candidates as they always have. (Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2012, p.1)

However, student teachers must absorb the additional costs and effort of creating video segments and gathering materials for submission, and then pay Pearson an estimated \$300 to have their materials analyzed (edTPA, n.d.). This evaluation is over and above what is already required of them by their own teacher education programs. Additionally, the authors can report that as edTPA comes into place in New York, colleges and universities are devoting considerable time to “test prep” with students for how to best present their targeted lessons.

What are the implications of this for teacher education? High-stakes decisions are made by assessors removed physically and intellectually from the programs that prepare teachers. A corporation profits from the activity. We do not know the results of any studies of the correlation for edTPA and future success, but there are preliminary studies involving PACT, a very similar instrument. In a study conducted by Linda Darling Hammond and others, there were found to be small, but statistically significant, correlations between success on PACT and the later achievement of a candidate’s students measured by value-added methodology (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2012). The role of cooperating teachers and university supervisors in assessing candidates for certification, arguably their most important role in educating educators, can be interpreted as being usurped by these trained assessors. And, while K-12 and university faculty can provide grades and narratives for student teachers, in states that have adopted edTPA as their model, the determining decision to certify is based on the report of an external assessor. The essence of our concern in the context of NNER institutions, and for what we should be on guard, is the further danger of

narrowing the curriculum to what can be measured. We see nothing in edTPA that suggests a broad view of the purposes of education.

StudentsFirst

This organization, begun by Michelle Rhee, a former Teach for America corps member who also served as chancellor of Washington, D.C. public schools, has identified a set of “anchor policies” deemed essential to improving education for children, including:

- Require meaningful teacher evaluation based on multiple measures, including student growth;
- Require meaningful principal evaluation based on multiple measures, including student growth;
- Reduce barriers to teaching through alternative pathways;
- Pay increases for teachers should be based on multiple factors of effectiveness, primarily student achievement;
- Ensure that schools have the authority to build and maintain an effective instructional team, including having autonomy over hiring decisions and the dismissal of ineffective teachers;
- Require staffing decisions, including layoffs, to be based on teacher effectiveness and prohibit seniority from driving personnel decisions;
- Require that all K–12 schools receive a letter grade annually based on student achievement and growth in learning;
- Provide publicly funded scholarships for low-income students in low-performing schools that include accountability requirements for participating schools;
- Provide comparable per-pupil funding for all public school students to the school in which they are enrolled;
- Strengthen charter accountability by creating clear, strong mechanisms for closing low-performing schools and holding authorizers accountable;
- Allow for mayoral and state control of academically low-performing schools and districts; and
- Provide teachers employer-sponsored retirement options that are portable and treat all teachers fairly (StudentsFirst, 2013, pp.16-17).

Taking a close look at these “anchor policies” and considering their connection to our first four examples, there is no question that they undermine college and university teacher education programs. We think the connections between some of these policies and the examples given so far are evident, including promoting value-added

measurement and paying teachers based primarily on student achievement, promoting alternative routes to teacher certification, and promoting charter schools. Not all of the recommendations are outside our worldview, including equity in funding and charter accountability, but on balance, they put a great emphasis on high stakes testing for the evaluation of educators.

Implications for NNER Members

What are the implications for educators in the United States, including teacher educators, and what can/should we do? These examples of significant policy forces influencing teacher education and K-12 education are generally outgrowths of the drive toward accountability, the increasing trend to count outcomes (except in the case of NCTQ, which focuses on inputs), and the growth of corporate investments in education. Assessment becomes a way of both criticizing existing educational institutions and measuring the success of new ones (many of them for-profit), as well as narrowing the curriculum.

One can easily see the overlap in the examples, reflecting a concerted effort to impose a particular worldview on education: one that bases all decisions, including personnel decisions, on the results of what we view as questionable value-added data. Finding what should count—be valued—depends on how one answers the question, “Why do we educate in a democracy?” Looking at the results of these measures in P-12 and college settings through the lens of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy, it is clear that only a small part of the agenda—access to knowledge—is reflected in these assessments. For those involved in the Agenda for Education in a Democracy, “access to knowledge” is attained through thinking critically in and about the disciplines. Some standardized tests might measure critical thinking; some lessons taught by student teachers might show instruction to that end; some course syllabi might mention critical thinking; but for the most part, we believe, these policies will provide a narrow measure of the meaning of access to knowledge. Additionally, there appears to be no room in these policies to measure success in preparing students to live in a socially just democratic society, in teachers providing nurturing pedagogy, or in preparing students to take advantage of life’s chances including moving into careers of their choice. It seems evident that the makers of these policies do not see these as important purposes of education. As corporations discover the nearly one trillion dollar education market, they continue to see a gold mine that may not protect public education or the public purposes of education.

Einstein was right about many things. One quotation widely attributed to him is, “Not everything we count counts, and not everything

that counts can be counted” (BrainyQuote, n.d.). Many of the tenets of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy cannot be measured through standardized assessments put forward in the current policies guiding education. Albert Shanker, in a personal communication with one of the authors, warned, “What counts is what we measure” (April 22, 1980). He did not mean that what we measure *should* count but that what we measure takes precedence over what cannot be counted through statistical and standardized measures. Without intervention, we can assume that tenets of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy, such as educating for democracy, social justice, and equity—concepts that are not easily measured through standardized tests—are less likely to be included in the curriculum. Instead, the emphasis will be primarily on what we can measure or, as Einstein would say, what can count rather than what counts.

What can we as teacher educators do? First, we need to be very smart in our approach to influencing policy to understand the sources of policy that affect our work. This includes being informed about the growing corporate influence motivation as well as the value-added assessment wave. We have to focus on changing policy makers’ perspectives or worldviews and not simply on changing policy. We should keep asking policy makers and parents, as well as educators, the seemingly simple but really very hard question, “Why do we educate in a democracy?”

We must prepare future teachers so that they not only understand the sources of policy but also how to effect its change. Enabling educators, future educators, and future teacher educators, including ourselves, to analyze and recognize the forces shaping education in this century is very important. We all need to think about what is at stake and how policy is formed in order to make informed decisions and become actors in the process. Perhaps most importantly, we cannot take the position that assessment itself is bad or that we are above assessment or even to appear that we hold that position. We know that there are authentic measures that can provide evidence of the most important work in education, including that reflected in the Agenda for Education in a Democracy, and we must nurture these measures collectively and be sure they are included and valued. This evidence can and should include showing through student work the enhanced ability of students to make arguments for their positions, to show respect for others, to rationally question arguments different from their own, and to modify their positions based upon such interaction. Assessing these learned behaviors (the essence of a civic and civil society) cannot be reduced to tests, but depend on assessing behavior and abilities in classroom communities of inquiry.

All of this is extremely difficult work. Education deans, who often are in the field advocating for these important principles, are sometimes questioned by their provosts as to why they are away from campus so often. In pursuing our beliefs, it may be seen as self-serving. Educators in K-12 and university settings are sometimes put off when their colleagues attempt to promote meaningful discussions at lunch tables or in teachers' rooms. However, if we fail to have conversations that will yield a shared vision and if we fail to provide input to confront the policy forces that are antithetical to our worldview, we must live with the consequences.

Finally, one more caution is in order. While we must be careful to argue and explain the relationship between our worldview and our sense of the purposes of education in a democracy, we must also talk with each other to be sure we have a shared vision regarding very complex and contested concepts. We must remember Rick Hess' admonition cited earlier, to not think of those with other worldviews as stupid, evil, or even wrong. Those who hold other perspectives and reach different conclusions may well be very smart and informed. We must work towards encouraging them to confront and examine their beliefs and engage in the difficult dialogue that will follow and, at the same time, recognizing the possibility of compromising our own positions while still maintaining the integrity of our views.

References

- American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence. (n.d.a). *American Board celebrates board of directors expansion*. Retrieved from <http://abcte.org/american-board-celebrates-board-of-directors-expansion/>
- American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence. (n.d.b). *Become a teacher*. Retrieved from <http://abcte.org/teach/>
- Associated Press. (2012, January 25). States weaken tenure rights for teachers. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/education/story/2012-01-25/teacher-tenure-rights-firings/52772354/1>
- Baker, E., Barton, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H., Ravitch, D., . . . Shepard, L. (2010, August 29). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers* (Issue Brief No. 278). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- BrainyQuote. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/alberteins100201.html>
- Broad Foundation. (2012). *Our approach to investing: Venture philanthropy*. Retrieved from <http://www.broadeducation.org/investments/approach.html>

- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. (2012, Summer). The role of performance assessment in developing teaching as a profession. *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4).
- Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, S., & Wei, R. (2012). *Developing and assessing beginning new teachers effectiveness: The potential of performance assessments*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Di Carlo, M. (2011, November). Explaining the consistently inconsistent results of charter schools [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://shankerblog.org/?p=4229#more-4229>
- edTPA. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.edTPA.aacte.org/faq#21>
- Green, E. (2011, February 14). *Gotham Schools, A New Graduate School of Education, Relay, to Open Next Fall*. Retrieved from <http://gothamschools.org/2011/02/14/a-new-graduate-school-of-education-relay-to-open-next-fall/>
- Greenberg, J., McKee, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). *Teacher prep review: A review of the nation's teacher preparation programs*. Retrieved from National Council for Teacher Quality website: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Teacher_Prep_Review_2013_Report
- Hess, F. (2011). Foot-dragging and overreaching: The story of federal education policy. In P. Earley, D. Imig, & N. Michelli (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in the United States: Issues and tension in an era of evolving expectations* (pp. 19-20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kaplan, T. (2013, January 20). Bloomberg asks for legislature's help in teacher evaluation fight. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/29/nyregion/bloomberg-seeks-legislatures-help-in-teacher-evaluation-fight.html?_r=0
- Ladner, M., & Myslinski, D. (2012). *ALEC report card on American education: Ranking state K-12 performance, progress, and reform* (17th ed.). Retrieved from http://www.alec.org/docs/ReportCard_18_Edition
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Manski, C. F. (2010). *Policy analysis with incredible certitude*. Evanston, IL: Department of Economics and Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.
- Michelli, N., & Earley, P. (2011). Teacher education policy context. In P. Earley, D. Imig, & N. Michelli (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in the United States: Issues and tension in an era of evolving expectations* (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Miron, G., Urschel, J. L., Mathis, W. J., & Tornquist, E. (2010). *Schools without diversity: Education management organizations, charter*

- schools and the demographic stratification of the American school system.* Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/schools-without-diversity>
- Miron, L., Urschel, J., & Saxton, N. (2011). *What makes KIPP work? A study of student characteristics, attrition and school finance.* Retrieved from www.edweek.org/media/kippstudy.pdf
- Moe, M. T. (2012). *American revolution 2.0: How education innovation is going to revitalize America and transform the U.S. economy.* Retrieved from <http://gsvadvisors.com/wordpress/wp-content/themes/gsvadvisors/American%20Revolution%202.0.pdf>
- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2012). *Building better teachers.* Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/p/edschools/home.jsp>
- Nelson, S., Leffler, J., & Hansen, B. (2009). *Toward a research agenda for understanding and improving the use of research evidence.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Pearson. (2011). *Stanford University and Pearson collaborate to deliver the teacher performance assessment.* Retrieved from <http://www.pearsoned.com/stanford-university-and-pearson-collaborate-to-deliver-the-teacher-performance-assessment-tpa/#.Ucmngpz4RGY>
- Schafer, W., Lissitz, R., Zhu, X., Zhang, Y., Hou, X., & Li, Y. (2012). Evaluating teachers and schools using student growth models. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 17*(17). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=17&n=17>
- StudentsFirst. (2013). *State of education: State policy report card, 2013.* Washington, DC: StudentsFirst. Retrieved from http://edref.3cdn.net/9e8505b2c4ad5ec0e8_u6m6ikky8.pdf
- University of Wisconsin, Madison. (n.d.). *What is edTPA?* Retrieved from <http://careers.education.wisc.edu/tpa/about.cfm>
- Vander Ark, T. (2009). *Private capital and public education: Toward quality at scale.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Walton Family Foundation. (2012). *Education reform.* Retrieved from <http://www.waltonfamilyfoundation.org/educationreform>

Tina Jacobowitz, Department of Early Childhood, Elementary and Literacy Education, Montclair State University; Michelle Kovacs, Department of Early Childhood, Elementary and Literacy Education, Montclair State University; Nicholas Michelli, Ph.D. Program in Urban Education, City University of New York.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tina Jacobowitz, Department of Early Childhood, Elementary and Literacy Education, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ 07043. E-mail: jacobowitzt@mail.montclair.edu