

# CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Collaboration | Academic Excellence | Research | Ethical Practice



[www.coedu.usf.edu](http://www.coedu.usf.edu)

# University of South Florida

## College of Education

4202 E. Fowler Avenue  
Tampa, FL 33620  
(813) 974-3400

**Vasti Torres, PhD**  
Dean

**Diane Yendol-Hoppey, PhD**  
Associate Dean for Educator Preparation

**Gladis Kersaint, PhD**  
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research

**Kristine Y. Hogarty, PhD**  
Director of Assessment

**Pam Magasich**  
NCATE Coordinator  
*Primary Contact Person:*  
[pmagasic@coedu.usf.edu](mailto:pmagasic@coedu.usf.edu)  
813 974-8777



## Table of Contents

<b>Mission and Vision for the College of Education.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Mission.....	3
<b>Educator Preparation Unit Philosophy, Purposes, Goals .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Philosophy.....	4
Purposes .....	4
Unit Goals .....	5
Dispositions.....	8
Professional Commitments .....	10
<b>Knowledge Base .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional, State and Institutional Standards ..</b>	<b>47</b>
Alignment of Professional Standards with USF Conceptual Framework .....	48
Alignment of ISTE Standards with COEDU Technology Outcome .....	50
<b>The System by which Candidate Performance is Regularly Assessed.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Conceptual Framework Chronology.....</b>	<b>54</b>

## **Mission and Vision for the College of Education**

### **Vision**

- The USF College of Education envisions itself as a leader in regional, national and international education. Leadership in Education encompasses:
- Academic excellence
- Research, scholarship, and inquiry that renews the educational process
- Collaboration that serves communities, institutions and individuals,
- Preparation that builds on academic excellence, scholarship, clinical practice and collaboration and that contributes to a just and productive society.

### **Mission**

To fulfill its vision, the College of Education is committed to:

- Offering challenging learning opportunities in a supportive and diverse environment;
- Creating and supporting research, scholarship, and inquiry in education;
- Preparing the next generation of educators, scholars, and leaders for P-12 and the professoriate through exemplary undergraduate and graduate degree programs;
- Serving the community through collaborative relationships, and,
- Working with schools, agencies, and communities to offer programs that prepare professionals who work competently, collaboratively, and ethically to improve educational outcomes for all.

The College of Education (COEDU) vision and mission are consistent with the vision and mission of USF as a pre-eminent research university with state, national, and global impact, dedicated to an interdisciplinary, learner-centered environment, research and scientific discovery and embracing innovation. The COEDU contributes to the institutional mission and vision through its participation in institutional strategic planning. Consistent with the university strategic priorities, the COEDU has identified four strategic initiatives that will contribute toward the fulfillment of both the COEDU vision and mission, and the USF vision and mission. These initiatives focus on:

- Research and innovation
- Promoting excellence in graduate and undergraduate programs
- Promoting e-learning
- Expanding local and global engagement

The COEDU has identified specific actions within these initiatives that will increase federal funding for research and maximize faculty scholarly productivity, enhance technology infrastructure for on-line learning, enable us to be more selective in those we admit to programs of study, enhance student services, and promote and build upon the college's extensive school/community partnerships.

## **Educator Preparation Unit Philosophy, Purposes, Goals**

The mission and vision for the College of Education, reflecting the ideals and goals embodied in the vision and mission of the University of South Florida, informs the conceptual framework for the Educator Preparation Unit. The framework is representative of both initial and advanced teacher preparation programs and advanced programs that prepare other professionals for P-12 schools. The major themes reflected in candidate outcomes and dispositions are summarized by the acronym **CARE**: **C**ollaboration, **A**cademic excellence, **R**esearch, **E**thical practice.

### **Philosophy**

Competent education professionals use their academic preparation and research skills to achieve positive outcomes among the diverse populations they serve. Ethical education professionals are advocates for social change who use cultural knowledge and sensitivity, and who work in and through systems toward equal access to high quality education and services for all citizens. Collaborative education professionals demonstrate democratic values as they interact with multiple communities (districts, schools, departments, professional societies, caregivers, and policy makers) in inclusive, egalitarian ways to achieve high quality instructional and service outcomes. The knowledge base (section III below) details the research and best practices, and expands upon the philosophies that inform the unit's goals for candidates.

### **Purposes**

At the initial preparation level, our purpose is to develop educators who possess the basic professional skills, knowledge, dispositions, and ability to use information that will prepare them to provide effective instruction to diverse learners. By respecting diversity and inclusiveness, exhibiting and promoting democratic values, and using resources available within the professional community, educators can create fair and equitable learning environments and positively influence the emotional, social and academic well being of students.

At the initial preparation level, candidates develop knowledge of appropriate information sources that will allow them to remain current in the theory and practice of their field. Undergraduate inquiry develops habits of mind compatible with reflection, investigation, analysis, collaboration, life long learning, informed decision-making and continuous professional development.

At the advanced master's degree level, beyond initial educator preparation, our purpose is to offer programs that advance the knowledge of educators through examination of classroom life and related theories. Candidates in these programs are expected to develop a working knowledge of research that relates to the practices of teaching and learning by reading broadly in their fields. They are expected to be adept at taking critical stances on current issues in education and defend positions through well-articulated and substantiated arguments, relying on multiple forms of evidence to the extent possible. Additionally, we expect that master teachers will take on leadership roles in teaching and curriculum development.

Advanced programs for other school professionals support research that broadens and deepens the knowledge base that is the foundation of our academic fields, and from that base, build upon strategies and practices that facilitate human growth and learning. Combining advanced skills with ethical practices, graduates of the advanced preparation programs provide services which promote human growth and development, assess and refine programs serving the public, and provide leadership to enhance the effectiveness of education and services.

To ensure that teachers and other professional educators who graduate from the University of South Florida are prepared to be successful in the dynamic and increasingly demanding field of education, the Educator Preparation Unit has collaborated with parents, candidates, alumni, school-based professional educators, and colleagues across the university in determining what graduates must be, know and be able to do.

## Unit Goals

Unit goals are expressed as the outcomes we have established for our graduates. There are six outcome “domains” that encompass both initial and advanced preparation programs. Each domain includes:

- a rationale or explanation that informs the outcome, based on our beliefs of what it means to be an education professional,
- an outcome statement of what the USF College of Education graduate will know or be able to do.



### 1. Collaboration

Professionals are members of several communities simultaneously (districts, schools, agencies, departments, professional societies, caregivers, and policymakers). This shared membership informs practices and policies to insure the education and care of each individual. At the advanced preparation level, other school professionals must become skilled at problem-solving and conflict resolution within and among the various constituencies they serve.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Collaborate and work in partnership with schools, families, other professionals and agencies.**



## **2. Content and Professional Knowledge**

Professionals demonstrate an understanding of their respective content areas and its connection to other disciplines by providing quality instruction and services. Content knowledge is not synonymous with knowledge of how to teach that content. Teachers must integrate content knowledge with pedagogical content knowledge as well as the knowledge base that is fundamental to all education professionals that includes, at a minimum, that which incorporates (a) behavior and process of learning and the theoretical bases of human development; (b) historical and social context of schools, families and communities; (c) cultural impacts on learning; (d) impact of language on learning for non-native English speaking persons; and (e) inclusion and equity concepts in schools and community. This knowledge is critical in making real world applications of a content area accessible to a variety of learners. Education professionals in other service roles as well must integrate the knowledge base fundamental to the education and human services professions, with the knowledge base specific to their professional domain. Content and professional knowledge and expertise also assumes currency of that knowledge and expertise.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Demonstrate expertise in a common professional knowledge base and the content-specific bases of their fields and integrate content and professional knowledge into teaching and service.**

## **3. Technology**

Professionals are skilled in utilizing a variety of technologies in instruction, assessment, and service and assist learners and clients in becoming competent with technology. To do so, education professionals must be both technologically proficient and literate. They have basic technical skills to utilize hardware and software, and are familiar with the range of available information technologies and on-line information sources relevant to their field of practice. They are able to choose appropriately among available technologies and information sources to enhance instruction and service. In addition, professionals must be aware of equity issues surrounding the use of technology and access to information, and understand how socio-cultural contexts can influence attitudes about technology. Professionals utilize information technologies in their own research and professional development.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Be technologically proficient and literate professionals.**

#### **4. Reflection, Analysis and Inquiry**

Professionals make sound decisions about complex events by considering alternative theories and research perspectives, as well as their personal beliefs. Professionals continuously inquire about theory and practice. They are active consumers of scholarship, and maintain an open mind toward new theories and perspectives while analyzing the research relevant to their professional field. Teachers and other education professionals engage in productive inquiry appropriate to their field and degree. Active engagement in inquiry fosters habits of reflection and analysis and commitment to life long learning. Educational professionals assess their own practices and monitor the progress of learners and clients in ways that inform decision-making and enhance subsequent practices.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Integrate reflection, analysis, and systematic inquiry into their professional practice.**

#### **5. Ethics and Diversity**

Education professionals function in schools and agencies as advocates in culturally diverse settings. This requires self-awareness, inclusive values, and skills in critiquing cultural practices. Educators must be skilled in addressing a wide range of diverse characteristics, including exceptionalities, in their recipient populations. Ethical practice requires not only adhering to professional codes of conduct, it requires as well fostering a positive egalitarian social environment.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Engage in ethical practice and effectively integrate awareness of and sensitivity to issues of diversity and exceptionality among the populations they serve.**

## **6. Student Learning and Development**

Teachers and other school professionals create, enrich and maintain environments that provide opportunities for positive outcomes for all learners and clients. They focus on the academic, emotional, and social growth and well being of those being served and engage in the most effective professional practices as identified by current research. This includes developing and using assessments as appropriate. Teachers strive to enhance the critical, creative and reflective thinking capabilities of all learners. Achieving outcome goals requires professionals to maintain flexibility in their approaches to teaching and service. They must be able to modify and adapt instruction, service or interventions, based upon continuous assessment and monitoring of learner and client progress, and analysis of assessment data, to achieve positive outcomes among a diversity of populations.

**USF graduates will:**

- **Provide instruction, services and/or programs that contribute to positive learning and developmental outcomes.**

These outcome domains represent the knowledge and skills that faculty have identified for all graduates of the COEDU's P-12 educator preparation programs. At the individual program level, knowledge, skills, and dispositions are further defined, and assessed, in accordance with the specific expectations of that particular field.

### **Dispositions**

The faculty have identified the following candidate dispositions reflective of the “CARE” theme (Collaboration, Academic excellence, Research, Ethical practice) of the conceptual framework:

- Commitment to Collaboration
- Continuous Professional Learning
- Reflective Thinking
- Respect for Diversity
- Ethical Responsibility
- Care and Advocacy for Students

“Dispositions” are defined here as the habits of mind and commitments that lead to intentional, conscious, and voluntary patterns of behavior toward students, families, colleagues and communities. These are the habitual actions or behaviors across outcomes to which our graduates should be regularly disposed in order to be effective educators.

**Commitment to collaboration**

Education professionals must work together with their professional colleagues in schools and agencies, as well as with students, families, and communities to achieve common goals and solve problems. Collaboration is founded upon the intentional seeking out of the opinions, expertise, and knowledge of others, consideration of all points of view, and a willingness to compromise to reach common goals.

**Continuous professional learning**

To meet high standards of instruction and service, and to assist those served to achieve their full potential, education professionals must strive to increase their own knowledge and skills. They continuously improve their own practice through self-assessment, progress monitoring and consultation and collaboration with colleagues. They remain current with theory and practice in their field and with technological innovations.

**Reflective thinking**

Education professionals engage in active analysis of information and data acquired through inquiry and-practice. Reflective thinking results in careful deliberation and reasoning in making decisions and in choosing courses of action in instruction and service. Educators also critically examine the personal and social contexts in which they practice.

**Respect for diversity**

Education professionals treat all individuals equitably and fairly. Their interactions with colleagues, families, and community reflect sensitivity to diverse values, norms, and points of view. They engage in practices that promote opportunities for learning and development among the diverse array of students they serve.

**Ethical responsibility**

Education professionals are guided by a commitment to adhere to professional codes of behavior. They hold themselves to high standards of conduct in their interactions with students, colleagues, families, and the community.

**Care and advocacy for students**

Education professionals take an active interest in the physical, emotional, and intellectual health, well-being and growth of students served. They take appropriate steps to intervene when student health or well being is in jeopardy, and support and encourage students to reach their full potential.

## Professional Commitments

To fulfill our mission and facilitate candidate success in meeting expected outcomes, faculty have made the following professional commitments that inform our professional practice, our interactions with candidates and colleagues, and the design and delivery of our educator preparation programs:

- A. To the shared preparation of candidates with our professional colleagues in the field and within the university
- B. To serve the global community with an emphasis on the metropolitan setting for improving the quality of life through education, and, enhancement of our community, state, and nation through principles of academic integrity, sound management, and equal opportunity
- C. To provide opportunities for candidates to interact with families, and school- and agency-based professionals
- D. To design clinical and field experiences that support systematic reflection and inquiry into professional practice, and that provide candidates with mentoring relationships with positive professional role models
- E. To provide clinical and field experiences in different settings and with diverse student populations
- F. To academic excellence in a student-centered environment and working together to facilitate the personal growth and professional development of candidates
- G. To provide a well articulated sequence of courses and experiences in the specialization to ensure that candidates demonstrate sufficient depth of subject matter knowledge and professional knowledge
- H. To design curriculum to reflect multiple perspectives
- I. To be on the cutting edge in the use of technologies in teaching and learning, and to that end, to engage in professional development activities to develop our skills in integrating 21<sup>st</sup> century technology into the classroom.
- J. To model effective use of technology in their teaching in an effort to provide meaningful, accessible, and realistic learning opportunities for candidates
- K. To integrate the general knowledge and skill expectations of the ISTE standards into preparation programs for all school personnel
- L. To encourage candidates to continuously assess both their own and others' actions and decisions in teaching and service

- M. To encourage participation in active, exploratory learning
- N. To serve a qualified, diverse student body, and to build upon the strengths that a diverse student population provides
- O. To model professionalism and ethical practice and incorporate into programs opportunities for the examination of ethical dilemmas and issues related to diversity

The professional commitments are aligned with the conceptual framework outcome domains, as summarized in the chart on the following pages.

Professional Commitments	Unit Outcomes					
	Collaboration	Content & Professional Knowledge	Technology	Reflection, Analysis, & Inquiry	Ethics & Diversity	Student Learning & Development
Unit faculty are committed to:						
<b>A.</b> the shared preparation of candidates	✓					
<b>B.</b> service to the global community and, enhancement of our community, state, and nation	✓				✓	
<b>C.</b> provide opportunities for candidates to interact with families, and school- and agency-based professionals.	✓				✓	
<b>D.</b> design clinical and field experiences that support systematic reflection and inquiry and that provide candidates with mentoring relationships		✓		✓		✓
<b>E.</b> provide clinical and field experiences in different settings and with diverse student populations	✓				✓	✓
<b>F.</b> academic excellence in a student-centered environment and working together to facilitate the personal growth and professional development of candidates.	✓	✓				
<b>G.</b> provide a well articulated sequence of courses and experiences in the specialization.	✓	✓				
<b>H.</b> design curriculum to reflect multiple perspectives.		✓			✓	
<b>I.</b> be on the cutting edge in the use of technologies in teaching and learning		✓	✓			
<b>J.</b> model effective use of technology in teaching		✓	✓			
<b>K.</b> integrate the general knowledge and skill expectations of the ISTE standards		✓	✓			✓
<b>L.</b> encourage candidates to reflect continuously upon both their own and others' actions and decisions				✓		✓
<b>M.</b> encourage participation in active, exploratory learning.				✓		

Professional Commitments	Unit Outcomes					
Unit faculty are committed to:	Collaboration	Content & Professional Knowledge	Technology	Reflection, Analysis, & Inquiry	Ethics & Diversity	Student Learning & Development
N. serve a qualified, diverse student body.					✓	
O. model professionalism and ethical practice					✓	

## **Knowledge Base**

All professions have generally accepted attributes and have developed their unique knowledge bases. Members of a profession have a responsibility to become expert in and remain well informed about the contents of the knowledge base unique to their profession (Good, 1990; Kincheloe, 1991).

The knowledge base for professional educators has been used as the basis for the six outcomes and informs the dispositions expected of, pre-service and in-service teachers, other school practitioners, and faculty in the Educator Preparation Unit. It is based on a body of literature that has been broadened to support the academic shift towards outcome-based instruction and assessment. The knowledge base today articulates the emphasis being placed on issues of diversity, technology and student learning in contemporary education. The outcomes and dispositions also reflect the clearly articulated state expectations for both pre-service and in-service teaching practice and student achievement, and professional practice for other school professionals, and are aligned with the standards of our professional learned societies. Faculty recognize the interrelatedness of these outcomes and dispositions. Together, they are reflective of the complexity of teaching and service in today's increasingly diverse schools. Additionally, the knowledge base reflects the commitment of faculty to *educate*, rather than merely *train*, teachers and other school professionals. The current knowledge base is at the heart of curricular decisions, college policy and program structures, and informs our dispositions and actions as educators of school professionals.

Teaching is increasingly recognized for the complex task that it is. Teacher preparation must encompass not only pedagogical and content training, but also an emphasis on cognition, reflection and personal perspectives and cause and effect between teaching and learning. (Carter & Anders, 1996; Randolph & Evertson, 1994; Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Teaching is never a straightforward occupation or routine job without texture and emotion. The aim of teacher preparation programs is not simply the candidate's acquisition of "expert teaching strategies" (Hiebert, et al. 2007, p. 49). Preparation programs must balance developing pedagogical skill with the development of analytical skills and dispositions that enable teachers to develop and test cause and effect hypotheses about teaching and learning (Hiebert, et al. 2007; Bransford, et al., 2005).

The development of the analytical skills and dispositions to critically examine one's practice, as well as the larger socio-political and cultural contexts of education is central to the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. These skills and dispositions are the hallmark of the "professionally prepared" educator (Liston, et al. 2009). The professionally prepared educator is grounded not only in the theory and best practices of their profession, but also in the historical, cultural, socio-political knowledge base and debates of education and schooling. This professional knowledge is the foundation upon which educators can develop the critical perspectives to challenge prevailing practices, policies and beliefs (Liston, et al., 2009; Cochran Smith, 2004).

## **1. Collaboration**

Education professionals are members of several learning communities. They work together within P-12 schools to support student learning and development. Another learning community is created as educators work in concert with families and care-givers. Education professionals also work within the larger community with social, recreational, and health and human service agencies. Finally, P-12 education professionals partner with colleges and universities to train future educators, provide professional development and advanced training for practicing professionals, and to investigate and find solutions for school-based problems. Collaboration occurs within and among communities as members work together, share responsibilities, and support each other's efforts in improving educational outcomes. Collaboration is founded upon the intentional seeking out of the opinions, expertise, and knowledge of others, consideration of all points of view, and a willingness to compromise to reach common goals.

Whether real or imagined, the gap between theory and practice in teacher preparation programs creates a need for blending university based content with classroom experiences and reflection that better explores the daily challenges and responsibilities faced by teachers. To do this, university personnel must be able to personally conceptualize the work of teachers in today's schools and assist candidates in making meaning of their site-based experiences. School-university partnerships can narrow the gap between the university and P-12 contexts by ensuring better alignments between university based coursework and actual practice (Clift & Brady, 2005).

Student teaching (culminating internship) is viewed as an experience during which candidates organize their content and pedagogical knowledge, draw upon their clinical skills and views of teaching, and develop a personal style of practice that is workable, defensible, and ethical. This moves student teaching away from the apprenticeship model, which implies learning the art of teaching as demonstrated by the cooperating teacher (Bunting, 1988; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). Recent research has pointed to "a more complex conceptualization of the interactive and social nature of developing one's practice" (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 325). Just as discussions regarding the sequence, timing, and duration of field experiences must occur internally within the college faculty to insure alignment with coursework, a clear explication and mutual understanding of the goals of field experience must also be developed through school-university partnerships that can raise the level of dialogue beyond course expectations and evaluation systems.

The shift toward increased accountability and performance-based assessment necessitates more collaboration between colleges of education and local school districts to improve clinical experiences, establish professional development schools or partnership schools and create processes for increasing the involvement of PK-12 personnel in the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. Darling Hammond (2008) notes the importance of serious clinical experience to help preservice candidates make connections between university coursework and practice. Such experiences must include access to high quality modeling and strategies, and multiple opportunities for practice. Increased accountability has also necessitated a stronger collaboration between education faculty and colleagues in arts & sciences in the face of rising expectations for teachers to have greater expertise in their content area. The preparation of

effective teachers is a shared responsibility among faculty in the College of Education and College of Arts and Science.

Schools function as part of the larger community. Clinical practice directly involves the candidate in communication and collaboration not only with students, teachers, staff, and families, but with community agencies, business, and service organizations as well. Candidates learn about services and resources available in the community and how to integrate services and resources into the school setting (National Association of School Psychologists, 2000; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002).

Boyle-Baise and McIntyre (2008) and Sleeter (2008) suggest university - school - community partnerships as a model for providing preservice educators with opportunities for service learning within the community. When service learning experiences take place in diverse settings, these experiences can help candidates develop an understanding and appreciation for the communities and students that they will serve, as well as help candidates confront stereotypes and preconceived notions about families and children from cultural backgrounds different from their own (Cooper, 2007).

The College of Education ensures that candidates have multiple field experiences and clinical practice in diverse settings with opportunities for observation, analysis, reflection and feedback. In addition, the College offers a number of service learning courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels in which candidates provide a service or conduct a research project that is related to the course learning goals. In all cases, the experiences are planned collaboratively with a community partner and meet a stated community need.

A critical responsibility for candidates is to seek purposefully to understand the lives of the children they teach. This process is inextricably linked with the children's home lives. Education professionals at all levels need to view families and communities as partners in the education of children. School environments can be reshaped by two-way communication and joint problem solving. Home-school collaboration establishes an attitude that is characterized by a sharing of common goals between parents and educators, mutual respect, and a willingness to work together to improve educational outcomes for children (Christenson, 1995;. Glanz, 2006).

Research reveals that effective schools act on the knowledge that student success can be increased through the development of connections between the school and families (Swap, 1992; Glanz, 2006). Collaboration and partnership enhance decision making, governance, and advocacy and provide avenues for coordinating resources and services (Glickman, 1993; Hooper-Brian & Lawson, 1994; Kagan, 1991; Swap, 1993; Glanz, 2006).

Establishing effective home-school collaboration is a complex process that must overcome many barriers for both parents and educators. Barriers for parents include feelings of inadequacy, lack of trust, prior bad experiences, and limited knowledge of schooling processes. Barriers for educators include poor communication patterns with parents, having negative attitudes towards parents, lack of commitment to parental involvement, and a lack of partnership skills (Liontos, 1992).

Some of these barriers are a result of cultural attitudes and values of both parents and educators (Tutweiler, 2005). Our schools are becoming increasingly diverse, and are witnessing a large influx of immigrant populations (Banks, 2007). Educators must find ways to navigate unfamiliar cultural and linguistic territory to empower parents to become partners in the educational process. To effectively communicate with families and communities, all education professionals must understand the socio-cultural and linguistic contexts in which a school operates. They must develop community knowledge (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008) and cultural competence. Attitudes and values towards education, educators, authority, and power relationships are influenced by factors of culture, economics, language, or immigration status. Similarly, educators must also be aware of how their own socio-economic and cultural background and experiences influence their attitudes toward families and communities (Sleeter, 2008; Cooper, 2007; Trumball, et al., 2007).

Lambert (1998) suggests that “skillful collaboration” requires competencies that are not generally part of educators’ traditional training. School culture often still reflects a traditional, hierarchical structure, with the principal in charge of the school and working with parents and the community, and the teacher in charge of the classroom. Collaboration requires the surrender of some control, and being open to others’ perspectives. Involving parents can be threatening to educators who have traditionally considered themselves “experts” in the schooling process (Conzemius and O’Neill, 2001; Winn Tutweiler, 2005). As Oakes, et al. (2002, p. 230) note “...the idea of expert needs to be broadly construed to include not only guiding teachers, colleagues, and university faculty, but also parents, community members, and the students themselves.” (Tutweiler, 2005) identifies three skill areas that educators must have to support family-school-community partnerships: communicating with parents and communities in ways that recognize their different, yet mutually supportive roles in student learning; building upon the diversity of experiences students bring to school; and assessing the needs of the community as a basis for working collaboratively with families and communities to address those needs.

Building collaboration requires leadership capacity – defined as the broad-based participation of all stakeholders – administrators, teachers, staff, families, communities, and students (Lambert, 1998). Epstein (1992) believes that the key to developing successful collaboration with parents begins with helping both educators and parents understand the family's obligations regarding the health and safety of their children. Schools must then take responsibility for establishing effective systems of communication from school-to-home and develop and encourage the options for home-to-school communication (Epstein, 1992; Kagan & Cohen, 1997; Glanz 2006). The final piece of the puzzle is the effective use of parent volunteers in the school (Iverson, 2003).

As school leaders, principals establish the climate, and the mechanisms by which parents become involved in their child’s schooling. They are proactive in reaching out to the community and identifying opportunities for collaboration. Leaders must develop skills in creating and sustaining positive community relations and in working with the media. (Fiore, 2007). Leaders must be able to participate in the political and policy making arenas. (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002; Florida Leadership Standards, 2005).

Effective collaborations can be formed when colleges seriously embrace the business of school restructuring and become partners in collaborative ventures with schools. Usually housed in partnership structures or professional development schools, these ventures recognize the cloudy history of university/school collaborations when the university voice usually dominated the interactions (Goodlad, 1990). Equitable and effective partnerships establish a two way learning environment that recognizes the knowledge and strengths that both partners bring to the process. More authentic responses are found when P-12 educators and community members with experiential knowledge are directly involved in analyses and solutions (Suarez-Balacar, et al., 2005).

Both institutions of higher education and schools benefit from collaborative inquiry in the form of action research focused on school/community improvement. Such inquiry is an opportunity for colleges and universities to form positive relationships with schools and communities. It is an avenue for faculty to stay current with real life problems in schools, as well as a mechanism for faculty research and publication. It also offers opportunities for graduate students to hone research skills while assisting with data gathering and analysis. (Gordon, 2008). The most meaningful learning takes place within the context of daily practice, rather than through externally provided, occasional “professional development” activities. (Chung Wei & Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009; Easton, 2008). In that regard, collaborative action research builds capacity within schools in the form of professional learning for school-based personnel; it empowers school professionals with increased capacity for problem solving, and hence, the greater ability to create change (Gordon, 2008). School leaders play an important role in fostering collaboration by ensuring the time, space, and resources needed for collaborative work among school professionals. Most importantly, they can build a culture of trust and open communication (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006; Hord, 2009; Chung Wei & Darling Hammond, et al., 2009).

We have sought to redesign our structures with more parity; more long-term vision; new roles for teachers, university personnel, district stakeholders; and a shared responsibility for both higher education and schools to co-create the knowledge base that informs practice (Paul, Epanchin, Rosselli, & Duchnowski, 1996; Su, 1999). This proactive response to school reform is resulting in a new job description for unit faculty, such as liaison roles to schools (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996). Faculty in these roles attend school meetings, serve on site-based management teams, and engage in informal visits with teachers both individually and in small groups. A unit faculty member's presence in schools is not always an easy path. The disparate range of roles expected can include that of cheerleader, translator, mediator, leader, broker, maverick, entrepreneur, and even counselor (Rosselli, Perez, Piersall, & Pantridge, 1993; Simmons, Crowell, Konecki, Duffield, & Rackliffe, 1999; Troen, Boles, & Larkin, 1995; Bullough, Birrell, Young, Clark, Erickson, & Earle, 1999). In addition, they must be well grounded in educational theory, have experience and comfort level for working in applied settings, be able to cope with the messiness of work in schools, have a broad world-view, and draw from a well-developed set of interpersonal skills (Troen, Boles, & Larkin, 1995; Walters, 1995).

As a “community engaged” research university, as designated by the Carnegie Foundation, USF is committed to scholarly and pedagogical activities that are carried out in collaboration with, and with potential benefit for, communities in the university’s service area. This commitment is reflected in the university’s Strategic Plan 2007-2012. Expectations for faculty promotion and tenure take into account participation in community engaged scholarship. the USF Collaborative for Children, Families, and Communities has been instrumental in mobilizing the University’s community involvement (Esring & Jetson, et al., 2007). The collaborative brings together faculty, students, researchers, community service organizations and residents. It provides grants to faculty who collaborate with community partners on community-engaged research. It also provides service-learning mini-grants to foster curricular engagement. The COEDU faculty are regularly engaged in community based participatory research that equitably involves all partners in the research process combining knowledge with action to improve school/community outcomes.

## **2. Content and Professional Knowledge**

Educators need professional knowledge about the role of schools within society, professional knowledge about how young children and adolescents learn, content and other specific knowledge within their areas of expertise, and pedagogical content knowledge and other expertise-specific practice knowledge for teachers and other educators.

First, educators need to know the broader social context in which schools operate: the historical development of schooling and education, the relationship between culture and education, an understanding of schools as organizations within a broader society, and key debates over inclusion and equity in schools and community. Liston, Whitcomb, and Borko (2009) explain how this background is critical to educator preparation as education, beyond technical socialization: “[W]e have serious concerns when a singular framework is offered to candidates as the sole lens through which to understand learning, schooling, and the larger social and political context. When few or no other options are considered, we train and inculcate—we aren’t educating” (p. 107). In contrast, when social foundations are a central part of educator preparation, graduates have the essential tools for a professional career. The Council for Social Foundations of Education (1996) described this professional knowledge as an important part of educators’ “developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education” (n.p.), the humanities and social-science perspectives that comprise the social foundations of education.

Second, educators need to be solidly grounded in knowledge of how children, adolescents, and young adults develop and learn in school and other educational settings. Such knowledge should include context-level forces that impinge broadly on human development and learning as well as person-level psychological factors that influence the learning process at any given point in time. The American Psychological Association (APA) has articulated 14 specific learner-centered principles that underscore the active and reflective nature of learning and are deemed critical to promoting effective learning. The principles are organized under four conceptual categories: cognitive and metacognitive factors, motivational and affective factors, developmental and social factors, and individual difference factors (APA Board of Educational Affairs, 1997). While these psychological principles of learning apply to all learners, to maximize learning, educators must be sensitive to individual differences in learning and development as well as group differences associated with linguistic, cultural, and social backgrounds (APA Board of Educational Affairs, 1997). When educational psychology is a central part of educator preparation, graduates enter the field ready to apply their understandings of developmental and learning processes to both the design of instruction and the evaluations of learning outcomes. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD, 2006) explains the importance of this professional knowledge for educators: “An [educator’s] main role involves more than helping students merely acquire content and information. Rather, it involves helping students develop the social, emotional, and ethical qualities that will enable them to have success in school and success in later life,” (p. 31). Thus, a deep understanding of developmental and learning processes grounded in the best traditions of theory and research is critical for the preparation of future educators.

This need for perspective and knowledge of foundational-area research is essential in the education of English language learners, and it requires the deft and thoughtful combination of both social and psychological foundations of education in educator preparation. At the forefront of demographic change, Florida needs education professionals who know both the sociocultural and linguistic research literature bases that address needs of English language learners. Students who face the greatest disadvantages and who are most at risk often have the least access to effective educators, educators who possess the knowledge and skills discussed above (Rowland & Allen, 2007).

The same knowledge of student development, learning theory, behavior, and instructional methodologies is central as well to the professional practice of other school professionals in providing counseling and psychological services (National Association of School Psychologists, 2000). School principals must be able to translate relevant theories and knowledge about teaching and learning, diversity, and social and organizational change into strategies and policies that will support student and educator success (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002).

Beyond the professional knowledge that USF expects of its educator candidates, preparation must insure that educator candidates develop a rich understanding of their specific area of expertise and how it is connected to the curriculum and other school responsibilities (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002). Specifically with regard to classroom teaching, candidates must know the subject matter they teach, how content in the subject matter is organized, and how it is connected to and applied to other areas of the curriculum. In addition, as Shulman (1986) argues, teachers must have the skills necessary to explain why the content is worth knowing and how it connects to other disciplines. Unit faculty in the College of Education recognize that the responsibility for developing content knowledge of educator candidates is shared with our colleagues in the College of Arts and Science. The faculty also understand that the continuing development of subject matter standards by both the learned societies and state guidelines such as the Sunshine State Standards requires collaboration between the colleges.

In addition to content knowledge, effective educators must also have a repertoire of technical skills. In the classroom, teachers must have a range of pedagogical content knowledge and the ability to present content in ways that promote student understanding, conceptual thinking and active engagement (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Schacter & Thum, 2004). Educators in other roles must also have technical skills tied to their areas of expertise. The faculty in the College of Education understand that the joint wisdom about teaching, learning, students and content, referred to by Shulman (1986) as pedagogical content knowledge, is the hallmark of accomplished educators and reaches beyond the classroom.

The College of Education is committed to preparing candidates who are well grounded in the content specific knowledge of their field, as well in the professional knowledge base common to all educators, and who are able to integrate content and professional knowledge to provide effective instruction and service to a variety of learners. The College ensures that all professional preparation programs are aligned with state and national content and professional standards. Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs gain an understanding of developmental and learning processes through required course work and assignments that focus

on the developmental and educational psychology of children and adolescents. Candidates as well complete coursework in the social foundations of education. At the advanced level, the College offers programs that allow experienced teachers to further develop their content and pedagogical expertise.

In response to the growing population of English language learners in the P-12 schools, teacher candidates in the unit who will be the primary language arts providers (elementary education, special education, and English and foreign language education) earn the state's ESOL endorsement. Through specialized ESOL courses and ESOL content infused into other program coursework and related field experiences, candidates are grounded in the theory and methodologies of teaching limited English proficient (LEP) students, second language acquisition, literacy development, and cross-cultural communication and understanding. Other teacher candidates, as well as candidates for other school professional roles take an ESOL survey course to better prepare them to provide instruction and service for LEP students.

### **3. Technology**

The landscape of what constitutes the technological knowledge base of educator preparation is continuing to evolve at a rapid pace, creating challenges for both P-12 school professionals, and higher education faculty.

In 2008, the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) revised its National Education Technology Standards for all teachers, and in 2009, revised its National Education Technology Standards for Administrators. Both sets of new standards focus heavily on *digital* technologies and learning.

Borko, Whitcomb, & Liston (2009) describe the distinction between “analogue” technologies, such as the Internet, e-mail, on-line publications and video, that have become generally well integrated into schooling, and digital technologies, characterized by shared workspaces, virtual worlds, sizable information storage capacity, portability, access and real-time participation anytime, anywhere. Dede (2007) points out that

*Past visions of technology in teaching and learning largely reflect using [technology] as a means of increasing the effectiveness of traditional instructional approaches: enhancing productivity through tools such as word processors, aiding communication through channels such as email and threaded asynchronous discussions, and expanding access to information via web browsers and streaming video. All these have proven worthy in conventional schooling; however....none draw the full power of technology for individual and collective expression, experience, and interpretation – core life skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. (p.12)*

The opportunities for teaching and learning in the digital age, however, are often frustrated by the rapid pace at which new technologies are introduced, the inherent flaws of new and untested innovations, and frequently by the incompatibility with existing hardware and software. The challenge is for faculty to keep abreast of the changing technologies, and to identify what teachers and other school professionals need to know and be able to do to use technology to help all students learn. (Mishra & Koehler, 2008; Borko, et al., 2009). Smolin, et al. (2007) note that “the world in which we are preparing our students is shifting, and requires that we emphasize different literacies, habits of mind, and skills...” (p. 5) Mishra and Koehler (2008) describe *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge* “TPACK” as the intersection of content, pedagogy, and technology. It is the knowledge teachers need to effectively integrate technology into instruction and includes:

*...an understanding of the representation of concepts using technologies; pedagogical techniques that use technologies in constructive ways to teach content; knowledge of what makes concepts difficult or easy to learn and how technology can help redress some of the problems that students face; knowledge of students’ prior knowledge and theories of epistemology; and knowledge of how technologies can be used to build on existing knowledge and to develop new epistemologies or strengthen old ones (pp17-18).*

The rapid pace of change makes “technological knowledge” a moving target, if understood only as knowing how to use a particular piece of hardware or software. As an indicator of modeling digital age work and learning, the National Education Technology Standards suggest that teachers “demonstrate fluency in technology systems and the transfer of current knowledge to new technologies and situations” (NETS for Teachers, 2008). Just as content knowledge is more than just knowing *facts* about a particular field – it is a deeper understanding of *concepts* - the why and the how, and the meaning in a larger context, so too, technological knowledge must be viewed in the broader sense of understanding the concepts, opportunities, limitations and potential impacts of technology.

*Technologies often come with their own imperatives that constrain the content that has to be covered and the nature of possible representations. These decisions have a ripple effect by defining, or in other ways, constraining, instructional moves and other pedagogical decisions.* (Mishra & Koehler, 2006, p.1025)

Teachers must be both technologically proficient and literate in order to make informed pedagogical choices enabling them to “use technologies in constructive ways” to transmit content and achieve the desired learning outcome.

School leaders responsible for making decisions about resource allocations are similarly challenged by the rapidly evolving digital environment. School leaders must not only keep abreast of current technology options and evaluate their effectiveness, but must also anticipate how technologies are evolving and the impact on existing infrastructure. They must make choices that support teaching, learning and school operations today and in the future. Developing and implementing a school technology plan with often limited resources requires strategic investment in technologies that will not be obsolete in the near future. (Donahoo, et al. 2006; Borko et al., 2009; FL Principal Leadership Standards, 2005)

Technological literacy entails as well the educator’s ability to critically evaluate the appropriateness of the electronic information sources and content related to their discipline for both personal use in the conduct of professional responsibilities, and for use by students in the classroom or within the context of counseling and psychological support services (Harvey & Carlson, 2003). Teachers can support students in their learning by helping them to develop the skills necessary to critically evaluate information and its sources (Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, 2004; Berson & VanFossen, 2008). Berson & Van Fossen (2008) suggest that purposeful instruction in “cyberliteracy” fosters “dispositions and skills to function as technologically fluent and engaged citizens who constructively contribute to our digitally mediated ways of being and learning” (p. 219).

As educators use technologies as assessment tools for both direct evaluation of students, and as a vehicle for data collection and analysis, they must evaluate the available hardware and software, choosing methods most appropriate for the purpose of the assessment, the student(s) to be assessed, and how and by whom the resulting data will be used. Within the classroom, Niess (2008) suggests that the method of assessment must match the method of instruction. The use of technology as a pedagogical tool necessitates the use of technology as an assessment tool. Niess further suggests that

*[A]pproaches that apply technology to teaching and learning must be accounted for when applying technology to the assessment of what is learned and how that learning is known and displayed....as preservice teachers learn about the various assessments, they must be engaged in a careful consideration of the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments in reflecting what students learn as they learn with technology.. (pp. 245, 246.)*

Assessment as a means of demonstrating accountability related to local, state, and national standards, or as a diagnostic for psychological or academic counseling and intervention requires educators to consider the *impact* of the assessment method on assessment outcomes. In using technology-based assessment, Camara and Lane (2006) point out that

*Both measurement and equity issues need to be considered, including the effect of test delivery (computer versus paper) on the inferences that can be drawn, the relationship between the delivery mode and the performance of different subgroups, and the relationship between delivery mode and computer experience. (p.39)*

The digital age has changed the nature of social interaction, by making possible communication among large groups of people without barriers of time and location. The learning environment is no longer physically confined within the walls of the school. The cyber environment presents new ethical and legal challenges and concerns for teachers, administrators, and other education professionals in establishing and maintaining a positive learning environment. Berson & Berson (2008) note that “curricular approaches to cybersafety must be fully integrated into the school content” (p. 223). Educators must promote appropriate etiquette, responsible social interactions, and critical decision making skills related to the use of digital technologies (NETS for Teachers, 2008; NETS for Administrators, 2009; Berson & Berson, et al., 2008). Too easily, inappropriate or inaccurate content, as well as false or misleading information about an individual or group of individuals can be quickly disseminated, with negative consequences for social, emotional and academic growth and development, as well as safety. The school-yard bully has become the cyber-bully, requiring a new set of preventions and interventions on the part of teachers, school administrators, counselors and psychologists to ensure students’ emotional and psychological growth and well-being (Trolley, et al., 2008; Merrell, et al., 2008; Tettegah, et al., 2006; Berson & Berson, et al., 2008). Legal and ethical issues also arise with regard to confidentiality and security of information as a result of technologies increasingly being used for record keeping.

While digital age technologies have made socializing, teaching, and learning possible anytime, anywhere, they have not yet made these interactions possible for everyone, everywhere. Inequities in access to technology resources and the knowledge needed to use them continue to exist. The digital divide has not been conquered. Monahan (2008) points out that in

*[D]iscourses of the digital divide, a focus on ‘universal access’ tends to deflect attention away from persistent social and economic inequalities, modes of technology use (or lack of use) in the classroom, and degrees of existing information expertise on the part of target populations who are constructed as ‘information-poor’ (p. 99).*

As our graduates take on professional roles in schools, they will be confronted by the realities of these inequities, and by the varying socio-cultural attitudes regarding the use of technology.

While it is incumbent upon educator preparation programs to provide candidates with the knowledge and skills to effectively use 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies as tools for teaching and learning, ultimately, what educators know and can do with regard to technology will be tempered by the realities in the schools and in the lives of the P-12 populations they serve. (Pellegrino, et al., 2007).

The College of Education is committed to best practices and research that support the preparation of school professionals who can effectively use 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies. The College provides a variety of resources that help candidates and faculty integrate technology into professional practice. The Florida Center for Instructional Technology located in the COEDU, staffed by college faculty and graduate students and supports the Laptop Initiative, and the i-Teach Lounge. Other resources include the e-portfolio, USF's i-Tunes university, and the "XRKade" Interactive Fitness Research Lab.

The COEDU has initiated technology training and support for faculty. A College Technology Action Group (TAG) advises the dean on issues related to technology and teaching. Increasingly, faculty model the use of technology in their practice both as an instructional tool and a productivity tool. Currently, faculty annual reporting university-wide is done on-line. The College offers several degree programs completely on-line, with on-line classes an option in a number of "traditionally" delivered programs. The use of technology to deliver instruction impacts the work of faculty by often requiring more time for on-line course development, and a different set of technology and pedagogical skills than many faculty are accustomed to. This has necessitated professional development support, as well as new methods for evaluating faculty who deliver on-line instruction. A Distance Learning Subcommittee of TAG is dedicated to identifying opportunities and resources for the professional development of faculty who provide instruction on-line, as well as alternative means of faculty evaluation.

#### **4.Reflection, Analysis, and Inquiry**

There is strong evidence that engaging teachers in inquiry is essential if teachers are to become lifelong learners. Teacher research projects can help teachers become reflective practitioners (Hoffman, Reed, & Rosenbluth, 1997; Zeichner 1999), become owners of research, and engage in greater levels of reflection about their own practices (Hollingsworth, Noffke, Walker, & Winter, 1997). An inquiry orientation moves teachers beyond reliance on routine and efficiency, enabling them to adapt to innovation, new situations and new challenges (Bransford & Derry, et al., 2005).

We believe the graduate programs in the unit can help inservice teachers become skilled at systematic intentional inquiry (Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1990, p.83), and members of a continuing learning community (NBPTS, 2002). Such inquiry develops in teachers the ability to learn *from* teaching, rather than *for* teaching (Darling Hammond & Hammerness, 2005). This focus assists teachers' efforts to understand their own practice, to develop a wider repertoire of teaching methods (McCutcheon & Jung, 1990; Sardo-Brown, 1992), to become better informed about their craft and the teaching field, and to see their role as an educator outside the immediate context of their classroom (Bennett, 1993; Cardelle-Elawar, 1993). Ultimately, it is hoped that inservice teachers will see themselves as master professionals committed to leadership in teacher and school development (Bullough & Gitlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Chung Wei & Darling-Hammond, et.al., 2009). The College's advanced programs for teachers provide coursework and experiences that develop greater pedagogical and content expertise, as well as develop knowledge and skills in research design and analysis, the application of research to classroom settings, and the analysis of current policies and trends in the field of specialization.

Preservice teachers also benefit from action research and assignments in the applied context of their field-experience by encouraging them to consider their role as proactive change agents and motivating them to develop problem-solving attributes that will be needed in their teaching (Bullough, 1991; Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Altrichter & Feldman, et. al, 2008). When teachers engage in action research, they have shown that they “can make an important contribution to the knowledge base of their profession” by “developing new theories about their practice, including a critique of its educational and social contexts” (Altrichter & Feldman, et. al, 2008, p. 6). Pre-service and in-service teachers, who have developed an image of themselves as a researcher with an eye towards improving their craft, will have simultaneously incorporated many of the characteristics associated with the reflective practitioner (Clift, Houston, & Pugach, 1991).

For teacher candidates, the influence of fifteen years of schooling and the beliefs they bring to the teacher education programs has the potential for serious conflict with the concept of teachers being reflective practitioners who lead their students toward becoming problem solvers. Teacher preparation programs must therefore help teacher candidates acquire the skill of teacher reflectivity that will enable them to critically examine teaching through continuous decision making before, during, and after classroom instruction (Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Posner, 1996; Hiebert, et al. 2007; Bransford & Derry, et al., 2005)

Conzemius & O'Neill (2001) observe that such reflectivity instills in the teacher an increased confidence in their methods and approaches. They further observe:

*...the greatest sense of focus, direction, and vibrant energy residing classrooms where the teachers (1) purposefully and intentionally link their plans to standards, expectations and goals; (2) review their student performance each day and week through classroom-based assessments and personal observations; and (3) constantly make instructional improvements based on these reflections. (p.15)*

As Schon's (1987) seminal work on reflection confirms, what teacher candidates learn about teaching while participating in teacher preparation programs depends on what they already have learned elsewhere (their schema), their pre-existing beliefs and dispositions toward teaching, and their ability to reflect on the significance of a teaching event for concurrent and future learning experiences. In *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task force on Teaching as a Profession (1986), a challenge to teacher education is offered:

*...students... must be active learners, busily engaged in the process of bringing new knowledge and new ways of knowing to bear on a widening range of increasingly difficult problems. The focus of schooling must shift from teaching to learning, from the passive acquisition of facts and routine to the active application of ideas to problems. This transition makes the role of the teacher more important, not less. ...teachers must think for themselves... and render critical judgment. (p. 25)*

As noted in the discussion of student learning and development, teachers must develop skills to analyze the complex cause and effect relationships between teaching and learning (Hiebert, et al. 2007; Bransford & Derry, et al., 2005). To that end, candidates have multiple opportunities through performance-based assessments and field experiences to implement lessons, reflect upon and analyze the results, and revise their teaching.

The use of teaching cases further develops prospective teachers' capacity to reflect on their practices (Shulman, 1992). The use of authentic dilemmas poses opportunities for teacher candidates to consider numerous and sometimes competing solutions within the context of both peer and faculty support. Through case studies, candidates learn to apply theoretical knowledge to real world examples (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005). Faculty who use case studies can also further identify areas of confusion, misunderstanding, and frustration when they use examples that candidates have written (Merseeth, 1996). Cases also assist in-service teachers as they consider controversial issues in education, avenues for widening their own teaching repertoire, and as they realize the potential of their role as an educator in the broader community. This emphasis on reflection is an essential part of initial and continued professional growth as mirrored by the NBPTS proposition Four (NBPTS, 2002).

Liston et.al (2009) suggest that "Professionally prepared teachers should learn how to inquire into as well as voice their understandings of students, learning, schools, and the varied cultural contexts of schooling" (p.107). Increasingly, the emphasis on accountability through high stakes testing has resulted in reflection as a "technique to evaluate the achievement of prespecified

outcomes” (Liston, et. al, 2009, p.109). Reflection as part of professional inquiry must be conceived not only as a means to the specific, measurable end – i.e. improved student learning, higher test scores – it is also the means by which “to examine and explore the variety of educational ends and values as well as our personal engagements” (Liston, et. al, 2009, p. 109). The all too common view of educator preparation as a utilitarian endeavor, in which the prospective teacher is trained on the job with a few instructional and management techniques, runs contrary to the notion of a “professionally prepared” educator. Institutions of higher education can, and must, guide prospective educators in a process of inquiry and reflection that engages them in examining personal, cultural, and socio-political contexts of education and schooling. The professionally prepared educator critically examines and challenges prevailing practices, policies and beliefs.(Liston, et al., 2009; Cochran Smith, 2004). When teachers have this capacity, they “have the capacity to challenge students to question the world around them including issues in their communities, topics in the nation, problems in the world, and problematizing ways to identify interventions for these occurrences.” (Howard & Aleman, 2008, p. 167)

Inquiry and analysis are central to advanced programs that prepare other school professionals. Candidates at this level acquire more sophisticated knowledge of pertinent research, statistics, and evaluation methods and learn to apply these in their field of expertise. School professionals with responsibilities for creating, implementing and evaluating school-based policies, practices and programs must make sound research and data-based decisions. (CACREP, Standards for School Counseling, 2009; NASP, Standards for Credentialing of School Psychologists, 2000). They must reflect upon and analyze the current political, social, and cultural environment and public policies that impact schools and student learning. School leaders, for example, use information from many sources to provide impetus for important discussions and to guide decisions and actions. They must closely attend to theory, research, and successful practice to enhance judgment and improve the quality of decision-making (Schon, 1983; Sergiovanni, 2001; Miles & Frank, 2008.)

Effectively carrying out these responsibilities presupposes a commitment to continuous professional learning.

## **5. Ethics and Diversity**

### **Ethics**

Ethical conduct is central to the behaviors associated with education professionals. Ethics is an ever-evolving process requiring conscious and continuous reflection about pedagogy that enables educational professionals to be more honest with those they teach and helps them select appropriate pedagogical approaches (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). Scholarly efforts focus on multi-dimensional approaches for thinking about ethical practice. Starratt's (1994; 2004) ethics of justice, critique, and care are fundamental components to "building an ethical school." The ethic of justice requires fairness, the ethic of critique looks for barriers to fairness, and the ethic of care calls for absolute regard for the dignity of individuals. Shapiro & Stefkovich (2005) adopted the notion that unique to the education profession is a moral imperative to serve the "best interests of students" making their well-being a fundamental value for all decision making and actions. As schools and classrooms become more complex, the "ethic of community" promotes the moral responsibility to pursue the purposes of schooling as a community (Furman, 2004). The ethic of community means that administrators, teachers, school staff, students, parents, and other community members commit to the communal process of listening with respect, striving for understanding others, communicating effectively, working in teams, engaging in ongoing professional dialogue and creating forums that allow all voices to be heard.

The goal is not to identify every value necessary for ethical behavior, but instead to provide a foundation for what constitutes professionally responsible, ethical behavior. The focus is on ethical values instead of specific behaviors: advocacy, fairness, equity, social responsibility, social justice, etc. Education professionals use ethical analysis as a disciplined way of thinking (Rebore, 2001; Starratt, 1994). Gathercoal (1997, 1998) and Wolfgang (1995) espoused the belief that education professionals should create an environment that respects students' constitutional rights of freedom, justice and equality. The moral demands of schooling require educational professionals to employ ethical models as guides to action. Ethical standards are intended to guide educational professionals in carrying out the responsibilities they have to the different groups with whom they interact (Svinicki, 2002). Ethical standards applied to practice include education professionals increasing their multicultural competencies including awareness, knowledge, and skills in order to serve racially and culturally diverse students (Sue & Sue, 2008).

The faculty in the COEDU are dedicated to the enhancement of the global community and the development of education professionals that are learner- and community-centered, multiculturally competent, ethical professionals. Opportunities are provided for candidates to interact with families, and schools and agency-based professionals as well as a wealth of clinical and field experiences in different settings and with diverse student populations. Faculty strive to design and implement curricula that reflect multiple perspectives to serve a qualified and diverse student body, and above all and at all times, endeavor to model the utmost degree of professional and ethical practices set forth in the *Code of Ethics of the Education Profession in Florida*. This code is guided by three principles: the ethical commitment to the student, community, and the profession.

*Our commitment to our students:* The educational professional's primary professional concern will always be for the student and for the development of the student's potential. The educator will therefore strive for professional growth and will seek to exercise the best professional judgment and integrity.

*Our commitment to the community:* Aware of the importance of maintaining the respect and confidence of one's colleagues, students, parents, and other members of the community, the educational professional strives to achieve and sustain the highest degree of ethical conduct.

*Our commitment to the profession:* The educational professional values the worth and dignity of every person, the pursuit of truth, devotion to excellence, acquisition of knowledge, and the nurture of democratic citizenship. Essential to the achievement of these standards are the freedom to learn and to teach and the guarantee of equal opportunity for all.

## **Diversity**

Central to the notion of ethical practice is the preparation of multiculturally competent and responsive education professionals. Given the ever-changing demographics in the US, it is essential that education professionals are prepared for working with diverse student populations. According to Sue and Sue (2008), America will become a "Diversified America" in that ethnic and racial minorities will comprise the majority by 2010. Further, culturally, racially, and linguistically diverse children will be the majority in the public school system by 2020 (Hays, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, 2005; Sue & Sue, 2008). Diversity encompasses the cultural categories of race/ethnicity, religion, social class, gender, disability, and sexual orientation as well as individual differences in learning styles, exceptionalities, and age (Sue & Sue, 2008). This necessitates a conscious focus on the multicultural competencies possessed by the education professionals which require adopting the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Lee, 2008) necessary to serve the diverse student population. It is incumbent upon the education professionals to embrace the diversity that students represent in the school setting, including diverse student abilities, development, and motivation.

Culturally responsive teachers employ pedagogy that supports the achievement of all students including exploration and self-reflection on personal biases (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), recognition and incorporation of students' cultural experiences in the classroom and instruction, and establishment of positive relationships among students, families, and community members. Multiculturally competent education professionals recognize and embrace the diversity that students bring to the schools. They recognize a plethora of abilities and aptitudes that are valued differently by the community, the school, and the family. Multiculturally competent education professionals must not only be cognizant of the diversity found among students, but appreciate differences and utilize a repertoire of diverse teaching strategies to engage all learners (Hipolito-Delgado & Lee, 2007). Education professionals have a responsibility to increase their multicultural competencies in order to serve the diverse student population and to model a democratic approach to education that supports and empowers groups that have been marginalized and oppressed (Mitcham-Smith, 2007). Additionally, education professionals

facilitate the development of a sense of political efficacy, and the social action skills that help groups that have been oppressed and marginalized acquire power in non-violent ways (Sleeter, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Lastly, education professionals value and adopt advocacy (Lee, 2008) and social justice disposition to meet the challenges and opportunities of all students (Bemak & Chung, 2008).

In order to prepare education professionals to work with diverse populations, the faculty in the COEDU provide learning experiences that directly confront sociopolitical constraints (Vavrus, Walton, Kido, Diffendal, & King, 1999; Sleeter, 1996) and ask critical questions about the effects of education structures and policies on all students (Cordeiro, 1996; Giroux, 1992; Harry, 1992; Nieto, 2000; Cochran Smith, 2004). Within this context, the faculty in the COEDU have three important obligations: a commitment to graduating education professionals who understand and can apply humanities and social science perspectives to diversity and the interaction between growing diversity and place of formal schooling in society; a commitment to helping create a diverse corps of education professionals mirroring the demographics of the nation's schools and who possess skills and competencies appropriate for the diverse students in America's classrooms; and a commitment to understanding diversity at the university level through responsiveness to the learning styles and needs of diverse education professionals (Delpit, 1995; Zalaquett & Foley, et. al, 2008).

Faculty operationalize these commitments through their scholarship and the various diversity-related activities sponsored by the College, led by the COEDU Diversity Committee. These activities have included:

- Faculty focus groups to gain a deeper understanding of what COEDU faculty do to infuse diversity into their curricula and courses, barriers experienced by faculty as they attempt to address diversity content, methods used to assess candidates in this area, and instructional strategies used within courses to address diversity.
- A survey to gauge candidates' perceptions of the college climate with regard to promoting a better understanding of diverse groups of people based on race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, language, religion, socio-economic background, disability, and political viewpoint, as well as to assess candidates' perceptions how well the COEDU has prepared them to work with diverse populations.
- Annual diversity forums entitled "Creating Teaching Opportunities from Critical Issues," designed to create and raise awareness of important issues related to human diversity as they impact students and teachers in classrooms and schools as well as in society. These forums are a series of three events during each fall semester with participation from community members, school personnel from surrounding school districts, and COEDU/USF faculty, staff, and students.
- A series of "Brown Bag Critical Friends" discussions related to teaching and learning as scholarship, focuses on enhancing cultural competence of our candidates. Faculty engage in dialogue about best practices, share successes, and assist with challenges. Faculty share their educational resources (e.g., research, assignments, case studies, learning

activities, discussion formats, teachable moments strategies, etc.) used in classes for the purpose of enhancing candidates' cultural competence and receive feedback from their peers.

## **6. Student Learning and Development**

Beginning teachers express a major concern for creating and maintaining an effective learning environment including classroom organization, classroom management and guiding behavior (Brophy 1998; Evertson & Harris, 1992). These aspects of teaching are most typically addressed through university instruction that builds upon subject matter preparation and connection to field experiences. As teaching is increasingly recognized for the complexity that it entails, models of pedagogy predictably have expanded to encompass not only skill training, but an emphasis on cognition, reflection and personal perspectives, and the relationship between content and instruction (Carter & Anders, 1996; Randolph & Evertson, 1994; Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Learning to teach is a developmental process and as such requires that candidates begin with the essential routines of teaching, and as knowledge and classroom experiences expand, the teacher's understanding of teaching practice also expands (Cochran-Smith, 2009). The relationship between content and instruction – the “core of teaching” - is learned through continuous, systematic analysis of teaching, rather than through routine or the acquisition of “expert strategies” (Hiebert, et al. 2007, p. 49). Thus preparation programs must balance developing pedagogical skills with the development of analytical skills and dispositions that enable teachers to develop and test cause and effect hypotheses about teaching and learning. (Hiebert, et al. 2007; Bransford, et al., 2005)

At the heart of a teacher's knowledge is an understanding of child and adolescent development. For student learning to emerge as the primary focus of teaching, a grounding in the principles of biological, emotional, interpersonal, social and cultural development must be embedded in their programs of study. School-based learning is supported (or not) by students' interactions with families, peer groups, and leisure time activities. Beginning teachers must have fundamental knowledge of learning theories that span a variety of approaches to classroom instruction. This foundational knowledge provides the base for the development of effective teaching strategies.(Darling Hammond, et. al, 2005). Such knowledge facilitates the formulation of cause and effect hypotheses about the impact of teaching on student learning. Knowing how, why, and when students learn is critical to analyzing how a particular teaching activity enhanced or hindered student learning (Hiebert, et al. 2007).

Numerous strategies are suggested as relevant for pedagogical studies. These can include cases, simulations, seminar discussions, opportunities to write about teaching, use of observation guides, and use of new digital technologies. In the unit's teacher education programs these pedagogies are used to engage teacher candidates in analyzing attributes of effective classrooms. These levels of analysis move candidates toward becoming more reflective about their practice. As reflected in NBPTS Proposition 3 (2002), these include but are not limited to, teacher-student interactions, developmentally appropriate instruction and guidance, strategies for grouping, organizing and managing the learning environment, and recognizing individual learning styles,

(Berliner, 1986; Berliner, 2000; Veenman, van Benthum, Bootsma, van Dieren, & van der Kemp, 2002; Yinger, 1986).

Teaching practices commonly modeled in the Educator Preparation Unit embody experiential, hands-on instruction that facilitates learning for candidates. As Bransford, et al. (2005) suggest, “learning in the ways they are expected to teach may be the most powerful form of teacher education.” The tendency is for teachers to teach in the manner in which they themselves were taught. Evidence from cognitive research supports the view that new information must be connected to existing schema, and that all learning is dependent on prior knowledge (Brophy, 1998; Resnick, 1987; Wadsworth, 1996). This attention to pedagogy in the teaching of content will ensure continued student learning.

In the present educational climate where accountability is linked to student achievement, there is an increasing awareness of P-12 student learning within programs preparing teachers. The recognition that the most important factor in achieving student learning is the competence of the teacher (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996) has stimulated the development of specified skills and standards for teachers to acquire during their teacher preparation programs. As revised in 2008, the NCATE performance-based standards emphasize the candidate's ability to positively impact P-12 student learning. The ability to impact student learning includes judging current learning status, designing and implementing lessons accordingly, assessing student learning using appropriate assessment tools, collecting and analyzing assessment data, and adjusting instruction as a result of that data. (NCATE 2008).

In Florida, a greater focus in state program review and approval has been placed on impact on student learning. The PreProfessional Educator Accomplished Practices have been developed for use as benchmarks for the assessment of candidate performance. Unlike earlier attempts in teacher education to define what should be included in teacher preparation programs, this approach defines what should be the end product (Cambell, Melenyzer, Nettles, & Wyman, 2000). To succeed in this task, colleges have developed performance-based assessment processes that include clearly defined expected outcomes for candidates. These are used to guide the design of learning experiences, as well as assessment processes that elicit complex evidence of candidates' performance (Diez & Hass, 1997). A key piece of that evidence is the candidate's ability to impact P-12 student learning. This is demonstrated through what is referred to by some programs in the unit as the “continuous teaching cycle (CTC)” as candidates design and teach lessons, assess student learning, analyze the results and implement changes to their lessons based on assessment results. The CTC has become a culminating activity within final internship (student teaching). It is a step towards helping pre-service candidates develop the analytical skills and dispositions to learn from, and improve, their teaching over time.

Portfolios have become the primary evidence of candidate and student learning. Candidates provide work samples that are illustrative of their own learning and they also include examples of work from their continuous teaching cycle to indicate their impact on student learning. Additionally, assessment has become a key component of our curriculum and portfolios provide a mechanism through which candidates develop an understanding of the continuous assessment process. Teacher candidates develop insight into their own abilities as teachers and are able to

see directions for their further learning. This portfolio process also provides faculty members with performance data to guide continuous course and curriculum revision and improvement.

Educator preparation programs in the unit seek to develop a culture of evidence, representing three quite different strands: observation, performance samples, and tests/test-like procedures. Observation includes observation logs, journals, interviews, and peer coaching; performance samples include portfolios, digital samples, exhibits of teaching projects, and self-evaluations; and test/test-like situations include tests, case studies, and simulations. Individual programs in the unit use portfolio systems and assessment processes to track the candidate's performance in meeting benchmarks as established by state and/or professional standards throughout their program. Program assessment systems inform a college-wide process for accountability and improvement linked to not only what our graduates know, but what they can do as prospective education professionals. Developing a culture of evidence is critical to enhancing candidates' ability to help all students learn.

Responsibility for student learning and development is shared by teachers with other education professionals. Administrators must commit to the education of all students to become successful adults by articulating a vision of high standards of learning. Increasingly, school leaders are coaches and facilitators who help students, teachers, other staff, and communities understand and question the mental models and basic assumptions underlying teaching and learning (Hart & Bredeson, 1996; Hughes, 1999). They are responsible for ensuring that decisions about curriculum, instructional strategies (including instructional technology), assessment and professional development are based on sound research, best practice, school and district data, and other contextual information and that observation and collaboration are used to design meaningful and effective experiences that improve student achievement (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, Florida Principal Leadership Standards, 2005; Miles & Frank, 2008.)

School counselors and psychologists understand the influence of the multiple factors that may impact student learning and development. They assess students' cognitive, emotional, social and academic development and design appropriate interventions to address individual student's needs. They also provide services to assist schools and other agencies to develop appropriate cognitive and academic goals for all students. (National Association of School Psychologists, 2000; Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs, 2009).

At a time when accountability and reform agendas have increasingly focused on student learning, there is a danger that we are moving toward a "technical view of teaching" that equates learning with testing (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p.3), and teaching with "achievement of prespecified outcomes" (Liston, et al., 2009, p. 109). While producing better teachers is one piece of the puzzle in improving schools, we must ultimately recognize that teacher quality is not the only or even the primary factor that impacts student learning. When factors such as socio-cultural and historical contexts, support for professional development, and disparate resource availability and allocation are considered, teachers and other school professionals alone cannot be held responsible for the disparities in student achievement, nor can educators alone overcome the inequalities in our schools (Cochran-Smith 2004). As we have posited in this conceptual framework, student achievement is a shared responsibility among teachers, other school

personnel, families, the community and policy-makers. The College of Education aims to prepare competent and ethical professionals who recognize inequities and act collaboratively in serving the diversity of students, families and communities to address inequalities and positively impact student achievement.

## **REFERENCES**

- Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy. National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (Retrieved from [www.ncrest.org](http://www.ncrest.org) on March 30, 2009).
- Altrichter, H., Feldman, A., Posch, P., Somekh, B. (2008) *Teachers Investigate Their Work*. New York: Routledge.
- American Psychological Association Board of Educational Affairs (1997). Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school reform and redesign. Washington, DC: Center for Psychology in Schools and Education, American Psychological Association Education Directorate.
- Banks, J. A., (2007) *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. C. (2008). New professional roles and advocacy strategies for school counselors: A multicultural/social justice perspective to move beyond the nice counselor syndrome. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86(3), 372-381.
- Bennett, C. (1993). Teacher-researchers: All dressed up and no place to go. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2), 69-70.
- Berliner, D (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 5-13.
- Berliner, D. C. (2000). A personal response to those who bash teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 358-371.
- Berson, I. R., Berson, M.J., Desai, S., Falls, D., Fenaughty, J. (2008) An analysis of electronic media to prepare children for safe and ethical practices in digital environments. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 8 (3), 223-243.
- Berson, M.J., VanFossen, P.J. (2008). Another look at civic literacy in a digital age. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*. 8 (3), 219-221.
- Borko, H., Whitcomb, J.; Liston, D. (Eds.) (2009). Wicked Problems and other thoughts on issues of technology and teacher learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 60 (1), 3-7.
- Boyle-Baise, M., McIntyre, J.D. (2008). What kind of experience? Preparing teachers in PDS or community experiences. In M.Cochran-Smith , S. Feiman Nemser, D.J. McIntyre, (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 307-329). New York: Routledge.

- Bransford, J., Derry, S., Berliner, D, Hammerness, K. (2005). Theories of learning and their roles in teaching. In Darling Hammond L., Bransford, J. (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. (pp. 40-87).
- Bullough, R. (1991). Exploring personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 43-51.
- Bullough, R., & Gitlin, A. (1995). *Becoming a student of teaching*. New York: Garland Publishing
- Camara, W., Lane, S. (2006). A Historical Perspective and Current Views on the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*. 25 (3) 35-41.
- Cambell, D. M., Melenyzer, B. J., Nettles, D. H., Wyman, R. M. (2000). *Portfolio and performance assessment in teacher education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chung Wei, R., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession*. Dallas: National Staff Development Council.
- Cardelle-Elawar, M. (1993). The teacher as researcher in the classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(1), 49-57.
- Clift, R., Houston, W., & Pugach, M. (Eds.) (1991). *Encouraging Reflective Practice in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clift, R.T., Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In Cochran-Smith, M. and Zeichner, K. (Eds.) *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 309-424). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cochran Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the Road: Race, Diversity and Social Justice in Teacher Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran Smith, M. (2009). "Reculturing" teacher education: inquiry, evidence, and action. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 60 (5), 458-468.
- Cooper, J.E. (2007). Strengthening the case for community-based learning in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(3), 245-255.
- Cordeiro, P. (1996). *Boundary crossings: Educational partnerships and school leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs. (2009). *Standards: School counseling*. Virginia: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs.
- Council of Learned Societies in Education (1996). *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., and Youngs, P. (2002). Defining ‘highly qualified teachers’: What does ‘scientifically-based research’ tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13-25
- Darling Hammond, L., and Hammerness, K. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In Darling Hammond L., Bransford, J. (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. (pp. 390-441).
- Darling Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Horowitz, F.D. (2005). Educating teachers for developmentally appropriate practice. In Darling Hammond L., Bransford, J. (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. (pp. 88-125).
- Darling Hammond, L. (2008). What do we know? In M. Cochran-Smith , S. Feiman Nemser, D.J. McIntyre (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 1316-1323). New York: Routledge.
- Dede, C. (2007). Reinventing the role of information and communications technologies in education. In Smolin, L., Lawless, K. and Burbules, N. (Eds.). *Information and Communication Technologies: Considerations of Current Practice for Teachers and Teacher Educators* (pp. 11-38). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, Inc
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Diez, M. E. & Hass, J. M. (1997). No more piecemeal reform: Using performance-based approaches to rethink teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 19(2), 1726.
- Donahoo, S., Whitney, M. (2006). Knowing and getting what your pay for: Administration, technology, and accountability in K-12 schools. In Tettegah, S. Y., Hunter, R.C. (Eds.). *Technology and Education: Issues in Administration, Policy, and Applications in K12 Schools*. (pp.125-142). California: Elsevier Inc.
- Easton, L. B. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(10), 755-759.)

- Epstein, J. L. (1992). School and Family Partnerships: Leadership Roles for School Psychologists. In S. L. Christenson & J. C. Conoley (Eds.), *Home-school collaboration: Enhancing children's academic and social competence* (pp. 499-515). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Ersing, R. L., Jetson, J., Jones, R., & Keller, H. (2007). Community engagement's role in creating institutional change within the academy: A case study of East Tampa and the University of South Florida. In S. Gelmon & S. Billig (Eds.), *From Passion to Objectivity: International and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Service Learning* (Advances in Service-Learning Research, Volume 7, pp. 177 -195). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Teacher learning: How do teachers learn to teach? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser D.J. McIntyre, (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Routledge. (pp. 697-705).
- Fiore, Douglas J. (2006). *School-Community Relations*. New York: Eye On Education, Inc.
- Florida Department of Education. (2005). Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Tallahassee: Author.
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gathercoal, F. (1997). *Judicious Discipline* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
- Gathercoal, F. (1998). Judicious Discipline. In R. E. Butchart, & B. ExEwan (Eds.). *Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education* (pp. 197-216). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Glanz, J. (2006). *What Every Principal Should Know About School-Community Leadership*. California: Corwin Press.
- Goddard, R.D., Hoy, W.K., & Hoy, A.W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Gordon, Stephen P. (Ed.) (2008). The power of collaborative action research. In *Collaborative Action Research: Developing Professional Learning Communities* (pp. 1-12). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Gore, J. M., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(2), 119-136.
- Harry, B. (1992). Cultural diversity, families, and the special education system. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harvey, V.S., Carlson J.F. (2003). Ethical and professional issues with computer-related technology. *School Psychology Review*. 32 (1), 92-107.
- Hays, D. G. (2008). Assessing multicultural competence in counselor trainees: A review of instrumentation and future directions. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86(1), 95-101.
- Hiebert, J., Morris, A.K., Berk, D., Jansen, A. (2007). Preparing teachers to learn from teaching. In *Journal of Teacher Education*. 58 (1) 47-61.
- Hipolito-Delgado, C. P., & Lee, C. C. (2007a). Empowerment theory for the professional school counselor: A manifesto for what really matters. *Professional School Counseling*, 10(4), 327-332.
- Hoffman, N. E., Reed, W. M., Rosenbluth, G. S. (1997). *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. New York: SUNY.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2005). Investigating school counselors' perceived multicultural competence. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(5), 414-423.
- Hollingsworth, S., Noffke, S. E. Walker, M., & Winter, R. (1997). Epilogue: What have we learned from these cases on action research and educational reform? In S. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *International action research: A casebook for educational reform* (pp. 312-317). London: Falmer.
- Hord, Shirley M., Hirsh, Stephanie A. (2009). The principal's role in supporting learning communities. In *Educational Leadership*. 66 (5), 22-23.
- Howard, T.C., Aleman, G.R. (2008). Teacher capacity for diverse learners: What do teachers need to know? In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman Nemser, S., McIntyre, D.J. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp.157 -174). New York: Routledge.
- International Society for Technology in Education (2008). National Education Technology Standards and Performance Indicators for Teachers. Eugene OR: Author.
- International Society for Technology in Education (2009). National Education Technology Standards for Administrators. Eugene OR: Author.

- Iverson, A. M. (2003). *Building competence in classroom management and discipline* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Kagan, S. L. & Cohen, N. E. (1997). *Not by chance: Creating an early care and education system for America's children*. New Haven, CT: The Quality 2000 Initiative.
- Lee, C. (2008). *Multicultural Issues in Counseling* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Alexandria: American Counseling Association.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Liston, D., Whitcomb, J., & Borko, H. (2009). The end of education in teacher education: Thoughts on reclaiming the role of social foundations in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(2), 107-111.
- Lytle, S. & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990). Learning from teacher research: A working typology. *Teachers College Record*, 92(I), 83-103.
- McCutcheon, G., & Jung, B., 1990. Alternative perspectives on action research. *Theory into Practice* 29(3), 144-151.
- McDiarmad, C. Williamson; Clevenger-Bright, Mary. (2008). Rethinking teacher capacity. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser, D.J. McIntyre (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge. (pp. 134-156).
- McLaughlin, M. W., Talbert, J. E. (2006). *Building School-based Teacher Learning Communities: Professional Strategies to Improve Student Achievement*. New York Teachers College Press.
- Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 26-42.
- Miles, K. H., Frank, S. (2008). *The strategic school: Making the most of people, time, and money*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mishra, P., Koehler M. (2006) Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for integrating technology in teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108 (6), 1017-1054.
- Mishra, P., Koehler M. (2008). Introducing TPCK. In AACTE Committee on Innovation and Technology (Ed.). *Handbook of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) for educators* (pp. 3-29). New York: Routledge.

- Mitcham-Smith, M. (2007). Advocacy- professional school counselors closing the achievement gap through empowerment: A response to Hipolito-Delgado and Lee. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(4), 341-343.
- Monahan, T. (2008). Picturing technological change: the materiality of information infrastructures in public education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 17*(2), 89-101.
- National Association of School Psychologists (2000). *Professional Conduct Manual for School Psychology*. Maryland: National Association of School Psychologists.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2002). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession*. Washington D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, & National Association for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2006). *Child and adolescent development research and teacher education: Evidence-based pedagogy, policy, and practice*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Niess, M. L. (2008) Guiding Preservice Teachers in TPACK. In AACTE Committee on Innovation and Technology (Ed.). *Handbook of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) for educators* (pp. 223-250). New York: Routledge.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills (2004). *Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning*. <http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/index.php>
- Paul, J., Epanchin, B., Rosselli, H., & Duchnowski, A. (1996). The transformation of teacher education and special education: Work in progress. *Remedial and Special Education, 17*(5), 310-322.
- Pellegrino, J. W., Goldman, S. R., Bertenthal, M., Lawless, K. (2007). Teacher Education and Technology: Initial Results from the “What Works and Why” Project. In Smolin, L., Lawless, K. and Burbules, N. (Eds.). *Information and Communication Technologies: Considerations of Current Practice for Teachers and Teacher Educators* (pp.52-86). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.

- Posner, G. (1996). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Rebore, R. W. (2001). *The ethics of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Rosselli, H., Perez, S., Piersall, K., & Pantridge, O. (1993). Evolution of a professional development school: The story of a partnership. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 16(2), 124-136.
- Rowland, C., & Allen, M. (2007). Emerging strategies and practices to improve teacher quality in at-risk and hard-to-staff school and subject areas. In C. Dwyer (Ed.), *America's Challenge: Effective Teachers for At-Risk School and Students* (pp. 51-86). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Sardo-Brown, D. (1992). Elementary Teachers Perceptions of Action Research. *Action in Teacher Education*, 14(2), 55-59.
- Schacter, J., & Thum, Y.M. (2004). Paying for high and low-quality teaching. *Economics of Education Review*, 23(4), 411-430.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shapiro, J.P. & Stefkovich, J.A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shulman, L. (1992). Toward a pedagogy of cases. In J. Shulman (Ed.), *Case methods in teacher education* (pp. 1-30). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Simmons, J. M., Crowell, R. A., Konecki, L. R., Duffield, P. G., & Rackliffe, G. (1996). *Creating a bicultural PDS professor persona: A journal based study of the implicit theories-of-action and reflective decision-making of professors working in PDS sites*. Paper presented at the ATE Annual Meeting in St. Louis.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1996). Multicultural education as a social movement. *Theory into Practice*, 35, 239-247.
- Sleeter, C.E. (2000). Creating an empowering multicultural curriculum. *Race , Gender, & Class in Education*, 7(3), 178-196.

- Sleeter, C.E. Preparing white teachers for diverse students. (2008). In M.Cochran-Smith , S. Feiman Nemser, D.J. McIntyre, (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 558-582). New York: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C.E. and Grant, C.A. (1988). Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender. New York: Macmillan.
- Smolin, L., Lawless, K. (2007) Technologies in schools: stimulating a dialogue. In Smolin, L., Lawless, K. and Burbules, N. (Eds.). *Information and Communication Technologies: Considerations of Current Practice for Teachers and Teacher Educators*. (pp. 1-10). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, Inc
- Starratt, R.J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Starratt, R.J. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Harper, G. W., & Lewis, R. (2005). An interactive and contextual model of community-university collaborations for research and action. *Health Education & Behavior*, 32 (1), 84-101.
- Su, Z. (1999). Creating an equal partnership for urban school and teacher education renewal: A California experience. In D. Byrd & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on professional development schools (Teacher Education Yearbook VII*, pp. 46-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Tettegah, S. Y., Betout D., Taylor, K.R. (2006). Cyber Bullying and Schools in an Electronic Era. In Tettegah, S. Y., Hunter, R.C. (Eds.). *Technology and Education: Issues in Administration, Policy, and Applications in K12 Schools*. (pp.17-28). California: Elsevier Inc.
- Troen, V., Boles, K. & Larkin, E. (1995, April). *Boundary spanners in professional development schools*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Trolley, B. C., Shields, L., Hanel, C. (2008). School Cyberbullying: Description, Assessment, and Therapeutic Intervention. *Journal of Technology in Counseling*. 5 (1), [http://jtc.colstate.edu/Vol5\\_1/Trolley.htm](http://jtc.colstate.edu/Vol5_1/Trolley.htm).
- Trumball, E., Greenfield, P.M., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Quiroz, B. (2007). Bridging cultures in parent conferences: Implications for school psychology. In Esquevez, G., Lopez, E., and Nahari, S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Multicultural School Psychology: an Interdisciplinary Perspective* (pp. 615-636). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

[USF Faculty Senate subcommittee report](#) on community-engaged scholarship.

- Vavrus, M., Walton, S. Kido, J., Diffendal, E. & King, P. (1999). Weaving the web of democracy: Confronting conflicting expectations for teachers and schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 50(2), 119-130.
- Veenman, S., van Benthum, N., Bootsma, D., van Dieren, J., & van der Kemp, N. (2002). Cooperative learning and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 81, 87-103.
- Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. SUNY Series, Teacher Preparation and Development.
- Walters, S.A. (1995, April). *Walking the fault line: Boundary spanning in professional development schools*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Winn Tutweiler, S.J. (2005). *Teachers as collaborative partners: Working with diverse families and communities*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wolfgang, C. H. (1995). *Solving discipline problems: Methods and models for today's teachers* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Yinger, R. J. (1986). Balancing the art and techniques of teaching: Renewing the profession. *NASSP Bulletin*, 70(491), 75-80.
- Zalaquett, C.P., Foley, P.F., Tillotson, K., Dinsmore, J.A., Hof, D. (2008). Multicultural and social justice training for counselor education programs and colleges of education: Rewards and challenges. In *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 86. (2), 323-329.

## **Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional, State and Institutional Standards**

The unit's conceptual framework has incorporated and embraced the principles and standards of the University, the State of Florida, NCATE, and the national learned societies to insure that our graduates acquire the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions of high quality professional practice.

For teacher education candidates, outcomes identified in the conceptual framework are aligned with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and the propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The Accomplished Practices are closely aligned with the INTASC Standards, so that the conceptual framework incorporates these principles as well. The Florida Test of Professional Knowledge is built around the Accomplished Practices. Practicing teachers are also held to these standards in advanced programs and all professional educators are held to these standards through the personnel evaluation model practiced in Florida schools.

Unit outcome #3, Technology, has been aligned with the ISTE standards.

Advanced preparation outcomes for other school professionals are aligned with the standards of the professional societies of each program.

## Alignment of Professional Standards with USF Conceptual Framework

<b>CARE Themes</b>	<b>USF OUTCOMES</b> USF graduates will:	<b>FL Accomplished Practices*</b>	<b>NBPTS Propositions</b>	<b>NCATE</b>
<b><u>Collaboration</u></b>	<b><u>1. Collaboration</u></b> Collaborate and work in partnership with schools, families, other professionals and agencies.	5. Continuous professional improvement  (INTASC** #10)	Teachers are members of learning communities.	<b>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions:</b> Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
<b><u>Academic Excellence</u></b>	<b><u>2. Content and Professional Knowledge</u></b> Have expertise in a common professional knowledge base and the content bases of their fields and the ability to integrate content and professional knowledge into teaching and service.	1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning  3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation  (INTASC # 4, 5, 7,8)	Teachers know their subjects and how to teach those subjects.	<b>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions:</b> Content Knowledge (for Teacher Candidates and Other Professional School Professionals) Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
	<b><u>3. Technology</u></b> Be technologically proficient and literate professionals.	2. Learning Environment;  3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation		<b>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions:</b> Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates; Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
<b><u>Research</u></b>	<b><u>4. Reflection, Analysis and Inquiry</u></b> Integrate reflection, analysis, and systematic inquiry into their professional practice.	5. Continuous Professional Improvement  (INTASC # 9)	Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.	<b>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions:</b> Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates; Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

<b>CARE Themes</b>	<b>USF OUTCOMES</b> USF graduates will:	<b>FL Accomplished Practices*</b>	<b>NBPTS Propositions</b>	<b>NCATE</b>
<b><u>Ethical Practice</u></b>	<b><u>5. Ethics &amp; Diversity</u></b> Engage in ethical practice and effectively integrate awareness of issues of diversity and exceptionality among the populations they serve.	2. Learning Environment;  6. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct  (INTASC #2, 9)	Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	<b>Standard 4: Diversity:</b> Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
	<b><u>6. Student Learning and Development</u></b> Provide instruction, services and/or programs that contribute to positive learning and developmental outcomes.	1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning; 2. Learning Environment; 3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation; 4. Assessment  (INTASC #1,2,3,6, 7,8)	Teachers are committed to students and their learning.  Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	<b>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions:</b> Student Learning (for Teacher Candidates and Other School Professionals) <b>Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practices:</b> Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn <b>Standard 4: Diversity:</b> Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

\* Florida Accomplished Practices adopted December 2010

\*\* INTASC Model Core Teaching Standards updated 2011

## Alignment of ISTE Standards with COEDU Technology Outcome

NETS – Teachers	NETS – Administrators	COEDU
<p><b>1. Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity</b></p> <p>...use their knowledge of subject matter, teaching and learning, and technology to facilitate experiences that advance student learning, creativity, and innovation in both face-to-face and virtual environments.</p>	<p><b>1. Inspire Excellence Through Transformational Leadership</b></p> <p>Inspire and lead development and implementation of a shared vision for comprehensive integration of technology to transform the educational enterprise and promote excellence throughout the organization.</p>	<p>...education professionals must be both technologically proficient <i>and literate</i>. They have basic technical skills to utilize hardware and software, and are familiar with the range of available information technologies and on-line information sources relevant to their field of practice...</p> <p>They are able to choose appropriately among available technologies and information sources to enhance instruction and service.</p>
<p><b>2. Design and Develop Digital Age Learning Experiences and Assessments</b></p> <p>... design, develop, and evaluate authentic learning experiences and assessments incorporating contemporary tools and resources to maximize content learning in context and to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes identified in the NETS•S.</p>	<p><b>2. Establish a Robust Digital age Learning Culture.</b></p> <p>Create, advocate for, and sustain an educational culture that values and rewards a rigorous, relevant digital age education for all students.</p>	<p>Professionals are skilled in utilizing a variety of technologies in instruction, assessment, and service and assist learners and clients in becoming competent with technology.</p> <p>They are able to choose appropriately among available technologies and information sources to enhance instruction and service.</p>
<p><b>3. Model Digital Age Work and learning</b></p> <p>... exhibit knowledge, skills, and work processes representative of an innovative professional in a global and digital society.</p>	<p><b>4. Ensure Systemic Transformation of the Educational Enterprise.</b></p> <p>Provide leadership to manage and implement strategic plans, monitor progress, and evaluate results to ensure ongoing improvement of the educational enterprise.</p>	<p>Professionals are skilled in utilizing a variety of technologies in instruction, assessment, and service and assist learners and clients in becoming competent with technology.</p>
<p><b>4. Promote and Model Digital Citizenship and Responsibility</b></p> <p>... understand local and global societal issues and responsibilities in an evolving digital culture and exhibit legal and ethical behavior in their professional practices.</p>	<p><b>5. Model and Advance Digital Age Citizenship.</b></p> <p>Model and advance digital citizenship by developing and implementing policies, acting with integrity, and facilitating understanding of social, ethical and legal responsibilities.</p>	<p>... professionals must be aware of equity issues surrounding the use of technology and access to information, and understand how socio-cultural contexts can influence attitudes about technology.</p>
<p><b>5. Engage in Professional Growth and Leadership</b></p> <p>...continuously improve their professional practice, model lifelong learning, and exhibit leadership in their school and professional community by promoting and demonstrating the effective use of digital tools and resources.</p>	<p><b>3. Advance Excellence in Digital Age Professional Practice.</b></p> <p>Advance and sustain a professional environment that promotes, supports, and rewards robust, continuous professional growth and fluency in the infusion of current and emerging technologies.</p>	<p>Professionals utilize information technologies in their own research and professional development.</p>

## **The System by which Candidate Performance is Regularly Assessed**

The professional education unit has developed and implemented an assessment system which monitors candidate and graduate performance on state, national and institutional standards and provides data to inform program improvement and unit operations.

Given the size and complex nature of the unit, the unit assessment system is built upon individual program assessment plans and strategies. While there are aspects of the assessment system that are common across many or all programs, there is a degree of variability by program.

Student Academic Services (SAS) monitors candidate progress in fulfilling COE requirements at admission, prior to internship and graduation/certification, including state mandated exams such as the General Knowledge Test, and the Florida Teacher Certification Exam.

The unit utilizes a variety of assessments across programs such as surveys of graduates, alumni, employers, and internship evaluations. Programs have identified major assessments and developed rubrics for scoring assessments. Major assessments include lesson and unit plans, teaching videos, case studies, internship evaluations, and ESOL portfolio at the initial teacher preparation level, and action research projects, clinical practice evaluations, and comprehensive exams at the advanced levels. Several programs have implemented electronic portfolios using the Chalk & Wire e-portfolio system. Other programs use portfolios in hard copy format or other electronic method. The Chalk & Wire system allows for the collection of candidate performance data related to the Florida Accomplished Practices (APs), professional standards, and conceptual framework outcomes. Programs not using the Chalk & Wire e-portfolio collect and store candidate performance data related to APs or professional standards using Excel spreadsheet or Access database programs. The unit assessment system provides for the systematic assessment of candidate dispositions. A disposition assessment survey has been developed and aligned with the dispositions outlined in the conceptual framework.

At the initial preparation level, the unit has identified transition points at:

- admission to the COE,
- prior to final internship,
- internship exit,
- graduation/certification and
- post-graduation follow-up.

Some programs specify additional transition points.

At the advanced preparation level for teachers and other school personnel, transition points vary by program, but generally follow:

- admission to program,
- mid-point (coursework completion/ prior to comprehensive exam or clinical practice), graduation/certification and
- post-graduation follow up.

At the unit level, the Director of Assessment collects and analyzes data from program level assessments, including assessment of dispositions, and data from internship evaluations, graduate, alumni and employer surveys. The Director manages the Chalk & Wire e-portfolio database, and provides programs with candidate performance data generated from the system each semester. Programs using their own portfolio or assessment strategies collect candidate data using Excel spreadsheet or Access database programs, and provide the Director of Assessment with data reports. Summarized assessment results for each program are distributed to the appropriate program coordinators and department chairs.

Summaries and analyses of data from surveys of graduates, principals, employers, alumni and internship evaluations are distributed to program coordinators and chairs by the Director of Assessment. Results are reviewed in department meetings and any necessary actions based on the data are considered.

Assessment data for all programs are reported to the associate deans and dean. If it appears that there are issues that are college-wide, they are referred to the appropriate group, [i.e. Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC), Graduate Program Committee (GPC) Diversity Committee, or Student Academic Services (SAS).]

Surveys and program assessments are supplemented by course evaluations, faculty reviews, and periodic surveys or audits that will inform unit operations and/or student performance.

## **Glossary**

**ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE:** Encompassed in academic excellence are not only the outcomes associated with content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills and technological competency, it includes also skills in written and verbal communication, literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking that form the basis for achieving these outcomes.

**COMMON PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE BASE:** For P-12 educators, this knowledge base includes information about student development, motivation, and personality, intelligence and how students learn. It includes as well the broader social context for the operation of schools – historical and cultural impacts on schooling and education, an understanding of schools as organizations within a broader society, and key concepts and debates over inclusion and equity in schools and community.

**DIVERSITY:** We define “diversity” in the broadest sense, including differences of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, language, national or regional origin, socio-economic group, sexual orientation, and mental, emotional, and physical exceptionality.

**EDUCATOR PREPARATION UNIT:** The unit includes all programs housed within the COE – on the main campus and regional campuses - that prepare professionals for the P-12 schools, as well as programs housed outside the COE in Arts & Sciences and Visual and Performing Arts that prepare teachers and other professionals for the P-12 schools. (In addition to programs for P-12 school personnel, the COE also includes programs that prepare professionals for careers outside of the P –12 schools, for example, athletic training, exercise science, and adult education.)

**JUST AND PRODUCTIVE SOCIETY:** A respectful and ethical society in which all citizens have equal access to high quality education and services that will assist them in realizing their full potential; one in which all citizens have the opportunity to contribute their talents and abilities, and in which those contributions are recognized and valued.

**RESEARCH:** We define research as the broad range of inquiry that includes original scholarship, research synthesis, applied research projects, and action research.

## Conceptual Framework Chronology

DATE	ACTIVITY
April 2001	College Council approves documents developed by Curriculum Reform Planning Committee <sup>i</sup> : <i>Characteristics for all USF Graduates of Educational Programs</i> , and <i>Guiding Principles for Teacher Education Programs</i>
August 2001	Faculty Forum, including COE, A&S, provost, district superintendents - discussions of values & goals of COE
March 2002	Conceptual framework draft completed <sup>ii</sup> based on documents from CRPC & discussions of August 2001 Faculty Forum
July 2002	COE chairs/coordinators retreat – review of draft conceptual framework
Fall 2002	NCATE Conceptual Framework Task Force <sup>iii</sup> convenes to make revisions based on July 02 retreat. Knowledge Base developed.
January 2003	Revised draft conceptual framework circulated to faculty & school district personnel
March 2003	Graduate conceptual framework drafted
December 2003	Conceptual Framework Synthesis Group (CFSG) <sup>iv</sup> convenes to begin to develop comprehensive conceptual framework document based on previous work.
January 2004	Revised vision/mission statement circulated to faculty for comment
March 2004	Conceptual framework draft circulated to COE faculty & select faculty in A&S, CVPA
April 2004	CFSG finalizes draft of CF/updates KB Open forums held for faculty to comment on final draft
August 2004	COE Strategic Planning Chair Retreat, mission/vision reviewed for congruence with strategic planning goals; minor revision to mission statement.
October 2004	Forwarded to Ad Hoc Committee of College Council for review and comment
November 2004	Endorsed by College Council with minor editorial changes to vision/mission statements

DATE	ACTIVITY
February-April 2009	Conceptual Framework Revision Committee <sup>v</sup> convenes to review outcomes/dispositions; update knowledge base
September 2009	Revised conceptual framework circulated for comment
February 2010	Revised conceptual framework approved by Faculty Council

---

<sup>i</sup> CPRC: Formed in 1996 to examine issues related to school renewal and curriculum reform. Included faculty from COE, A&S, CVPA and school personnel from surrounding counties. Work of CPRC work groups 2000-2001 form foundation of conceptual framework.

<sup>ii</sup> Faculty group led by Dr. Roselli

<sup>iii</sup> Applegate, Epanchin, Brindley, Hall, Terry, Hogarty

<sup>iv</sup> Applegate, Allsopp, Brindley, Dorn, Feyten, Faucette, Graves, Hogarty, Kromrey, Magasich, Stewart, Ponticell, Vasquez (grad. student)

<sup>v</sup> Faculty from COEDU, CAS, CVPA; school personnel; candidates