



Conceptual Framework

Professional Teacher Education Unit
Bagwell College of Education
Kennesaw State University

*The Collaborative Development of Expertise
in Teaching and Learning*

Abstract

Collaborative Development of Expertise in Teaching and Learning

The Professional Teacher Education Unit (PTEU) at Kennesaw State University is committed to developing expertise among candidates in initial and advanced programs as teachers and leaders who possess the capability, intent and expertise to facilitate high levels of learning in all of their students through effective, research-based practices in classroom instruction, and who enhance the structures that support all learning. To that end, the PTEU fosters the development of candidates as they progress through stages of growth from novice to proficient to expert and leader. Within the PTEU conceptual framework, expertise is viewed as a process of continued development, not an end-state. To be effective, teachers and educational leaders must embrace the notion that teaching and learning are entwined and that only through the implementation of validated practices can all students construct meaning and reach high levels of learning. In that way, candidates are facilitators of the teaching and learning process. Finally, the PTEU recognizes, values and demonstrates collaborative practices across the college and university and extends collaboration to the community-at-large. Through this collaboration with professionals in the university, the public and private schools, parents and other professional partners, the PTEU meets the ultimate goal of assisting Georgia schools in bringing all students to high levels of learning.

Collaborative Development of Expertise in Teaching and Learning.

Unit Vision

At Kennesaw State University (KSU), the Professional Teacher Education Unit (PTEU) envisions teacher education programs as pivotal in the preparation of a workforce composed of subject matter experts. In a variety of professional roles, these developing teachers and educational leaders work collaboratively, wholeheartedly, and effectively to serve learners by facilitating learning and developing successful learners across multicultural educational communities.

The PTEU embraces Dewey's vision of education as a "...process in which the immature members of the teaching profession are shaped, formed, and molded into the profession's own social form" (1916/1956). This vision presupposes "schools as places where only such as would make a better future society is transmitted--and where each individual gets an opportunity to escape from the limitations of the social group in which he/she was born, and to come into living contact with a broader environment" (Dewey, 1916/1956).

What unites the diverse work of the PTEU is the underlying aspiration to guide educators who bring learners of diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning. As part of that work, we believe that collaborative teaching partnerships have the potential to play a significant role in advancing education toward this desired future (Dottin, 2001). As a result, the vision for the Professional Teacher Education program at Kennesaw State University may be captured in the following theme:

Collaborative Development Of Expertise In Teaching And Learning.

This theme is directed by the following definitions as applied to the initial and advanced Professional Teacher Education Programs:

Collaboration. Working together in an intellectual effort is the hallmark of collaboration (Earle, Seehafer, & Ostlund, 2001; Friend & Cook, 2000; Galassi, 2000). The concept encompasses *how* professionals work together, and unfolds as a developmental process that proceeds from networking to coordination to cooperation until true collaboration is achieved. Effective educators

who are capable of meeting the needs of every learner must work collaboratively and in partnership with parents, professional colleagues, and the community (Strieker, & Logan, 2001). In the context of increased student diversity, teachers need to support one another in an intellectual effort to serve multicultural communities. In the absence of collaboration, it will be difficult to assure that each student is accepted and actively supported in accessing the full array of education experiences (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989). Thus, at KSU one portion of our theme rests on collaboration.

Development of Expertise. Another aspect of our theme includes the development of expertise. According to Odell, Huling and Sweeny (2000), each teacher progresses through stages of development that advance from novice to proficient to expert to teacher leader. This progression occurs in a continuum of growth from pre-service to induction to in-service and finally renewal (Huling, 1997). To move from one stage to the next, graduates must recognize and act upon the significance of life-long professional development of subject matter knowledge and pedagogical practice. Expertise is viewed as a process of continued development, not an end state (Berlinger, 1988). In developing expertise, teachers work to achieve intellectual proficiency or "know-how" in the teaching/learning process (Marshall, Fittinghoff, & Cheney, 1990; Katz, 1972). Educators with expertise in both areas hold high expectations for every learner, possess professional insight, use and organize knowledge about teaching and learning effectively, and search for creative solutions to problems and challenges. At KSU, we use the terms *expertise* and *expert* in the same way as the National Board on Professional Teacher Standards (The National Board, 1999) uses the term *accomplished*.

Teaching and Learning. Besides collaboration and development of expertise, our theme also includes consideration for the teaching and learning process that is demonstrated and facilitated by the PTEU faculty, to the teacher candidates, and ultimately, to their students. To be effective, teachers and educational leaders must meet the needs of diverse student populations by understanding individual students' backgrounds, preferences and interests, and by using this information in the instructional process (Salisbury & Strieker, 2004; Ross, Seaborn & Wilson,

2002). KSU faculty embrace and model the intertwined processes of teaching and learning. That is, expert teachers use validated practices to facilitate the learning process and assist their students as they explore and investigate concepts so that learning becomes the acquisition of personal meaning, knowledge, and skills rather than simply the acquisition of a measurable outcome (Dottin, 2001, p. 40). The acquisition of meaning, knowledge, and skills is consonant with a constructivist paradigm of teaching and learning in which candidates (as well as their students) build their “...own knowledge and their own representations of knowledge from their own experiences and thought...” (Martin, 2003, p.169). Thus, the learning and development of candidates (and their future students) is assisted within an environment where emphasis is placed on a recursive process for the construction of knowledge (Elam & Duckinfield, 2000).

Unit Mission

The unit mission is built upon the PTEU vision and theme. KSU is committed to providing a challenging and facilitative collegial environment that fosters high-quality academic preparation, critical thinking, global and multicultural perspectives, effective communication and interpersonal skills, leadership development, social responsibility, and lifelong learning (KSU Catalog, 2002-03). In concert with this institutional mission, the PTEU embraces the commitment of developing educational professionals who, as collaborative partners, engaged in local, national, and international endeavors in teaching, research, and service, become subject matter experts capable of facilitating high levels of learning within diverse student populations. Paramount to this activity is scholarly activity, which, broadly defined, is multi-dimensional in nature, is methodologically based upon the level and context of inquiry, and is combined with service activities that promote the well being of the University and the community-at-large. The PTEU, therefore, is committed to building a community of learners, who in turn will enfold, nurture, and engender in the Pre-K through grade 12 students a “shared vision of intellectual and social possibilities” (Boyer, 1995) as they prepare to live productively within a global society.

Philosophy

“...education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing” (Dewey, 1910:1937).

Teacher as Nurturer, Facilitator (of Learning), Collaborator

Within the context of our general mission and vision, the PTEU philosophy is based upon a shared view of teacher preparation. The Professional Teacher Education Unit at Kennesaw State University views teachers and other school personnel as nurturers, facilitators, and collaborators. Since teachers and other school personnel in the PTEU care deeply about candidate learners and are particularly responsive to learners’ needs, they act as nurturers to assist candidates in the development of necessary basic learning skills and dispositions (ERIC Digest, 1993). Professional educators in the PTEU use validated practices to facilitate a learning process that acknowledges and values prospective teachers’ constructions of knowledge and aid candidates in reflecting about their content areas. Finally, these professional educators embrace an ideology that speaks to the collective and collaborative nature of shared work among effective professionals in the field.

Nurturer. “To see teaching and learning as the act of nurturing is to understand the essence of the phrase, *to educate.*” As Dewey posits, learners grow in concert with others. “Every experience lives on in further experiences. Hence, the central problem of...education...is to select the kind of present experiences that develop fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences” (Dewey, 1937, p.45).

Facilitator. “Real, genuine attention means mental movement, not only on the part of the individual but also on the part of the class. It means that ideas come into the class, various persons follow out those ideas, and new points are brought out; and yet the teacher harmonizes it all, combining this play of variety, this expression of different elements, so that it leads consistently and consecutively in a definite direction” (Dewey, 1904).

To see teaching and learning as the act of facilitating is to see the teacher as one who views students as curious, active, and capable learners who are able to obtain complex understandings and

skills through the guidance of a knowledgeable instructor. There is a philosophical perspective that asserts that teachers cannot “give” knowledge to their students. Rather, each individual constructs meaning based on prior knowledge and experiences (Bruner, 1960). Teachers' *making sense* of their classrooms is a constructivist process; understanding evolves and is influenced by teachers' prior knowledge, values, and beliefs. Interpretation of classroom events is viewed as a quest for order and intelligibility among the many possible patterns of sense that a classroom scene affords the teacher. The sense that a teacher makes of a particular scene is a product of ordered prior knowledge of classroom scenes, awareness of particular features of the present scene, and cognitive processes that connect knowledge with current awareness (Calderhead, 1987).

As teacher educators, our task is to assist our candidates in examining, critiquing, and refining their meaning (constructions) as they search for greater understanding. Moreover, while we understand that learners create their own meanings, we also understand that not all constructions are of the same worth or usefulness. One of the dangers of misunderstood and misapplied constructivism is rampant relativism. Constructions that are justified solely on the basis of uniqueness and “reality” for the particular individual are potentially biased and self-serving. Thus, while we embrace constructivist teacher education programs, we do so with the understanding and intent that the constructions must be subjected to standards, a knowledge base, and processes by which they can be examined, reflected upon; and evaluated on a basis more persuasive than one’s personal reality.

Collaborators. “...it behooves the school to make ceaseless and intelligently organized effort to develop above all else the will for co-operation and the spirit which sees in every other individual one who has an equal right to share in the cultural and material fruits of collective human invention...” (Dewey, 1937)

Dewey’s ideology and his approach to education encompassed a view that human beings had the natural tendency to connect with others, “to give out, to do, and to serve” (Dewey, 1916, p. 55). This led him to take an approach to education which stressed the importance of learning to get

along with others because cooperation actually satisfies a deep-seated human need (Purkey & Siegel, 2003).

To see teaching and learning as the act of collaborating is to see the teacher as one who values teaching and learning as more than just an end unto itself. Teachers are charged to create a community of learners who construct meaning within a socio-cultural context. As Vygotsky (1962) theorized, learning is enhanced through social interaction. Later, Johnson & Johnson (1994) posited that learning is socially-mediated and that interaction with more capable peers and/or more knowledgeable others, and under the guidance of accomplished, mentor teachers produces higher levels of achievement.

Beyond these defined philosophical tenets, the PTEU has agreed upon the following Belief and Action Statements to elucidate how learning occurs. The model of teaching and learning envisioned at KSU brings to the foreground the needs of the learner rather than the teacher.

Belief and Action Statements

1. All human beings are worthy of respect; high regard for human dignity is essential.
2. All students are capable of high-levels of learning, and it is the responsibility of faculty and candidates to ensure this occurs by using a variety of validated practices in a constructivist learning environment.
3. Development of teaching expertise by faculty and candidates is a complex intellectual and developmental process requiring the integration of strong content and pedagogical knowledge within well-structured classroom experiences. Teaching expertise is facilitated through thoughtful reflection on practice, student success, and on-going professional development.
4. Appropriate use of technology is essential to effective teaching and learning for faculty and candidates. Instructional plans that use research-based methods, materials, and technologies are necessary to meet the needs of all students.

5. To enhance candidate learning, faculty members must model best educational practice, who possess a spirit of inquiry and engage in professional collaboration and professional development that enhances candidate learning.
6. Collaboration with the professional education community is essential for the successful preparation of effective teachers and teacher leaders.
7. Ongoing candidate evaluation, both formative and summative, is necessary for documenting candidates' development of teaching expertise.
8. Teachers use the results of ongoing program evaluation, scholarly inquiry about best educational practice in teaching and learning, and an understanding of changes in state policy and professional standards.
9. To facilitate high levels of learning in all students, initial and advanced programs support candidates' efforts to be self-directed and to value a spirit of inquiry through research.

We believe that learning is both personally and socially mediated. Personally, KSU candidates build upon their own experiences to construct their own meaning, gain sophisticated pedagogical skills, and demonstrate dispositions that enhance their daily practice and ultimately, student learning. Socially, KSU candidates engage in collegial discourse and are recipients of extended practice, mentoring, and assistance to help them learn.

Aim

Directed Purpose

The aim is the directed purpose for all unit activity that emerges from its vision (theme), its mission, and its underlying beliefs (Dottin, 2001, p. 45). The PTEU seeks to facilitate high levels of candidate learning and the development of teaching expertise through extensive collaboration among numerous departments across the university and with many partner schools and practicing professionals in the field. Such collaborative efforts are designed to aid in the candidate's acquisition of critical understandings, knowledge, and skills, as well as foster dispositions that reflect high regard for learner diversity, professional

reflection and growth, and student success. The unit's commitment to collaboration with the professional educational community serves as a model, the purpose of which is *to develop expertise among candidates in their initial and advanced programs as teachers and leaders who possess the capability, intent, and expertise to facilitate high levels of learning in all students through effective classroom instruction, and who enhance structures that support learning*. Our aim is to produce teachers and school leaders who are

- Subject Matter Experts who assist students in subject matter mastery, who accurately represent content, and who use effective instructional strategies/techniques, including the use of technology.
- Facilitators of Learning who understand how individuals construct knowledge, who help learners develop complex cognitive structures, who adapt instruction to accommodate learners' levels of understanding, and who use a wide array of teaching strategies and methodologies.
- Collaborative Professionals who work together to improve teaching and learning, who are committed to life-long learning, who promote a climate of collaboration and trust, and who have high ethical and professional values.

Institutional Standards

Institutional standards are used in unit evaluation to measure candidate proficiencies in mastering the desired outcomes mentioned above. All of the instruction provided on campus, as well as in field experiences, is designed to meet the unit aim. Candidate assessment is divided into three succinct categories of a) Subject Matter Experts; b) Facilitators of Learning; and c) Collaborative Professionals.

Knowledge Base

The justification for the development of unit outcomes and proficiencies is grounded in research and a knowledge base that emerges from the professional literature on the preparation of teachers and other school personnel.

Know Subject Matter Deeply

Wilson, Schulman & Richert (1987) identified three critical components of a teacher's professional knowledge base: subject matter content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and curricular knowledge. Thus, teacher candidates must be knowledgeable of their content areas (The National Boards, 1999) and the state-approved standards and curriculum, as well as possess a broad repertoire of instructional and assessment practices (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998), technology applications (Ross, 2003; Churma, 1999), and know how to collaborate with other professionals (Kohler, et. al., 1997).

Sternberg (1998) supports our belief that expertise is a process of continued development, not an end state. In developing expertise, teachers exhibit characteristics that set them apart from novice teachers. They differentiate themselves in the areas of knowledge, efficiency, and insight (Sternberg, 1996). Expert teachers use knowledge effectively in professional problem-solving, organize their knowledge, and have tacit situational knowledge (Robbins, 2001). Finally, teachers with higher levels of expertise search for solutions to teaching/learning situations through creative problem-solving.

Accomplished, expert teachers command the specialized knowledge of their discipline (Robbins, 2001) and know how to present that information to a diverse group of students (Buckman, 1984; The National Board, 1999; Zheng, 1999). Accomplished, expert teachers are aware of the background knowledge students bring to the subject area as well as necessary instructional strategies to help students capitalize upon their background knowledge. Also, accomplished, expert teachers predict where instruction can be hindered or enhanced and have the ability to modify practices accordingly.

Facilitate Learning

Teachers assume the role of facilitators of learning (Johnson, 2000) by assisting students as they explore and investigate concepts. This role, grounded in constructivist philosophy, transforms learning from the demonstration of a measurable outcome to the acquisition of personal meaning (Dottin, 2001). In all teacher preparation

programs at KSU, facilitation is key to the teaching and learning process. Teacher facilitation fosters an instructional climate that promotes active and authentic learning of a standards-based curriculum (Zemelman, Daniels & Hyde, 1998). The instructional climate in the facilitated classroom supports risk-taking and inquiry (Elias, et. al., 1997) so that students are able to make connections between and among disciplines and apply knowledge and skills from one discipline or situation to another (Brigman, 2000). Elam and Duckenfield (2000) describe the teacher facilitator as an instructional leader who, through collaboration with university faculty, master teachers, cooperating teachers, and role models in the community, provides collective experiences and opportunities for student learning (Robbins & Cooper, 2003; Robbins, Miesiazek & Andrews, 2002). An instructional leader fosters a climate that encourages and promotes active learning of a standards-based curriculum.

Constructivist teaching and learning approaches act in tandem with this belief. With constructivist approaches, “the single most important factor influencing learning is what the learner already knows” (Ausubel, Novak & Hanessian, 1978, p. *iv*). Therefore, it is critical that teachers embrace diversity and use students’ knowledge and experiences to build the instructional program. Von Glassersfield (1991) states, “Teachers must try to infer, from what they can observe, what students’ concepts are and how they operate with them. Only on the basis of some such hypothesis can teachers devise ways and means to orient, direct, or modify the students’ mental operating” (p. 22). In constructivist classrooms “...learning activities must begin by considering the role of students’ current knowledge, how knowledge is constructed, and the role of the activity in building knowledge” (Penner, 2001, p. 3). Zahorik, (1997) suggests that teachers “help students negotiate meaning” by extending activities with discussions in which children compare their constructions with the experts’ constructions to “gain insights into both and begin to reconceptualize their constructions in the direction of those of the experts” (p. 32).

While facilitation and constructivist thinking permeate the teacher preparation program, particular emphasis is also placed upon validated methods and procedures for planning curriculum

(Miller, 2002), delivering instruction (Daniels & Bazar, 1998; Miller, 2002; Zimelman, Daniels & Hyde, 1998), and evaluating and reporting student progress (Herman, Gearhart & Baker, 1993) that result in high levels of student learning and teacher effectiveness. Such validated practices include, but are not restricted to, direct instruction (Engelmann, Becker, Carnine & Gersten (1998), cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1994), strategy instruction (Englert, 1984), classroom and behavioral management (Taylor-Green, Horner, Sugai & Sprague, 1999), and authentic assessment (Valencia, 1990).

Engender Collaboration

The Holmes Group (1990) and NCATE (1997) proposed professional development schools as the means of connecting schools and universities in a collaborative endeavor. The essential attributes of collaboration between the university and partner schools and/or professional development schools are commitment, collaboration, and connectedness. These partnerships are based on mutual trust, understanding, and collaboration (Osguthorpe, et. al., 1995). Coalitions, consortiums, networks, and partnerships have been developed to provide the connections between schools and universities. These terms are often used interchangeably and represent the idea of making connections in the learning process.

Historically, there has been a call for collaboration between schools and universities. John Dewey (1904, p.10) urged schools and colleges of education to look to “the matured experience” of other professional callings to provide lessons and insight into an improved teaching/learning experience. Goodlad and Sirotnick (1988) interpreted this statement to mean that professions such as law and medicine connected the scholarly endeavors of the academy with application of the discipline in the courts and in hospitals to produce effective lawyers and doctors. Dewey was suggesting a similar collaboration between schools and colleges of education to produce effective teachers.

The National Board (1999) ascribes a leadership role to teachers that is directed primarily at the building level but certainly could be accomplished in larger communities. In that regard, the National Board encourages teachers to work collaboratively with parents and other professionals and to be proactive and creative--engaging them in development of curriculum, coordination and

implementation of instruction, new teacher professional development and other policy decisions fundamental to development of quality learning environments. Expert teachers focus upon their students’ educational needs by developing their partnerships with parents, the community, and other professional colleagues (Bessette, 1999).

Candidate Outcomes and Proficiencies

Candidate proficiencies represent a common core of essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective classroom instruction. Candidate proficiencies are organized into three outcomes that are linked to the institutional standards and unit aim. They are: a) Subject Matter Experts, b) Facilitators of Learning, and c) Collaborative Professionals. Candidates’ performance of specific teaching or professional decisions and actions will occur in numerous and varied contexts, which means that the evidence of candidates’ performance vis-à-vis the institutional standards will be numerous and varied. Candidates in the initial programs develop beginning levels of expertise, facilitate learning in all students, and recognize the significance of life-long professional development and collaboration. Proficiencies in each area reflect a continuum of development and expectation as candidates proceed through their programs from initial field experiences through student teaching. Table 1 depicts the PTEU outcomes and proficiencies at the initial level as well as their designations to categories of “**K**nowledge, **S**kills and/or **D**ispositions” and their alignment with NCATE standards.

Table 1
PTEU Outcomes and Proficiencies for Initial Programs

OUTCOMES & PROFICIENCIES	KSD	NCATE Standard
Outcome 1: Subject Matter Expert		
1.1 Candidate possesses knowledge of discipline content, methods of inquiry, and connections to other disciplines and applications to common life experiences.	K	Content
1.2 Candidate knows and represents content accurately in multiple explanations, technology integration, and the application of various instructional strategies.	S	Pedagogical Content
1.3 Candidate uses content and pedagogical knowledge to assist students in the mastery of subject matter knowledge.	S	Pedagogical Content

OUTCOMES & PROFICIENCIES	KSD	NCATE Standard
Outcome 2: Facilitator of Learning		
2.1 Candidate demonstrates knowledge of how learners develop, learn and think about subject content, as well as successful strategies to motivate students to learn.	K	Pedagogical & Professional
2.2 Candidate uses knowledge of the influences of society, culture, community, and family on schools and learning to create and implement instruction that embodies multiple cultures and a rich, diverse curriculum.	K	Pedagogical & Professional
2.3 Candidate creates effective, well-managed and active learning environments that reflect high expectations for student achievement.	S	Pedagogical & Professional
2.4 Candidate designs and implements instruction that makes effective use of a variety of methods, materials, and technologies to positively impact learning of all students.	S	Pedagogical & Professional Student Learning
2.5 Candidate utilizes a variety of assessments to evaluate student learning and uses the results to improve the quality of instruction that is differentiated to accommodate students' diversities.	S	Pedagogical & Professional Student Learning
Outcome 3: Collaborative Professional		
3.1 Candidate reflects upon and improves professional performance based on professional standards, feedback, best practices and effective communication.	D	Disposition
3.2 Candidate builds collaborative and respectful relationships with colleagues, supervisors, students, parents and community members.	D	Disposition
3.3 Candidate displays professional and ethical behavior consistent with recognized educational standards and codes of ethics.	D	Disposition

Candidates in the advanced programs develop expertise in sophisticated pedagogical skills and as leaders in their educational community. Proficiencies in each area in the advanced programs and are organized under the same three outcomes: a) Subject Matter Experts, b) Facilitators of Learning, and c) Collaborative Professionals. At the advanced level, KSU offers programs in teacher education and educational leadership. Thus, the outcomes and proficiencies are broad enough to encompass both types of advanced programs and to reflect professional standards in both arenas. Table 2 depicts the PTEU outcomes and proficiencies at the advanced level as well as their designations to categories of “Knowledge, Skills and/or Dispositions” and their alignment with NCATE and National Board Standards.

Table 2
Outcomes and Proficiencies for Advanced Programs

OUTCOMES & PROFICIENCIES	KSD	NCATE Standard 1 Element	NBPTS Core Principles	ISLLC Standard
Outcome 1: A Subject Matter Expert knows the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.			2	
1.1 Candidate possesses broad, current and specialized knowledge of subject matter and communicates this understanding to colleagues, parents and students. – OR – 1.1 EDL: Candidate promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	K	Content	2	1, 4
1.2 Candidate possesses a global understanding of connections within and across disciplines and applications to real life and accurately represents understanding through use of multiple explanations, technologies and strategies.	K/S	Pedagogical Content	2	2, 3
1.3 Candidate demonstrates a passion for education and creates environments conducive to the development of powerful approaches to instructional challenges.	K/S	Pedagogical Content	2	2
1.4 Candidate teaches or leads in ways that convey knowledge as a combination of skills, dispositions and beliefs-integrated, flexible, elaborate and deep.	K/S/D	Pedagogical Content	2	1, 2, 5
Outcome 2: A Facilitator of Learning is committed to students and is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.			1, 3	
2.1 Candidate believes that all students can learn and helps students develop a positive disposition for learning.	D	Disposition	1	2
2.2 Candidate treats students equitably and provides equitable access to the full curriculum by respecting individual differences and adjusting (or assisting teachers in adjusting) practices accordingly.	S	Professional & Pedagogical Student Learning	1	5
2.3 Candidate understands human development and learning and uses this understanding to create enriching educational experiences and/or environments for all students.	K/S/D	Professional & Pedagogical Disposition	1	2

OUTCOMES & PROFICIENCIES	KSD	NCATE Standard 1 Element	NBPTS Core Principles	ISLLC Standard
2.4 Candidate creates safe, well-managed, supportive, inclusive and challenging learning environments.	K/S	Professional & Pedagogical	3	2
2.5 Candidate uses multiple methods, technologies, resources, and organizational arrangements to meet goals articulated for individual students, class instruction and the overall school improvement plan.	K/S	Professional & Pedagogical Student Learning	3	3
2.6 Candidate monitors student progress with a variety of formal and informal evaluation methods and uses results to improve student learning.	K/S	Professional & Pedagogical Student Learning	3	3, 2
2.7 Candidate is accountable to multiple audiences, accurately interprets student performance data and communicates results to multiple audiences in multiple formats.	K/S	Professional & Pedagogical	3	4
Outcome 3: A COLLABORATIVE PROFESSIONAL thinks systematically about her practice, learns from experience, and is a member of learning communities.			4, 5	
3.1 Candidate collaborates with colleagues, parents and other professionals to strengthen school effectiveness, to advance knowledge, and to influence policy and practice.	K/D	Professional & Pedagogical Disposition	5	4, 6
3.2 Candidate reflects regularly upon daily practice, and draws upon experience and the professional literature to design and conduct research aimed at improved student achievement.	K/D	Professional & Pedagogical Disposition Student Learning	4	2
3.3 Candidate proactively involves parents and other members of the community in support of instruction and education.	D	Disposition	5	4
3.4 Candidate engages in on-going professional development by joining professional organizations, participating in conferences, mentoring new staff.	D	Disposition	4, 5	3, 6

Standards Alignment

At KSU, the institutional standards for the unit are derived from the expected outcomes and proficiencies for candidate learning and are aligned with the knowledge, skills, or dispositions identified in professional and state standards. Tables 3 and 4 depict the alignment of initial and advanced outcomes and proficiencies with the Georgia Board of Regents' (BOR) Principles, Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards [advanced program in educational leadership only], and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Table 3

Alignment of Initial Program Outcomes & Proficiencies with State and National Standards

INITIAL PROGRAM OUTCOMES and PROFICIENCIES	GEORGIA BOARD OF REGENTS' PRINCIPLES	INTASC STANDARDS	NBPTS STANDARDS
Outcome 1: Subject Matter Experts			
1.1 Discipline Content Knowledge	II B (1) - Depth in Content II B (2) – High Lrning Stds	1 - Concepts, Inquiry, and Structures of Discipline	2 - Know & Tch Subjects 3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
1.2 Multiple Explanations	II B (3) - Customize Inst	1 - Concepts, Inquiry, and Structures of Discipline 4 - Instructional Strategies 7 - Plans Instruction	2 – Know & Tch Subjects
1.3 Use of Content & Pedagogical Knowledge	II B (3) - Customize Inst	1 - Concepts, Inquiry, and Structures of Discipline 4 - Instructional Strategies 7 - Plans Instruction	2 – Know & Tch Subjects
Outcome 2: Facilitators of Learning			
2.1 Learner Characteristics & Motivation		2 - Learning & Development 5 – Motivation	1 - Commitment to Students
2.2 Influences of Society	II B (3) - Customize Inst	3 - Diverse Learners 10 - Collaboration	1 - Commitment to Students
2.3 Management of Learning Environments	II B (2) - High Lrning Stds II B (7) - Manage Classrooms	4 - Instructional Strategies 1 - Concepts, Inquiry, and Structures of Discipline 5 – Motivation	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
2.4 Design & Implementation of Instruction	II B (6) - Telecommun & Info Tech	4 - Instructional Strategies 5 - Motivation 6 - Communication 7 - Plans Instruction	2 – Know & Tch Subjects
2.5 Assess, Evaluate, Improve	II B (5) - Use Stu Data III A - Inst Results in St Learning - Init III B - Inst Results in St Learning - Induction	8 – Assessment 4 - Instructional Strategies	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
Outcome 3: Collaborative Professionals			
3.1 Reflect, Improve Professional Performance		9 – Reflection 6 - Communication	4 – Think About Practice
3.2 Collaborative, Respectful Relationships		10 – Collaboration 6 Communication 9 – Reflection	5 - Learning Communities 4 – Think About Practice
3.3 Professional & Ethical Behavior		9 – Reflection	4 – Think About Practice

Table 4

Alignment of Advanced Program Outcomes & Proficiencies with State and National Standards

ADVANCED PROGRAM OUTCOMES AND PROFICIENCIES	GEORGIA BOARD OF REGENTS' PRINCIPLES	ISLLC STANDARDS	NBPTS STANDARDS
Outcome 1: Subject Matter Experts	III C		2 - Know & Tch Subjects
1.1 Subject matter expert		1, 4	2 - Know & Tch Subjects
1.2 Understanding of connections		2, 3	2 - Know & Tch Subjects
1.3 Powerful instructional approaches		2	2 - Know & Tch Subjects
1.4 Knowledge as combination of understanding, skills & dispositions		1, 2, 5	2 - Know & Tch Subjects
Outcome 2: Facilitators of Learning	III C		1- Commitment to Students 3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
2.1 Belief that all students can learn		2	1- Commitment to Students
2.2 Equitable treatment and access		5	1- Commitment to Students
2.3 Human development and learning		2	1- Commitment to Students
2.4 Challenging environments		2	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
2.5 Multiple methods		3	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
2.6 Evaluating progress		3, 2	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
2.7 Interpreting & reporting student performance		4	3 - Manage & Monitor Learning
Outcome 3: Collaborative Professionals	III C		4 - Think About Practice 5 - Learning Communities
3.1 Collaboration with professional partners		4, 5	5 - Learning Communities
3.2 Reflection, research & scholarship		2	4 - Think About Practice
3.3 Parental and Community Involvement		4	5 - Learning Communities
3.4 Professional Development		3, 6	4 - Think About Practice 5 - Learning Communities

Unit Assessment System

Goal

The goal of the unit and program evaluation system at KSU is to determine whether candidates acquire the unit's outcomes and as a result whether the unit is achieving its aim *to develop expertise among candidates in their initial and advanced programs as teachers and leaders who possess the capability, intent, and expertise to facilitate high levels of learning in all students through effective classroom instruction, and who enhance structures that support learning*. To achieve this aim, the unit has developed internal and external assessments of candidate performance to be used in combination with unit and program operational assessments to determine overall effectiveness in meeting the unit goal and institutional standards.

Two-Tiered Assessment System

The unit assessment system in the PTEU and Bagwell College of Education is designed to inform all stakeholders of overall unit effectiveness and to guide the unit's efforts in making improvements in programs and services that help produce highly qualified beginning and experienced teachers and school leaders. Initial and advanced candidate proficiencies listed in Tables 1 and 2 of the conceptual framework serve as the primary focus of internal and external assessments to determine candidate qualifications. The unit ensures common collection and reporting of information pertaining to all programs and services, but some assessments originate at the program level and become the basis for analysis and application to the unit. A similar structure provides the unit with information regarding field experiences, diversity, faculty and resources. Table 5 PTEU Assessment System summarizes the two-tiered conceptual structure to show how various sources of data interrelate and compliment the unit's ability to maintain or improve its effectiveness. Although the unit is the level most accountable for the delivery of teacher education programs and services, it recognizes and depends upon the unique contributions of programs in supplementing its major

assessments (e.g. program specific requirements at points of admission, state licensure exams in the content field, technology competencies).

Table 5

PTEU Assessment System

DATA SOURCE	TIER	
	Program Assessment	Unit Assessment
Internal	Candidate Performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Program specific requirements at admission points and exit <input type="checkbox"/> Key assessments of professional content standards (SPA & PSC) <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate Performance Assessment Instrument (CPI) <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio Narrative Rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Student Learning Rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Infusion of technology <input type="checkbox"/> Self assessment 	Candidate Performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Common requirements at each decision point of admission/exit <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate Performance Assessment Instrument (CPI) at Exit <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio Narrative Rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Student Learning Rubric
	Field Experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Placements in content area courses <input type="checkbox"/> Placements in TOSS/practicum <input type="checkbox"/> Observations <input type="checkbox"/> Applications to own classroom (advanced) 	Field Experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Placements in core courses (EDUC 2201 and EXC 3304) and student teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Observations
		Diversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Candidates <input type="checkbox"/> Field Experiences <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment & Retention
	End of Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate survey 	Faculty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Biographical information <input type="checkbox"/> Vita and supporting documentation <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> Performance reviews (e.g. annual, P & T, Post-Tenure Review)
		Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Technology
External	Candidate Performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Praxis I <input type="checkbox"/> Praxis II <input type="checkbox"/> MAT/GRE <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperating teachers 	End of Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Collaborating teachers survey (initial only) <input type="checkbox"/> Principal survey (initial only)
		Graduates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> First Year Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Second Year Survey (initial only)
		Employers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Surveys

General Description

Candidate performance assessment and the evaluation of learning in field and clinical experiences is the crux of unit evaluation. However, to assure that the unit meets its overall aim, faculty vitality and unit accountability are also continuously assessed.

At the unit level, candidate assessments are related to requirements agreed upon by all programs and are consistent with the unit's beliefs about the qualifications its candidates should have; however, each program retains the right and responsibility for keeping records on additional requirements. At the initial certification level, quantitative data (e.g. GPAs and Praxis scores) are collected and summarized at each of four phases in a candidate's initial program:

1. Admission to Teacher Education,
2. Admission to TOSS or Practicum,
3. Admission to Student Teaching, and
4. Graduation or completion of program.

The capability of aggregating data by program, semester, and demographics enables the unit and programs to observe change over time. Unit data on candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs (M.Ed.), endorsement, and add-on certificate programs are kept at the time of 1) initial admission and 2) exit/graduation. Unit data, like those kept at the initial level, are summarized on quantitative measures such as GPAs and SAT scores; however, the uniqueness of each discipline's specific criteria for admission, including qualitative measures, requires some data be kept at the program level.

Candidate assessment reflects the unit's commitment to the development of expertise. Within each phase of preparation, initial and advanced candidates are assessed on competencies derived from the institutional standards by integrating components of the unit's principle instrument called the Candidate Performance Instrument (CPI) into various program-created assessments. At the program level, the CPI is also aligned with the professional standards of each program area. In this manner, our programs ensure that each candidate has mastered the outcomes and proficiencies identified by

the unit as well as those articulated by their professional organizations. The integrated program assessments are used routinely in designated courses and field observations.

As a unit instrument, the CPI is used for exit evaluation to assess and document candidate performance at the end of each initial and advanced program; but its comprehensiveness and adaptable rubric also make it easy to extend use to other unit assessments, such as the portfolio narrative and impact on student learning. As previously noted, the two-tiered assessment system ensures common collection and reporting of information pertaining to all programs because critical assessments originate at the program level and become the basis for analysis and application to the unit. For example, the Impact on Student Learning rubric is administered throughout the initial and advanced candidate preparation programs to ensure that each candidate is able to bring all students to high levels of learning. Similarly, all programs use the Portfolio Narrative rubric is used to assess candidate mastery of desired outcomes and proficiencies as they exit their programs of study. The aggregate scores on both rubrics are reported regularly to the unit for interpretation and analysis college-wide. In this manner, the inherent alignment between the criteria/rubrics of related assessments and the CPI preserves the connection with our conceptual framework.

The assessment system also includes external measures to assess candidates in field and clinical experiences as well as the quality of the experience as perceived by the cooperating school personnel. Surveys by cooperating teachers and principals evaluate the adequacy of preparation, logistical arrangements for placements, and awareness/application of the conceptual framework. Following graduation, the unit monitors all of its graduates for two years following completion of the degree program in accordance with the Georgia Board of Regent's policy, *Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools (1998)*. The unit honors the commitment to the specific Regents' principle that guarantees the quality of any teacher it [system institution] prepares by providing any graduate deemed less than effective in helping students make satisfactory progress additional preparation at no cost to the teacher or school district. Furthermore, by offering first and second year induction programs throughout the service area to all teachers, the unit recognizes the

benefit of early mentoring and support to inexperienced teachers in offsetting a national trend of significant attrition among highly qualified teachers in their first years of teaching. Surveys completed by graduates and employers of graduates constitute the unit's primary source of feedback used to determine the following: a.) quality of the induction program, b.) the extent to which the induction program influences teaching and students' learning, and c.) quality of the KSU teacher education program in preparing teachers and school leaders for their roles.

Assessments of unit capacity related to field experiences and diversity utilize a variety of paper and electronic surveys and electronic tracking systems to ensure balance in initial and advanced field and clinical placements with diverse teachers and students. The unit uses a combination of electronic vita templates and surveys completed by candidates as well as professional participation/contribution records to show the quality of its faculty, and instruction and supervision of candidates. Evidence to show the adequacy of available resources, including technology, and the effectiveness of unit governance comes from unit, departmental and university sources. This evidence represents a different level of data reporting and access because of the complexities associated with shared resources.

Because of generous financial and personnel support from key university administrative levels, the unit is able to develop and maintain a state-of-the-art, electronic data management system (DMS). The purpose of the DMS is to improve the accuracy and lessen the burden of record keeping through advanced electronic and technologic means. As the DMS develops in sophistication, it will expand from its current focus on candidate tracking to support the electronic entry, storage, and reporting of data related to faculty qualifications, field experience and diversity placements, and unit/program resources. In addition, the system will monitor and electronically notify programs about candidates whose records are ready for review for admission or graduation. The capability for examining cross-sectional and longitudinal slices of data will be possible through live and archival components. Integrating this system with the BANNER system that supports university student records provides an almost limitless potential for managing data electronically.

The unit is committed to the delivery of quality experiences in all phases of candidate preparation, including the essential services that provide advisement and technology support. As the assessment system develops and broadens its scope, the unit will utilize more comprehensive feedback to make positive changes.

References

- Ausubel, D. P., Novak, J. D. & Hanessian, H. (1978). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Berliner, D. C. (1988). The development of expertise in pedagogy. *Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture*, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. New Orleans, LA.
- Bessette, H. J. (1999). *A Case Study of General and Special Educators' Perspectives on Co-teaching and Collaboration within an Integrated, Language-Based Elementary Classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.
- Brigman, D.C. (2000). Building social skills in a learning environment. In *Creating a community of learners*. In K.G. Elam & M. Duckenfield (Eds.), Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University.
- Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. (1998). *Making the commitment: Guaranteeing the quality of future educators*. [Brochure]. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Boyer, E. (1995). *The Basic School: A Community of Learners*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teachers, Princeton: NJ.
- Brookhart, S.M. (1994). Teachers' grading: Practice and theory. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 7(4), 279-301.
- Bruner, J.S. (1960). *The process of education*. New York: Vintage.
- Calderhead, J. (Ed.) (1987). *Explaining Teachers Thinking*. (pp. 1-4-124). London: Cassell.
- Churma, M. (1999). *A guide to integrating technology standards into the curriculum*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Daniels, H. & Bizar, M. (1998) *Methods that Matter: Six structures for best practice classrooms*. York: ME. Stenhouse Publishers.

- Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. A. McMurry (Ed.), *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers*, 3rd Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston: Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Holt.
- Dewey, J. (1937). *Experience and education*. New York: McMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1956). *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1960). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dottin, E. S. (2001). *The development of a conceptual framework: The stimulation for coherence and continuous improvement in teacher education*. Lanham: MD: University Press of America.
- Earle, R.S., Seehafer, S., & Ostlund, M.F. (2001). Systematic reform in teacher education: Quality teachers through partnering. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 14(28), 53-69.
- Englert, C.S. (1984). Effective instructional practices in special education settings. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5(2), 38-47.
- Engelmann, S., Becker, W., Carnine, D. & Gersten, R. (1988). The Direction Instruction Follow Through Model: Design and outcomes. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 11(4), 303-317.
- Elam, K.G., & Duckenfield, M. (2000) (Eds.). *Creating a community of learners*. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University.
- Friend, M. & Cook, L. (2003). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. Allyn & Bacon, Boston: MA.
- Galassi, J.P. (2000). PDS site selection: Implications for educational reform and restructuring. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. ERIC. ED 444984.

- Goodlad, J. & Sirotnik, K. (1988). The future of school-university partnerships. In K. A. Sirotnik and J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Herman, J., Aschbacher, P. & Winters, L. (1992). *A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Huling, L. 1997. Novice teacher needs. A commissioned paper. Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.
- Johnson, R. (2000). The accidental theorist: Constructivist foundations and applications in teacher's odyssey. In K. G. Elam and M. Duckenfield (Eds.), *Creating a community of learners*. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1994). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning* (4th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Katz, L.G. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 73, (1), 50-54.
- (1993, September). Dispositions as educational goals. *ERIC Digest*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. (EDO-PS-93-10).
- Kennesaw State University (2002). *Kennesaw state university catalogued, 2002-2003*. Kennesaw, GA: Author.
- Kohler, F., Crilley, K., & Shearer, D. (1997). Effects of peer coaching on teaching and student outcomes, *Journal of Educational Research*, 90(4), 240-250.
- Lipsky, D. & Gardner, A. (1989). *Beyond separate education: Quality education for all*. Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

- Martin, D. J. (2003). *Elementary science methods: A constructivist approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Marshall, P., Fittinghoff, S., & Cheney, C. O. (1990). Beginning teacher developmental stages: Implications for creating collaborative internship programs. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 17, (3), 25-35.
- McGregor, G. & Vogelsberg, T. (1998). *Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical & Research Foundations*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Washington, D.C.
- Miller, S. (2002). Validated practices for teaching students with diverse needs and abilities. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1999). What teachers should know and be able to do. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (1997). *Draft standards for identifying and supporting quality professional development schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Odell, S.J., Huling, L., & Sweeny, B.W. (2000). Conceptualizing quality mentoring-- Background information. In S.J. Odell & L. Huling (Eds.), *Quality mentoring for novice teachers* (pp. 3-14). Indianapolis, IA: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Osguthorpe, R.T., Harris, R. C., Black, S., Cutler, B. R., & Harris, M. F. (1995). Introduction: Understanding school-university partnerships. In R. T. Osguthorpe, R. C. Harris, S. Black, B. R. Cutler, and M. F. Harris (Eds.), *Partner schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Penner, D. E. (2001). Cognition, computers, and synthetic science: Building knowledge and meaning through modeling. *Review of Research in Education*, 25 (2000-2001), 1-35).

- Purkey, W. & Siegel, B. (2003). *Becoming an invitational leader: A new approach to professional and personal success*. Atlanta: Humanics.
- Robbins, S. & Cooper, M. (April, 2003). Creating a shared space for English education: The history of a personal and professional collaboration. English Education, 35, pp 223-224.
- Robbins, S., Miesiazek, M & Andrews, B. (2002). Promoting a relevant classroom literacy. In R. Yagelski & S. Leonard (Eds.) *In the relevance of English: Teaching that matters to students' lives*. Urbana: NCTC, pp. 157-182.
- Robbins, S. (2001). Afterword: Where do we go from here? Future work for making American literatures. In A. Ruggles-Gere & P. Shaheen. *In making American literatures*. Urbana: NCTE Press, pp.210-220.
- Ross, M. C. (2003). Blending Cooperative Learning and Technology in the Classroom, Georgia Council of Teachers of English, 40, (1) 7-12.
- Ross, M. Seaborn, A. & Wilson, E. (2002). Is cooperative learning a valuable instructional method for teaching social studies to urban African American students? *An imperfect world: Resonance from the nation's violence. (Volume II)*. 2002 National Conference Education Monograph Series (pp. 687-720).
- Salisbury, C. & Strieker, T. (2004). Inclusive education in elementary school. In C. Kennedy & E. Horn (Eds.) *Including students with severe disabilities*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sparks, D., & Hirsch, S. (1997). *A New Vision for Staff Development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1996). Educational psychology has fallen, but it can get up. *Educational Psychology Review*, 8 (2), 175-185.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1998). Metacognition, abilities, and developing expertise: What makes an expert student? *Instructional Science*, 26, 127-140.

- Strieker, T. & Logan, K. (2001). Everybody WINS! The State Education Standard.
Autumn, Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.
- Taylor-Green, A., Horner, R., Sugai, G., & Sprague, J. (1999). Effective behavior support: Strengthening school-wide systems through a team-based approach. *Effective School Practices, 17(4), 23-33*.
- Valencia, S. (1990). A portfolio approach to classroom reading assessment: The why's, what's, and how's. *The Reading Teacher, 43, 338-340*.
- Von glassersfeld, E. (1991). *Knowing without metaphysics: Aspects of the radical constructivist position*. In F. Steier, *Research and reflexivity (pp. 22-27)*. London: Sage Publishers.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wilson, S., Shulman, L., & Rickert, A. (1987). 150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.) *Explaining Teachers Thinking*. (pp. 1-4-124). London: Cassell.
- Zahorik, J. A. (1997). Encouraging – and challenging- students' understandings. *Educational researcher, 54(6), 30-32*.
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (1998). *Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools (2nd Ed.)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Zheng, B. (1999). Working with cultural differences: Some aspects teachers need to know. *Becoming, 11(1), 16-18*.

Glossary

Advanced Preparation. Programs at the postbaccalaureate levels for (1) the continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation or (2) the preparation of other professional school personnel. Advanced preparation programs commonly award graduate credit and include master's, specialist, and doctoral degree programs as well as nondegree licensure programs offered at the graduate level. (NCATE, 2001, p. 54)

ALL students. "All students includes students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, socioeconomic, [sexual orientation], and regional/geographic origins." (NCATE, 2001, p.10).

Best Practice. This term is borrowed from the field of medicine and law where the phrase is used to describe solid, reputable, state-of-the-art work in a field. If a practitioner is following best practice standards, he or she is aware of current research and consistently offers clients the full benefits of the latest knowledge, technology, and procedures....the term *Best Practice*—"as a shorthand emblem of serious, thoughtful, informed, responsible, state-of-the-art teaching." Best practice reflects teaching that is "student-centered, active experiential, democratic, collaborative, and yet rigorous and challenging." (Zemelman, Daniels, Hyde, *Best Practice*, p. viii, 1998)

Candidates. "Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers, teachers continuing their professional development, or other professional school personnel. Candidates are distinguished from "students" in P-12 schools" (NCATE, 2001, p. 53).

Collaborative. Working together especially in an intellectual effort is the hallmark of collaboration. "The developmental nature of collaboration includes:

- Networking – exchanging information for mutual benefit
- Coordination – exchanging information and altering strategies for mutual benefit
- Cooperation – exchanging information, altering strategies, and integrating resources for mutual benefit

- Collaboration – exchanging information, altering activities, integrating resources, and initiating new synergistic approaches for mutual benefit.” (School & Main Institute, Inc, Boston, MA, 2000)

Cultural Background. "The context of one's life experience as shaped by me membership in groups based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area" (NCATE, 2001, p. 53).

Dispositions. "The values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice. For example, they might include a belief that all students can learn, a vision of high and challenging standards, or a commitment to a safe and supportive learning environment" (NCATE, 2001, p. 53).

Diversity. "Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area" (NCATE, 2001, p. 53).

Expert Learner. Expert learners when compared to novice learners are those who are able to use their learning in appropriate situations, use a range of "learning-to-learn" skills, utilize a variety of resources (info and people) in problem solving, and reflect on and improve their learning performance (Sternberg, 1996, pp 179-80)

Expert Teacher. According to Sternberg (1996) expert teachers as compared to novices can be characterized as using more knowledge more effectively in professional problem solving, organizing their knowledge differently, and possessing more tacit situational knowledge. Expert teachers are able to solve problems more efficiently than novices by showing more automatization of functioning, using smoothly functioning metacognitive processes, and using new problems as opportunities to expand their knowledge and competence. Expert teachers possess insight and are more likely to search for nonobvious solutions to novel problems (Sternberg, 1996, pp 179-80)

Expertise. To develop expertise in an area is to achieve a state of proficiency or "know-how." "Expertise is not an endstate but a process of continued development." (Sternberg, 1996, pp 179-80)

Facilitate learning. To facilitate learning is to assist or help learning occur. Teachers provide new and varied experiences, which learners can use to build upon their own foundation of existing knowledge. Teachers must understand that students construct their own knowledge, how they construct that knowledge, and how each student recognizes and understands his or her own learning experiences. To support this process of learning, teachers must work at creating environments, implementing strategies, and selecting teaching and learning resources that will maximize learning for each student's unique learning abilities. Teacher-centered instruction shifts to learner-centered instruction.

Initial Teacher Preparation. Programs at the baccalaureate or postbaccalaureate levels that prepare candidates for the first license to teach (NCATE, 2001, p. 54).

Teacher development. Teacher development is "a continuum of growth that includes four phases: pre-service, induction, in-service, renewal" (Odell, Huling, and Sweeny, 2000).