

Making Practice Public: Teacher Learning in the 21st Century

Ann Lieberman and Desiree Pointer Mace

There is world wide concern that schools must change to meet the demands of the rapidly changing demographics, the globalization of the economy as well as the technological and cultural changes that are happening around us. There is much agreement that the teacher is the key figure in any changes that are needed (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). There is also a commonly held view that the professional development of teachers should be the primary vehicle for teachers to improve their practice. Though well intentioned, teachers have long perceived professional development to be fragmented, disconnected and irrelevant to the real problems of their classroom practice. Researchers too have joined the chorus in agreement with teachers' perceptions (Ball & Cohen, 1999, Borko & Putnam, 1995, Hatch, et. al, 2005, Lieberman & Miller, 2001). In this paper, we challenge the entrenched professional development practices. We describe and discuss local, sustainable and economical teacher learning experiences that utilize professional learning communities, center on the study of practice, and incorporate the use of technology. Our cases were developed collaboratively with teachers over a decade, and led us to some learnings we think can contribute to a new understanding of the content and purposes of professional development. Others have suggested that the road from practitioner knowledge to professional knowledge is just in its infancy, but clearly provides much of what we need to explore. Practitioner knowledge comes from the problems of practice as they are "detailed, concrete and specific" (Hiebert, Gallimore & Stigler, 2002). But more than that, the knowledge must be made public, so that it can be shared, critiqued and verified. We propose that the advent and ubiquity of new media tools and social networking web resources provide a means for networked learning to "scale up." These important conceptual hooks present some new possibilities for thinking differently about the codification of professional knowledge, the conditions for its evolvment and the ways that professional development is organized. The idea of teacher quality and its importance in improving student learning has made this a time when such ideas as professional knowledge are paramount. We preface our discussion with a review of the research that has led us to argue for professional learning communities; document the policies and practices of professional development in high achieving countries internationally that have transformed the way teachers learn; and discuss the importance of online social networking as it is being used for teacher learning.

From Isolation to Collegueship

For many years, researchers have written about the isolation of teachers and the harm that it brings to their continued learning and development (Lieberman & Miller 1984, Lortie 1975, Sarason, 1982). Over twenty-five years ago, researchers began to look at the importance of collegiality among teachers (Little, 1982, 1986) to see if it made a difference in the professional development of teachers. Little's seminal work showed that teachers who planned and worked together over time not only built commitment to each other, but to further learning. Even the act of "struggling" together

1 at the same time in the same ways helped teachers to master new practices. Some
2 researchers warned that without the necessary supports, collegiality could be “contrived”
3 (Hargreaves, 2003, p. 165). Policies, Hargreaves argued, could get in the way of
4 collegiality by putting too many requirements and restrictions not allowing teachers to
5 grow the necessary relationships and shared work.

6 Perhaps our best example of collegiality (and community) is the National
7 Writing Project (NWP) now celebrating its over thirty years of existence in over 200 sites
8 in the United States. In 2000, Lieberman and Wood studied two sites of the NWP, one
9 urban and one rural, and found that the practices that occurred during the summer
10 institute helped teachers see that working together was a powerful way to learn about
11 their own and others’ practices. During the institute teachers learned to share their best
12 strategies, learn from others, become writers themselves and became open to learning as
13 a life long process. Teachers left the institute with a pile of tried and tested practices and
14 in observing six teachers classrooms after the summer institute, Lieberman and Wood
15 found that teachers were using many of the strategies they learned during the summer. A
16 big learning was that teachers became students of their own practice and for many went
17 public with their work *for the first time*.

18 19 **From Collegiality to Professional Learning Community**

20 It has only been quite recently that researchers and policymakers have recognized
21 that our current mode of providing professional development for teachers needs radical
22 change (Borko 1995, Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1993, Fullan 1995, Knapp 2003, Lieberman
23 & Miller 2001). Researchers have played an important role in not only critiquing
24 professional development that promises real change with only a few workshops, but they
25 have also brought a new language and new evidence of what it will take to turn the
26 isolation of teachers into professional learning communities. McLaughlin & Talbert
27 (2001) studied high schools in Michigan and California and have provided us with the
28 first in-depth study of communities of teachers in secondary schools. They found that
29 subject matter departments were either “moving” or “stuck” referring to their openness to
30 change or their sticking to the status quo. Departments were either “weak”, “strong-
31 traditional” or “strong innovative.” They either “enacted tradition”, “lowered standards
32 and expectations of students” or “innovatively engaged students”. The idea of a
33 professional community encompassed collegiality, but gave us a more nuanced picture of
34 how teachers learn not only to work together, but how teaching and learning are
35 connected differentially in *various types of communities*.

36 37 **Making Practice – and Communities of Practice – Public**

38 The multimedia online age has heralded new opportunities for individuals and
39 communities to “go public” with their work. Since the advent of widespread access to
40 multimedia tools, such tools have been used to capture teaching and learning. Many K-
41 12 teachers now have daily access to cameras, computers, video editing software, and
42 interactive whiteboards. More importantly, they are disposed to use these tools to connect
43 with their students and their colleagues in new ways. As “Digital Natives” (Prensky
44 2001) enter the teaching ranks, insular professional learning models are poorly positioned
45 to capitalize on their talents and interests. A second-grade teacher may start and end her
46 day by checking in with her friends world-wide via facebook or twitter. But while she’s

1 at school, her classroom door is too often closed, literally and metaphorically. The
2 interconnectedness and ground-up user-generated world of Web 2.0 has yet to reach into
3 the realm of teacher professional learning.

4 But change is coming. Many teachers keep blogs of their practice, create video
5 podcasts of their students' performances, communicate with their students' parents via
6 email, and integrate technology into their pedagogy. The emerging field of
7 Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge, or TPACK (Mishra & Koehler 2006),
8 articulates the ways in which technology can be deployed in powerful service of teaching
9 and learning. Yet deploying those same tools for professional learning has been limited.

10 **Professional Learning Communities 2.0: Moving Teacher Development Online**

11 Social psychology teaches us that public performance leads to improved
12 performance (Gibbons 1993). We believe that public *teaching* facilitates improved
13 teaching, and that all teachers can benefit from making their practices public and sharing
14 them with each other. "Public," in this sense, means making artifacts and events of
15 practice, and reflections on practice, available to interested educational audiences.
16 Technological innovations are not the destination, but the means by which this leap is
17 made.
18

19 By making teaching public, we are not launching the search for America's Next
20 Top Teacher. Nor is this an initiative to develop worshipful tales of inspiring teachers
21 who buck the odds and help the most challenging students to triumph, as wonderful as
22 that is. Having been elementary school teachers ourselves, we know too well that the
23 daily practices of teaching would not make a good "sell" in a Hollywood pitch meeting.
24 Rather, we have learned from our work with teachers making their practices public that
25 the most powerful result of going public with teaching is a new kind of conversation
26 about teaching. Instead of anecdotal venting in the teachers' lounge at lunch, we imagine
27 faculty looking closely at a writing workshop conference video and a piece of student
28 work, saying "Wow! Did you notice that? What do you think?"

29 Because we believe that multimedia representations of teaching travel best online,
30 the notion of who our colleagues are greatly expands. In one scenario, a teacher in her
31 second year might have a persistent problem with her guided reading circle during
32 language arts. She could videotape herself with her students, collect and scan their
33 running records, upload them to her blog with some reflections about what she thinks is
34 going on, and "tag" her veteran teaching friends on facebook to come give her feedback
35 and counsel—perhaps within minutes or hours. This changes the whole experience of the
36 induction years, eliminating the isolation and wheel-spinning that drive so many
37 promising novices from the profession and joins them early on with their colleagues.¹
38 As we have been trying to understand the power of technology and social networking,
39 countries in Europe and Asia have been changing the way teachers learn their craft.

40 **UNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT NETWORKED LEARNING COMMUNITIES AND** 41 **TEACHING**

42 **International Perspectives on Professional Learning** 43 44

1 Many of our international colleagues in the highest achieving countries (on
2 international measures as TIMSS -Third International Math & Science Study - and PISA
3 - Programme for International Student Assessment) have already changed both the forms
4 and the meaning of professional development for teachers (OECD, 2005). While some
5 professional development in some places has changed in the U.S., as a general rule we
6 have not recognized the power of teachers to analyze their own practice as a critical
7 centerpiece of high quality professional development (Hammond, et. al, 2009).

8 In the U.S. teachers have from 3-5 hours a week for lesson planning (NCTAF,
9 1996). In Japan, Singapore and South Korea, teachers spend 35% of their time teaching
10 students, while the rest is spent on a variety of activities to enhance their practice,
11 including having shared office space where teachers have access to materials and to each
12 other for large portions of the day (Kang & Hong, 2008). In Finland teachers meet once
13 a week to plan and develop curriculum, and schools in the same area are encouraged to
14 share materials (NSDC, 2009). Other countries such as Denmark, Norway and
15 Switzerland deliberately provide time for teachers to collaborate on issues of curriculum
16 and instruction (p. 17, Darling-Hammond, et al. 2009). Time is considered a precious
17 commodity for teacher's learning as well as student learning.

18 Somewhat known in this country is Japan's "lesson study", the process by which
19 a teacher prepares and teaches a good lesson replete with materials for a group of her
20 peers. In Japan sometimes there are as many as 200 teachers observing the lesson.
21 Afterwards teachers join in a discussion to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the
22 lesson and ask questions of the teacher. In this way, teachers control the professional
23 development as it is centered on their own teaching practice. Sometimes teachers work
24 in groups and plan lessons together. These "research" lessons provide opportunities for
25 teachers to learn from one another, refine their practice, and work with others to deepen
26 their understanding of the complexities of teaching. This continued focus on teacher's
27 work builds a culture of participation, the importance of the public nature of teaching and
28 collaboration with one's peers as a continued part of improving one's practice
29 (Hammond, et. al, 2009, Lewis & Tsuchida, 1998, Ma, 1999).

30 In Singapore, their new focus entitled: Thinking Schools, Learning Nation"
31 attends to not only a new curriculum for students, but also its support for teacher
32 learning. Its aim is to make a learning environment for everyone involved in the
33 educational enterprise, from policy makers to students. There are a number of different
34 components to the new focus on education, but one of the most interesting is a Teacher's
35 Network - an effort to mobilize groups of teachers who initiate a variety of activities of
36 their own making including: teacher -led workshops; writing publications; conferences,
37 website work and learning circles. The national university sponsors an initial whole
38 school training program in reflection, dialogue and action research. They also train
39 teachers as facilitators, mentors and critical friends. In these circles, the idea is to build
40 collegiality, but also to teach teachers that they are producing knowledge themselves as
41 well as gaining it from others. There are teacher led workshops again with the idea of
42 elevating tacit knowledge as a way of unearthing teacher knowledge publicly shared and
43 discussed (Hammond, et. al 2009).

44 In the UK, they have concentrated on a National Literacy and Numeracy strategy
45 that concentrates on these two areas by a model that specifically works to help teachers
46 use new materials and gain understanding of new methods. Within this strategy is an

1 effort to provide teacher leadership at the local level, including leading math and literacy
2 teachers (Hammond, et. al). Many resources are supplied by the government such as
3 high quality teaching materials and videos of good practice. This national initiative also
4 trains and mobilizes school heads, lead math teachers and expert literacy teachers. They,
5 in turn, work with teachers. The idea is to increase teacher expertise at the local level.
6 Many have already stated that the rise in the percentage of students meeting literacy
7 standards is due to this program (from 63% to 75%) Hammond, et. al, 2009). Building
8 on this strategy, they have also funded groups of schools to work together to improve
9 their practices (Fullan, 2007).

10 Inherent in all these leading countries is the idea that teachers must not only be
11 involved in collaborating with each other, but that the work needs to focus on teachers'
12 learning and the knowledge they create. This professional knowledge has become a large
13 part of the professional development that has been organized. Working in communities,
14 working on improving practice, and working locally with teachers as leaders are the
15 major themes in these high achieving countries. Creating professional knowledge that
16 comes from teachers appears to be the starting point of the professional development in
17 these high achieving countries. In other fields, there has been work on deeper
18 understandings that learning is not only individual, but *social* as well. And this too has
19 added to our understanding that people work in “communities of practice” as they make
20 public their collective understanding of their work.

21 22 **Understandings that Learning is Social within Communities of Practice**

23 Both research and development of new modes of working **with** rather than **on**
24 teachers has added to our understanding that learning is also social and therefore
25 changing professional learning for teachers demands a deeper understanding of the kinds
26 of conditions and contexts that support and encourage such learning (Cochran-Smith &
27 Lytle, 2009, McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006, Lieberman & Miller, 2008, Wenger, 1998).

28 Wenger has described the idea that most people learn in ‘communities of practice’
29 and that these communities have within them three processes – learning, meaning and
30 identity – and learning happens through experience and practice. People learn in practice
31 (by doing), through meaning (learning is intentional), through learning in participation
32 with others; and through identity (learning and changing who we are). Professional
33 learning described in this way is rooted in the human need to belong; to make a
34 contribution to a community; and to understand that experience and knowledge are part
35 of community property. These “communities of practice” are everywhere and integral to
36 our lives. And when thought of in this way, they call our attention to the fact that
37 learning rather than being solely individual is also social and as such helps us understand
38 why and how practice becomes a public contribution to be shared, used, shaped and
39 understood by the community. This professional knowledge is what becomes community
40 property. As Wenger puts it: “such participation shapes not only what we do, but also
41 who we are and how we interpret what we do” (1998, p.4). With this understanding,
42 along with important shifts in studying teachers’ practice, the development of learning
43 communities has become a worldwide focus for teacher learning.

44 Some researchers have actually developed communities in order to try and
45 understand how they get started; how people get engaged; what communities take on; the
46 developmental sequence; how they are sustained; and the eventual impact on students.

1 The most comprehensive rendering of how a professional community develops has been
2 described by Grossman, Wineburg & Woolworth (2001). The researchers created a book
3 group with members from an English and Social Studies department in
4 a secondary school in Washington. The researchers documented how teachers interacted,
5 what they talked about and how they developed into a learning community. Teachers
6 went from concern only with *themselves as individuals*; to uncovering the *fault lines*
7 (conflicts over gender, race, differences in teaching styles); to eventually *taking*
8 *responsibility for their own and their colleagues' learning* and well being in the
9 community. This important inside look at the development of a community helped
10 deepen our understanding of the complexity of creating the conditions for community and
11 the complicated way that interactions over time changed both the relationships and the
12 teachers ability to work in a group and learn together. These understandings have also
13 been brought to virtual communities as well.

14 **The Origins and Outcomes of Online Professional Learning Communities**

16 Current research on teachers' professional learning, including online environments,
17 suggests that evaluations of outcomes be framed around "core features" including
18 "content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation."
19 (Desimone 2009). From more formal networks designed with particular purposes to
20 informal grassroots connections, teacher professional learning is thriving online. Over a
21 decade ago, Harvard University's Education with New Technologies Networked
22 Learning Community (Wiske et al. 1997), SRI International's TappedIn.org (Schlager &
23 Shank 1997) and the Canadian TeleLearning Professional Development School
24 (Breuleux et al 1998) provided among the first widely accessible online learning
25 environments to support teachers' professional development. These pioneering projects
26 re-envisioned how Schwab's commonplaces of teaching (1978) might apply to online
27 learning environments. Such online communities for teacher professional learning would
28 need to anticipate:

- 29 • The "teachers": Who were the designers/ developers and what were their goals?
30 What roles might they take as moderators or coaches?
- 31 • The "students": Who were the participating teachers, and what did they hope to
32 get out of their engagement in an online professional learning community?
- 33 • The content: What resources would support teachers' learning in such an
34 environment?
- 35 • And the context: How could online learning communities be designed to support
36 teachers' sustained engagement?

37 Outcomes of participation in networked professional learning communities include
38 transformation of practices, philosophies, instructional time and collegial interactions
39 (Borko 2004). When this participation occurs asynchronously and online, it also supports
40 the integration of the various domains in which teacher learning can occur, bridging
41 divides that previously existed between teachers' homes, school hallways and
42 lunchrooms, and university schools of education. Fletcher et al. (2007) describe that the
43 strength of online learning experiences depend on the robustness of "learning objects"
44 around which the development initiatives are centered. We propose that when these
45 learning objects emerge from teachers' own practices and are presented by teachers
46 themselves, these new texts of teaching can advance educators' professional

1 development, inverting traditional top-down models. We have seen this inversion in our
2 own work with teachers and teacher educators to create such texts.

4 **LOOKING BACK: A DECADE OF MAKING TEACHING PUBLIC**

6 **The Context: Multiple Initiatives for Making Teaching Public**

7 In 1998, as part of a new program at the Carnegie Foundation for the
8 Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), Lee Shulman proposed that teachers could be
9 scholars in much the same way as academics. He described **scholarship** as having three
10 parts. It was necessary to make knowledge *public*: to *critique it*; and to *build upon it*
11 and *pass it on*. With this definition as our guide, in 1999 we invited some teachers and
12 teacher educators to spend some time at Carnegie as our first K-12 cohort of the Carnegie
13 Academy of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). We soon realized that
14 the simple aphorism of scholarship was far more complicated than we thought. By the
15 end of the first cohort's time at Carnegie, we began to talk about showing an artifact of
16 each teacher's practice online: adopting a multimedia approach to our work. By the
17 second cohort two years later, we realized that we needed to start with the ideas and
18 dilemmas that teachers talked about in their own teaching rather than the abstraction of
19 scholarship. Out of their ideas, we reasoned they could make their teaching public.
20 Instead of saying teaching should be public and talking about what that might look like,
21 we were teaching them *how* to go public. We were struggling with how to model the
22 kind of teaching we were doing as they were learning how to go public; work with their
23 peers who helped them clarify their ideas; and strengthen their own work by building on
24 the work of their colleagues. We were getting close: multimedia representations of
25 teacher's practices were multiplying and more audiences around the world were using
26 them to provoke teacher learning. We were learning to start with practice and develop
27 representations of teaching in ways that could extend others' learning..

29 **The Development of Multimedia “Texts” of Teaching**

30 Our teacher collaborators were as diverse as the profession itself embraces: The
31 three CASTL cohorts' faculty came from many different cultural and language
32 backgrounds; had finished their fourth, or fortieth, year in the classroom; were men and
33 women teaching in contexts ranging from New York City (pop. 8.2 million) to Shelby,
34 Mississippi (pop. 2626). But they shared a common characteristic—the belief that they
35 had something to share as educators, and that by sharing their practices with each other,
36 they all could learn to better serve students.

37 Phase 1: Inventing Different Ways to Go Public. Our first CASTL collaborators
38 were teachers who already emphasized the creative arts in their teaching and could easily
39 visualize how they might represent their work using multimedia.

40 Irma Lyons – then a 5th grade teacher and now the principal of Will Rogers
41 Learning Community School in Santa Monica, California – wanted to visually represent
42 the diverse school community in attendance at a dramatic performance assessment of her
43 students' learning about the Harlem Renaissance. We videotaped interviews with as
44 many attendees during this “Harlem Renaissance Museum Day” as we could, then
45 created an interactive collage of the faces, demonstrating the interconnections between

1 the video interviewees (Lyons 2001). In the website, video clips of parents were linked
2 to children, who were linked to teachers, who were linked to colleagues, and so on.

3 Heidi Lyne, a history teacher at Mission Hill School in Boston, created her own
4 year-long documentary account of the school faculty's work to develop students' "habits
5 of mind" through a portfolio interview assessment (Lyne 2001). Lyne collected and
6 represented video and student work samples from multiple points during the students'
7 preparation for their portfolio defense, interviewed school founder Deborah Meier about
8 her rationale for setting school standards for student learning, and Lyne and her Mission
9 Hill colleagues used the resulting website to reflect on how better to support students in
10 the assessment process.

11 Marsha Pincus created a site centered on her work bridging domains of English
12 and Drama at the high school level in Philadelphia (Pincus 2001), influenced by the
13 dramatic theorist Augusto Boal (1979). She drew together videos of student-authored
14 monologues, her own practitioner reflections on drama and inquiry, and developed an
15 aesthetic for the website that was influenced by the graphic design of a theatrical
16 performance's "Playbill". Our goal during this Phase was to invent different ways in
17 which teachers might share the artifacts of their practice and to inspire greater numbers of
18 their colleagues to follow suit.

19 Phase 2: Articulating essential artifacts and events of teaching practice. The first
20 group of multimedia representations of teaching (MRTs) authored by CASTL scholars
21 went "live" in 2001. Subsequent teacher learning cohorts, both in the CASTL initiative
22 (1999-2004) as well as the Goldman-Carnegie Quest project (2004-2006), were then able
23 to read and explore these MRTs to begin to envision how they would share their own
24 practices. We realized that audiences found it most generative for their learning when
25 they could make their way easily and intuitively through an MRT, and so we developed a
26 series of templates for the use of multiple faculty to share their teaching practices with
27 external audiences.

28 Yvonne Hutchinson developed a "class anatomy" (Hutchinson 2003) juxtaposing
29 video clips from a single two-hour classroom instructional block with resources and
30 reflections from her practice at King Drew Medical Magnet School in Los Angeles. On
31 the site, Hutchinson's ninth grade English students discuss an excerpt from the jazz
32 musician Willie Ruff's autobiography *A Call To Assembly* (1991). Hutchinson provides
33 artifacts for some of the literacy practices shared on that day, including a "Class Scribe
34 Report" and an "Anticipation Guide", as well as materials she had authored to support
35 her departmental and district colleagues in their professional development, part of her
36 work as a Teacher Consultant for the National Writing Project.

37 Jennifer Myers, a second grade teacher in a suburb of San Jose, also captured a
38 block of language arts instruction as well as images of student work and reflections on
39 her practice. But with Myers' site (2006) and others developed at the same time, we
40 created a similar frame for representing teachers' practice: a sidebar for the website with
41 features common to all of the teachers' practices (a statement about their teaching
42 contexts, connections to state and local standards, a rationale for the content being taught
43 that day or days) as well as a horizontal navigation designed around the particular
44 practitioner's themes for reflecting on her or his practice. Myers' themes included a
45 description of the rituals and routines she established at the beginning of the year to

1 support her students' literacy learning, a description of her workshop approach, and a
2 discussion of the role of "touchstone texts" in her instruction.

3 The same frame informed our collaboration with Philip Levien, a high school
4 drama teacher in Santa Barbara, California. Levien, a former professional actor, worked
5 with the University of California Center for Education and Social Justice to document an
6 entire semester-long project working with his students to rehearse and perform a
7 Shakespearean comedy. So while his MRT (Levien 2005) shares some of the same
8 navigational features as Myers' along the left of the browser window, his practitioner
9 themes describe his particular challenges of serving a student population that speaks four
10 different languages natively, and a classroom designed to support the learning needs of
11 multiple students with significant learning disabilities in an inclusive setting. He
12 describes how he builds community, develops his students' capacities to read and
13 perform "gatekeeper texts," and how he serves his diverse learners.

14 Phase 3: Broadening the Frame - Looking across practices and classrooms: Even
15 with explicit attention to a similar frame for reading across multiple MRTs, we still found
16 that audiences experienced the sites as an individual encounter, a virtual visit to a
17 particular practitioner's classroom. This was generative in some ways—it was helping to
18 open classroom doors to observation, reflection and conversation about teaching
19 practices. But the emphasis was firmly focused on the practitioner. We wondered what
20 it would be like to shift the focus from practitioner to *practices*.

21 In 2006, we were able to partner with the Noyce Foundation to document four
22 teachers' professional learning practices as influenced by their mutual participation in the
23 Every Child a Reader and Writer Program: the resulting site was
24 InsideWritingWorkshop.org (Noyce Foundation 2007). To develop the site, we
25 documented three days of a seminar series for Bay Area educators on personal narrative
26 writing, and then captured an entire writing workshop session in a Spanish immersion
27 kindergarten class, two different second grade classrooms, and a fifth grade classroom.
28 Because each practitioner not only shared a content theme of personal narrative writing,
29 but a structural continuity in their writing workshop pedagogy, we were able to create a
30 navigational matrix connecting each teacher's practice to all of the others. A teacher
31 exploring the site might begin by examining Cyrus Limón's kindergarten writing
32 workshop mini-lesson, and follow the video documentation into an individual student
33 writing conference. At that point, the teacher might wonder what a writing conference
34 would look like with older children. InsideWritingWorkshop encourages and makes
35 visible the connections between Limon's conference with an emerging 5-year-old writer
36 and Mark White's much more elaborate conversation with his fifth grade student
37 concerned with her paragraphing revisions. Similarly, audiences of
38 InsideWritingWorkshop could compare the practices in two different second grade
39 classrooms and make some determinations about children's development as writers at
40 that age, or reflect on how the different student populations in Rachel Rothman's and
41 Becky Pereira's classrooms informed each teacher's pedagogical and curricular choices.
42 In many ways, our work developing InsideWritingWorkshop was the culmination of
43 desires we each long held as teachers ourselves—to see others teach, to examine artifacts
44 of learning, to hear accomplished practitioners reflect on their work, but also to uncover
45 the subtleties of particularly effective practices.

46

1 **Collaboration and Teacher Voice**

2 In all of our collaborative work with CASTL and QUEST faculty, it was critical for us to
3 ensure that they felt like the resulting representations of their teaching practices were
4 *theirs*. We had heard tales, even from our own collaborators, of other well-intentioned
5 projects who had swooped into their classroom with cameras one day, disappeared, and
6 proudly reappeared months later to present the highly polished DVD of their teaching.
7 One teacher even spoke about a camera crew interrupting her while she was teaching,
8 asking her to “stick to the script” of her lesson plan! As teachers ourselves, we knew that
9 this was important to avoid. We wanted the sites to emerge from these classrooms, speak
10 with the voices of the teachers themselves, and not prioritize glitz over classroom reality.

11 An essential determinant in our success in bringing this about was time. Unlike
12 their higher education counterparts or their K-12 counterparts in other countries,
13 American K-12 teachers do not commonly have substantial time built into their school
14 day to reflect on their practice. As a result, we built paid release time into our project
15 budgets, and regularly gathered teacher collaborators together to reflect on the videos,
16 student work samples, and other artifacts of their documented practices. We built
17 narrative templates to guide their reflections: introducing themselves, providing a
18 description of their professional experiences, and sharing goals for their own professional
19 learning. For each artifact or video clip, we invited the teachers to describe the artifact
20 event as well as provide commentary about it. This gave the resulting multimedia
21 representations of teaching an intimacy akin to sitting down with the teacher and looking
22 at the artifacts “side by side”, as Erickson (2006) reminds ethnographers and classroom
23 documentarians to do.

24 **New Texts for Pre-service Teacher Education**

25 The more multimedia representations of teaching we created, the more we were
26 learning about what makes a “good” multimedia text. How much detail should a site
27 have? How could one show the complexity of teaching without making so much detail
28 that one would get lost in trying to find the pedagogy and the content? We began to get
29 feedback from a variety of global audiences from diverse educational sectors. And we
30 began to realize that we were providing opportunities for teachers to become articulate
31 about their practice as well as building the conditions for a different kind of professional
32 learning.

33 By the time we had worked with three cohorts of teachers, we were learning that
34 some teacher educators were using the K-12 websites to prepare novice teachers in their
35 teacher education classes. They recognized that access to these kinds of texts would be a
36 powerful additional resource for their students, and collaborated with us to identify and
37 share some of their practices where MRTs were integrated into the teacher education
38 curriculum.

39 **Developing Records of Teacher Educators’ Practices**

40 Since teacher educators were already using the sites, we decided to organize and
41 support a teacher educator cohort to learn and to expand the work. We titled this
42 initiative *The Quest Project for Signature Pedagogies in Teacher Education*, as it was a
43 quest to understand how to use the wisdom of practice to prepare novices to the
44 profession. We highlight here how three teacher educators used Yvonne Hutchinson’s
45
46

1 MRT on her high school English curriculum emphasizing academic discourse, described
2 earlier in Phase 2 of our collaborative work with K-12 practitioners. Each was teaching
3 a different course, using Hutchinson’s practice for different purposes, yet their
4 representations of their teaching helped us understand *how* they taught and *what* they
5 taught when they used the teacher sites in their teacher education courses². We were
6 coming to understand that the complexity of teaching could be mined online not only by
7 the teacher’s purposes, but by teacher educators who were using the teacher sites for *their*
8 purposes as well.

9
10 **Content Area Connection: Learning from Yvonne Hutchinson in a Course on**
11 **Secondary English Methods**

12 Pam Grossman and her colleague Christa Compton created a website (2006) in which
13 they describe a multipartite assignment for their Secondary English Methods course at
14 Stanford University. In the course, Grossman and Compton invited their students to work
15 in pairs to investigate particular questions about Hutchinson’s site, such as “What is the
16 role of the anticipation guide before and during the class discussion?” and “Who speaks?
17 How often? What does Hutchinson do to encourage everyone’s participation?” The pairs
18 compiled evidence from the website for their responses to these questions, and then
19 divided into two groups to present the evidence to their fellow students by facilitating a
20 discussion on their question. Grossman and Compton’s students are then asked to try out
21 one or more of the strategies identified in Hutchinson’s practice in their own field
22 placements, and finally the students reflect on what it took for them to adapt the strategies
23 to their particular contexts.

24 In the multimedia representation of their teaching, Grossman and Compton share
25 evidence of their students’ insights. One reported success using Hutchinson’s strategies
26 for getting students to participate, that “the one student who had never, ever, ever spoken,
27 spoke-- it was a real victory!” Another observed that in trying to get his own discussion
28 going he realized “how much preparation needs to go into it. You can’t just sort of show
29 up and it sort of *happens*. Hutchinson obviously does so many specific things in order to
30 reach that point where it can happen, and sort of seem like magic. Behind the scenes
31 there’s so much more.” Still another of Grossman’s students even successfully sought
32 out a teaching position at King-Drew and is now one of Hutchinson’s colleagues. The
33 impact on these students from digging under the surface of practices that can seem
34 “magical” is considerable.

35
36 **Cross-Curricular Connection: Learning from Yvonne Hutchinson in a Course on**
37 **Secondary Social Studies Methods**

38 Gloria Ladson-Billings is a professor of education at the University of Wisconsin at
39 Madison, and the author of the acclaimed book *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers*
40 *of African American Children* (1997). Hutchinson’s MRT includes several quotes from
41 *Dreamkeepers*, and she considers Ladson-Billings an important influence on her work
42 serving “black and brown” children in an urban setting. Ladson-Billings came to know

² Portions of the description of the teacher educators has been adapted from Teacher Practice Online: Sharing Wisdom, Opening Doors by Desiree Pointer Mace, published by Teachers College Press (2009).

1 Hutchinson’s work when they participated on the same panel presentation at a conference
2 for the National Council of Teachers of English in 2004, and subsequently began
3 integrating Hutchinson’s work into a course for pre-service teachers in Middle School
4 Social Studies. Like Pam Grossman, Ladson-Billings has used the site as an illustration
5 of how a teacher can subvert the traditional “ping-pong” style of classroom discussion,
6 where each student response is directed to the teacher, who then directs a question to
7 another student. She calls their attention to how Hutchinson gets the students up out of
8 their seats and into small group conversations with each other about issues of race and
9 racism, and encourages the students to recognize each other’s turns to talk in the whole-
10 class discussion. Ladson-Billings, like Grossman, also then asks her students to try out
11 some of the strategies they identify in Hutchinson’s class in their practicum field sites,
12 videotape their teaching, and add it to their digital portfolios.

13 But there are some content area differences in how Ladson-Billings uses Hutchinson’s
14 site within the discipline of Social Studies. A focus of her course is for students to
15 articulate how social studies teachers “help kids learn to be citizens in a democratic
16 society” (Personal Communication, 2/25/08) and toward that end she invites her students
17 to put together a “text-set” of developmentally appropriate literature on a social issue.
18 Teaching about power and inequity, as Ladson-Billings observes, is “tricky, because the
19 students themselves don’t feel all that comfortable” discussing race and racism with
20 children. By interrogating the ways in which Hutchinson frames her students’ discussion
21 of the “n word” in the Ruff text and in their everyday discourse, Ladson-Billings’
22 students can think about how to facilitate class conversations on controversial topics, not
23 only on race and racism, but poverty, homelessness, immigration, political change, civic
24 engagement, and so on. Additionally, the mutual use of each other’s work by Hutchinson
25 and Ladson-Billings reinforces a significant outcome of “going public” with K-12
26 practice: subverting the traditional power dynamic between university-based research
27 expertise and school-based wisdom of practice. Instead of a top-down university-school
28 relationship, Ladson-Billings and Hutchinson become colleagues in conversation about
29 issues of mutual concern.

31 **Foundational Connection: Learning from Yvonne Hutchinson in a Course on** 32 **Adolescent Development**

33 Anna Richert is a professor of education at Mills College. In her course on
34 Adolescent Development, she used Hutchinson’s work along with several others as
35 “silent teaching partners” as described on her MRT “Learning About Adolescents from
36 Teachers Who Teach Them Well” (Richert, 2006). The “Foundational” courses in
37 Teacher Education can all too often be abstracted from practice as pre-service teachers
38 focus on theories of child development, the history of public education, and philosophies
39 of education. In Richert’s case, she found that she needed to make the case to her own
40 students of the relevance of the class to their intended future practices as high school
41 teachers. Richert observed that her secondary teaching students often came to their
42 studies with a considerable love for their subject area but only a peripheral sense of why
43 they would need to know about adolescents as learners in a particular developmental
44 stage. By integrating Hutchinson’s work into her class, Richert created a content
45 connection for pre-service English teachers, subsequently opening up for a whole-class

1 conversation about how different teachers approach the challenges of curriculum and
2 pedagogy in middle and high school contexts.
3 Richert considers there to be three central texts for her course: the “silent teaching
4 partners” whose practices are documented on their websites; the course readings; and the
5 voices of adolescent learners themselves. To bring together all three, Richert developed
6 an innovative outreach project in which local high school students visit her class as
7 “experts” in adolescent development (Viadero, 2005.) As Richert describes on her
8 website,

9 We were joined for the day by a group of high school students whose teachers
10 are two Mills grads. When the students arrived they were assigned Mills
11 partners with whom they worked for the afternoon. The Mills students had
12 selected something from one of the websites they had studied that they found
13 puzzling about teaching or learning as it was portrayed on the site. The goal
14 was to share that puzzle with the high school student and discuss it to get the
15 high schooler’s perspective on the events that the clip portrayed. A more
16 general conversation about teaching and learning in the high school setting
17 followed. (Richert, 2006)

18 There were significant outcomes for both sides of this exchange. The high school partners
19 engaged confidently and animatedly in this exchange, comfortably slipping into their
20 roles as “experts” in the conversation. One observed that “I think that every student
21 should have to think about what teachers have to go through.. it was cool because we got
22 to teach someone older than us, how to teach.” Another commented that seeing how
23 engaged the pre-service teacher was by his expertise “made us want to learn, made us
24 want to listen to him.” Another student described how she would take the learnings from
25 the day back to her own school setting: “It made me want to be a better student for the
26 teachers because they go through so much work for us. It also opens our eyes, as
27 students, to *how* we should learn, the different ways we can learn.”

28 The Mills students were similarly transformed by the experience, especially by
29 seeking expertise from the high school students about how best to serve them as learners.
30 One remarked that “I was able to give the best of myself as a listener, and create that
31 connection with the child;” another contributed that “So much of school is about teachers
32 knowing and kids not knowing – teachers holding, therefore, power, and kids not. This
33 project really allows for an opportunity for kids to hold knowledge too.” These learnings
34 are pivotal for those about to begin their teaching careers: another of Anna’s students
35 observed that the collaborative project “puts you in a situation where you feel like you
36 have a lot of power. You feel like you have a lot of weight on your shoulders. You’re
37 learning what you have to do, so it makes you want to go and do that even better.”

38 By looking collaboratively at Hutchinson’s practice (among others), the high
39 school students and the teacher candidates were able to begin their conversation about a
40 neutral common text; instead of beginning by either critiquing the other’s experiences
41 and practices as a teacher or learner, they were able to bring their individual perspectives
42 to a record of others’ school experiences, and link their insights into agendas of change
43 for each.

1 **Teachers’ Practices for Teachers’ Learning and Development**

2 Grossman, Ladson-Billings, and Richert provide just three examples of how
3 accomplished K-12 teachers’ practices connect to and inform different environments of
4 pre-service teacher education. But the same is true for in-service teacher learning.
5 Hutchinson herself makes regular reference to the site in her work with novice and
6 veteran teaching colleagues in the Los Angeles area. Lee Shulman observed that “we are
7 using our analyses of Hutchinson’s teaching to develop more powerful theoretical
8 principles for teaching and learning literacy, especially in creating bridges between the
9 interpretations of text and the active use of discussion and dialogue among students”
10 (2005). Still other applications have yet to be invented, but all rest on a careful reading
11 of classroom practices and a creative vision of how teachers’ practices can extend other
12 educators’ professional learning.

13 14 **THE TRANSLOCATION (and Transformation) OF KNOWLEDGE OF – AND** 15 **FOR – TEACHING**

16 When texts for learning about teaching emerge from classrooms and are voiced by
17 teachers themselves, a powerful shift occurs. We can begin to learn from the everyday
18 accomplished practices that characterize many – but not enough—classrooms around the
19 country and world. We have an opportunity to connect accomplished practitioners with
20 struggling ones, to interrupt patterns of burnout by inviting despairing teachers to unpack
21 the challenges they face into surmountable tasks, to consider teaching not as a magical
22 calling, but as a complex profession that can be refined over time. But none of that is
23 possible if teaching remains ephemeral, evaporating as soon as it occurs. We have
24 proposed that practice become public, and not just for the “best and brightest” – though
25 certainly we want to learn from our most accomplished colleagues—but for everyone.

26 27 **Availability and Ubiquity of Tools: Universal Access Means No Excuses**

28 Many of us now have daily access to computers, cell phone cameras, and other
29 multimedia tools. We use them to connect with our friends and families, and while
30 facebook alone, as of this writing, is rapidly expanding especially among older users, we
31 have yet to capture the potential of these connections for professional learning. If each
32 teacher starts small—scanning a piece of student work, videotaping a conversation with a
33 student, envisioning how she might share the events and artifacts of her practice—and
34 then takes the first step of asking a colleague (next door, or online) to examine it with
35 her, new conversations happen. Together, teaching professionals consider the subtleties
36 of relational practice and strategize about how to improve student learning. Teachers
37 don’t have to wait for a monthly release in-service hour to reflect on their practice; doing
38 so emerges from one’s teaching and becomes part of daily practice. If a teacher can find
39 time to reunite with former students, friends and classmates online, it’s a small next step
40 to engage in conversation about teaching and learning.

41 42 **Responsive Feedback Opens our Doors to Mentors and Colleagues Worldwide**

43 Because this vision of professional learning plays out in a “flat world” where
44 one’s teaching colleagues may be next door or across oceans, educators need no longer
45 struggle alone. To be certain, it is daunting to open one’s doors to feedback and critique.
46 But the value added is considerable. Venting in teachers’ lounges could actually be

1 transformed into strategy about how to ameliorate classroom challenges. Pedagogical
2 loneliness gives way to international professional collaboration. Strong practices travel
3 from practitioner to practitioner, and weak practices can't hide behind closed doors. If
4 the assumption is that practice is public and shared, our hope is that such a shift may in
5 itself begin to improve teaching.

6 7 SUMMARY: A VISION OF HOME-GROWN PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

8 9 **The Tools for the Task**

10 This is not a call for the multimedia cavalry to gallop in and save teachers from
11 professional isolation and stagnation. And indeed, we recognize that many practitioners
12 may be resistant to the idea of opening their classroom doors (literally or virtually) to
13 peer review by others. School districts are still working to develop and refine media
14 permissions protocols to protect student privacy. For those who recognize the value
15 added by inviting critique on practice, however, we think that going public is a powerful
16 form of professional learning.

17 To launch and sustain local movements for making teaching public and shared,
18 educators need to develop the habits of having multimedia documentation tools close at
19 hand. With handheld, small, tapeless USB camcorders costing less than \$200, teachers
20 can make a persuasive case to their administrators that powerful professional learning
21 collaborations might be launched with comparably little financial investment. Once these
22 tools are incorporated into daily practice, then teachers can act on moments when they
23 wish their colleagues could hear a student erroneously conceptualize a challenging idea,
24 or a teacher's particularly complex whole-group explanation. Once those moments are
25 captured, then they can be blogged, or emailed, or posted – even to open a conversation
26 with an individual student's parents about how best to advance their learning. The shift
27 involves having the tools “at the ready” and not viewing them as irrelevant or external to
28 teachers' practices.

29 30 **Professional Learning from the Ground Up**

31 We argue that much can be learned from the robust example provided by
32 professional learning communities that have proved to be sustaining and to bring
33 demonstrable results for teacher and student learning, such as the National Writing
34 Project. The NWP has carefully evolved over decades a certain power-sharing alchemy
35 in which the national organization is ever-mindful of the important directive power
36 emerging from participating teachers. The same is true for collaboratives that emerge
37 online. Any attempt to design networks for teacher learning must be done with active
38 leadership from classroom teachers themselves. Representations of teaching must
39 emerge from classroom practices, not merely describe them for outsiders.

40 41 **Online Social Networking and Teacher Professional Learning**

42 Hundreds of millions of users have signed up for social networking services and
43 more are joining every day. The emergence and ubiquity of facebook, MySpace and
44 twitter are not cause for hand-wringing among district technology leaders who decry the
45 amount of hits such sites receive during the hours of the teaching day. Instead,
46 technology leaders need to make clear to teachers how these gathering places and points

1 of connection are not distractions from, but opportunities for, professional learning and
2 development. The Digital Natives are already there. We need to capitalize on that time
3 and social investment and harness it toward improved learning outcomes for teachers and
4 students. Just as the 2008 Presidential election illustrated the rise and influence of the
5 “netroots,” the teaching profession needs to open doors literally and metaphorically to
6 share the wisdom of practice online.

8 **Growing a “Local Teaching” Movement**

9 In recent years, Michael Pollan, Barbara Kingsolver and others have transformed
10 public dialogue about food, nutrition, and environmentalism by naming and promoting
11 the “locavore” movement, in which the most sustaining foods are those grown closest to
12 your plate. We need a similar movement in professional learning for teachers. What we
13 have proposed in this paper is a vision for professional learning initiatives that is
14 democratic, participatory and inexpensive. “Growing your own” professional
15 development means granting value to the everyday decisions that shape teaching and
16 learning in classrooms. Just as a local-foods gardener is invested in the daily care to grow
17 food that will grace the tables of her community, teachers can access a greater investment
18 in their own knowledge and expertise by sharing the fruits of their labors with each other.
19 This task is not intended to result in one standard for teaching and learning (like the
20 search for a perfectly round tomato), but to recognize the different heirloom varieties of
21 accomplished teaching practices already in place, refining themselves over years and
22 decades in schools. This vision of professional learning is intentionally local, humble,
23 sustainable, and intended to nourish both individuals and their communities. But it is
24 predicated on a vision of sharing your practices with others, which starts with each of us.

25 We have studied and worked with a number of teachers and know that “going
26 public” with teaching is a transformative idea for the field and for teachers. When
27 teachers go public with their work, they open themselves up to learning not only from
28 their own practice, but from research and others who help expand their knowledge.
29 When professional development opportunities start with other people’s ideas *first*, they
30 deny what teachers know. Starting with teachers’ practice invites them into the
31 conversation and opens them up to critique, to learning and to expanding their repertoire.
32 Making multimedia representations of practice helps teachers articulate what they know
33 (and what they need to know) and teaches the rest of us about the complexities and
34 layered nature of teaching. It helps teachers understand that their learning as adults is
35 tied to a larger community of professional educators – one where they are central to its
36 development. This, we believe, is transformative!

38 Notes

40 Ball, D.L. & D.K. Cohen (1999) *Developing Practice, developing practitioners: Toward a*
41 *practice-based theory of professional education*. In *Teaching as the learning*
42 *profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. Hammond, L.D. & G.Sykes (Eds)
43 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

45 Boal, Augusto. (1979). *Theater of the Oppressed*. London: Pluto Press.

- 1 Borko, H. & R. Putnam(1995) Expanding a Teacher’s Knowledge Base:A Cognitive
2 Psychological Perspective on Professional Development in Professional
3 Development in Education: New Paradigms & Practices. (Eds) Guskey, T. & M.
4 Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.
5
- 6 Borko, H. (2004). Professional Development and Teacher Learning: Mapping the
7 Terrain. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER 2004; 33; 3.
8
- 9 Breuleux, A., Laferrière, T., Bracewell, R. (1998). Networked Learning Communities in
10 Teacher Education. SITE 98: Society for Information Technology & Teacher
11 Education International Conference (9th, Washington, DC, March 10-14, 1998).
12 Proceedings. Retrieved 5/6/09 from
13 <http://www.education.mcgill.ca/profs/breuleux/onlinepubs/site98/SITE98Breuleux.pdf>.
14
15
- 16 Chandler, B., Erickson, F., & Northwestern Univ., E. (1968, January 1). Sounds Of
17 Society, A Demonstration Program In Group Inquiry. Final Report. . (Eric
18 Document Reproduction Service No. Ed018522) Retrieved April 5, 2009, From
19 Eric Database.
20
- 21 Cochran-Smith, M. & S. Lytle (2009) Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the
22 Next Generation. New York: Teachers College Press.
23
- 24 Darling-Hammond, L. & J. Bransford (2005) Preparing teachers for a changing world:
25 What teachers should learn and be able to do. National Academy of Education:
26 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
27
- 28 Darling-Hammond, L., R. Chung-Wei, A. Andree, N. Richardson, & S. Orphanos (2009).
29 Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher
30 Development in the U.S. and Abroad. Published by the National Staff
31 Development Council and School Redesign Network at Stanford University.
32
- 33 Desimone, L. (2009). Improving Impact Studies of Teachers’ Professional Development:
34 Toward Better Conceptualizations and Measures. Educational Researcher, Vol.
35 38, No. 3, pp. 181–199.
36
- 37 Erickson, Frederick (2006). Studying Side by Side: Collaborative Action Ethnography in
38 Educational Research. In Innovations in Educational Ethnography: Theory,
39 Methods and Results. New York: Routledge.
40
- 41 Fletcher, J.D., Tobias, S., Wisher, R. (2007). Learning Anytime, Anywhere: Advanced
42 Distributed Learning and the Changing Face of Education. EDUCATIONAL
43 RESEARCHER 2007; 36; 96
44

- 1 Fullan, M. (1995) The Limits and the Potential of Professional Development. In
2 Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms & Practices. (Eds)
3 Guskey, T. & M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.
4
- 5 Fullan, M. (2007) The new meaning of educational change, 4th edition. New
6 York: Teachers College Press.
7
- 8 Gibbons, F. (1993). Self-Attention and Behavior: A Review and Theoretical Update.
9 Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology , 23, 249-295.
10
- 11 Grossman, P., Compton, C. (2006) How do we prepare teachers to lead student-centered,
12 text-based discussions in their classrooms? Retrieved 2/24/08 from
13 <http://quest.carnegiefoundation.org/~pgrossman/> .
14
- 15 Grossman, P., Wineburg, S., & S. Woolworth. (2001) Toward a Theory of Community.
16 Teachers College Record. 103, (6). 942-1012.
17
- 18 Hargreaves, A. (2003) Teaching in the knowledge society. New York: Teachers College
19 Press. page 165.
20
- 21 Hiebert, J, Gallimore, R. & Stigler, J.W. (2002) A knowledge base for the teaching
22 profession: What would it look like and How can we get one? In Educational
23 Researcher, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp.3-15, American Educational Research Association:
24 Washington, D.C.
25
- 26 Hatch, T. D. Ahmed, A. Lieberman, D. Faigenbaum, M.E. White, D.H. Pointer-Mace
27 (Eds.) (2005) Going Public with our teaching: An anthology of practice. New
28 York: Teachers College Press.
29
- 30 Hutchinson, Y. (2003). A Friend of Their Minds: Capitalizing on the Oral Tradition of
31 My African American Students. Retrieved 3/10/08 from
32 <http://goingpublicwithteaching.org/yhutchinson/>
33
34
- 35 Kang, N., & Hong, M. (2008) Achieving excellence in teacher workforce and equity in
36 learning opportunities in So. Korea. Educational Researcher, 37 (4), 200-2
37
- 38 Knapp, M.S. (2003) Professional development as a policy pathway. Review of Research
39 in Education., 27,109-157.
40
- 41 Ladson-Billings, Gloria (1997). The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-
42 American Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
43
- 44 Levien, P. (2005) Why Teach and Perform Shakespeare? Learning from the Bard.
45 Retrieved 3/10/08 from <http://quest.carnegiefoundation.org/~dpointer/phillevien/>
46

1 Lewis, C. & Tsuchida, I (1998, Winter) A lesson is like a swiftly flowing river: Research
2 lessons and the improvement of Japanese education. *American Educator*, 14-17
3 & 50-52.
4

5 Lieberman, A. & L. Miller (1984) *Teachers: Their world and their work*. Association for
6 Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria: Virginia.
7

8 Lieberman, A. and L. Miller (Eds). (2001) *Teachers caught in the action: Professional*
9 *development that matters* New York: Teachers College Press.
10

11 Lieberman, A. and D. Wood (2000) *Inside the National Writing Project: Connecting*
12 *Network Learning and Classroom Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
13

14 Lieberman, A. and L. Miller (2008) *Teachers in Professional Communities: Improving*
15 *Teaching and Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
16

17 Little, J.W. (1982) Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace conditions of
18 school success. In *American Educational Research Journal*. Fall Vol. 19, No. 3.
19 Pps. 325-340.
20

21 Little, J.W. (1986) *Seductive Images and Organizational Realities in professional*
22 *development*. In *Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft and concept*
23 (Eds) A. Lieberman and L. Miller. New York: Teachers College Press. pps. 26-
24 44.
25

26 Lortie, D.(1975) *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
27

28 Lyne, H. (2001) *The Mission Hill School*. Retrieved 3/10/08 from
29 <http://goingpublicwithteaching.org/hlyne/>
30

31 Lyons, I. (2001) *Multiple Measures of Student Achievement in an Interdisciplinary Unit*
32 *on the Harlem Renaissance*. Retrieved 3/10/08 from
33 <http://gallery.carnegiefoundation.org/ilyons>
34

35 Ma, Li Ping (1999) *Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics: Teacher's*
36 *Understanding of Fundamental Mathematics in China and the United States*.
37 Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, N.J.
38

39 McLaughlin, M.W. and J. Talbert (2001) *Professional Communities and the work of*
40 *high school teaching*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
41

42 Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A*
43 *new framework for teacher knowledge*. *Teachers College Record*. 108(6), 1017-
44 1054.
45

- 1 Myers, Jennifer (2006). Living the Life of a Reader and Writer.
2 http://cms.carnegiefoundation.org/collections/quest/collections/sites/myers_jennif
3 [er/](http://cms.carnegiefoundation.org/collections/quest/collections/sites/myers_jennif)
4
- 5 National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2005) Induction into learning
6 communities. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and
7 America's Future.
8
- 9 The Noyce Foundation (2007). Inside Writing Workshop. Retrieved 1/15/08 from
10 <http://www.INSIDEwritingworkshop.org>.
11
- 12 Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD) (2005) Teachers matter: Attracting,
13 developing, and retaining effective teachers. Paris: OECD
14
- 15 Pincus, M. (2001) Playing With the Possible: Teaching, Learning and Drama on the
16 Second Stage. Retrieved 3/10/08 from
17 <http://goingpublicwithteaching.org/mpincus/>
18
- 19 Pointer Mace, Desiree (2009). Teacher Practice Online: Sharing Wisdom, Opening
20 Doors. New York: Teachers College Press.
21
- 22 Prensky, M. (2001, October n/a). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. Retrieved March
23 16, 2009, from <http://www.marcprensky.com/>:
24 [http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-](http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf)
25 [%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf](http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf)
26
- 27 Richert, A. (2006). Learning about adolescents from teachers who teach them well.
28 Retrieved 2/24/08 from <http://quest.carnegiefoundation.org/~arichert/> .
29
- 30 Ruff, Willie (1991) A Call to Assembly: The Autobiography of a Musical Storyteller.
31 New York: Viking.
32
- 33 Sarason, S.(1982) The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn
34 & Bacon.
35
- 36 Schwab, J. J. (1978). The practical: Translation into curriculum. In I. Westbury and N. J.
37 Wilkoff (Eds.), Science curriculum and liberal education: Selected essays of
38 Joseph J. Schwab (chapter 12, pp. 365–383). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
39 Press. Seago, N. (2004).
40
- 41 Shulman, L. (2005) To dignify the profession of the teacher: the Carnegie Foundation
42 celebrates 100 years. Change Magazine, 9/1/2005.
43
- 44 Viadero, Debra (2005). "Scholars Eye 'Signature' Method of Teacher Training"
45 Education Week, 10/12/05.
46

1 Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*
2 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3
4 Wiske, S., Moore, J., Sweeney, L.B., Grogan, D., Strumminger, R., Williams, A. (1997)
5 *Designing a Networked Learning Environment: A Working Paper*. Retrieved
6 5/6/09 from http://learnweb.harvard.edu/ent/library/avd_paper1.html .
7