



The CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph

Published by
the California Council on Teacher Education

Containing Research Articles
Based on Presentations
at the CCTE Spring 2025 SPAN Virtual Conference



CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph

Published by the California Council on Teacher Education

Officers of the California Council on Teacher Education:

Karen Escalante, President (California State University San Bernardino)
Terrelle Sales, President Elect (Pepperdine University)
Kimberly White-Smith, Vice President for AACTE (University of San Diego)
Michele McConnell, Vice President for ATE (California State University Fresno)
Betina Hsieh, Past President (University of Washington)

Board of Directors:

James Fabionar (University of San Diego)
Nirmla Griarte Flores (California State Polytechnic University Pomona)
Reyna Garcia Ramos (Pepperdine University)
Nat Hansuvadha (California State University Long Beach)
Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz (San Jose State University)
John Pascarella (University of Southern California)
Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi (University of Redlands)
Elsie Solis (California State University San Marcos)
Juliet Wahleithner (California State University Fresno)

CCTE Spring 2025 SPAN Conference Co-Chairs:

Cynthia Grutzik (San Francisco State University)
Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz (San Jose State University)
Allison Smith (University of Massachusetts Global)
Pia Wong (California State University Sacramento)

CCTE Research Committee Co-Chairs:

Marni E. Fisher (Saddleback College)
Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi (University of Redlands)

CCTE Executive Secretary:

Alan H. Jones, Caddo Gap Press

The copyright for each article in this monograph is held by the author(s) and material is not to be copied, distributed, or sold without their permission.

The monograph is available as a PDF File and copies have been distributed to all members of the California Council on Teacher Education.

Other individuals or organizations wishing copies of the PDF may purchase them from CCTE for \$25 each (see order form on page 23).



Contents

Introduction by CCTE President.....	3
<i>Karen Escalante</i>	
A Call to Action:	
Examining Language and Collaboration	
<i>Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi & Marni E. Fisher</i>	
Tinkering Toward Heteroglossia:	
Deconstructing Language Conceptions	
to Rehumanize Teaching and Learning	
in California's Teaching Performance Expectations	
6	
<i>Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz</i>	
Evolving Professional Development	
for Faculty and University Supervisors	
to Model Asset-Based Practices for Teacher Candidates.....	
14	
<i>Nina Benegas & Isabel Orejel</i>	
Additional Research Presentations	
at the CCTE Spring 2025 SPAN Conference	
21	
California Council	
on the Education of Teachers	
2	
Order Form for CCTE Spring 2025	
Research Monograph.....	
24	

Information on the California Council on Teacher Education

Founded in 1945, the California Council on the Education of Teachers (now the California Council on Teacher Education since July 2001) is a non-profit organization devoted to stimulating the improvement of the preservice and inservice education of teachers and related school personnel. The Council attends to this general goal with the support of a community of teacher educators, drawn from diverse constituencies, who seek to be informed, reflective, and active regarding significant research, sound practice, and current public educational issues.

Membership in the California Council on Teacher Education can be either institutional or individual. Colleges and universities with credential programs, professional organizations with interests in the preparation of teachers, school districts and public agencies in the field of education, and individuals involved in or concerned about the field are encouraged to join. Membership includes announcements of semi-annual spring and fall conferences, receipt via email in PDF format of the journals *Teacher Education Quarterly* and *Issues in Teacher Education*, emailed newsletters on timely issues, an informal network for sharing sound practices in teacher education, and involvement in annual awards and recognitions in the field.

The semi-annual conferences of the California Council on Teacher Education, rotate each year between sites in northern and southern California, feature significant themes in the field of education, highlight prominent speakers, afford opportunities for presentation of research and discussion of promising practices, and consider current and future policy issues in the field.

For information about membership in the California Council on Teacher Education, please contact: Alan H. Jones, Executive Secretary, California Council on Teacher Education, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, California 94118; telephone 415/666-3012; email alan.jones@ccte.org; website www.ccte.org



Introduction by CCTE President

By Karen Escalante

Our California Council on Teacher Education Spring 2025 Policy Action Network (SPAN) Conference held this past March focused on key priorities across our state. These priorities include an ongoing teacher shortage of new teachers entering and remaining in the profession, the retention of midcareer teachers, and ensuring Ethnic Studies remains a salient facet within our state to ensure our school curricula represent and serve our diverse student populations. Our SPAN conferences remain a steadfast way for teacher educators, doctoral students, teacher candidates, Pk-12 teachers, and school personnel to engage with and present scholarly work. The articles presented in this monograph are a sample of what was shared at SPAN 2025. My sincere appreciation to our monograph contributors and to our CCTE Research Committee Chairs Marni Fisher and Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi.

In Community,

—Karen Escalante, CCTE President
California State University San Bernardino
karen.escalante@csusb.edu

A Call to Action: Examining Language and Collaboration

By Marni E. Fisher & Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi

The California Council on Teacher Education SPAN 2025 Conference highlighted three priorities: addressing the teacher shortage by attracting new teachers to the profession and reducing obstacles, retaining our already highly qualified

Introductions

and effective teachers, and support for the implementation and funding of Ethnic Studies in California. The conference was a delight of research and engagement as well as surprising conversations with politicians, and authors who presented during the research roundtables contributed two articles to this monograph, each well worth reading.

In the first article, Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz (2025) examines heteroglossia and the ways in which the language inherent to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) reflects paradigms and hegemonies: “An analysis of the TPEs reveals what concepts and structures are shaping the profession as a cultural product of our society, often revealing unspoken societal assumptions and tensions embedded in our educational system” (p. 6). In light of the conference themes, his well-reasoned and critically sound theoretical article leaves us asking: Who is this language excluding? What hegemonic elements are we failing to see (Freire, 1970/2005; Freire & Macedo, 2009; Macedo et al., 2003)? Muñoz-Muñoz’s (2025) writing leaves a lingering consideration of how the language inherent to the TPEs impact not only traditionally minoritized teacher candidates in a predominantly white female profession (Petty et al., 2023) who may be systematically excluded, but also k-12 students. As such, Muñoz-Muñoz’s (2025) work is in alignment with the conference’s first priority, in terms of how to attract new teachers to the field, and third priority, when unexamined language can unconsciously influence the support or rejection of ethnic studies.

In the second article, Nina Benegas and Isabel Orajel’s (2025) practice piece reflects on the post-covid gap in connections between university supervisors and university partners, highlighting “best practices for asset-based PD that recognizes and leverages educator strengths to uncover and validate diverse experiences” and the ongoing work through collaborative communities to “to address communication and hierarchy barriers between teacher education faculty and University Supervisors” (p. 14). They do this through a “potluck model” that leverages knowledge in alignment with university supervisor requests while fostering “an asset-based, democratic, and equitable learning environment (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995)” (p. 16). However, Benegas and Orajel’s (2025) work cautions against structures that set up the university faculty as experts when the knowledge of the supervisors should also be leveraged in a culturally responsive manner. Overall a successful model that suggests effective ideas that any supervisor program might integrate, Benegas and Orajel’s (2025) practice oriented article aligned with the first priority of the conference in that, with better connections and knowledge for university supervisors, the teacher candidates then benefit. The focus on an equitable learning environment could potentially reflect the third priority to support ethnic studies, when modeled practices influence perceptions and praxis.

Whether examining our language or building collaboration and connections, both articles suggest a call to action, as CCTE works tends to do, for each reader to consider. We are called to examine our words: How does the language we use reflect

the dominant culture? Where should considerations and language be questioned, qualified, or modified? We are also offered ideas for addressing the post-COVID gaps for connection and collaboration, again suggesting reflective questions: Where have the divides highlighted during covid persisted five years later? Are we seeing, addressing, and changing them? Or have we already forgotten them? Education is a dynamic institution with the weight of history and tradition tempting the world to forget that, even as our world changes, so must teaching and schools. It is our power and privilege to continue to not only grow as life-long learners, but also to remind the world that the dynamic elements of education are inherent to the profession.

References

- Benegas, N. & Orejel, I. (2025). Evolving professional development for faculty and university supervisors to model asset-based practices for teacher candidates. *The CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph*, pp. 13-19.
- Freire, P. (1970/2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.; 30th Anniversary ed.). Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2009). Rethinking literacy: A dialogue. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 354-364). Routledge.
- Macedo, D. P., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R. (2025). Tinkering toward heteroglossia: Deconstructing language conceptions to rehumanize teaching and learning in California's Teaching Performance Expectations. *The CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph*, pp. 5-12.
- Petty, J. A., Fisher, M. E., Chun, M., Dorner, M. A., Del Rosario, S., Beaty, I., Maghzi, K. S., Cavallaro, J., Ramirez, J., Tickel, D., & Cho, C. (2023). Uncharted waters: Building an ethnic studies capacity into a predominately white charter school. *CCTE Fall 2023 Research Monograph*.

Marni E. Fisher (Saddleback College)
Kimiya Sohrab Maghzi (University of Redlands)
Co-Chairs, CCTE Research Committee
mfisher@saddleback.edu & kimiya_maghzi@redlands.edu



Tinkering Toward Heteroglossia: Deconstructing Language Conceptions to Rehumanize Teaching and Learning in California's Teaching Performance Expectations

By Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz

Overview-Abstract

This paper presents the results of an interdisciplinary policy analysis of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) (CTC, 2016; 2022) to ponder issues of goal-setting, population representation, and coherence in their articulation around conceptions of language. Two contributions are presented to the field: first, a call to a policy revision that adopts a heteroglossic stance on language (Blackledge & Creese, 2014); second, a combined policy analysis approach combining traditional discourse analysis (Johnstone & Andrus, 2018) followed by a Poststructural Policy Analysis (PSA) (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). Specifically, the analysis focuses on language and speakerhood conceptions in the TPEs and proceeds first by defining its language policy ecology (Hornberger, 2002). Then, linguistic constructs embedded in the TPEs, (e.g., Academic English, Standard English, translanguaging) were analyzed exposing critical coherence issues on their notions of language and the expectations for their implementation. Dissonances and issues of policy coherence are highlighted between TPE 1-6 and TPE 7, and an

Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz is an associate professor in the Teacher Education Department of the Connie L. Lurie College of Education at San José State University and director of the Stanford World Language Project. Email address: eduardo.munoz-munoz@sjsu.edu

argument is made so that future revisions and recreations that encompass dynamic/humanizing conceptions of language, as recently captured by recent policies such as the Bilingual Teacher Expectations (BTPEs, CTC, 2021).

Up Close the TPEs: A Methodological and Critical Combination of Lenses

The California TPEs as a policy and credentialing instrument embody a combination of traits, skills, and practices that are socially legitimated and accepted to be pedagogically effective: self-purported truths about teaching and learning in their context and time (Maire, 2021). An analysis of the TPEs reveals what concepts and structures are shaping the profession as a cultural product of our society, often revealing unspoken societal assumptions and tensions embedded in our educational system. Their role in the policy ecology that defines the teaching profession in California calls for constant monitoring of their relevance and application, scrutinizing their positive role in professionalizing teaching and their silences, ambiguities, and contradictions as they may affect the most vulnerable and underrepresented of our students and workforce.

As proposed in this paper, a deep understanding of the TPEs benefits from a combination of traditional policy Discourse Analysis (DA) followed by Post-structural Analysis (PSA) to balance their respective assets: DAs focus on formal linguistic content and PSAs focus on underlying constructs. As a corollary to the overall analysis, PSA invites us to question the assumed ways of thinking behind policies that otherwise are just “common sense” or “taken for granted” material (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). Accordingly, the scrutiny of the TPEs necessitates genealogical scrutiny of their embedded concepts (such as language and language learning), the context where they were produced (i.e., the sociolinguistic context of California), as well as a nuanced comprehension of the subject that they govern (e.g., becoming a teacher of language learners).

Contrary to a classic rationalist policy analysis assumption that problems lie outside of the policy text (Ricento, 2006), a PSA approach dissects how a given problem is discursively constructed in the policy itself. In relation to this paper’s contention, the TPEs define becoming a teacher as an actor in the dissemination of cultural and societal acumen (including linguistic behavior), while implicitly ruling out actions that do not behoove or are deemed appropriate to the position. Following a “no-stone-untuned” premise, PSA asks questions that are deceptively simple, naïve, or even outlandish because they counter the commonsensical. This paper embraces heteroglossic, inclusive aspirations and asks: How are the TPEs constructing the linguistic dimension of teaching? How are those language and pedagogical ontologies flattening teachers and students (i.e., standardizing them) or opening spaces of possibility (i.e., embracing repertoires)? How are different ways of being linguistically and culturally prescribed or excluded? Ultimately, how can a dynamic, heteroglossic view of language beyond the standard humanize learning, as glimpsed in some strands of the current teacher policy frameworks?

Tinkering Toward Heteroglossia

A fine-grained analysis of the TPEs is of high relevance to the field, as this policy determines the structure of teacher preparation programs and teacher behavior at the onset of their careers. A PSA analysis conceives the TPEs as an instance of overarching control discourses, which are unmonitored truths that almost imperceptibly control teacher behavior through preparation programs pedagogy and testing mechanisms (e.g., the TPAs), and they continue supporting a hegemonic view of learning that counts on every single educator (and student) to police for compliance (Foucault, 1971). Nevertheless, it is also possible that policy contains the seeds of counterhegemonic stances on learning and speaking, but they require recognition and cultivation in their discourse as this paper sets out to do with regard to TPE 7.

First Things First: Considering Heteroglossia in Teacher Preparation

Heteroglossia represents a powerful framework in teacher education, highlighting the coexistence of multiple linguistic varieties, discourses, and ideologies within educational contexts (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). This dialogic concept, derived from Bakhtin's work, creates both ideological and implementational spaces for teacher educators to contest monoglossic language policies (Flores & Schissel, 2014). Research suggests that fostering heteroglossic awareness among pre-service teachers promotes more inclusive pedagogical practices that value students' diverse linguistic repertoires (Choi & Angay-Crowder, 2023). By developing heteroglossic instructional approaches, teacher preparation programs can better prepare educators to support multilingual learners while challenging traditional language hierarchies (Singh, 2023), but the interpretation and implementation of the TPEs ultimately condition this.

The TPEs as a Historical and Ecological Product

The TPEs are the outcome of significant transformations since they were first implemented in 2001 as part of a policy discourse community. Both content and structure have progressed to align with other documents in its policy ecology; for instance, the 2016 edition is now closely aligned in language and structure to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs – CTC, 2009, updated 2024), and its content is filled with intertextual references to other current sets of standards such as California's ELA/ELD framework (CTC, 2014). More significantly, the TPEs underwent what this paper calls a "linguistic turn" by dramatically increasing the centrality of language in its mandate, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The corollary to this evolution has been the inclusion of TPE 7 focusing on literacy with content and form that not only reflect current literacy instruction controversies known as "the Reading Wars," but also other policies that tinker toward heteroglossia, such as the Bilingual Teacher Performance Expectations (CTC, 2023).

A Heteroglossic Pathway Toward Inclusiveness in California Policy

Embracing the diversity of California's community, their culture, and their means of expression must guide policy for democratic and pluralistic education. Language is a cornerstone identifier and a vehicle for the expression of world-views that has been increasingly present in California policies, such as the Seal of Biliteracy or the EL Roadmap, that make the question of adopting heteroglossic stances viable (Muñoz-Muñoz et al., 2021). Heteroglossia entails transcending the debate of monolingualism versus bilingualism. It reframes the dialogue as one where we debate static, standardized perceptions of language vis-à-vis a dialogic, fluid ontology of language (Solsona-Puig et al., 2024). This paper identifies the frictions between TPEs that prescribe standardized, monolithic language and the seeds of heteroglossia, that is, embracing linguistic repertoires, while identifying areas of promise for a conceptualization of language that may transmit to future revisions of the TPEs and other policies in their ecology.

Empirical Foundation for the Analysis

From a discourse analysis (DA) perspective (Johnstone & Andrus, 2018), the 2001, 2013, 2016, and 2022 TPEs were parsed with qualitative software (atlas.ti). First, structural qualities of the texts were highlighted (i.e., text divisions, formulaic sentences) together with language references in a broader sense (e.g., "literacy," "communication with families," "primary language"). A second iteration with inductive-deductive thematic coding led to the interpretive identification of ideologically-driven linguistic indexicality, such as the identification of speaker categories, linguistic expectations, or prescribed language-related pedagogical approaches. DA and thematic coding provide the proposition and argumentative substance that drive the PSA analysis, which follows Bacchi and Goodwin's heuristic "what's the problem presented to be?" or WPR (2016). In this approach, the authors describe a set of questions/steps in the process of PSA analysis, which serve to organize the findings in the next section.

Findings: A Tale of Two Paradigms

The analysis of the combined policy documents highlights the disconnect between 2016 TPEs and the 2022 Literacy TPE, not only in the timing of their inception and style, but in the way language and speakers are constructed and framed.

A DA Perspective:

How Language Becomes Quantitatively a Central Construct in the TPEs

The Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) underwent a significant transformation regarding language prominence across the 2011 to 2016 editions. While the

2001 TPEs contained only 18 references to language-related concepts, this number dramatically increased to 56 in the 2013 edition, and then surged to 234 references in the 2016 edition (Muñoz-Muñoz, 2018). This quantitative shift was accompanied by qualitative changes, with “Academic English” references increasing from three in 2001 to 27 in 2016, and the introduction of the “Standard English Learner” category appearing seven times in 2016 despite being absent in previous editions. Text analysis revealed that the 2016 TPEs contain systematic references to the English Language Development standards at the introduction of every credential-specific narrative, demonstrating how language became embedded throughout the policy structure.

A PSA Perspective:

How Language Conceptualizations Clash in the TPEs

The 2016 TPEs embody monoglossic language conceptions, positioning Standard English (SE) and Academic English (AE) as discrete, bounded entities students must acquire (Muñoz-Muñoz, 2018). This framework categorizes students into rigid speaker groups—“students whose first language is English, English learners, Standard English learners” (CTC, 2016, p. 12)—reinforcing language hierarchies. Contrastingly, the 2022 TPE 7 introduces distinctly heteroglossic perspectives by explicitly endorsing translanguaging: “Conduct instruction that leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging” (CTC, 2022, p. 10). This revolutionary stance on translanguaging—the fluid movement between languages as a pedagogical strategy—directly challenges previous monoglossic policies by legitimizing formerly marginalized practices. These profoundly different ontological perspectives on language can be further explored following Bacchi and Goodwin’s framework of “What’s the Problem Represented to Be?” and its seven questions:

a. What is the problem represented to be in the specific policy?

From a linguistic angle, TPEs 1-6 present subpopulations that do not have the language practices necessary to be successful in school, which calls for a standardization of teacher language along the lines of SE and AE. Teachers must therefore model those language practices (see TPE 1, element 6).

In TPE 7, the problem is the decentering of literacy as general goal of education, the misalignment between instruction and literacy pedagogy (the need for practical, integrated instruction across five themes: foundational skills, meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge.) and the disconnect with the assets and needs of the students which need (see TPE 7, pp.1-2).

b. What deep-seated presuppositions or assumptions underlying his representation of the problem?

In TPEs 1-6, language is present in multiple ways: addressing the language

variety (AE, SE, or “primary language”); referencing speaker groups (ELs, SELs); and alluding to linguistic background and assets in the speaking populations. The language varieties are regarded as discretely bounded, and communities are conceived as homogeneous in their understanding/consensus about the fundamental characteristics of those language varieties. Access to that curricularized language (Kibler & Valdes, 2016) is a precondition for learning.

In TPE 7, the focus on language is geared toward its use in reading, but noticeable changes contrast with TPE 1-6, such as a discrete move from AE to disciplinary complex language (TPE 7, p. 5). Furthermore, the mention and encouragement in the use of translanguaging makes this policy the most heteroglossic CA state-level educational policy to date.

c. How has this representation of the problem come about?

By textual alignment with other standards sets, the 1-6 TPEs participate in the standards-based movement fueled by narratives of educational crisis and “gaps” that target ethnically and linguistically minoritized populations. TPE 7 not only has absorbed the asset-oriented perspectives brought on by policies such as California’s EL Roadmap (CDE, 2018), but it is also heavily influenced by the extant debate on literacy (Muñoz-Muñoz et al., 2022) and other intersecting policy discursive streams such as BTPEs (CDE 2023). TPE 7 repeatedly emphasizes students’ linguistic assets, stating that teachers should “create environments that foster students’ oral and written language development... that leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects” (CTC, 2022, p. 10). The document further advocates for “asset-based pedagogies” that view “the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socio-economic status, immigration status, and sexuality as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities” (CTC, 2022, p. 2). Additionally, TPE 7 explicitly directs teachers to “incorporate asset-based pedagogies, inclusive approaches, and culturally and linguistically affirming and sustaining practices in literacy instruction” (CTC, 2022, p. 9), positioning students’ diverse linguistic backgrounds as resources rather than deficits.

d. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation?

Where are the silences? Can the problem be conceptualized differently?

A foundational “silence” in the TPEs in general involves avoiding defining terms that are subject to contestation in the field or are often misconstrued in application (e.g., Standard English, translanguaging). A more conflicting issue is the coexistence of terms that create “conceptual noise” and dissonance (e.g., language transfer and translanguaging; standard language and linguistic repertoires) because they pertain to different linguistic paradigms. Stated differently, TPEs 1-6 and TPE 7 are simply juxtaposed and undergirded by conflicting and hard-to-reconcile par-

Tinkering Toward Heteroglossia

adigms of language and its speakers. A heteroglossic revision of the TPEs would work to reconcile these conceptual clashes with a holistic and humanizing view on language.

e. What effects (discursive, subjectification, lived) are produced by this representation of the “problem”?

This two-body policy represents conceptual coherence tensions, as discussed above. TPE 1-6 contribute to the reification of two constructs, SE and AE, which perpetuate societal-monoglossic hierarchies among speaker communities. In contrast, TPE 7 embraces a more progressive, community-oriented, and fluid view on language. The uncritical adoption of the TPEs as a unified body creates conflicting messages in the definition of the teaching profession. When policy documents like the TPEs simultaneously promote standardized language ideologies (emphasizing Standard English acquisition) while newer sections embrace heteroglossic approaches (supporting translanguaging and linguistic diversity), teacher educators face the challenge of reconciling these contradictory mandates. This ontological inconsistency forces preparation programs to choose between fostering critical language awareness that questions linguistic hierarchies or preparing teachers to implement standardization practices that they will be evaluated on professionally. Consequently, pre-service teachers may develop conflicted understandings about their role in language instruction, unsure whether to prioritize students’ linguistic repertoires as assets or to view non-standard varieties as deficiencies requiring remediation—ultimately impacting their instructional decisions and their ability to create linguistically inclusive classrooms.

f. How long has this representation of the “problem” being produced, disseminated and defended? How has it been and/or how can he be disrupted and replaced?

The TPEs have existed since 2001. However, the presence of monoglossic language conceptions has been most notable in the 2013 and the 2016 editions. Language became central and the dissemination of the categories was aligned with its ecology of policy documents, specifically the CA ELA/ELD framework (2014). This state of affairs becomes disrupted with the introduction of TPE 7, which presents the field of CA teacher preparation with a linguistic dilemma: standardized categorization versus linguistic diversity and variation, the continuity of monoglossia versus the inclusivity of heteroglossia.

Conclusion and Implications

This paper elaborated on the empirical analysis of the TPEs and the potential disruption and replacement of these linguistic concepts, which would support the expansion of heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces (Flores &

Schissel, 2014) into a potential reconstruction of the TPEs that not only unifies their linguistic stances and reconciles conceptual tensions but also advances the notion of linguistic repertoire and multimodalities as an axis of inclusive learning. A humanizing approach to the redrafting of the TPEs in which linguistic diversity is recognized and the linguistic repertoires of teachers and students are recognized has the potential to deeply transform the education of all students in California starting by the basic preparation expectations of its diverse workforce.

References

- Bacchi, C., & Goodwin, S. (2016). *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice*. Springer.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*.
- California Department of Education. (2014). *The California ELA/ELD framework*.
- Choi, J., & Angay-Crowder, T. (2023). U.S. preservice teachers learning with multilingual learners in Korea through educational technology: Bringing heteroglossia home. *ECNU Review of Education*.
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2023). *Bilingual authorization program standards and performance expectations*. California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016). *Teaching performance expectations*. California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2024). *California teaching performance expectations*. California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *Tesol Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479.
- Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information*, 10(2), 7–30.
- Johnstone, B., & Andrus, J. (2024). *Discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509–532.
- Kibler, A. K., & Valdes, G. (2016). Conceptualizing language learners: Socioinstitutional mechanisms and their consequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 96–116.
- Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R. (2018). *Destandardizing the standard (s): Ideological and implementational spaces in preservice teacher education*. Stanford University.
- Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R., Goldenberg, C., & Krivoruchko, M. (2023). *Narrowing down to find common ground*. Pivot Learning.
- Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R., Poza, L. E., & Briceño, A. (2023). Critical translingual perspectives on California multilingual education policy. *Educational Policy*, 37(6), 1791–1817.
- Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice—An introduction. *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, 10, 10–23.
- Singh, J. (2023). Embedding multilingualism in undergraduate courses: A need for heteroglossia in US TESOL teacher preparation. In S. Haneda (Ed.), *Multilingual teacher education* (pp. 445–460).
- Solsona-Puig, J., Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R., & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2024). Reimagining bilingual education in California: A critical analysis of bilingual teacher performance expectations (BTPE). *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1–13.



Evolving Professional Development for Faculty and University Supervisors to Model Asset-Based Practices for Teacher Candidates

By Nina Benegas & Isabel Orejel

Abstract

In the fall of 2023, two years after the return of in-person campus operations, we recognized a gap in opportunities for connection and a strong desire from university supervisors (US) to reconnect with university partners. Building upon our coaching for equity model that uses an asset-based lens to improve professional development (PD) opportunities, we integrated “Potluck PDs” for US and faculty to connect and build community. These PD sessions evolved from a monthly voted theme with the US bringing a question, a best practice, and/or resource to adding faculty-led lectures. The article highlights Potluck PD’s significance in teacher preparation.

Keywords: Coaching for equity, asset-based practices, teacher preparation, culturally responsive pedagogy, equity, university supervisors, faculty, professional development

Nina Benegas is an assistant professor and faculty fieldwork coordinator and Isabel Orejel is an assistant professor and director of teacher education, both with the LaFetra College of Education at the University of La Verne, La Verne, California. Email addresses: nbenegas@laverne.edu & iorejel@laverne.edu

Overview Including Purpose and Objectives

Post-pandemic, our institution, among other institutions, faced many challenges, including rebuilding connections and community as in-person operations resumed. The inequities of digital access and learning environments and the teacher candidate's (TC) preparedness to address equity in diverse classrooms became a critical area of focus. Through our Coaching for Equity Model, we modeled best practices to support equity and justice (Orejel & Matamala, 2024). Formal training sessions focused on existing skills and knowledge and the cultural wealth educators bring to encourage reflective practices to identify assets and align them with program goals. Asset-based practices, such as culturally responsive pedagogy, address systemic inequities by framing diversity as a strength (Ladson-Billings, 2021).

The objective of this article is twofold. First, to share best practices for asset-based PD that recognizes and leverages educator strengths to uncover and validate diverse experiences. Second, to share how we are continuing to address communication and hierarchy barriers between teacher education faculty and University Supervisors (US) by creating collaborative communities where joint participation is embedded through the "Potluck PD" model.

Point of View

In recent feedback surveys, our US expressed a desire for further opportunities for connection with the university and with each other. The university's multiple satellite campuses result in a pool of US representing Ventura, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties. The sprawling range of zip codes limit options for in-person gatherings, so department leadership, particularly the Department Chair and Faculty Fieldwork Coordinator, discussed ways to build community amongst the US beyond the two existing formal training opportunities in the school year. An additional consideration was the department's continued commitment to implementing culturally responsive and sustaining practices where they have been lacking historically in teacher preparation programs (Hayes & Juárez, 2012). Developing community-building sessions for our US was an opportunity for them to receive direct instruction on culturally responsive pedagogy and other asset-based practices, which we were confident would increase their own confidence and efficacy in supporting their TC in utilizing these strategies (Pevac-Zimmer et al., 2024).

Key Elements of Practice

The initial goal of the virtual gatherings (held on the Zoom video platform) was to build community. To give US space to share best practices, questions, and moral support, the initial conceptualization of the sessions was a "potluck," aptly named, "Potluck PDs." Each month's meeting had a theme, generated at the end of the prior month's gathering by participant nomination and popular vote, and

Evolving Professional Development for Faculty and University Supervisors

attendees were invited to “bring” an item to the potluck, that item being either a question, a best practice, and/or a resource. We utilized this iteration of the potluck model for one semester, and the themes included: scheduling and time management, communicating with students, and teacher performance assessments and expectations (TPAs/TPEs). In each hour-long virtual meeting, an emphasis was placed on community building with an asset-based lens, facilitating networking between USs in different regions, connecting new USs with their veteran counterparts, and providing an opportunity for USs to share questions or concerns with the Faculty Fieldwork Coordinator. In their end-of-semester feedback, USs expressed gratitude at the opportunity to forge connections with their peers; however, there also materialized a desire for more targeted professional development, specifically addressing questions they had concerning how to support their TC in the new literacy TPE and classroom management. We invited USs to share session topics for future meetings that would be of interest to them professionally.

The following semester, we recruited faculty to present on their individual specialties, especially topics requested by the USs that were covered in the courses that their TCs were taking. Accompanying this change in format (though the name, “Potluck PD” remained by popular demand) was an additional resource: we asked faculty to contribute to a shared spreadsheet, where, in one place, we sought to gather the course objective(s), key concepts, key vocabulary, and course syllabus of each teacher education course in our program. That way, USs could more closely align their feedback to TCs with what they were learning in their courses. Prior to the creation of this course index, the only access US had to their TCs course content was through the TC themselves, if they asked, or if the TC volunteered a course syllabus. This document represented the first step of improved communication between teacher education faculty and our US.

Potluck PD

The second step was the reformatted Potluck PD. The sessions assumed a lecture-style format, occasionally with brief opportunities for interactive elements such as breakout room discussions and opportunities for attendee participation. The topics, each presented by one or two faculty members since this adjustment in the structure of the Potluck PDs are as follows:

- Strategies for Supporting English Language Development
- Inquiry-Based Learning and the 5E Model
- Social Justice Standards
- Supporting Inclusive Education candidates
- Supporting Student Teaching Candidates in their TPAs
- Science of Reading
- Social Emotional Learning

The course index and two semesters of these targeted, intentional Potluck PDs

yielded encouraging results: semester-end feedback from US was consistently positive and faculty began to reach out to volunteer to share their insights into what USs might need to better support their TC. However, when we viewed the current format through a culturally responsive lens, it was clear that a hierarchy had formed; or, rather, a hierarchy that had always existed was now more clearly visible. While the topics of the sessions were responsive to the expressed needs of the USs, they perpetuated an implicit bias: the faculty had the knowledge which they shared with the USs. There had developed an expectation that faculty were the source of expertise, even though our USs often have decades more classroom experience as educators and administrators than do our faculty, not to mention, their own graduate degrees and research interests. This does not align with our vision as a department to welcome our TCs into an asset-based, democratic, and equitable learning environment (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995).

This structure of professional development being led by faculty is a common practice in higher education and is not unexpected as the role of the educational institution is to educate. However, in teacher education, there are three different groups of educators involved in the development of emerging TC: the faculty,¹ the US, and the School Site Supervisors (SSS). The faculty teach the credential courses and oversee TC completion of Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) requirements; US complete the CTC-mandated observations of each TC and serve as liaisons between the university and the TC's fieldwork experience; SSS host TCs in their classrooms, providing opportunities for observation and hands-on experience leading up to the Student Teaching semester. In this model, the CTC expects the university, as the employer of the latter two groups of educators, to provide professional development and all necessary training. There is little to no opportunity, nor expectation, for US or SSS to inform the faculty's work, though these two groups have extensive experience and training to offer.

Conclusions

The eagerness of our faculty to volunteer their time to provide professional development to our US speaks to our department's commitment to continuous learning and community across all stakeholder groups involved in educating our TCs. However, when viewing our practices through an asset-based lens, we considered the cultural responsiveness of our current professional development structure. Our department culture includes an implicit superiority of our faculty's capital over that of our US, so if we aim to model for our TCs how a culturally responsive educational environment requires an asset-based lens, we need to re-evaluate how the various groups of educators involved in our fieldwork program share information in an equitable and democratic way.

Significance to the Field of Teacher Education

Post-pandemic teacher credential programs challenges stemmed from shifts in educational delivery, equity concerns, and the need for adaptive strategies. TCs had limited access to in-person classroom placements, a key developmental cornerstone for teacher preparation. Virtual placements were often less immersive and provided limited opportunities for mentoring from the US. Candidates felt less prepared to implement teaching strategies and handle real-world classroom dynamics (Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2020). Our program shifted pedagogical approaches to online and hybrid teaching models that helped our TCs develop new technical skills and adapt instructional methods. Our US shifted with the university, but TCs and US both felt deterred by the challenges surrounding the systemic inequities encountered during the pandemic and, as it remains, a post-pandemic reality. Our institution called on the need for PD that aligns teaching practices with antiracist and culturally responsive approaches.

Asset-based practices emphasize identifying and utilizing the strengths of TCs, students, families, and communities rather than focusing on perceived deficits (Moll et. al., 1992). It counters the deficit-oriented narratives that disproportionately impact marginalized communities which became more evident during the pandemic. Training TCs to integrate culturally responsive practices empowers TCs to design lesson plans that incorporate students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds validating the strengths and resilience of underserved communities. Asset-based practices align with Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) by promoting positive relationships, self-awareness, and empathy supporting P-12 students, TCs, faculty, and US recovering from pandemic-related trauma (Hammond, 2014).

Teacher preparation programs must integrate asset-based frameworks to prepare TC for diverse classrooms. Faculty that engage in workshops and training sessions to learn about implicit bias, equity-centered instruction and culturally sustaining pedagogy are more effective in fostering equity-focused teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015). US and faculty play a vital role in ensuring that TCs recognize and build on the cultural wealth and experiences students bring to the classroom (Yosso, 2005). To the same extent, US and faculty need to recognize the cultural wealth and experiences that TCs bring to the teacher preparation program. As a third layer, faculty and US in teacher education programs need to recognize their role in modeling asset-based practices which includes challenging the hierarchy among faculty and US.

Connection to the Conference Theme

Our institution has embedded an asset-based lens through the Coaching for Equity Model utilized in all workshops and training sessions for teacher preparation stakeholders including district partners and university faculty, supervisors, and staff. USs and district mentors benefit in their own practices from these opportunities for

meaningful, culturally sustaining partnerships, and are encouraged to apply what they have learned to their support of our TCs, enriching the cycle of coaching for all participants in our fieldwork program.

Inquiry Questions

Inquiry questions related to your work that could provoke thought and discussion related to this article:

1. What supports do we as department leaders need to put in place for our US to feel confident enough to share their own expertise with our faculty?
2. How do we define the capital that our US possess—perhaps, “professional capital”?—and how will increasing that capital’s value in our department affect how we view our teacher candidates’ cultural capital as well?

Note

¹ University staff, such as credential analysts and fieldwork specialists are, for the purpose of this conversation, their own group not directly involved in professional development of those directly supervising or instructing teacher candidates. For that purpose, they are not included in this list, though they play a vital role in teacher candidates’ fieldwork experiences.

References

- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part II. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 109-121.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2020). Preparing educators for the time of COVID... and beyond. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 457-465.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 181–187. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_3
- Hammond, Z. (2014). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Corwin Press.
- Hayes, C., & Juarez, B. (2012). There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here: A critical race perspective. *Democracy & Education*, 20(1).
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that’s just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). I’m here for the hard re-set: Post pandemic pedagogy to preserve our culture. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 54(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2020.1863883>
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- Orejel, I., & Matamala, S. (2024). Coaching for equity. *The CCTE Fall 2024 Research Monograph*, 81.

Evolving Professional Development for Faculty and University Supervisors

- Pevec-Zimmer, S., Juang, L. P., & Schachner, M. K. (2024). Promoting awareness and self-efficacy for culturally responsive teaching of pre-service teachers through the identity project: A mixed methods study. *Identity*, 24(4), 288–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2024.2344086>
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.



Additional Research Presentations from the CCTE Spring 2025 SPAN Virtual Conference

“Empowering Preservice Multilingual Teachers.”

Sara Caniglia Schulte & Sudha Krishnan, San Jose State University.

This research investigates the experiences of preservice multilingual teacher candidates, who were students in K-12 programs and are now enrolled in an education specialist credential program. It examines the challenges they faced during their K-12 education, highlighting strategies and supports that facilitated their success. The study identifies recommendations for improving teacher preparation programs to better support bilingual learners. These findings aim to inform program improvements, empowering future educators to effectively serve diverse student populations and meet the growing demand for bilingual education in K-12 schools.

“Supporting Pathways to Reduce Inequities: The Bay Area K-12 Collaborative Approach to Education and Workforce Alignment.”

Agustin Cervantes, Bay Area T-16 Collaborative & Chabot Las Positas Community College District.

The Bay Area K-16 Collaborative is an equity-centered regional initiative aimed at improving postsecondary and workforce participation by streamlining education-to-career pathways. This roundtable will discuss key strategies, including dual enrollment expansion, articulated course pathways, work-based learning, and industry partnerships, to address systemic inequities in education. By aligning with high-demand sectors such as STEM, Healthcare, and Education, the Collaborative fosters upward mobility for students, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds. The roundtable session will engage on how intersegmental collaboration, employer engagement, and structured transitions between K-12, community colleges, and four-year institutions can enhance student success and workforce readiness for upward mobility.

Other Presentations

“Equity in Integrated Teacher Education Pathways.”

Monica D. Fitzgerald & Jill A. Rathjen, Saint Mary’s College of California.

At our liberal arts college, we revised the undergraduate major and integrated teacher education pathways to center equity and justice. As part of being a mission-based school that focuses on a humanizing education and concern for social justice, our goal is to develop teachers with cultural humility who see their families and communities as assets. With two separate grants from the CTC, we have created integrated MSTE and SPED pathways through our Justice, Community and Leadership Major and 43 SSTE pathways with majors across the College. We have partnered with five community colleges to create pipelines for BA/credential completion.

“Pedagogical and Practice-Based Outcomes of SB488 Certification in the CSU Teacher Preparation Programs.”

Tanya Flushman, California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo.

Participants will learn about the promising pedagogical and practice-based outcomes for CSU teacher preparation programs as a result of the SB488 certification process. The focus will be on how programs are continuing to ensure that teacher candidates have opportunities to learn, practice and be assessed on key literacy content and teaching practices that are explicitly aligned with SB488. Examples of some practices to be shared include a literacy clinical practice portfolio as well as multiple clinical practice evaluation tools with a focus on literacy teaching.

“Building Impactful Special Education Teaching Pathways: Collaborative Partnerships Between CSUs and Community Colleges.”

Nat Hansuvadha & Kristin Stout, California State University Long Beach.

Clear and seamless pathways from high school to community college and university are important for future teachers to move seamlessly from early learning to classroom teaching. This is especially true when it comes to recruiting and preparing candidates to enter the high-needs area of special education. The result of state-supported grants for the university’s Education Specialist Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP) facilitated collaborative efforts that address structural barriers preventing candidates from exploring special education early in their schooling. This collaboration resulted in flexible and impactful pathways that strengthen the field at large and exponentially prepare future special education teachers.

“Building a More Diverse Teacher Workforce: The Teacher Preparation Experience.”

Janelle A. Harmon, California State University Long Beach.

Teachers of Color (TOCs) make up just 20% of the teacher workforce in the United States, while the proportion of TK-12 Students of Color (SOCs) has steadily grown to over half the nation’s student population. To increase the ethnoracial diversity of the teacher workforce, teacher preparation programs (TPPs) must increase the number of Teacher Candidates of Color (TCOCs) who enroll in and successfully complete their programs by providing humanizing support that reduces the influence of whiteness on their experience throughout the TPP. This study provides an overview of the experiences of teacher candidates enrolled in a TPP.

Other Presentations

“AI in Action: Practical Video Coaching Strategies for Teacher Preparation.”

Allison Smith, University of Massachusetts Global, **Keith Walters**, California Baptist University, & **Sam Butterfield**, GoReact.

This session explores a research-based coaching protocol that nurtures candidate resiliency during clinical practice. The protocol honors the disappointments and frustrations that emerge when candidate dreams collide with reality. Discover how using powerful AI tools within a proactive coaching film-study format can cultivate candidate agency. A demonstration focused on targeted feedback, collaborative inquiry, streamlined analysis, and data-driven program improvement using GoReact can unleash candidate growth mindset. Participants will leave with tangible tools and techniques to elevate their AI use during their program’s video coaching activities.

“Supporting Teacher Wellbeing.”

Marco A. Nava, Los Angeles Unified School District.

Teachers face increasing demands in balancing student academic achievement and student well-being, which worsened during COVID-19. The District’s Wellness Wednesdays provided teachers with structured wellness activities to mitigate stress and burnout. This mixed-method study examines Wellness Wednesday’s impact, showing increased teacher engagement in self-care strategies. Survey results indicated a shift from stress and exhaustion towards calm and gratitude. Findings highlight the necessity of integrating wellness practices into professional development, reinforcing that teacher well-being is essential for effective education. Supporting educators’ wellness enables them to foster thriving school communities and sustain their roles as transformative leaders.

“Balancing Robust Preparation and Access: Early Childhood Teacher Credential Program Design Choices.”

Cathy Yun, Learning Policy Institute.

California’s expansion of universal transitional kindergarten and the new PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential present opportunities to design preparation programs for both rigor and accessibility. This study examines approaches to early childhood teacher credentials through national case studies of preparation programs in Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York. Using qualitative methods, including interviews and document analysis, findings highlight design choices that strengthen quality and access. Key takeaways include integrating coursework with clinical practice, financial and structural supports for diverse candidates, and scalable pathways for workforce growth. Implications for California’s policy and preparation program development will be discussed.

To Order the CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph

The *CCTE Spring 2025 Research Monograph* is available in PDF format from the California Council on Teacher Education for \$25.

To order please complete this form:

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City, State, & Zipcode _____

Telephone Number _____

E-mail Address _____

Please mail this form with a \$25 check payable to the California Council on Teacher Education to:

Alan H. Jones, CCTE Executive Secretary
California Council on Teacher Education
3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275
San Francisco, CA 94118

Please indicate which delivery option you prefer below:

- ☐ E-mail the PDF file to my e-mail address above.
- ☐ Send PDF file on disk by regular mail to my address above.