

CCNews

**Newsletter of the
California Council on Teacher Education**

Volume 28, Number 1, Spring Issue, March 2017

Jo Birdsell, Editor (National University)

Prepared for CCTE by Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118

In This Issue of CCNews . . .

Section 1 — News & Reports

Message from CCTE President Sharon Russell.....2-3
 CCTE Seeks Member Expertise 3
 An Invitation from *Teacher Education Quarterly*..... 3
 Upcoming CCTE Conferences 3
 New Opportunities for CCTE Members through AACTE.... 4
 Report from Association of Teacher Educators..... 4
 CCNews Call for Articles and News 4
 From the Desk of the CCTE Executive Secretary..... 5
 Update from CCTE Policy Committee6-7
 Update from Commission on Teacher Credentialing 8

Section 2 — CCTE Conferences

Preview of the CCTE Spring 2017 Conference 9
 Tentative Program for Spring 2017 Conference 10
 Registration Form for Spring 2017 Conference..... 11
 Special Features of SPAN Conference 12
 Update from ICCUCET 12
 CCTE Fall 2016/7 Conference Plans 12

Section 3 — CCTE Organizational Information

2017 CCTE Annual Election in Process 13
 CCTE Standing Committees..... 13

Section 4 — Voices from the Field

Reports from the CCTE Conference Presentations 14
 Check Out the CCTE Website Regularly 14
 “University-School Partnerships: A Collective Approach to Teacher Education”
 by Maryann Krikorian & Manny A. Aceves 15-17
 “Reflections of a Veteran Educator”
 by Leslie Young 18
 “Exorcising the Curriculum: Examination of the Deep Structures of Education.”
 by Marni E. Fisher, Meredith A. Dorner, Gregory Warren, Kevin Stockbridge, & Anat Herzog 19-23
 “Changing Educational Lenses: Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry.”
 By Charlotte Achieng Evensen, Marni E. Fisher, Sabina Giakoumis, Aja McKee, Audri Gomez, Kevin Stockbridge, Meredith A. Dorner, Kimiya Maghzi, & Myla Candelario24-27

CCTE Spring 2017 Conference, March 30-31



See Preview, Tentative Program, and Registration Form on Pages 9-11



CCNews

Newsletter of the
California Council on Teacher Education

The Fruits of Collaboration and the Power of Advocacy

A Message from CCTE President Sharon Russell

Intersegmental Project

In response to the Intersegmental Project Proposal approved by the California Council on Teacher Education Board of Directors back in November 2016, a coalition from all segments of California Teacher Preparation, representing over twenty programs with the support of the Professional Services Division of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), came together in December 2016 to establish project goals and develop an initial blueprint. The Intersegmental Project will create a statewide curriculum for district-employed supervisor (DES) training for all Basic Teaching Credential Programs.

The goal is to create a curriculum that California Teacher Educators could approve and deem transportable among programs. The agreement reached in the discussion to date is to identify and design eight hours of a common curriculum to be complemented by two hours of a program specific curriculum. To provide maximum access the training would be web-based and a certification could be generated upon completion of each module. This completion certification could then be portable to California Teacher Preparation Programs.

The Intersegmental Project Coalition met again recently on Thursday, February 9th, from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Friday, February 10th from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. to identify, design, and begin to craft a curriculum. The meeting was hosted by National University at the National University Spectrum Center in San Diego. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing reimbursed travel costs and another partner catered a light lunch. CCTE agreed to facilitate the meeting and communicate its logistics.

After analyzing the required elements of the standard, the participants identified the following module themes and designed a tentative scope and sequence: adult learning theory (one hour), cognitive coaching (three hours), content specific pedagogy and learning practices (one hour), inclusive practices (two hours), and professional expecta-

tions (one hour). A curriculum structure was established and rough drafts of the modules were begun in all modules except inclusive practices. The Coalition has reached out to inclusive practices faculty asking them to join the collaboration. If you would like to work with any of the teams developing the modules, please contact me (email sharonrussell@calcouncil.com) and I will connect you with the relevant team members.

The Coalition is now in the process of sharing widely with constituents and stakeholders to get constructive feedback from a large sample of our teacher education community. CCTE will be sponsoring a poster session at the March 30-31, Spring 2017 Policy Action Network Conference in Sacramento to share information and collect feedback about the curriculum structure and content. Please come, review the materials, and complete the survey at the session. In April, we hope to incorporate stakeholder feedback, complete the modules, and launch a public online draft.



Sharon Russell

Advocacy

This February, as President of Cal Council, I sent a request to our Congressional Representatives asking them to rescind the Teacher Preparation Regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Education on October 31, 2016. These regulations mandate a rating system for evaluating each of the nation's 27,000 teacher preparation programs annually, and linking the rating to eligibility for Title IV federal student financial aid. The action I took this past month is in keeping with the position previously taken by CCTE during the framing of the regulations when Juan Flores was President. As an organization we have stood against these regulations for a number of factors such as the crippling costs of the mandate, the lack of an evidence base for the new regulations, the conflict with the *Every Student Succeeds Act*, and the negative impact on diverse and poverty serving institutions.

As part of our role as advocates for teacher education policy at the state and national arena, we need to do research

—continued on next page—

Message from CCTE President (continued)

on the consequences of policy decisions, identify policy proposals that have no evidential base, and inform our stakeholders and policy makers of the lack of foundation for such proposals.

I urge all CCTE members and delegates to come to our Spring Policy Action Network Conference as one of the best vehicles for staying informed about the national and California context and to communicate with policy makers to continue support for California public education and quality teacher preparation.

—**Sharon Russell**, CCTE President
CalStateTEACH
sharonrussell@calcouncil.com

CCTE Seeks Member Expertise

As institutional memberships are received this year, the delegates listed for each institution are being sent an e-mail message from the CCTE Membership Committee, welcoming them into their service as delegates and also asking each person who wishes to share with CCTE the fields of teacher education expertise which they have to offer.

Such information will be utilized when CCTE is asked by policymakers or others for assistance with topics and issues that may surface.

All CCTE members, delegates, and friends are asked to join this new “bank of expertise.” Even if you didn’t get a direct request, just send an e-mail message to both CCTE Membership Chair Deborah Hamm (deborah.hamm@csulb.edu) and CCTE Executive Secretary Alan Jones (alan.jones@ccte.org) with your name, institution, and areas of expertise.

An Invitation from the New Editor of *Teacher Education Quarterly*

This new year has ushered in numerous changes of importance to the teacher education community. Changes such as bilingual policies at the state level and a new U.S. Secretary of Education under a new presidential administration will greatly affect students, teachers, and teacher educators throughout the United States.

At this pivotal moment in time, we must lead our profession and ensure that research on teacher education guides the development of teachers and students. Please consider submitting your research article manuscripts to, and becoming a reviewer for, our California Council on Teacher Education sponsored academic journal, *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Check out our new website at:

www.teqjournal.org

and keep up with the latest TEQ news on our new facebook page.

—**Mary Christianakis**
Editor, *Teacher Education Quarterly*
Occidental College

Upcoming CCTE Conferences

Spring 2017

The Citizen Hotel, Sacramento

March 30-31

Theme: “SPAN: Spring Policy Action Network”

Fall 2017

Kona Kai Resort, San Diego

October 19-21

Theme: “Equity and Social Justice”

New Opportunities for CCTE Members to Join the National Conversation about Teacher Preparation through AACTE

By **Linda Hoff**

CCTE Vice President for AACTE

Fresno Pacific University

The California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) has enjoyed a long-term relationship with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). While not all current CCTE institutions maintain active membership in AACTE, many of AACTE's resources are available to non-members.

In addition, we are particularly delighted to announce that our past CCTE President, Reyes Quezada, a Professor in the Department of Learning and Teaching of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego, has recently been elected to the AACTE Board of Directors as an at-large member. Dr. Quezada will begin his three-year AACTE term (2017-2020) after the annual meeting this March in Tampa, Florida. He will attend the annual AACTE Board of Directors orientation and observe the Board of Directors meeting before his term begins.

Reyes states that he is humbled and that "it is an honor to have been elected to the premier national teacher education organization as one of its Board of Directors. I believe being Past President of CCTE contributed to my election as well as having been CCTE's Vice President to AACTE as the California Representative for two terms as well as being CCTE's Vice President for ATE and California representative, also for two terms. My current position as Vice-Chair of the International Council for the Education of Teachers (ICET) also helped me garner the necessary votes in a national election. I will represent California, CCTE as well as other teacher preparation institutions, as best as I can in making sure that our children are taught by the most effective teachers in the world."

We will all benefit from having Reyes directly involved with the AACTE Board and the national association's many activities.

Also, at our CCTE Spring Conference in Sacramento this March we will be joined by and welcome AACTE staff members Sungti Hsu and Mark Lacelle-Peterson. Mark will be our luncheon speaker on the first day of the conference. Both Mark and Sungti also attended our Spring 2016 Conference in San Jose, so it will be great to have them with us again. Don't miss this opportunity to talk with our AACTE colleagues who are eager to understand how AACTE can support CCTE, the California chapter of AACTE.

Report from ATE

By **Sue Westbrook**

CCTE Vice President for ATE

California Federation of Teachers

ATE held its Annual Meeting from February 10-14, 2017, in Orlando, Florida. The theme was "Teacher Educators: Inspiring the Future, Honoring the Past." The 2017 Delegate Assembly was held on Saturday, February 11. A proposed website was presented, and the Leadership Academy, the 2017 Summer Conference, and the 2018 Annual Meeting were discussed. As the meeting was taking place as this article was being written, further information on the outcome of the conference will be in the next *CCNews*.

The 2017 Summer Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators will be held in Pittsburgh, and it is only months away. Please consider volunteering to review conference proposals by completing a reviewer interest survey: <https://goo.gl/forms/dX5zwYC1TyQ53C5F3>.

CCNews Call for Articles and News

The goal of *CCNews* continues to be to create a forum for CCTE members to share information and celebrate our successes. In addition to reports from officers and committees, we encourage all SIG chairs and concurrent session and poster session presenters at CCTE semi-annual conferences to write about their sessions and presentations for the newsletter. Just e-mail your submissions as an attachment to the editor:

jbirdsell@nu.edu

The deadline for materials for the Summer 2017 issue is May 15.

—**Jo Birdsell**
National University,
Editor of *CCNews*

From the Desk of the CCTE Executive Secretary

Following are brief updates on current activities of the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) which should be of interest to all CCTE members, delegates, and friends:

Membership Remains Strong

To date CCTE has received membership renewals for the 2016-2017 year from over 65 institutions (colleges, universities, county offices, and educational associations and agencies) and 50 individuals. Several new memberships have also been received, and additional renewals and new members are anticipated and will be welcomed.

Annual Sponsorship Program

CCTE is also seeking to expand our annual sponsorship program. We appreciate the renewal of institutional co-sponsorships from California State University, Long Beach, Loyola Marymount University, and the University of Redlands for this 2016-2017 year and also the addition of a sponsorship from California State University, Los Angeles. We hope other institutions will sign on as sponsors as well.

Spring Conference in Sacramento

As you have already heard via a survey to the membership last spring, reports in previous issues of the newsletter, and recently e-mailed announcements and reminders, the Spring 2017 CCTE Conference will be held in Sacramento on March 30-31 under the theme "SPAN: Spring Policy Action Network." You will find a preview of the Conference, the tentative program, and a registration form in this issue of *CCNews*. All CCTE delegates, members, and friends are encouraged to join us in Sacramento in March.

Quest for Teacher Education Research Continues

As first reported in the Fall 2014 issue of *CCNews*, the goal of the CCTE Quest for Teacher Education Research is to encourage and support research on teacher education in our state in order to increase the knowledge base and better inform teacher education practice and policy. During the initial 2014-2015 year of the Quest, 37 different research studies were involved with support from a State Chapter Grant from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. The program expanded to 42 studies during 2015-2016. We are hoping for even more studies to participate during 2016-2017 and beyond. Currently a survey of all Quest participants is underway to gather information to share with the CCTE membership.

CCTE New Faculty Program

The CCTE New Faculty Support Program is enjoying its sixth year during 2016-2017. The program is open to any

teacher education faculty in their first five years of service at any of our CCTE member institutions. The benefits of the program include discounted CCTE membership and conference registration as well as mentorship from an experienced CCTE leader.

CCTE Graduate Student Support Program

The CCTE Graduate Student Support Program is in its seventh year during 2016-2017. The program is open to graduate students at any CCTE member institution. The benefits include discounted CCTE membership and conference registration, an opportunity to submit a proposal for one of our conference programs, mentorship from a CCTE leader, and participation in the CCTE Graduate Student Caucus.

Position and Event Announcements

Over recent years CCTE has distributed announcements of available positions and special events at member institutions via e-mail to all members and delegates. Because of a rapidly increasing number of announcements, last year we added a special section to the CCTE website for posting of such announcements. Having such announcements posted is one of the benefits of being a member institution of CCTE. There are currently about 120 announcements on the website. Please be sure to log in and check the announcements at www.ccte.org

CCTE Annual Election Soon

The 2017 CCTE election involves election of three new members of the CCTE Board of Directors to replace three members whose terms expire this March. The CCTE Nominations and Elections Committee, under the leadership of Past President Juan Flores, has recruited six candidates for those positions and an election announcement has been sent to the membership followed by a link to an e-mail ballot. Voting will end and the newly elected Board members will be announced on March 31, the final day of the Spring Conference.

CCTE Journals

All CCTE members and institutional delegates receive each issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* and *Issues in Teacher Education* in PDF format via e-mail as they are published. The Winter 2017 issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* was distributed in January and the Spring 2017 issues of both journals will be published in April.

—Alan H. Jones, CCTE Executive Secretary
3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275,
San Francisco, CA 94118
Telephone 415-666-3012
e-mail alan.jones@ccte.org

Update from the CCTE Policy Committee

By **Sue Westbrook & Mona Thompson**
Co-Chairs, CCTE Policy Committee

The California Council on Teacher Education Policy Committee has been following the California Budget process, some new education bills that have been introduced in the Legislature, and the federal education situation.

California 2017-18 Education Budget

The Governor's proposed 2017-2018 budget reflects decreases in prior-year Proposition 98 funding levels compared to those assumed in the 2016-2017 budget agreement. The Governor's proposed budget assumes a 2016-2017 Proposition 98 funding level of \$71.4 billion, \$506 million less than the level assumed in the 2016-2017 budget agreement, and a \$68.7 billion 2015-2016 Prop. 98 funding level, \$380 million below the level assumed in the 2016-2017 budget agreement.

The Governor's proposed budget increases funding for the state's K-12 education funding formula—the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)—and pays off outstanding obligations to school districts. Voter approval of Prop. 51 in November 2016 authorized \$7 billion in state general obligation (GO) bonds for K-12 school facilities. However, the Governor's proposed budget notes shortcomings in the State Facilities Program and suggests that until measures are in place to verify that state GO bond funds “are appropriately used,” the Administration will not support the expenditure of Prop. 51 dollars. The Governor also proposes to engage stakeholders in discussions during the spring budget process to respond to recommendations made to improve the current special education finance system.

The proposed budget increases funding by \$744.4 million in 2017-2018 to continue implementation of the LCFF. The LCFF provides school districts, charter schools, and COEs a base grant per student, adjusted to reflect the number of students at various grade levels, as well as additional grants for the costs of educating English learners, students from low-income families, and foster youth. The Governor's proposal to increase LCFF funding may reduce the amount of time it takes to fully implement the LCFF, which depends on funding sufficient for all districts to reach a target base grant (all COEs reached their LCFF funding targets in 2014-2015). According to the Administration, the proposed 2017-2018 LCFF funding level “maintains formula implementation at the current-year level of 96 percent.”

The Governor's proposed budget provides California Community Colleges (CCCs) with \$150 million in one-time funding for grants to develop and implement “guided pathways” programs, an institution-wide approach to support student success. Participating CCCs can use guided pathway grants for activities such as targeted advising and support services and designing “academic roadmaps and transfer pathways that explicitly detail the courses students must take to complete a credential or degree on time.”

The Governor's proposed budget includes modest increases in General Fund spending for the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC), with the expectation that CSU and UC implement new practices that reduce the cost of instruction and expand access to higher education for California students. At the same time, the Governor's budget proposal notes that the UC Office of the President will propose a 2.5 percent tuition increase to the UC Board of Regents later in January and that the CSU Chancellor's Office will propose a 5 percent tuition increase to the CSU Board of Trustees in March. The Governor's proposal notes that these tuition increases would increase the 2017-2018 Cal Grant costs for UC and CSU students by \$17.7 million and \$24.9 million respectively. However, the Governor's proposed budget does not include funding to pay for these increased costs and states “any tuition increases must be viewed in the context of reducing the overall cost structure at UC and improving the graduation rates at the CSU.”

The 2016-2017 budget agreement called for implementation of a multiyear plan to reinvest in the state's child care and development system, including by updating provider payment rates in order to keep pace with the state's rising minimum wage and further boosting the number of full-day state preschool slots. Yet due to the projected decrease in revenue, the Governor's proposed 2017-2018 budget now “pauses” these proposed reinvestments until the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

The above information is from the California Budget & Policy Center <http://calbudgetcenter.org/resources/first-look-restrained-budget-proposal-reflects-uncertainty-federal-commitments-economic-conditions/>.

Legislation of Interest

Credentialing

AB 170 (O'Donnell) - Teaching credentialing. Status: May be heard in committee February 17. Summary: This bill would no longer require, for issuance of a multiple subject teaching credential only, that the baccalaureate degree be in a subject other than professional education. Additional Notes: Any institution that chooses to offer a bachelor's degree in professional education would forgo Pell Grant eligibility for their post-graduate credentialing programs.

AB 226 (Cervantes) – Teacher Credentialing: Application Priority. Status: Assembly Committee on Education. Summary: This bill would require the commission to adopt regulations to give priority for review and processing to applications for credentials, temporary certificates, and permits by spouses of military personnel on active duty. Expedites the process for military spouses in California to receive their teaching credentials in order to help them find rewarding work as teachers.

AB 410 (Cervantes) – Teacher Credentialing: Beginning Teacher Induction. Status: Introduced. Summary: This bill

—continued on next page—

Update from CCTE Policy Committee

(continued from previous page)

would, commencing with hiring for the 2017–2018 school year, and each school year thereafter, prohibit a school district, county office of education, or charter school from charging a fee to a beginning teacher to participate in a beginning teacher induction program that is approved by the commission and the Superintendent, and would define a beginning teacher for purposes of that provision to include a teacher with a preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential, or a preliminary education specialist credential. The bill also would prohibit a local educational agency from charging a fee to a beginning teacher to participate in an alternative program of beginning teacher induction program that it provides.

Curriculum Changes

AB 37 (O'Donnell) - Pupil instruction: visual and performing arts: content standards in media arts. Status: Referred to Assembly Committee on Education. Summary: This bill would require the Superintendent to recommend visual and performing arts (VAPA) standards in the subject of media arts, and would require those recommendations to go through the same development, public review, and approval process outlined in AB 2862 (Chapter 647, Statutes of 2016) for the existing VAPA content areas. Additional Notes: The governor's January budget plan proposes delaying the AB 2862 approval process by a year.

AB 155 (Gomez) - Pupil instruction: civic online reasoning. Status: May be heard in committee February 11. Summary: This bill would require the Instructional Quality Commission to develop, and the State Board of Education (State Board) to adopt, revised curriculum standards and frameworks for English language arts, mathematics, history-social science, and science that incorporate civic online reasoning. For the purposes of this bill, "civic online reasoning" is defined as, "the ability to judge the credibility and quality of information found on Internet Web sites, including social media."

SB 135 (Dodd) - Pupil instruction: media literacy. Status: May be heard in committee February 11. Summary: This bill would require the State Board, in the next revision of instructional materials or curriculum frameworks in social sciences for grades 1 to 12, to include instruction on media literacy. For the purposes of this bill, "media literacy" means "the ability to encode and decode the symbols transmitted via electronic or digital media and the ability to synthesize, analyze, and produce mediated messages." The bill would also require the State Department of Education to make a list of resources and materials on media literacy available to teachers on its website.

Financial Aid

AB 169 (O'Donnell) - Teaching credential: teacher recruitment: High Need Teacher Grant Program. Status: May be heard in committee February 17. Summary: Subject to an

appropriation by the Legislature, this bill would establish a program to be administered by the State Department of Education to provide a grant of \$20,000 to each student enrolled in an approved teacher credentialing program who commits to working in a high-need field for four years after credentialing. The Commission would be required to confirm a recipient had fulfilled their four-year commitment. High need fields for the purposes of this program would include: bilingual education, special education, and STEM. Additional Notes: Staff have recommended amendments that would remove the Commission from the bill.

The above information is from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2017-02/2017-02-4A.pdf> and [leginfo.legislature.ca.gov](http://leginfo.ca.gov)

National Education News

The U.S. Senate has narrowly confirmed Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education. She is a proponent of school choice, charter schools, and vouchers.

President Donald Trump has vowed to repeal Common Core State Standards (CCSS). He cannot, as it is not a federal program. Only states can adopt CCSS, and at least 37 states and the District of Columbia officially use CCSS. The Trump administration would like to expand school choice, charter schools, and home schooling. Trump advocated a \$20 billion voucher plan on the campaign trail.

Evangelical Christian leader Jerry Falwell Jr. will head an education reform task force under President Trump and is keen to cut university regulations, including rules on dealing with campus sexual assault, the school he heads said. Falwell is president of Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia, which bills itself as the world's biggest Christian university. A school spokesman, Len Stevens, said on Wednesday it was not clear yet when the task force would start its work. Stevens said Falwell was interested in eliminating numerous regulations the U.S. Department of Education has placed on colleges and universities, adding that many college presidents felt the same, regardless of their political orientation. "It's an autonomy issue for universities to be able to not be micro-managed by the Department of Education," Stevens said in an email. Falwell also wants to cut federal rules on investigating and reporting sexual assault under Title IX, the federal law that bars sexual discrimination in education, according to Stevens. The information above about Jerry Falwell is from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-falwell-idUSKBN15G5F4>.

CCTE Policy Contacts

The CCTE Policy Committee Co-Chairs can be contacted by e-mail as follows:

Mona Thompson at almothomp@gmail.com
Susan Westbrook at suew447@aol.com

Updates from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Technical Assistance for the Revised Accreditation System

The Commission established a transition year during 2016-2017 so that Commission staff could plan technical assistance activities and institutional representatives would have the opportunity to learn about the revised accreditation system. To ensure adequate time, no accreditation site visits are being held this year. An accreditation technical assistance web page has been developed and all presentations and resources, as well as sign-ups for technical assistance events can be found on that webpage.

Year 5 Submission Requirements Technical Assistance

All institutions in the Red, Orange, Blue, Indigo, and Violet cohorts are invited to the Year 5 Technical Assistance sessions. These sessions are designed to support institutions to understand the Program Review and Common Standard submissions in Year 5 of the accreditation cycle and the review process. There are separate events for Induction programs and Preliminary and other Initial programs. Information and registration can be found on the accreditation technical assistance web page.

Accreditation Due Dates

March 31, 2017 - Common Standards submission from Green Cohort due

March 31, 2017 - Preconditions from Green Yellow, and Violet Cohorts due

April 17, 2017 - Transition Plans from Clear Education Specialist Induction programs are due

October 15, 2017 - Program Review submission from Yellow Cohort due

All submissions should be emailed to accreditation@ctc.ca.gov

Elementary Subject Matter Programs

Revised Title 5 regulations that will become effective April 1, 2017 will restore the option for preliminary multiple subject credential candidates to complete a Commission-approved elementary subject matter program as an option to meet the subject matter requirement in lieu of passing the CSET: Multiple Subject examination.

Pilot Testing Underway for the Updated CalTPA and the newly-developed CalAPA

The pilot of the two new performance assessments is underway. We are still looking for assessors for the many of the low incidence subjects. For more information on the Commission's performance assessments for teachers and leaders and to apply to be an assessor for the pilot study, please visit www.ctcpa.nesinc.com.

Update to the Commission's log in and passwords for the Credential system

The online credential system has been updated and each educator will be required to create a log in and password. The login and passwords will be valid for 6 months. Logins must be 8 alphabetical characters while the password must be a minimum of 9 characters, with at least one capital letter, one lower case letter, one number, and one of the following symbols: < > ' ~ ! # \$ % ^ & * () _ + @ .

Teacher Induction

At its October 2016 meeting the Commission adopted Teacher Induction Standards that apply to both general education and special education teachers who hold Preliminary teaching credentials. PSA 17-01 provides information for both general education and special education induction programs. All general education induction programs must transition to the standards by September 2017 while clear education specialist induction programs must transition to the 2016 Teacher Induction Standards by September 2018. As of September 2018, there will only be Teacher Induction programs and the programs may work with both general education and special education Preliminary credential holders.

Workshops by CTC at CCTE Spring Conference

Friday, March 31
The Citizen Hotel, Sacramento
as part of the CCTE Spring Program

9:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.
Workshop on Accreditation
for Teacher Education Faculty

9:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.
Leadership for Accreditation
for Deans and Directors



CCNews

Newsletter of the
California Council on Teacher Education

Volume 28, Number 1, Spring Issue, March 2017, Section 2

Jo Birdsell, Editor (National University)

Prepared for CCTE by Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118

Preview of CCTE Spring 2017 Conference “SPAN: Spring Policy Action Network”

By **Karen Lafferty, Cindy Grutzik, & Pia Wong**
Co-Chairs of CCTE Spring 2017 Conference

Are your bags packed for Sacramento?

In just a few weeks CCTE will be in the state capital for our first Spring Policy Action Network, or SPAN conference. We are looking forward to a renewed focus on policy with a streamlined conference format.

Our decision to move, based on both financial considerations and a desire to strengthen CCTE’s voice in teacher education policy, has afforded us new opportunities at the state level.

Thank you to all the members who took our survey and provided input for planning. We are excited to share details and highlights.

Our Focus

With the move to Sacramento we have set the following goals for the SPAN conference. As a leader in teacher education policy, we will:

- ◆ build relationships and expand CCTE’s policy network;
- ◆ develop members’ skills as partners, advocates, and communicators; and
- ◆ affirm CCTE’s expert influence at the state level.

Conference Details

The conference will be held at The Citizen Hotel.

Thursday, March 30th kicks off with a “Meet and Greet” continental breakfast and time for SIGs to meet before coming together to learn more about policy and the hot issues in California. At lunch, included in your registration, AACTE’s Mark LaCelle-Peterson will provide some context for policy at the national level.

That afternoon CCTE members will have the choice of staying at The Citizen Hotel to work on policy analysis in regional groups, or walking over to the Capitol to become familiar with legislative offices and leave materials with legislative staffers. Later that afternoon, we will come back

together for a debrief session followed by a sponsored reception. While sponsors for the conference are still being recruited, at present sponsorship commitments have been received from the California School Boards Association, California State University Sacramento, the Independent California Colleges and Universities Council on the Education of Teachers, and the Thompson Policy Institute on Disability and Autism of the College of Educational Studies at Chapman University.

Friday of the conference will start with the CCTE President’s Networking Breakfast and continues with two special sessions on accreditation, one for faculty and one for deans and program directors, provided by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. After affiliate group meetings, we will introduce a new element for CCTE conferences—research roundtables. Members will have the opportunity to hear about teacher education research as well as attend the concurrent poster session. We are also excited that the poster session will feature, in addition to current research, a special series of posters focusing on Cesar Chavez from teacher education students at California State University Sacramento.

In our move to Sacramento we look forward to building new relationships as we strengthen our commitment to improving teacher education at every level. Please make plans to join us.

Spring Conference Information

Tentative Spring Conference Program
(see next page)

Spring Conference Registration Form
(see page 11)

Tentative Spring 2017 CCTE Conference Program

Wednesday, March 29:

10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Meeting of the California State University Field Coordinators' Forum.
10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Meeting of Board of Directors of the California Council on Teacher Education.
Meeting of Education Deans from Private and Independent Colleges and Universities.

Thursday, March 30:

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. - Meet and Greet Continental Breakfast.
9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. - Roundtable Meetings of CCTE Special Interest Groups.
10:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. - Break.
10:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. - California Priorities Meeting:
 Welcome, Introductions, & Overview.
 Legislative Updates and Seminar on Legislative Process.
 Identifying the Hot Issues.
 Exploring Policies in Regional Policy Groups with Team Facilitators (based on combinations of State Senate districts).
 Debriefing and Review.
11:45 a.m. to Noon. - Break.
Noon to 1:00 p.m. - Advocacy Lunch with Speaker Mark LaCelle-Peterson, AACTE Senior Vice President for Policy & Programs.
1:00 p.m. to 1:15 p.m. - Break.
1:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. - Reconvene in Regional Groups.
1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. - Policy Activities to Build Capacity—Choose One:
 Exploring the Capitol with Your Regional Policy Group.
 or
 Policy Analysis Session with AACTE Staff Experts and CCTE Policy Committee.
1:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. - AICCU Meeting at State Capitol.
2:00 p.m. to 4 p.m. - Statewide Deans' Meeting at State Capitol.
4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Debriefing and Goal Setting:
 Policy Activity Report Outs: Highlights from Explore the Capitol and Policy Analysis Groups.
 Implications for Goals and Future Activities.
 Hearing from Our Allies: Panel of Leaders from Other California Educational Associations on Legislative Relations.
5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. - Sponsored Reception.
7:00 p.m. - Dinner on Your Own.
7:00 p.m. - Segment Deans' Dinner Meetings.

Friday, March 31:

8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. - President's Networking Breakfast.
9:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. - CTC Workshop on Accreditation.
9:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. - Leadership for Accreditation for Deans and Directors with CTC Staff.
10:15 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. - Break.
10:30 a.m. to Noon - Associated Organization Meetings:
 California Association of Bilingual Teacher Educators.
 California Association of Professors of Special Education.
 Independent California Colleges and Universities Council on the Education of Teachers.
Noon to 12:30 p.m. - Buffet Lunch.
 Deadline for Voting in CCTE Annual Election.
12:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Research Sessions:
 Research Roundtables (Two Sessions, Three Roundtables Each).
 Research and Practice Posters.
3:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. - President's Conference Wrap-Up:
 Announcement of New CCTE Board Members.
 Preview of Fall 2017 CCTE Conference.
 Closing Comments.
3:30 p.m. - Conference Adjourns.

California Council on Teacher Education Spring 2017 Conference Registration

Please use this form to register for the Spring 2017 CCTE Conference and return by mail with payment by check;
Or if you wish to pay by credit card, use the on-line form in the "Conferences" page of the CCTE website (www.ccte.org).

Name _____

Preferred Mailing Address _____

_____ (include ZIP code)

Telephone _____

E-Mail _____

Institutional Affiliation _____

Registration Category: Each Category Includes Conference Registration and Meals (check the appropriate category):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Pre-Registration - \$295 (will be \$325 on site) | Note: CABTE, CAPSE, & ICCUCET will meet on Friday morning at the Spring 2017 Conference, but there is no separate registration charge for those meeting this time because all food service is included in the Conference registration. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special for Retired Educators - \$150 (will be \$175 on site) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special for P-12 Educators - \$150 (will be \$175 on site) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special for Students - \$50 (will be \$75 on site) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special for 4 or more registrants from the same institution - \$275 each (submit a form for each with combined payment) | |

California State University Field Coordinators' Forum and Refreshments (Wednesday)

- Special Fee for Those Attending - \$25

Total from above (please enclose check for this amount payable to California Council on Teacher Education): \$_____

Special Interest Groups: You are urged to attend a SIG of your choosing during the Thursday meet-and-greet breakfast (check the one you may attend):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arts in Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Equity and Social Justice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Credential Program Coordinators/Directors | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Induction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RAIN | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedagogies for College and Career Readiness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lives of Teachers | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology and Teacher Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Teacher Preparation |

Please indicate which Regional Policy Group You Are In (By State Senate Districts):

- Group 1 - North - Senate Districts 1, 2, 3, & 4.
 Group 2 - Northern Central Valley - Senate Districts 5, 6, 12, & 14.
 Group 3 - San Francisco Bay Area - Senate Districts 7, 9, 10, & 11.
 Group 4 - Silicon Valley & Central Coast - Senate Districts 8, 13, 15, & 17.
 Group 5 - South Central Valley - Senate Districts 16, 18, 19, & 21.
 Group 6 - San Bernardino Area & High Desert - Senate Districts 23, 24, 25, & 32.
 Group 7 - Ventura & San Fernando Valley - Senate Districts 20, 22, 26, & 27.
 Group 8 - Central Los Angeles & Long Beach Area - Senate Districts 28, 30, 33, & 35.
 Group 9 - Orange County & Riverside Area - Senate Districts 29, 31, 34, & 37.
 Group 10 - San Diego Area & Imperial Valley - Senate Districts 36, 38, 39, & 40.
 If you would be willing to serve as a facilitator of your Policy Group, please check here

Please be sure to complete this section as it will help facilitate conference logistics.

Please mail completed form with check payable to "California Council on Teacher Education" to:

Alan H. Jones, CCTE Executive Secretary, 3145 Geary Boulevard PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118

For on-line registration and payment via credit card, access the form on the "Conferences" page of the CCTE website:
www.ccte.org

**Special Features
of the CCTE Spring 2017
SPAN Conference**

**March 29-31
The Citizen Hotel
Sacramento**

Wednesday, March 29

CSU Field Coordinators Forum
CCTE Board of Directors Meeting

Thursday, March 30

Meet and Greet Breakfast
SIG Meetings
Policy Orientation Session
Luncheon Speaker: Mark LaCelle-Peterson, AACTE
Afternoon Policy Visits and Analysis
Deans' Meeting at State Capitol
Debriefing with Education Allies

Reception Sponsored by
California State University, Sacramento
California School Boards Association
Independent California Colleges and Universities
Council on the Education of Teachers
(other sponsors still being recruited)

Friday, March 31

President's Breakfast Sponsored by
Association of Independent California Colleges
and Universities
(other sponsors still being recruited)

Associated Group Meetings
Research Roundtables and Posters
Closing Session

Annual Co-Sponsors of CCTE for 2016-2017

*College of Education at California State University,
Long Beach*
*Charter College of Education at California State
University, Los Angeles*
School of Education at Loyola Marymount University
School of Education at University of Redlands

Special Sponsor of CCTE Spring 2017 Conference

*Thompson Policy Institute for Disabilities and Autism,
College of Educational Studies, Chapman University*

Update from ICCUCET

By **Christine Zeppos**
ICCUCET President
Brandman University

The Independent California College and University Council on the Education of Teachers (ICCUCET) general assembly meeting will be held from 10:30 a.m. to Noon on Friday, March 31st at The Citizen Hotel in Sacramento as part of the Spring 2017 Conference of the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE).

We will receive Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) updates and will hold elections for the 2017-2018 ICCUCET Executive Board. Nominations for representatives will be presented and also accepted from the floor. Please contact Jo Birdsell (email jbirdsell@nu.edu) if you have questions or would like to offer a nomination prior to the meeting.

We also thank and congratulate Jo for her many years of service to ICCUCET, most recently during the past four years as President and Past President. Her leadership has strengthened the ICCUCET voice in policy making and has provided solid support for the independent colleges and universities member institutions.

We looking forward to seeing members on Friday, March 31st in Sacramento!

ICCUCET supports non-profit Independent California colleges and universities committed to preparing teachers, administrators, counselors, and other educators working in P-12 educational settings. ICCUCET assists teacher educators in becoming more effective within the profession; facilitates communication and dissemination of information on the education of teachers; and provides opportunities for collaboration on relevant policies and issues of concern to institutional members.

CCTE Fall 2017 Conference

The Fall 2017 CCTE Conference will be held October 19-21 at the Kona Kai Resort in San Diego around the theme "Equity and Social Justice." The planning for the Conference is being coordinated by the CCTE Equity and Social Justice Special Interest Group, and Shannon Stanton (Whittier College) and Charlane Starks (Elk Grove Unified School District), the SIG co-chairs, are also co-chairing the Conference planning committee. Anyone wishing to assist with planning the Fall Conference should contact either of them: sstanton@whittier & cfstarks@egusd.net



CCNews

Newsletter of the California Council on Teacher Education

Volume 28, Number 41 Spring Issue, March 2017, Section 3

Jo Birdsell, Editor (National University)

Prepared for CCTE by Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118

2017 CCTE Annual Election in Process

The 2017 California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) annual election involves election of three new members of the Board of Directors to serve three-year terms. The three members of the Board of Directors whose terms expire in 2017, and who will therefore be replaced in the 2017 election, are Eric Engdahl (California State University, East Bay), Lyn Scott (California State University, East Bay), and Mona Thompson (California State University, Channel Islands).

The Nominations and Elections Committee, chaired by CCTE Past President Juan Flores (California State University, Stanislaus), has, as stipulated in the CCTE by-laws, recruited a slate of nominees for the offices to be elected. The persons nominated by the Committee to stand for election to the Board of Directors in 2017 are:

Monica Boomgard (California State University, Northridge)
 Victoria Graf (Loyola Marymount University)
 Nicol Howard (University of Redlands)
 Betina Hsieh (California State University, Long Beach)
 Melissa Meetze-Hall (Riverside and San Bernardino County Office of Education)
 Kelly Vaughn (Notre Dame de Namur University)

Each CCTE member or delegate may vote for up to three candidates, and the three candidates receiving the most votes will be elected to the Board of Directors.

A formal e-mail announcement of the election has been

sent to all CCTE members and delegates. That announcement included the report of the Nominations and Elections Committee, statements by and photos of the six nominated candidates, and a description of the election procedures. Each CCTE member and delegate has also received an e-mailed link to the on-line ballot through which the election is being conducted.

While the deadline for voting is noon on Friday, March 31 (the final day of the CCTE Spring 2017 Conference), all members and delegates are encouraged to vote on-line prior to the Conference. In addition, computers will be available in the registration area at the Conference for anyone who has not voted prior to attending the Conference.

The Nominations and Elections Committee will tally the results immediately after noon on March 31, and the three candidates receiving the most votes for the Board of Directors will be declared elected. An announcement of the election results will be made at the end of the Conference that day, and those elected will take office upon adjournment of the 2017 Spring Conference.

If you have any questions about these election procedures, please contact CCTE Executive Secretary Alan H. Jones. If you have an interest in being nominated for a CCTE office in 2018 or other future years, please share that information with the Nominations and Elections Committee. All CCTE officers are volunteers, and persons interested in such service are encouraged to initially volunteer for and participate on any of the various CCTE committees.

CCTE Standing Committees

There are six standing committees involved with primary CCTE activities. Those committees are:

Awards Committee
Communications Committee
Membership Committee
Nominations and Election Committee
Policy Committee
Research Committee

All CCTE committees are composed of volunteers from the membership. If you are interested in joining any of these committees, please e-mail CCTE Executive Secretary Alan Jones at alan.jones@ccte.org



CCNews

**Newsletter of the
California Council on Teacher Education**

Volume 28, Number 1, Spring Issue, March 2017, Section 4

Jo Birdsell, Editor (National University)

Prepared for CCTE by Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118

Reports from CCTE Conference Presentations

Presenters at concurrent and poster sessions and Special Interest Groups at California Council on Teacher Education semi-annual conferences are invited to submit reports on their research and practice for publication in *CCNews*.

Following are three such reports from the Fall 2016 Conference:

“University-School Partnerships: A Collective Approach to Teacher Preparation.”

By Maryann Krikorian & Manny A. Aceves, *Loyola Marymount University*.

“Reflections of a Veteran Teacher.”

By Leslie Young, *Claremont Graduate University*.

“Exorcising the Curriculum: Examination of the Deep Structures of Education.”

By Marni E. Fisher, *Chapman University*, Meredith A. Dorner, *Irvine Valley College*,
Gregory Warren, *Chapman University*, Kevin Stockbridge, *Chapman University*,
& Anat Herzog, *Chapman University*.

“Changing Educational Lenses: Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry.”

By Charlotte Achieng Evensen, *Downey Unified School District*, Marni E. Fisher,
Chapman University, Sabina Giakoumis, *University of California, Irvine*,
Aja McKee, *Irvine Unified School District*, Audri Gomnez, *Newport-Mesa Unified School District*,
Kevin Stockbridge, *Chapman University*, Meredith A. Dorner, *Irvine Valley College*,
Kimiya Maghzi, *Chapman University*, & Myla Candelario, *Community Roots Academy*.

Other reports and articles will appear in future issues of the newsletter.

Be Sure to Check the CCTE Website Regularly

www.ccte.org

The CCTE website offers information and background on all of our activities. All delegates, members, and friends of the organization are encouraged to visit the site regularly.

You will find news, announcements, membership information, previews and retrospectives on our semi-annual conferences, policy updates, and invitations for participation in such programs as the CCTE New Faculty Support Program, CCTE Graduate Student Support Program, and the CCTE Quest for Teacher Education Research.

The latest feature of the website is a listing of teacher education position openings and special events at our member institutions. That listing is at the top of the right hand column of the home page.

Be sure to check it all out regularly.

University-School Partnerships A Collective Approach to Teacher Preparation

By **Maryann Krikorian & Manny A. Aceves**
Loyola Marymount University

Given the emphasis on partnerships and continuous improvement efforts (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2016; Council on Accreditation of Educator Preparation Board of Directors, 2015), university and school constituencies may consider partnering to advance educator preparation programs. Using the Professional Learning Community model as a framework (Hall & Hord, 2001; Eaker & Sells, 2016), this short article examines how a School of Education (SOE) collaborates with local school-sites. The elements for a PLC include: (a) shared values and vision, (b) collective learning and application, (c) supportive and shared leadership, (d) supportive conditions, and (e) shared personal practice (Hall and Hord, 2001). Such collaborative foundations helped to reimagine a more thoughtful integration between partnerships and continuous improvement to further the following areas: (a) School partnership development; (b) Continuous improvement system development; and (c) Teacher preparation program design.

Given that the focus of this article concentrates on one university site, a document analysis allowed for the investigation of emerging themes related to university-school partnerships within a SOE (Yin, 2009). First, the processes of university-school partnerships were examined by reviewing the literature in the area of creating strategic partnerships (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Second, document analysis of the Memorandums of Understanding, individual partnership work plans (if applicable), institutional descriptions of personnel roles and responsibilities, and organization charts were reviewed for each existing partnership. Third, to identify linkage between the partnerships and decision-making regarding resource allocation, the budget requests and grant submissions put forward in the years of 2014, 2015, and 2016 were also reviewed. By utilizing pattern analysis with the multiple data sets, emergent themes were identified to inform practices.

School Partnership Development

Trust is the foundation that sets the stage for successful strategic partnerships. The degree of trust between stakeholders may be established over a period of time by agreeing to co-constructed goals and showing behavior aligned with shared goals (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Additionally, detailing expectations for future interactions and establishing how information will be shared may strengthen the initial phases of relationship building within the partnership (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Strategic partnerships require a considerable amount of time and dedication to ensure trust, ongoing communication, transparency, and positive intentionality that will ultimately set the stage for each stakeholder. That said, prac-

tical implications may aid in operationalizing shared goals only if a foundation of trust has been developed, maintained, and sustained between partners. With that context in mind, the following key findings were identified specific to creating strategic partnerships after analyzing multiple data sets: a) A clear and shared mission and vision is integral to the university-school partnership, b) Roles and responsibilities should be detailed and outlined for all stakeholders, c) Co-construction of assessment philosophy and learning outcomes should be mutually agreed upon, d) Shared governance and processes for joint decision making should be shared and documented, and e) Funding and processes for resource allocation should be negotiated (See Table 1). In turn, the aforementioned agreements will set a foundation for norms and expectations to successfully approach the operationalization of initial partnership building for optimal results.

Foundational elements for the creation of strategic partnerships include trust, shared meaning, and strategic alignment (Eddy & Amey, 2015). For example, reoccurring meetings with appropriate stakeholders is encouraged to facilitate ongoing communication. Moreover, transparency during the meetings is vital to promote positive intentionality. A clear and shared mission and vision involving all stakeholders will strengthen a community dedicated to supporting students, teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators at every level in education (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Relationships influence the decision-making process within partnerships and sets expectations early on in the process for mutual understanding and decision-making (Eddy & Amey, 2015).

For example, leaders should consider how to approach staffing plans (i.e., hiring processes) for the school-site and incorporate such guidelines into the Memorandum of Understanding. Stakeholders may also consider co-constructing roles and responsibilities for all members within the community: a) students, b) parents, c) teachers, d) school-site administrators, e) university partner, and f) community partners. The outline of such duties may be used to reference the type of role each stakeholder will assume and the expectation specific to the roles presented from the perspective of the community. Lastly, different types of school governance models may create barriers to partnering or foster collaboration (Eddy & Amey, 2015). University-school partnerships may consider exploring governance, staffing, and budgeting autonomies to create democratic leadership and shared decision-making. Appropriate governance models may also ensure the university-school mission and vision is aligned with the financial expenditures of all stakeholders and increases the likelihood of external funding (i.e., grants) to help support such goals.

—continued on next page—

University-School Partnerships

A Collective Approach to Teacher Preparation

(continued)

Continuous Improvement

To date, teacher preparation programs are under great pressure to adapt to new curricular and instructional frameworks (i.e., Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies) while also assessing program preparation effectiveness of state and national standards (i.e., California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). That said, if we are to provide our youth high quality education, Schools of Education, PK-12 schools, districts, and organizations must come together in collaboration to ensure educational experiences are aligned and grounded in common teacher preparation outcomes to effectively bridge researched-based approaches with practical experiences.

Evidence-based research and assessment must occur to determine whether the partnership is achieving its intended goals (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Developing collaborative relationships with administration and teachers at multiple school-site partnerships may aid in the selection and collection of data specific indicators in an effort to inform teacher preparation program design efforts on a continuous basis. Strategic partnerships also involve the creation of shared terms and language (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Additionally, the co-construction of educator preparation instruments for assessment (i.e. clinical evaluation instruments) may contribute to more authentic practices and outcomes focused assessments to investigate effectiveness related to best practices in the field.

Table 1
Developing Strategic University-School Partnerships

DEVELOPING STRATEGIC UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

Building Trust

- Detail Expectations for Future Interaction
- Establish How Communication will be Shared
- Outline Anticipated Level of Campus Presence
- Stakeholders to include: Administrators (School, University, District), teachers, teacher leaders, families and students, community members

Shared Governance: School Model Structures	Co-Construction of Agreements and Processes	Unified Mission, Vision, and Goals	Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities	Assessment Philosophy	Resource Allocation Methods
Create governance structure for increased decision making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget autonomies • Staff selection autonomies • Principal selection autonomies • Curriculum and assessment autonomies • School schedule autonomies 	Document Governance Structures and Agreements in Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	Create shared terminology and language	Develop organization chart for clear structures and communication	Identify relevant data indicators for assessment of strategic goals	Align resource allocation and financial expenditures with unified mission, vision, and strategic goals
Establish equal stakeholder representation for decision-making	Co-Construct Work Plan to detail processes for autonomies	Align strategic goals	Develop responsibilities for ALL stakeholders in the community	Co-construct instruments for assessment of strategic goals	Collaborate on opportunities for external funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants • Donations
		Create timeline and action plan for future implementation	Develop approaches to hiring processes	Make data based decision making for partnership improvements	
		Revisit mission, vision, and goals continuously	Assign key leaders to action plan for strategic goal implementation	Continue to document and assess for systematic improvement	

While Being Mindful of State and National Requirements on Local School Sites and Institutions of Higher Education

University-School Partnerships

A Collective Approach to Teacher Preparation

(continued)

Teacher Preparation Programs

Strategic partnerships between universities and school-sites may benefit teacher preparation programs. By schools serving as anchor school-sites, a collaborative approach between IHEs and school-sites, will improve the likelihood that teacher candidates receive a high quality clinical experience. Doing so while placing more emphasis on continuous improvement efforts may allow for data-driven decision making to enhance various programmatic components (i.e., courses offered, university structure, operations to support program implementation, and K-12 teacher leader development) aligned with current content, state, and national standards in pursuit of the highest quality of teacher preparation.

Thus, a successful strategic partnership may create nurturing opportunities for aspiring teacher education candidates to develop, practice, and demonstrate content knowledge and skills and may also strengthen the University's understanding related to teacher education candidate learning and development specific to the preparation of teachers. The need for a university presence at partner school-sites may bridge the gap between the university (theory) and PK-12 schools (practice) in a more thoughtful and reciprocal manner (Eddy & Amey, 2015). Moving forward, it is imperative that practices specific to the operations of creating strategic partnerships are discussed further to meet the needs of future educators today. By working together in partnership, we may position ourselves together to develop a new cadre of teachers entering the field to effectively raise academic achievement and positively impact the lives of the youth in schools.

Conclusion

If the PLC is the point of emphasis for university-school partnerships moving forward, elements of the PLC must ground the work of strategic partnerships. This approach will allow for optimal outcomes, thus supporting and enhancing educator preparation models that will ultimately benefit PK-12 student learning. This article serves as the launch to more conversations exploring and advancing strategic partnerships in pursuit of educational equity and excellence. In order to determine whether strategic partnerships are creating aligned and complimentary experiences for future educators, a commitment to collaboration as well as continuous improvement must be in place and data sharing practices should be used to assess for effectiveness.

References

- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016). *Teaching performance expectations* (TPEs).
- Council on Accreditation of Educator Preparation Board of Directors. (2015). *CAEP accreditation standards*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction>
- Eddy, P. L., & Amey, M. J. (2015). *Creating strategic partnerships: A guide for educational institutions and their partners*. Stirling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Eaker, R., & Sells, D. (2016). *A new way: Introducing higher education to professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reflections of a Veteran Educator

By **Leslie Young**

Claremont Graduate University

To make your life in teaching is largely to find your own way.

—William Ayers,

To Teach: The Journey of a Teacher, 2001, p. 1

Monday, six o'clock a.m. My lone car in the dimly-lit parking lot. An uncommon silence on the damp blacktop. Invisible bird chatter emanating from the motionless sycamore trees dwarfing the upper grade bungalows. A yapping mutt standing in the strewn yard of a house behind the school's chain-link fence. These are the moments when the stir of life's details collides with what lies ahead of me.

During mornings like this, I can believe anything is possible. I will persuade Luis to finally stop yelling out during lessons. Noe will say he had a fantastic weekend at his dad's house. Yvonne will win the district speech contest. We can even finish the read-aloud we started three weeks ago. And I can actually leave at the end of the day, knowing I've taught every standard the district wants my students to master this month.

But the only part of this scenario that truly happens as planned is the walk from my car to the classroom. The rest is part of my daily mission items on a never-ending "to do" list. I see myself as a boat—moving forward on an unpredictable lake—leaving a wake behind my stern. The wake's water is deeply affected by the boat's movement, but eventually each ripple arrives at its own destination.

Teaching is terribly imprecise despite the claims of staff development "experts." The day's plans are constantly gnawed on by phone calls asking for students to go to the office, last minute schedule changes on the lounge white board, the whims of the district technology server, and the moods of the students (just to name a few). The neatly-typed lesson plans with administrator-requested standard numbers next to objectives are merely that: plans. Teaching is not about following them, but persevering in achieving the goals. My job is to guide the bow of the boat whether

the water is smooth, choppy, shallow or deep, and adjust the direction accordingly. Such a daunting task sends many well-meaning beginners to the ranks of educators who make up the dreaded "attrition rate."

Those that stay and continue to find meaning in their mission learn to redefine the obstacles by relegating them to the status of minor details. Phone call during a lesson from the office? Assign a student to answer the phone and pass on the message. New announcement suddenly marked on the lounge white board? Flip the language arts lesson until after the surprise assembly and postpone (or delete) the district-mandated character education lesson. Server down? Teach the math lesson without the brand new online publisher's presentation slides that all teachers in the school are expected to use fluently. Students restless and resistant? Have everyone stand up and do five minutes of calisthenics in a foreign language.

Teaching is intuition applied to technique; a non-stop exercise in professional judgement honed by persistent resilience. If you lose the original motivation you had to teach in the first place, it's all over. It will then be very difficult to give in a way that the profession demands.

To say that I have never felt a sense of dread as I walked across that parking lot in the pre-dawn hours would be a lie. Teaching, but more importantly, continuing to teach takes faith: faith in the idea and practice of a meaningful exchange within a system that inspires the teacher and learner all too rarely. Against this backdrop, my mission becomes crucial, and that is why I will continue to accept it until I can no longer do so physically or mentally. Anything less feels like caving into those who would like to see this great public experiment fail.

So, it's onto tomorrow at 6 a.m.

Note: This article was first published in *The California Educator* of the California Teachers Association. It is reprinted here with CTA's permission. Leslie Young also presented a report on her research on veteran educators at the Lives of Teachers Special Interest Group meeting at the California Council on Teacher Education Fall 2016 Conference in San Diego.

Exorcising the Curriculum

Examination of the Deep Structures of Education

By **Marni E. Fisher**
Chapman University

Meredith A. Dorner
Irvine Valley College

Gregory Warren
Chapman University

Kevin Stockbridge
Chapman University

Anat Herzog
Chapman University

In order to step forward into the transformation and regeneration of the educational field, scholars, practitioners, and partners benefit from not only understanding the deep structures of education but also identifying where and how change can be implemented to counteract the inhibiting forces. To examine the deep structures and inhibiting forces of education, we have chosen to address: parental expectations and community assumptions, the emphasis and undermining of science and mathematics, the hegemony of exceptionalism, the demands of teaching, and the spaces for hope and change.

Significance to the Field of Teacher Education

In consideration of the deep structures and inhibiting forces (Tye, 2000) that cement both education and curriculum into outdated and ineffective forms, the question of education and educational reform becomes how to identify these the inhibiting forces of these deep structures, determine the underlying causes and structures that thwart change, and find ways to either work within and around the inhibiting forces. The distinction between the deep structure itself (societal expectations of schools at any given point in time) and the inhibiting forces that hold these societal expectations in place is important.

The identification of the deep structures and inhibiting forces of education is essential for identifying why previous educational shifts were unsuccessful and developing future change that is transformative and enduring. The purpose of this project was to examine the inhibiting forces of specific areas of education in order to then facilitate change that recognizes, and therefor can work to overcome, the ways in which these structures counteract movements toward change.

Theoretical Framework

Deep structure theory requires descriptive analysis (what is; what actually happens; how the process of defeating innovation actually works) (Tye, 2000). Our theoretical framework employed grounded theory, balancing the intuitive with the empirical (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, &

Taubman, 2004; Stern, 2007) and applying a “disciplined, rigorous effort to understand experience profoundly and authentically” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 405). Situated within the literature (Stern, 2007), each cycle of study and theoretical examination informed the rounds of dialogic analysis similar to the testing of dialogic validity (Anderson & Herr, 1999; Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1996). At the same time, the researchers themselves were instruments to collect data (Eisner, 1991a, 1991b).

Methodology

Beginning with the concept of deep structure (Tye, 2000), we developed a series of meetings and theoretical exploration in the pattern of the practical application of critical pedagogy (Boutelier et al., 2009; Luschei, Luschei, Nowicki, & Fisher, 2013), developing our own direction of study and theoretical examination. In order to further understand Tye’s (2000) identification of the deep structures and inhibiting forces of education, we explored the concept of epistemology (Stroud, 2011) and the structuralist lens (Solo, 1975). From there, we examined connections between societal shifts, teaching practices, politics, leadership, and curriculum; influences of parental expectation, inspiration, and accountability; standardization; science, Sputnik, and the era of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) focused education; educational pathways, advanced placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB) programs, tracking, and the inhibiting forces of meritocracy; education for the whole child (Guisbond et al., 2006); the deep structures of inclusion and exclusion; and the applications of Foucault. We met with Barbara Tye to discuss her original findings (2000) and the next steps of her research. We then revisited the connections across education, keeping in mind educational change in the past 15 years, and analyzed where the inhibiting forces have shifted, morphed, or stayed the same. Each area was then examined in depth by one researcher, and tested dialogically by the research group.

Overview of Results

We ultimately focused on five areas. These areas were: parental expectations, the emphasis on science and mathematics, tracking and meritocracy, the demands of teaching, and spaces for hope and change.

Parental Expectations

Teachers are caught in the middle of a maelstrom of finger pointing and denial. Despite the fact that student performance is not commensurate with the resources that have been allocated toward improving performance and

—continued on next page—

Exorcising the Curriculum

Examination of the Deep Structures of Education

(continued)

the root cause of diminished student performance has been evasive. As politicians, parents and guardians seek to find a solution; they have collaboratively pardoned themselves from accountability, and the teacher is positioned as the convenient common denominator of blame (Pinar, 2012). Consequently, parental expectation for student learning and the vitriol of blame is conveyed toward the teacher.

Today, the demands placed upon teachers are greater than ever. With increasing student-teacher ratios, high stakes standardized tests, declining educational budgets, and the seismic impact of our economy, the field of education and pedagogy is ripe for change. Unfortunately, through unintentional complicity, the vested interests of a vast array of stakeholders have collectively impeded needed change in our educational system.

Emphasis on Science and Mathematics

There are inhibiting forces within our culture that have influenced the shift in education both towards an emphasis on and an undermining of science and math. While the book *Hard Truths* (Tye, 2000) deals with curriculum only briefly, any part of the analysis of the inhibiting forces can be used to what has happened/is happening to math and science. It is the inhibiting forces, not the deep structure, which pull change efforts back to the conventional.

In 1957, when Russia ‘beat’ the Americans into space, with Sputnik, we saw a major shift in education in this country both in terms of educational identity, function, and control. Our failure was attributed to the myth that that Russia won because they had better schools, more dedicated students, and more emphasis on math and science in school (Steeves, Berhardt, Burns, & Lombard, 2009). Identifying American education as being in a state of crisis, allowed the government to justify more oversight. The American government began to spend significant funding and resources on public education, linking education to competition and national success, which promoted a view of education as a matter of national security. Beginning with the *National Defense Education Act* (NDEA, 1958) and through *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB, 2002), we have seen a rapid shift toward emphasizing more rigorous testing, scientific measurement, penalties, etc., and toward “technical rationality, federal oversight, competitiveness, and widespread school reform” (Steeves et al., 2009, p. 73).

Ironically, while science and math have become more prevalent in the curriculum, science has also been more undermined. Banks asserts “knowledge is viewed as most influential when it reinforces the beliefs, ideologies, and assumptions of the peoples who exercise the most political and economic power within a society” (2002, p. 12). We can observe religion being used to undermine science

particularly in areas of science that are viewed as controversial among the public, such as evolution (although this is not controversial in the scientific community). In the case of evolution particularly, there is a gap between what the experts know to be scientifically sound and what the public believes (Campbell & Daughtrey, 2006). The influence of religion on our understanding of these types of science topics can be seen in the multitude of court cases that have tried to force teachers to include creationism and/or Intelligent Design in the science classroom (for a summary see Moore, 2007; Wiles, 2011). Although each has been struck down in court as a violation of the separation of church and state, we can delve more deeply into the inhibiting forces at play here that are influencing the place and role of math and science in our education system.

The Hegemony of Exceptionalism

When one speaks of the “deep structure,” one necessarily speaks descriptively of what currently exists (Tye, 2000). Tracking policies and practices that reward “merit” are elements of the deep structure, but it is the inhibiting forces that combine to defeat efforts to change those policies and practices in any meaningful way.

Meritocracy evolved from the American dream, which focused on individualism and merit for success. Coupled with the theories domination and subordination and the hegemonic patterns within education (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009), the results of the mentality is detrimental for minorities. This plays out within schools and school policy where the dominant culture has defined what is exceptional and worthy of merit, rewarded accordingly, and judged those who do not meet this definition of “exceptional” as unworthy (Apple, 2006).

While the term “tracking” has disappeared from school nomenclature, students are shifted into or excluded from various “meritorious” programs within education. The structure of normativity is the mandating social force behind tracking, and therefore resistant to elimination.

Demands of Teaching

There are a number of inhibiting forces that surround teachers (Tye, 2000). Teachers typically have a “need for deference, need to yield to others’ judgment and leadership, need for order, avoidance of change, conformity to custom, and avoidance of the unconventional” (Tye, 2000, p. 132, citing Jackson and Guba, 1957). The daily realities of the job involve inhibiting structures, such as the rhythm of the academic year, competing demands for time, resources issues, defense mechanisms, and the pervading morale:

—continued on next page—

Exorcising the Curriculum

Examination of the Deep Structures of Education

(continued)

... studies show fairly definitively that much of the tone and nuance of a school can be directly attributed to the leadership style of the principal. The ambiance—whether supportive or tyrannical—pervades the workplace and affects the day-to-day interactions of teachers with each other, with other adults, and with their students. (Tye, 2000, p. 138)

Additionally, the norms and assumptions have shifted the entire responsibility of teaching onto the shoulders of teachers with neither the tools nor power required for success. The undermining of teachers undermines education, putting decisions in the hands of political policymakers (Apple, 2006; Pinar, 2012) while teachers are increasingly marginalized and perceived as thoughtless amateurs defending the status quo (Tye, 2000). The culture of teaching includes both conservatism, which reduces permanent implementation of change, and egalitarianism, which reduces competition coupled with autonomy, making change erratic. Finally, there is the issue of personnel turnover and induction, so that teaching is viewed as a short-term career, and those with promotional goals have a vested interest in preserving the system in order to develop power within it.

Spaces for Hope and Change

There are two key spaces for change and hope: (1) a period of societal shift affecting the inhibiting forces and deep structure, and (2) the unique personality of each individual school working on its own problems and challenges (Tye, 2000). *If* the deep structure is in a period of shift and *if* that shift is in a more positive, constructive direction, then change is possible.

Contesting that we are within a period of shift, as reflected through parent push back against high stakes testing, rise in charter schools offering other formats for learning, changes in technology (Fisher, 2013; Fisher & Mulhern, 2014; Gu, Zhu, & Guo, 2013; Halverson & Smith, 2009), and the upset of common core replacing the traditional forms prevalent under NCLB, this change creates a space that may be negative or positive. There are a number of areas for adaptation emerging within the social context, parental expectations and community assumptions, teaching demands and the nature of the teaching profession, and the uniqueness of schools.

First, a few of these demands for change are driven through revolutions in technology that have altered the dissemination of information as well as models for learning and collaboration (Bruque, Moyano, & Eisenberg, 2008; Gu et al., 2013; Halverson & Smith, 2009). Second, a result of the scripted lessons that emerged under No Child Left Behind (Ede, 2006) was the confirmation that a cookie cutter approach fails to meet the needs of many students

(Shaffer, 2001), resulting in parents looking for schools and educational programs that provided the resources their child needed (Malonai & Duncan, 2012), which increased privatization and home schooling (Apple, 2006). Third, the shift in education from focusing on individual segments of knowledge to core standards (“Common core state standards initiative,” 2012) has created a potential atmosphere where, once again, the multiple intelligences are recognized (Gardner, 2006), higher level thinking skills are valued (Bloom, 1956), and an understanding of the importance of connecting learning across the curriculum is beginning to be recognized (Routman, 2005). Fourth, the transmutation of the international business model (Gill, 2011) to include transformational leadership (Evans, 2009; Glanz, 2006), the fostering of change (Fullan, Cuttress, & Kilcher, 2005; Kaufman, 2005), shared leadership (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958), and servant leadership (Cunningham, 2004; Greenleaf, Frick, & Spears, 1996), which offers newer forms of leadership as affective, oversetting traditional ideas of top down leadership. Fifth, educational forms have included a shift in focus on learning (DuFour, 2002), on principals in the field (instead of the office) (Ginsberg & Murphy, 2002), and on the development of culturally proficient and socially just leadership (Lindsey, Roberts, & Campbell-Jones, 2005; Marshall & Oliva, 2010).

Working with these societal shifts, several points of change can be implemented. Educators and schools can educate parents in terms of defining quality education (Tye, 2000). A focus on teacher strengths requires the development of teachers as leaders (Barth, 2001; Bowman, 2004, 2005; Fullan, 1993). A strong mentoring program indoctrinating new teachers supports sustainable change (Tye, 2000). Finally, the uniqueness of each school (Tye, 2000) offers a specific point for schools to focus upon is the distinctive qualities of students, and meeting their individual learning needs (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003; Shaffer, 2001; Whitaker, 2004, in press). Additionally, much of the distinguishing quality of each school revolves around the culture of the student population and local community. By recognizing these as valuable qualities upon which to build student learning and meet individual needs (Darder et al., 2003; Dewey, 1916; Nieto, 2002, 2003, 2005), schools may nurture intrinsic strengths.

Areas for Future Exploration

In view of what *Hard Truths* (Tye, 2000) has to say about the culture of teaching, future examinations might consider a movement to install teachers as transformative leaders, since teacher leadership is an established point of

—continued on next page—

Exorcising the Curriculum

Examination of the Deep Structures of Education

(continued)

effective teaching (Barth, 2001; Bowman, 2004, 2005; Fullan, 1993). Future analysis might focus on the forces that are arrayed against teachers as transformational leaders, and how they would need to be overcome.

Conclusion

The transformation and regeneration of education cannot help but be framed by the deep structures, and the inhibiting forces counteract efforts at change. Through understanding the inhibiting forces explicitly, we can target the patterns of weakness within the educational system. The shifts in education at this time open up a space for flux that scholars, practitioners, and educational partners might exploit while keeping an awareness of and targeting the inhibiting forces. The strength of change at the individual level, like that within *Hard Truths* (Tye, 2000), also opens a space for grass movement styled change.

References

- Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities. *Educational Researcher*, 28(5), 12-21, 40.
- Anderson, G. L., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. S. (1996). What does practitioner research look like? *Teaching and Change*, 3(2), 173-206.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Banks, J. (2002). Race, knowledge construction, and education in the U.S.A.: Lessons from history. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 5(1), 7-27.
- Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 443.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Longmans, Green.
- Boutelier, S., Eleteby, D., Fisher, M. E., Kitonga, N., SooHoo, S., & Tanner, A. (2009, April 10-13, 2009). *Freaky Freire: Applications of critical pedagogy in the classroom*. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Curricular Studies Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Bowman, R. (2004). Teachers as leaders. *The Clearing House*, 77(5), 187-189.
- Bowman, R. (2005). Teacher as servant leader. *The Clearing House*, 78(6), 257-259.
- Bruque, S., Moyano, J., & Eisenberg, J. (2008). Individual adaptation to IT-induced change: The role of social networks. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 25(3), 177-206.
- Campbell, J. A., & Daughtrey, T. (2006). Teaching the contexts: Why evolution should be taught as an argument and how it might be done. *Religion & Education*, 33(3), 14-39.
- Common core state standards initiative*. (2012). Retrieved December 20, 2012, from <http://www.corestandards.org>
- Cunningham, R. (2004). Servant leadership—An introduction. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 5(3), 2-6.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2009). *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- DuFour, R. (2002). The learning centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 12-15.
- Ede, A. (2006). Scripted curriculum: Is it a 'prescription for success?'. *Childhood Education*, 83(1), 29+.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991a). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York, NY; Toronto, Canada: Macmillan Publishing.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991b). On the art and science of qualitative research in psychology. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes & I. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 17-29). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Evans, J. (2009). *Inspirational presence: The art of transformational leadership* (ePub ed.). New York, NY: Ingram Publishing Services.
- Fisher, M. E. (2013). *Tomorrow's child: Multimodal technology integration for language arts*. Paper presented at the Orange County Reading Association Conference, Fullerton, CA.
- Fisher, M. E., & Mulhern, S. D. (2014). *Integrating technology for today's child*. Paper presented at the Orange County Reading Association Conference, Irvine, CA.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 12-18.
- Fullan, M., Cuttress, C., & Kilcher, A. (2005). Eight forces for leaders of change. *National Staff Development Council*, 26(4), 54-58, 64.
- Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons* (Completely rev. and updated. ed.). New York, NY: BasicBooks.
- Gill, R. (2011). *Theory and practice of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ginsberg, M. B., & Murphy, D. (2002). How walkthroughs open doors. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 34-36.
- Glanz, J. (2006). *Operational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K., Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (1996). *On becoming a servant-leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gu, X., Zhu, Y., & Guo, X. (2013). Meeting the 'digital natives': understanding the acceptance of technology in classrooms. *Educational Technology & Society*, 1, 392.
- Guisbond, L., Dunphy, P., Johnson, J., Kaplan, K., Neill, M., Segal, M., & Valentine, L. (2006). *The campaign for the education of the whole child. A report from the Alliance for the Education of the Whole Child*. Boston, MA: Alliance for the Education of the Whole Child.
- Halverson, R., & Smith, A. (2009). How new technologies have (and have not) changed teaching and learning in schools.

—continued on next page—

Exorcising the Curriculum Examination of the Deep Structures of Education (continued)

- Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 2, 49-54.
- Kaufman, B. (2005). The leader as change agent: The power of purpose, passion, and perseverance. *University Business*, 8(3), 53-55.
- Lindsey, R. B., Roberts, L. M., & Campbell-Jones, F. (2005). *The culturally proficient school: An implementation guide for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Luschei, S., Luschei, A., Nowicki, K., & Fisher, M. E. (2013). *Even when castles fall: Collaborative practitioner action research between students and teachers*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Malonai, G., & Duncan, S. (2012). *Gifted identity project*. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from <https://http://www.facebook.com/GiftedIdentityProject>
- Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2010). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Moore, R. (2007). The history of the creationism/evolution controversy and likely future developments. In L. Jones & M. Reiss (Eds.), *Teaching about scientific origins: Taking account of creationism* (pp. 11-29). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, 20 C.F.R. § 5301 (2002).
- National Defense Education Act of 1958*, 72 C.F.R. § 1580 (1958).
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (2005). *Why we teach*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pinar, W. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.). New York, NY; London, UK: Routledge.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (2004). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Routman, R. (2005). *Writing essentials: raising expectations and results while simplifying teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Shaffer, G. (2001). Cookie cutter education. *The Humanist*, 6(3), 14-19.
- Solo, R. A. (1975). What is structuralism? Piaget's genetic epistemology and the varieties of structuralist thought. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 9(4), 605-625.
- Steeves, K. A., Berhardt, P. E., Burns, J. P., & Lombard, M. K. (2009). Transforming American educational identity after Sputnik. *American Educational History Journal*, 36(1), 71-87.
- Stern, P. N. (2007). On solid ground: Essential properties for growing grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 114-126). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Stroud, B. (2011). *Epistemology, the history of epistemology, historical epistemology*. New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media B. V.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36(2), 95-101.
- Tye, B. B. (2000). *Hard truths: Uncovering the deep structure of schooling*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Whitaker, L. C. (2004). *Differentiating literacy centers*. Fullerton, CA: College of Education, California State University Fullerton.
- Whitaker, L. C. (in press). *Differentiating literacy centers*. Huntington Beach, CA: Teacher Created Materials.
- Wiles, J. R. (2011). Challenges to teaching evolution: What's ahead? *Futures*, 43, 787-796.

Changing Educational Lenses Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry

By **Charlotte Achieng Evensen**

Downey Unified School District

Marni E. Fisher

Chapman University

Sabina Giakoumis

University of California, Irvine

Aja McKee

Irvine Unified School District

Audri Gomez

Newport-Mesa Unified School District

Kevin Stockbridge

Chapman University

Meredith A. Dorner

Irvine Valley College

Kimiya Maghzi

Chapman University

Myla Candelario

Community Roots Academy

As educational researchers, we are well aware that the intensity in focus necessary to carry out research lends itself to isolation. This is especially true as a researcher concentrates on her particular line of study. We contend that collaborating with others offers a new perspectives that can be applied to any topic. The process of collaboration opens us up to outside ideas, thereby cultivating a research *praxis* that is richer and more effective in addressing societal needs. Akin to the understanding that educational assessment is more descriptive and effective through a variety of forms (Ainsworth & Viegut, 2006), educational research and inquiry can also blossom through the use of multiple lenses. As a community of scholars, we attempted to explore the ways in which collaborative practice can inform the depth and complexity of individual areas of research. We asked ourselves the question: How can collaboration with colleagues in different lines of research inform our own individual work?

Over the past decade, the tendency to use a reductionist lens has increased, particularly under the auspices of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) and high stakes testing (Apple, 2006). Test scores become all that is seen, leaving the public unaware that high stakes testing inherently hides its own flaws (Apple, 2006). “Just as buying the same size pants for all second graders would leave some children ill clothed, education cannot adopt a reductionist one size fits all pattern and expect it to work (Gauthier, 2008). Neither can educational research” (Fisher, 2013, p. 42). Prismatic theory and prismatic inquiry propose a new lens that builds out of a contemporary surrealist foundation that blends the philosophical and psychological factors of Breton (1924, 1929/1969, 1934/1936) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987), then explores other frameworks, such as grounded theory,

critical theory, feminist theory, and arts-based research for mapping. This article explores the practice of collaborative inquiry through multiple perspectives with the goal of identifying common patterns of success across platforms and levels of inquiry.

Significance to the Field of Teacher Education

Collaborating with others offers a new perspective about any topic, opening us up to outside ideas. Teaching and research easily become isolated activities, but today’s educational field is richer and more effective within a collaborative environment. Similar to the understanding that educational assessment is more descriptive and effective through a variety of forms (Ainsworth & Viegut, 2006), educational research can gather more information through a prismatic lens that deliberately explores from multiple perspectives. Prismatic collaborative inquiry offers

... a new lens in hopes of some recognition that improving and studying education cannot be reduced to one element: not test scores, nor some ambivalent description of “highly qualified” or “high performing,” nor can teachers, schools, or educational leaders shoulder the blame or success alone when teaching fails or succeeds. (Fisher, 2013, p. 42)

The Key Elements of Practice

Prismatic collaborative inquiry explores educational phenomena through: (1) a call to action, (2) mapping of the inside/outside, (3) exploration of freedom and expression, (4) *praxis* and engagement, and (5) testing findings through convergence and divergence. “A prismatic inquiry methodology utilizes the convergence, divergence and juxtaposition of data in the exploration of hidden or unexpected relationships, opening the paths to other ways of knowing while maintaining a criterion of quality and definitions of success” (Fisher, 2013, p. viii). Just as prismatic theory “requires transcending arborescent and hegemonic patterns as well as implementing imagination and flexibility to change the view of education and the face of educational research” (Fisher, 2013, p. viii), prismatic collaborative inquiry explores phenomena from a multitude of perspectives with the goal of creating change.

Methodology

We utilized a prismatic lens as a means of exploring our question from multiple perspectives. This requires creative analysis of self within the research, an integration of multiple perspectives, coupled with an action outcome (Fisher, 2013). As such, it allows the flexibility to encom-

—continued on next page—

Changing Educational Lenses Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry (continued)

pass wicked problems (Rittel & Webber, 1972), explore margins, recognize different realities, create spaces for alternative ways of seeing and speaking (Eisner, 1991), and promote social justice through including dialogue and non-dominant voices. As a collaborative group, we collected data through both face-to-face dialogue and electronic means. We then analyzed data utilizing qualitative coding methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Findings

Four themes emerged from our query. These are: (1) collaboration allows us to have experiences that expand our perspectives as professionals; (2) through collaborative practice, we gain knowledge beyond our own individual understanding; (3) in working with others, we participate in a supportive community that both nurtures and protects us from isolation; and (4) the process of engaging with others deepens our ability to reflect upon our own work, and therefore, to determine a course of action.

Experience

The team noted how the collaboration experience expands our perspectives as professionals outside the personal viewpoint. In particular, Aja, Holly, Marni, and Kevin noted key experiences.

Commenting on her work experience, Aja notes,

Collaborating has led me to great experiences throughout my career. From the beginning of my time in the education field, I sought out and collaborated with veteran teachers to learn the in's and out's (logistics) of the profession... As time went on, collaboration began to look different. I sought out information I found interesting in order to add to my existing body of knowledge. I quickly realized that two or more heads were better than one, so to speak, and collaborating with others offered a new perspective about the topic. Fellow colleagues brought their education and experience to the table, and the end result was much richer than it would have been if I was working alone.

For Aja, collaboration creates a process of individual growth as her career trajectory moves forward. Through the mutuality of work with others, she is able to encounter, unearth, and learn about her profession.

For Holly, collaborative experience urges her to move beyond the individual. She comments,

The opportunities to engaging in prismatic collaborative inquiry not only broaden my understanding of what constitutes "good" inquiry, but also instilled a greater sense of interdependency and democratic responsibility.

According to Holly, the experience of working with others

through the processes of research creates a space for the individual to think about her civic responsibilities.

Continuing along this theme of an agreed upon social contract, Marni adds:

Building something together out of shared ideas is exciting. Having a large research group means that someone has to be the anchor, and sometimes it's me, but that everyone has a chance to drop the ball without censure, knowing the rest of the team has your back.

For Marni, the act of working together is underscored with safety, specifically when circumstances mandate attention elsewhere.

Kevin notes how collaboration leads those who participate to develop their intellectual awareness more fully. Reflecting on his collaborative approach to teaching a course, he adds:

Welcoming many perspectives and experiences to be shared in the classroom has been important for the flow-ering of the course... What a more prismatic approach to teaching means is that I am not in charge of the end results, but I am a key aspect in the facilitation of new knowledge. In this kind of work, all arrive at new un-imagined knowledge, both teacher and student alike.

Gaining Knowledge

In academia, knowledge acquisition is a common discussion. Through collaborative practice, the team noted how collaboration inspired gaining knowledge on a wider spectrum. Thus, our team recognized that in working collaboratively, the gathering of knowledge becomes a group learning experience. Audri and Kimiya identified gaining knowledge as especially important.

For Audri, time dedicated to focused work was a key component of gaining knowledge as teachers worked to develop pedagogical practices:

Working with teachers while conducting action research informed me of the necessity in providing teachers time to collaborate in a structured manner. Working together as a team 2-3 times a week improved pedagogical practices as we learned from one another's successes and failures. We began to methodically study our practice as a team. The collaboration between us became a constant. We spoke on days we didn't meet for collaboration. The excitement brought us together as a unified team.

Given time to improve and collaborate generated an excitement that unified Audri and her colleagues toward the common goal of knowledge acquisition.

Kimiya, on the other hand, focused on her experiences specific to the prismatic environment. She noticed that:

—continued on next page—

Changing Educational Lenses Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry (continued)

As a researcher and educator I have recently been engaging in a prismatic lens with the encouragement of a colleague. It has been an eye opening experience to witness how this multiplicity of perspectives can facilitate my understanding of my research and practice. Also, this layering of perspectives has also helped bridge the gap between research and practice. Instead of my practice being episodic, the prismatic lens has helped develop my research and practice into a systematic opportunity for real life learning.

Thus, she finds that the collaborative experience has aided her in developing her own understanding.

Support

In working with others, the participation in a supportive community produces both a nurturing environment and the protection from isolation. Meredith, in particular, focused on the strengths of this type of support:

Collaborating both with students and other faculty has lead me to reflect on my teaching and research strategies. After engaging in prismatic inquiry, I have restructured all of my face-to-face classes to include a significant amount of collaboration both through small group work and specific projects. Encouraging my students to express themselves and find meaningful connections to our course content comes through in their enhanced understanding of the work.

She goes on to explore how support within research collaboration has encouraged support in other areas:

I have also worked to increase collaboration among my fellow faculty and staff members. By initiating monthly work sessions for instructors of specific multi-course sections, we have achieved several goals: (1) increased parity between sections; (2) an increase in the amount of interactive activities offered in each section; (3) provided a venue for comparing teaching strategies; and (4) assisted new faculty in adapting to a more collaborative classroom. It has been rewarding to see the positive developments towards collaboration in my own class as well as others.

Reflection

As researchers, reflection is an iterative process that works to both clarify and inform our work. By asking, how can collaboration with colleagues in different lines of research inform our own individual work? We both engaged in the act of reflection and interrogated the ways in which prismatic collaborative inquiry informed our research agendas.

Aja's comments focused on the richness of what was shared as well as her personal enjoyment of the experience:

Fellow colleagues brought their education and experi-

ence to the table, and the end result was much richer than it would have been if I was working alone. I really enjoyed my time collaborating, and I saw the end result benefit my students and colleagues in great ways. I enjoyed this moment of transformation best of all; I was no longer collaborating from a place of need, but from a place of joy.

Collaboration, therefore, was more than a closed process limited to a specific time and context. Through her reflection about her collaborative experience, she observed positive outcomes for her classroom.

Holly's reflection underscored the importance of working with others. For Holly, collaboration engenders an authentic diversity that is inclusive of the different strengths that each individual brings. By doing so, collaboration highlights the multiplicity of intersections.

In the process of sharing scholarship, I learned different ways of engaging, gained exposure to areas of interests outside of my specialization, embraced the diversity among people's strengths and weakness, became open to the evolution within the creative process, and understood how collaboration is an embodiment of how we all are interconnected, both intentionally and unintentionally. As Freire (1998) stated, "Respect for the autonomy and dignity of every person is an ethical imperative and not a favor that we may or may not concede to each other" (p. 59). Therefore, being open to including a multitude of perspectives, backgrounds, and dis/abilities reflects and disrupts the dominant hegemony of inquiry isolation. Scholarly endeavors do not have to be an isolating experience as it is imprinted upon oneself.

Holly's recognition that the interconnections fostered through collaboration is mirrored by Kevin. He notes how the connections made through prismatic discovery allowed for deterritorialization that reduces the creation of knowledge in isolation.

As a beginning teacher, I discovered how much richer my theological curriculum became when there was collaboration with teachers from other disciplines. We were able to develop learning on important topics, which did not silo knowledge into unrelated categories of information. More importantly, I was challenged by these teachers to reexamine my practices while I invited them to consider incorporating new ideas as well.

Conclusion

In many ways, prismatic collaborative inquiry moves quickly into the inclusion of multiple perspectives, and, as

—continued on next page—

Changing Educational Lenses Prismatic Collaborative Inquiry (continued)

our first finding identifies, collaboration grants expansive access to new experiences. In addition, the exploration of participants in prismatic collaborative inquiry noted enjoyment in the process, the celebration of ideas, the sharing of scholarship, and the transformation of personal thinking. The second finding discusses the breadth of knowledge acquisition as a benefit of collaboration. By working together, researchers were able to rhizomatically develop and incorporate intersectional viewpoints. Our third finding identified communal support as an outcome of collaboration. More than merely allowing for the reduction of workload when shared among multiple researchers, collaboration also provides holistic safety for the researcher. Finally, the key to success is the process of reflection, when each researcher-participant is given a chance to recognize, value, and include the richness of perspectives outside personal points of view and individual research agendas.

References

- Ainsworth, L., & Viegut, D. (2006). *Common formative assessments: How to connect standards-based instruction and assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans. M. Holquist Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Minnesota Press.
- Berryman, M., SooHoo, S., & Nevin, A. (2013). *Culturally responsive methodologies*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.
- Breton, A. (1924, 1929/1969). *Manifestoes of surrealism* (R. Seaver & H. R. Lane, Trans.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Breton, A. (1934/1936). *What is surrealism?* (D. Gascoyne, Trans.). London, UK: Faber & Faber.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York, NY; Toronto, Canada: Macmillan.
- Fisher, M. E. (2013). *Here there be dragons: The initial defining of prism theory and prismatic inquiry*. (Doctoral Dissertation), Chapman University, Orange, CA.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Trans. Forward by D. Macedo; Introduction by S. Aronowitz ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gauthier, K. (2008, April). [Retrospective interviews about educational experiences of the past decade].
- Glaser, B. G. A., & Strauss, A. L. A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine.
- Lorde, A. (2010). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (4th ed., pp. 449-451). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1972). *Dilemmas in a general theory of planning*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Urban & Regional Development, University of California.