California State University, Long Beach
Conceptual Framework for the College of Education and Affiliated Programs

I. Theme

Teaching for Life-Long Learning, Professional Growth, and Social Responsibility

II. Mission

Our mission is to foster a learning and teaching community committed to student success and academic quality. Our community:

- Promotes intellectual, personal, and interpersonal growth for all students;
- Prepares socially responsible leaders for a rapidly changing, technologically-rich world;
- Values diversity and prepares students for a diverse world;
- Serves and collaborates with other educators and the community;
- Promotes school improvement for all students; and
- Engages in research, scholarly activity, and ongoing evaluation.

III. Key Ideas and Knowledge Base

Introduction

The educational ideals and ideologies of the United States reflect two important and often conflicting currents of social thought (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985). On the one hand educational images are rich with individualistic themes--personal responsibility, human development, empowerment, motivation, effort, achievement, personal growth and excellence, and life-long learning. Conversely, our practice and rhetoric often reflect a different set of socially-based constructions which transcend the individual and the personal--community, commitment, collaboration, social justice, caring, equity, and respect for differences. Part of the challenge facing programs that prepare professionals for work in U.S. schools is to reconcile these disparate images and ideals while at the same time rendering comprehensible a complex and sometimes contradictory conceptual terrain riddled with deep, abiding, and historically grounded tensions.

The theme of the conceptual framework--Teaching for Life-Long Learning, Professional Growth, and Social Responsibility--states our vision. It also underscores our key functions as an integral part of California State University, Long Beach—a metropolitan comprehensive institution serving richly diverse communities. We honor the individual and value individualistic ideals of learning, effort, responsibility, growth, and achievement. But no less do we value and honor the community, the society, and the social group that transcends the individual. Society is not simply an aggregation of individuals, just as individuals are not merely molecules in the social corpus. Without the social group the individual is not fully realized.

Social responsibility, no less than individual learning and growth, must drive our practice. At least since John Dewey, we have recognized how dependent democracy is on education; since Robert Hutchins we have acknowledged the imperative that the "best education for the best is the best education for all" (Adler, 1982). We commit ourselves to creating a teaching and learning community within the University and with our community partners, that contributes to the development of professional educators who

help students from all segments of society achieve to their fullest potential and contribute to a vibrant democracy—resulting in educators who are caring, effective, reflective, and committed to improving schools and communities.

Our vision as educators thus encompasses the concerns of both the individual and the larger society. Six key ideas, enumerated in our mission statement, under gird our vision and define the essentials of the knowledge base upon which we build our programs and our practice. These ideas are not discrete concepts; there is considerable overlap among them. As a community of scholars we use these ideas to guide our practice. These six key ideas form the basis of our learning and teaching community and are consistent with the priorities of the University. The CSULB Vision of Excellence established in 2005, envisions a university committed to being an outstanding teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives (http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/provost/vision).

Growth and Learning

Reflecting the vision of the university, student *growth and learning* is at the center of our practice and our programs. Educational theories abound regarding teaching, learning, and human growth and development more generally. No one theory adequately encompasses the full range of processes and dynamics involved in what we call "education." Behavioral, social learning, cognitive, affective, and socio-cultural theories all offer important perspectives on behavior, development, thinking, feeling, motivation, and the growth of competence. Different theories reflect different philosophical traditions. Ongoing disagreements among adherents of different theories are the continuation of centuries' old philosophical debates about the nature of humankind and prospects for its improvement. In behavioral or cognitive theories for example, as disparate as they are (e.g., Ausubel, 1963; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Piaget, 1973; Thorndike, 1962), the individual is the locus; what matters is what people do and what happens inside their heads. In contrast, socio-cultural theories (e.g., Cole & Griffin, 1987; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978) see cognition (and affect) as socially distributed; spending too much time looking in people's heads will miss crucial aspects of what matters. Multiple intelligence theory e.g., (Carter & Campbell, 1999; Gardner, 1983, 1999) tries to reach across other theories of learning and growth to include all domains of human endeavor--cognitive, affective, aesthetic, kinesthetic, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and others. What all theories have in common and what is central to our practice, however, is that learners must be actively engaged in the learning process and that teachers, students themselves, and the communities in which they live must share in the responsibility for that learning. Effective pedagogy enables teachers to scaffold learning so that the content becomes comprehensible. If teachers are to enable all learners with different experiences, learning styles and foundational knowledge to acquire common high-level knowledge and skills, they must possess tools for accessing what students think and be able to adapt instruction to their individual needs (Darling-Hammond & Snowden, 2005). Effective teachers engage students in learning, so that students build understanding of concepts and ideas.

Critical thinking is an aspect of growth and learning that forms an important part of the foundation of our practice. The term "critical thinking" subsumes a number of

mental processes, all of which have to do with going "beyond the information given." Possessing skills and comprehending information is certainly important, but so is a person's ability and disposition to do something with skills and information. Perhaps the most useful scheme for operationalizing critical thinking is the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Cognitive Domain (Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D. (2001). Originally known as "Bloom's taxonomy" this system has been one of the most influential educational publications of the last half of the 20th century. While acknowledging the importance of knowledge acquisition and comprehension, Bloom's taxonomy also articulates "higher order" or "critical thinking" skills or objectives--application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. All learners must have opportunities and be encouraged to engage in these mental processes, at whatever level is appropriate.

Critical thinking must be taught, but it also requires settings where students and educators are encouraged to discuss, state ideas freely, and develop a "critical spirit" (Norris, 1985). Partnership education (Eisler, 2000) promotes the concept of school as a "place of exploration," a place to search for and share ideas and feelings freely without fear of reproach. Eisler's model also is applicable to higher education, in which critical thinking is encouraged as a process that incorporates open inquiry and respect for diverse perspectives. Rather than support a system in which students only acquire information (as important as information is), the College of Education and Affiliated Programs seek to nourish informed independent thought and create an atmosphere in which students feel safe in articulating their beliefs. Information literacy (Loertsher & Woolls, 2002), problem-solving and decision-making models (e.g., D'Zurilla & Nazu, 1999) are related aspects of critical thinking, and they serve to provide students with tools to assist in these processes.

Life-long learning is also fundamental to our view of student success and academic quality. Graduating students with highly valued degrees is CSULB's core purpose (CSULB Strategic Planning Priorities and Goals, 2006-2009). In the long term however, our aim is to facilitate students' acquisition of the knowledge and skills that will help prepare them for environmental, technological, economic, and social change throughout their entire lives. The concept of life-long learning considers not only the necessity of dealing with change but also that of effecting change. Contemporary human development (Evers, 1998; Tuijnman & Van Der Kamp, 1992) and career development models (Brown, 2002) reinforce this perspective. Therefore, a primary goal of our programs of professional preparation is to facilitate students' development of skills and knowledge for a lifetime of learning, as well as for their involvement in scholarly and creative pursuits.

Social Responsibility

Learning institutions must be learning communities that promote and support *social responsibility*. This suggests both a belief system and a social structure that nurture "equitable, democratic, nonviolent, and caring relations" (Eisler, 2000, p. xiv). Educators must be cognizant of the values reflected in their practice and research and be "committed to educational policies that foster democracy and educational equity" (Banks, 1998, p. 15). As noted in the introduction, we must be concerned with the larger society as well as the individual. As educators, we must encourage both self-actualization as well as collective responsibility for the maintenance and welfare of our communities and our

world. This must be part of the mission of a metropolitan comprehensive institution such as ours, and we must be dedicated to serving a wide range of students with diverse needs: "non-traditional, underrepresented, and international students," as well as "academically and artistically talented" students. This is not to suggest that "non-traditional students" cannot also be "academically and artistically talented." We simply mean that part of social responsibility involves redefining the parameters that determine our pool of eligible students.

As teacher educators we need to instill in our future teachers and other school professionals the ideas of social justice as a part of social responsibility. The majority of our future educators will be working in large urban districts that are multicultural and multilingual. In these schools inequities often exist with regard to qualified teachers, materials, and resources (Oakes, 2004). In our College Of Education and Affiliated Programs, we prepare our students to work in these multicultural, multilingual schools and provide them with the knowledge and skills to promote change.

Leadership is a necessary ingredient in successful communities where members take responsibility for themselves and for others. We do not mean leadership in a traditional sense. To the contrary, our notion of social responsibility suggests that many individuals must have the opportunity to provide leadership on different occasions. We conceive of leadership that takes the initiative to make positive and productive changes, that is proactive rather than reactive, and that can marshal resources and build coalitions of individuals in the service of providing improved services and more effective practices to benefit students. Leadership must provide an artful blend of support and pressure--helping others accomplish what they are unlikely to accomplish on their own (Goldenberg, 2004). Researchers and writers have been arguing for the past decade or so that traditional leadership models, which tend to be authoritarian, top/down, individualistic and disconnected, are no longer viable. Leadership models now emphasize employing the full talents of all, flexibility, adaptability, and resourcefulness, as well as focus, follow-through, and effectiveness (Heifetz, 1994; Lipman-Blumen , 1996; Wheatley, 1999).

We have seen in the past few years a growing "teacher leadership" movement (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996) that bodes well for the profession and for education in general. Part of our mission as programs is to prepare leaders at all levels--in the classroom, in the counseling office, at the building level, in the district office, and in the community. We need leaders at all levels who are willing to defend what they believe in (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996) despite apathy and countervailing pressures. Through this collective leadership model, we must advocate for the rights of all learners. Advocacy, indeed, is an essential part of social responsibility.

Given the many inequities that exist in our society, teachers and other school personnel must be advocates for *all* of their students. It is important that teachers advocate for all students, particularly as it concerns access to curriculum and resources. In recent years, a framework called Universal Design for Learning (UDL) has made it possible for curriculum to be accessible for all students (Hitchcock, Rose, Meyer, & Jackson, 2002). The UDL frameworks sets goals that are challenging for all students but then allows flexibility in the materials used, methods of instruction employed, and ways of assessing. Teachers who plan and implement instruction for all students with this framework as a guide are able to meet the needs of students with diverse learning needs.

In using UDL, we ensure that all students have materials that are accessible to students despite issues that may traditionally be considered barriers including language, learning difficulties, or disability.

Information technologies are driving large-scale social changes, affording unprecedented educational opportunities and radically changing the world of work for this generation of students. Social responsibility and leadership are thus particularly important when considering the role of technology in education. Educators and learners can now access resources from around the world, exchange perspectives with peers in other countries, obtain recent research on virtually any topic, view images from Mars and beyond, and run simulations of processes impossible to replicate in the classroom. With the incorporation of technology, educators and learners increase the repertoire of tools for analyzing, synthesizing and sharing information. 99% of all public schools and more than 90% of U.S. classrooms are connected to the World Wide Web, and the ratio of instructional computers to students continues to increase (*Education Week*, 1999; National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). 75% of California students use technology in the classroom at least once a month (California Department of Education, 2006). As a result of such trends, notions of what it means to be educated, or even literate, are also changing.

While information technologies have the demonstrated potential to be a socially positive force, they also can have negative consequences. For example, despite some progress toward promoting more equitable access to technology, a "digital divide" (Holloway, 2000) separates those who have access to information technologies and those who do not. While the difference in computer/student ratio of the richest and poorest schools is insignificant (California Department of Education, 2006), the equity issues are far deeper than simple physical access to technologies. Students have a great deal to gain (or lose) from the manner in which information technologies are used (Burnett, 1994). The Consortium for School Networking (2006) asserts that visionary leadership and parental support appear to drive change in the most technology-intensive schools. Students from higher poverty schools are less likely to use computers at schools, particularly Hispanic students, African American students, and students with disabilities. These are the students who are also less likely to have access to computers at home (Patrick, 2004). On a positive note, while student use may differ, schools do provide the technology safety net for students of color and students in lower socioeconomic environments. Currently, the problem is not necessarily lack of funds, but lack of adequate training and lack of understanding of how computers can be used to enrich the learning experience of students (U. S. Department of Education, 2004).

Educators must be mindful that technology alone will change very little in educational settings (Becker, 2000b). Warschauer (2003) proposes a technology framework for social inclusion, with a focus on transformation rather than technology. Training that integrates technology with sound pedagogies and that fosters students' critical views of technology is critical. To be inclusive, such training must incorporate consideration of students' processing styles, cultural context (DeVillar & Faltis, 1991; Cole & Griffin, 1987; Hourcade, Parette, & Huer, 1997) and include applications of assistive technology for persons with disabilities (Gray, Quatrano, & Lieberman, 1998). Technology must also be a part of learning activities, rather than a stand-alone activity. Technology is most effective when integrated as one component into learning

environments and used as a tool for active construction and demonstration of higher levels of critical, creative thinking and problem-solving (Papert, 1980; Brooks, 1993; Heinich, 1996). Furthermore, technology-enhanced education also involves digital rights and responsibilities such as intellectual property, netiquette, privacy, and security. Almost half of PK-12 students do not consider hacking to be a crime. Internet plagiarism is increasing, cyber bullying is rampant, and cyber crime occurs without thinking (Baum, 2005). Therefore, educators also have to help students construct a “moral compass” by which to use technology responsibility. Cyber ethics needs to be taught as part of the curriculum so students can become good digital citizens (http://coe.ksu.edu/digitalcitizenship/).

Despite technology’s impact on education, research has shown that even technological savvy teachers have difficulty incorporating technology into learning activities. Teachers feel that students do not have enough time on the computer and that they need extra time to plan for computer activities (Bauer & Kenton, 2005). As a faculty we have the task of providing teachers and other school personnel to be confident and skilled in integrating computer technologies effectively. The need to integrate computer technologies effectively extends to all College of Education and Affiliated programs, not just teacher preparation. For example, educational administrators must be at least as fluent with the promise and pitfalls of these technologies (if not more so) as the teachers they will lead. In short, in order to become socially responsible leaders who model lifelong learning, graduates of the College of Education and Affiliated Programs must be prepared to use technology proactively and responsibly. A program of ongoing faculty development and technology planning is essential if we are to realize the potential of new learning technologies (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Diversity

Diversity is a fact of life among humans. What changes and is continually at issue is the extent to which we accept and embrace, or reject those who look, think, and act differently from us; speak different languages; engage in different practices; and have different, more, or fewer abilities. Tensions emerge as individuals and groups perceive different interests in including or excluding groups and individuals in the educational and social arenas. As California and the rest of the U.S. increase in diversity—California's population is already "majority minority" according to 2000 U.S. Census Bureau figures--the issues will become even more pronounced. Our challenge and our opportunity are to recognize the full potential of all learners, regardless of background, and to help them recognize the full range of personal and career options they have (Rendon & Hope, 1996).

Human diversity has many dimensions--cultural, linguistic, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, intellectual abilities, physical abilities, personality, learning styles, and socio-economic class (Slavin, 1994). Individually and in combinations, these dimensions add great complexity and richness to the educational process. The challenge for educators is to provide optimal growth and learning experiences for all students. One way to do this is through multicultural education (Banks & Banks, 2003). Multicultural education can mean many different things. One common definition of multicultural education is that it is an approach:

> …whose major aim is to create equal educational opportunities for students from diverse racial, ethnic, social-class, and cultural groups. One of its important goals is to help all students to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society and to interact, negotiate, and communicate with peoples from diverse groups in order to create a civic and moral community that works for the common good (Banks & Banks, 1995, p. xi).

Important for majority and minority students alike, multicultural education is part of a process of comprehensive school reform that includes antiracist education, critical pedagogy, and education for social justice (Nieto, 2004). Multicultural educators often utilize a "culturally relevant pedagogy" in which a teacher utilizes a student's own culture as a vehicle for learning and attaining academic competence (Ladson-Billings, 2000). Drawing on "funds of knowledge" (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), or resources of experiential, non-academic knowledge located in homes and communities, teachers can facilitate connections between the lived experiences of minority students and the linguistic and content demands of the standard curriculum.

A related issue facing California educators is effectively educating the over 1.5 million K-12 students who are English language learners, coming to school speaking languages other than English and not yet proficient in English. Although four meta-analyses over the past 20 years (Greene, 1997; Rollstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Slavin & Cheung, 2005; Willig, 1985) have concluded that instruction in a student's primary language makes a positive contribution to achievement in both the first and second languages, California state law currently favors instruction "overwhelmingly in English" for English learners. In this context, providing these students with comprehensible content instruction, as well as English language development instruction designed to meet their diagnosed needs, is essential. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model provides guidelines for the effective instruction of English Language Learners which includes planning instructional objectives and activities, building background knowledge, providing comprehensible input, making use of scaffolding techniques and higher-order thinking skills, structuring opportunities for interaction among students, providing regular feedback to students, and assessing student progress (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004).

Another way to approach the challenges and opportunities of diversity is through inclusive education models that include students of diverse abilities in the school's academic program and social contexts. It can be argued that special education has existed for many wrong reasons, but the strategies that have emerged from this discipline nonetheless have utility for the general education system and for the education and nurturance of all children (Meyer, Harry, & Sapon-Shevin, 1997). Inclusive education models provide all students--including those with significant disabilities--with equitable and effective educational services. Effective inclusion strategies require changes in curriculum, how teachers teach, how students learn, and how students and teachers interact with one another (Grenot-Scheyer, Fisher, & Staub, 2001). Supplementary aids and support services, in age-appropriate classrooms in neighborhood schools, are provided as needed in order to help prepare students for productive lives as full members of society (National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, 1995).

Inclusive schooling for students with diverse abilities is a part of the multicultural perspective in schooling. Such an orientation might pave the way toward the creation of

schools that can better address the inclusion of the full range of students with diverse abilities and characteristics. Both multicultural and inclusive education are designed to address constructively and productively the great diversity among students. This is a serious challenge for most schools and teachers, who often lack sophisticated understanding of the varieties of human experiences and attributes and how they can influence the teaching/learning process. It is therefore a challenge for faculty in professional preparation programs, who are responsible for helping equip professionals for educating increasingly diverse classrooms of children.

An essential element of diverse schools must be personal *empowerment*. This theme is particularly important for students of color, female students, and students with diverse needs and abilities, who too often have been dis-empowered by the educational institutions of the country. Although the school remains a primary vehicle for social mobility among immigrants and non-dominant or oppressed groups, disparities in achievement remain great (Education Trust, 2001; Kimmel, 2000; Miller, 1995). On a broader level, an empowerment framework promotes academic success among all students, particularly minority students, whose role in society is reflected in the schools. P-K-18 education can choose to transform society by empowering minority students rather than reflect society by disabling them (Cummins, 1986). Empowerment of others is a process that educators serve to facilitate; it is not an entity that can be bestowed. The facilitation or cultivation of students' empowerment is a critical aspect of the educator's role.

Service and Collaboration

Partnership education integrates three core components: partnership process, structure, and content, described as "how, where, and what we learn and teach" (Eisler, 2000, p. xv). Partnership education includes tools that can be used to facilitate students' (and educators') thinking about their society and become intentional about creating a society that is oriented toward partnership rather than domination and intolerance. The College of Education and Affiliated Programs' partnerships with Cerritos Community College, Long Beach Unified School District, and other institutions and agencies are representative of these broader goals and consistent with the University's envisioned future regarding community engagement:

> "CSULB faculty, staff, and students are intensely involved in community service and partnerships with community agencies and non-profits, schools, and local government agencies." (Division of Academic Affairs, 2005).

A primary example of this type of engagement is the nationally known Long Beach Education Partnership. The partnership is comprised of the Long Beach Unified School District, CSULB, and Long Beach City College. The partnership seeks to improve student achievement across all segments of the community, including –PK-12, community college, and the university (Houck, Cohn, & Cohn, 2004).

Additionally, collaboration within as well as between groups is reflected in the College of Education's priorities and activities. Collaboration includes collaboration among colleagues and professionals at the same site. At the University and within our own programs we use inclusive processes for governance, planning, communication, and assessing progress toward our goals. Members of our unit regularly collaborate with faculties in other colleges (e.g., Liberal Arts and Mathematics and Natural Sciences) on

research and service projects to benefit the university, the schools, and the larger community. Consistent with the partnership model, the College of Education celebrates diverse perspectives and actively seeks to form relationships that enrich individual lives as well as strengthen communities. Scholarly activities and research projects that are conducted by teams are congruent with this emphasis. Productive collaboration, indeed, is at the heart of organizational improvement and renewal (Fullan, 1993, 1999). Leadership and efficiency are essential for organizational effectiveness, but rigid bureaucratic hierarchies with "command and control" structures are simply not viable in today's dynamic, fast-changing environments. McGrath (1998) suggests that the best collaborative efforts generate the following lessons:

- Collaboration often produces less hierarchical organizations with shared boundaries.
- Collaboration emphasizes that community problems are interconnected.
- Collaboration builds relationships even among institutions that are ostensibly competitors.
- Collaboration promotes new relationships with funders.
- Collaboration requires a commitment to assessment.

To engage our students in partnership and collaboration, we incorporate service learning (Johnson & Notah, 1999; Kaye, 1999) into our programs, where students learn content and skills integral to their professional preparation while simultaneously serving the community by working in classrooms, schools, and clinics. Service learning incorporates many of the concepts that are foundational for our practice—active life-long learning in community contexts, the melding of academic learning and social concerns, and collaboration with agencies and individuals in the larger community. An exemplary service learning program, Service Experiences for ReVitalizing Education Program, (SERVE), housed in the College of Education, (http://www.csulb.edu/serve) creates opportunities for students at the undergraduate level, in particular for those who are considering careers in P-K-12 education, to learn about the realities of urban classrooms and the needs of the diverse P-K-12 student population. SERVE interns work with students individually and in small groups to provide academic support and encourage personal growth. It is through this involvement that CSULB students assess their career goals and provide direct service to students and teachers in grades P-K-12 and to their communities.

School Improvement

An essential component of school improvement is effective practice. *Effective practice* must be the cornerstone of our knowledge base and professional practice. Effective practice is defined in practical and empirical terms as, ideas, concepts, techniques, and procedures that help educators accomplish desired results. Translation of theory into practice is a critical dimension of what a professional school of education must do. The important test of any theory's validity is the extent to which it provides the basis for effective practice. As a result of given theories and practices, do students learn more, develop more positive attitudes, become more creative thinkers and doers, take control of their lives and take responsibility for the welfare of others? It is not sufficient to claim a philosophical affinity for a particular theory or body of practice; we must demand of ourselves that we engage in practice that produces desired outcomes.

One way of increasing the likelihood that we engage in effective practice is to engage in ongoing evaluation of our practices and our students' practices. Another way is by incorporating into our courses and our own teaching the results of research demonstrating effective practices (e.g., Wittrock, 1986; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993). Action research is defined as "the process of studying a real school or classroom situation to understand and improve the quality of actions or instruction" (Johnson, 2005, p.21). Classroom action research, in which practitioners apply research skills to study student learning in their own classrooms, has been utilized as a method of enhancing teachers' professional development as well as contributing to a climate for school improvement by "changing schools from within" (Wells, 1994). Classroom teachers and other educators can engage in critical reflection and examination of their own practice as well as contribute to a redefinition of what is meant by a professional knowledge base (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Hubbard & Power, 2003). Thus classroom action research, an integral part of coursework in many professional preparation programs in the College of Education and Affiliated Programs, is one way of designing, implementing, and evaluating effective practices in local settings. As we evaluate ourselves as teachers we also model and guide our students to evaluate themselves and their practices through action research.

Effective practice is essential if we are to live up to the ideals of promoting life-long learning, professional growth, and social responsibility. However, effective teaching is more than technique. As Palmer (1998) writes, ". . . good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p. 10). Good teaching--"effective" teaching-- involves subjectivity, interpretation, and working through the many uncertainties inherent in dealing with human beings. At the same time, it is our responsibility to promote teaching and educational practices that are effective, that is, successful in helping students attain important educational and personal outcomes.

American education is in the midst of an avalanche of educational reform and (at least attempted) improvement. The pace, breadth, and sheer number of proposed and attempted changes in everything from parent involvement to instruction to counseling to school governance are unprecedented (Darling-Hammond, 1997: Fullan, 1993; Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997; Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000: Slavin & Fashola, 1998). The standards movement focuses on identifying what every student should know and be able to do, and federal legislation requires standardized testing to ensure that students are meeting established goals (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). While some would argue that America is still educationally "at risk," the growing body of research on how children learn and what constitutes good teaching suggests that we are clearly not in the same place we were 20 years ago. Various initiatives and reform efforts have helped to keep education reform at the top of the political agenda at local, state, and federal levels (Grosso de Leon, 2003). No one knows which if any of these reforms will last and make an enduring contribution to education. Results so far remain mixed (U.S, Department of Education, 1999 a & b; National Education Goals Panel, 1997, 1998, 1999). Certainly sustainability of reform outcomes over time remains a critical school improvement challenge (Goldenberg 2004). Regardless, the university programs that prepare professional educators must be in the forefront of promoting school reform to enhance educational, social, and economic opportunity for all learners. We must be proactive, not simply reactive. In keeping with our key idea of effective practice,

however, we are committed not to change for change's sake but to change that makes a positive difference in the lives of our students and our students' students. Moreover, the school reform agenda must encompass more than academics. Although academic and cognitive goals must and will have a central role in schooling, non-cognitive outcomes are important as well.

Emphasis on academic achievement has tended to overshadow the personal and social needs of students and those aspects of their development. Partnership education and partnership processes (Eisler, 2000) promote not only learning and personal growth but also a necessary shift to a more equitable, less violent and caring society. Themes of care--for self, intimate others, global others, plants, animals, the environment, objects and instruments, and ideas (Noddings, 1995a, 1995b)--provide part of the framework for P-K-12 education and educational reform. The College of Education and Affiliated Programs recognize that students learn better in an environment characterized by mutual respect rather than domination, by open-mindedness rather than closed minds, and by empowerment rather than control (Shor, 1992). As the lens through which education is viewed becomes broader, "the vital relationships among teaching, learning, and the education of the heart" (Kessler, 2000, p. xiv) become more evident. Research and scholarly pursuits reflect these beliefs and help us broaden the agenda for school reform. Cognitive outcomes of schooling are undeniably important, but we must not forget other important outcomes such as social, ethical, and civic dispositions which, research suggests, schools have the power to influence (Battistich, Watson, Solomon, Lewis, & Schaps, 1999).

Research, Scholarship, and Evaluation

Integral to the work of higher education faculty is *research and scholarship*. As stated in the university strategic planning priorities, "CSULB is a teaching-intensive, research driven university" (Division of Academic Affairs, 2005). Although our primary mission remains teaching and the preparation of students for the professional challenges they will face in schools and communities, our practice is enhanced when we actively contribute to the community of scholars in our respective disciplines. Active researchers help advance knowledge in areas that are foundational to our profession. Teachers and other educators who are researchers also gain important familiarity with current research and emerging lines of thought; this enriches their work as teachers, thereby enriching the experiences of their students and their students' students. There is often a tension between these two aspects of our work--teaching and scholarship--but we see each complementing and rounding out the other. Boyer (1990), in fact, has argued that teaching can and does include a scholarship dimension. Moreover, as Boice (2006) argues, the enhancement of a faculty member's—particularly a new faculty member's—teaching performance "depends on progress in related domains… such as scholarship" (p. xii).

Our own university, moreover, advocates a broadening of the definition of scholarship to include "the scholarship of teaching" --depth and breadth of understanding in the discipline being taught, the ability to communicate that understanding, and the creation of innovative ways of teaching one's own students and students removed in time and place (Provost's Advisory Committee on the Functions and Values of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity and University and Community Service, 1992). Regardless of its relationship to teaching, however, part of the inherent responsibility of

higher education faculty is to contribute, synthesize, and disseminate knowledge in their chosen disciplines.

There is another aspect to the scholarly enterprise: The *evaluation* of our work as teachers. Program evaluation does not typically lead to publication, so it is not 'scholarship' in the traditional sense of discovery or the generation of new, foundational knowledge. But it is scholarship if by scholarship we mean bringing disciplined tools of inquiry to bear on significant social and professional questions. How well our programs are preparing education professionals is a significant social and professional question. It matters enormously whether our work as educators is having the desired effects on our students and on the students and communities they serve. This is a critical, but enormously complex, question that only recently has begun receiving adequate attention. In the field of teacher education, for example, there is disagreement over whether teacher credentialing has an impact on P-K-12 students' achievement. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996, 2001) concludes that fully credentialed teachers are more effective than teachers with emergency, provisional, or no credential. In contrast, Goldhaber and Brewer (1999) report that while students whose teachers have any type of credential outperform students whose teachers have no credential, it made little difference on student achievement whether teachers had standard, emergency, or provisional credentials. Given the uncertainties and controversies in our field, it is particularly important that each institution and every program that prepares education professionals use all scholarly tools at their disposal to address the central questions of our practice: How good a job are we doing in preparing our students for the professional challenges they will face in the schools? To what extent are we providing them with knowledge and skills that will help them make a positive difference in the lives of their students?

As faculty in the College of Education and Affiliated Programs, not only are we involved with research and scholarly activities but we are also charged with conveying the importance of research, scholarship, and evaluation to our students. With the recent federal legislation, No Child Left Behind, (NCLB 2001), never before has research and evaluation become so important in P-K-12 education. NCLB calls for evidence based practices to be used in schools, therefore emphasizing the strong relationship between scientific based research and teaching practices (Johnson, 2005).

Our scholarly work--whether conceived of as research or evaluation--has a social dimension to it that links back to the key idea of social responsibility. Education is inherently a social process, and the opportunities and challenges of educating an increasingly diverse population of students are inherently social opportunities and challenges. Our scholarship must simultaneously take advantage of the opportunities and meet the challenges. When addressing a 1966 conference on Social Change and the Role of Social Scientists, Martin Luther King made the following request, which is as relevant today as it was a generation ago:

> … we ask you to focus on the fresh social issues of the day; to move from observing operant learning, the psychology of risk… to the test tubes of Watts, Harlem, Selma, and Bogalusa. We ask you to make society's problems your laboratory. We ask you to translate your data into direction--direction for action (quoted in Noffke, 1997, p. 305).

The ultimate goal of our research, scholarship, and evaluation is to gather data that help provide direction for action in those areas comprising the foundation of our practice: student growth and learning; preparing socially responsible leaders at all levels; human diversity and the educational process; service to and collaboration with the community; and promoting school improvement for every segment and every student in our society. We strive to impart this goal to our students as they become leaders in schools and communities.

Bibliography

Adler, M. (1982). *The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.

Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Ausubel, D. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Banks, J. & Banks, C. (2003). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (4th ed.).* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Banks, J. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher, 27*(7), 4-17.

Banks, J. & Banks, C. (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Battistich, V., Watson, M., Solomon, D., Lewis, C., & Schaps, E. (1999). Beyond the three R's: A broader agenda for school reform. *The Elementary School Journal, 99,* 415-432.

Bauer, J., & Kenton, J. (2005). Technology integration in the schools: Why it isn't happening. *Journal of Technology & Teacher Education, 13,* 519-526.

Baum, J. (2005). Cyber ethics: The new frontier. *TechTrends, 49*(0), 54-55.

Becker, H. (2000a). Who's wired and who's not. Unpublished manuscript. University of California, Irvine.

Becker, H. (2000b). Findings from the teaching, learning, and computing survey: Is Larry Cuban right? *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(51) Retrieved September 21, 2006, from ERIC database.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York: Harper.

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Boice, R. (2006). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development.* Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brooks, J. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Associated for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, D., (Ed.). (2002). *Career choice and development (4th ed.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burnett, G. (1994). *Technology as a tool for urban classrooms.* Available: http://eric-web.tc.columbia.edu/digests/dig95.html.

California Department of Education (2006). DataQuest Student Technology Use Survey for California. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California State University, Long Beach, (2006). California State University, Long Beach, Strategic Planning Priorities and Goals, 2006-2009. Retrieved February 24, 2006, from: http://www.csulb.edu/web/projects/planning/.

Carter, L. & Campbell, B. (1999). *Multiple intelligences and student achievement: Success stories from six schools.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1993*). Inside/Outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Cole, M. & Griffin, P. (Eds). (1987). *Contextual factors in education: Improving science and mathematics education for minorities and women*. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
Consortium for School Networking (2006). *Digital leadership divide.* Washington, DC: Author. http://cosn.org/resources/grunwald/digital_leadership_divide.pdf
Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 19-36.
Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (eds.), (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve.* The National Academy of Education, Committee on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
D'Zurilla, T. J. & Nazu, A. M. (1999). *Problem-solving therapy: A social competence approach to clinical intervention (2nd ed.).* New York: Springer.
DeVillar R. & Faltis, C. (1991). *Computers and cultural diversity: Restructuring for school success.* New York: State University of New York Press.
Division of Academic Affairs, (2005, June). *Vision for Excellence.* Retrieved, May, 4, 2006, from California State University, Long Beach: (http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/provost/vision/).
Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model.* Boston: Pearson.
Education Trust. (2001). *Achievement in America, 2001*. Retrieved 5/9/06 from (http:www2.edtrust.org/edtrust/Product+Catalog/data+disks.htm).
*Education Week. (*1999). *19* (4) [Entire issue]. Technology counts '99: Building the digital curriculum.
Eisler, R. (2000). *Tomorrow's children: A blueprint for partnership education in the 21st century.* Boulder, CO: Westview.
Evers, F. T. (1998). *The bases of competence: Skills for lifelong learning and employability.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. London: Falmer.
Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* London: Falmer.
Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York: Teachers College Press.
Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind.* New York: Basic Books.
Gardner, H. (1999). *The disciplined mind: What all students should understand.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
Goldenberg, C. (2004). *Successful school change: Creating settings to improve teaching and learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Goldhaber, D. & Brewer, D. (1999). Teacher licensing and student achievement. In M. Kanstoroom & C. Finn, Jr. (Eds.). *Better teachers, better schools* (83-116). Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Foundation.
Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gray, D., Quatrano, L., & Lieberman, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Designing and using assistive technology: The human perspective.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal, 21,* 103-122.
Grenot-Scheyer, M., Fisher, M., & Staub, D. (Eds.) (2001). *At the end of the day: Lessons learned in inclusive education.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
Grosso de Leon, A. (2003). After 20 years of educational reform, progress, but plenty of unfinished business. *Carnegie Results, 1*(3), 1-2.
Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.
Heinich, R. (1996). Instructional *media and technologies for learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
Hitchcock, C., Meyer, A., Rose, D. Jackson, R. (2002). Providing new access to the general education curriculum: Universal design for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 35*, 8-17.
Holloway, J. (2000). The digital divide. *Educational Leadership, 58*(October), 90-91.
Houck, J.W., Cohn, K.C., & Cohn, C.A. (2004). *Partnering to lead educational renewal: High-quality teachers, high-quality schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Hourcade, J., Parette, H., & Huer, M. (1997). Family and cultural alert! Considerations in assistive technology assessment. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 30* (1), 40-44.
Hubbard, R. & Power, B. (2003). *The art of classroom inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Johnson, A.P. (2005). *A short guide to action research*. Boston: Pearson Education.
Johnson, A. & Notah, D. (1999). Service learning: History, literature review, and a pilot study of eighth graders. *The Elementary School Journal, 99,* 453-468.
Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (1996). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Leadership development for teachers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
Kaye, C. (1999). *The service learning bookshelf.* Los Angeles, CA: Author.
Kessler, R. (2000). *The soul of education.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Kimmel, M. (2000). *The gendered society.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). But that's just good teaching. In Noel, J. (Ed.). *Sources: Notable selections in multicultural education* (pp. 206-216). Guilford, CT: Duskin/McGraw-Hill).
Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge: Leading in an interdependent world.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Loertsher, D. & Woolls, B. (2002). Information literacy: *A review of the literature (2nd edition).* San Jose, CA: HiWillow Publishing.
McGrath, D. (Ed.) (1998). Creating and benefiting from institutional collaboration: Models for success. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 103* (Fall). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Meyer, L., Harry, B., & Sapon-Shevin, M. (1997). School inclusion and multicultural issues in special education. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (3rd ed.)*, (pp. 334-360). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Miller, L. (1995). *An American imperative: Accelerating minority educational advancement.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Miramontes, O., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. (1997). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena.* New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion (1995). *National study of inclusive education.* New York: The City University of New York.

National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *Internet access in U.S. public schools and classrooms: 1994-2002.* Washington, DC: US Dept. of Education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). *What matters most? Teaching for America's future.* New York: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2001). Teacher preparation research, retrieved from: http://www.edutopia.org/php/print.php?id=Art_788&template=printarticle.php

National Education Goals Panel (1997). *The National Education Goals report: Building a nation of learners, 1997.* Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents. (Available: http://www.negp.gov)

National Education Goals Panel (1998). *Mathematics and science achievement state by state, 1998.* Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents. (Available: http://www.negp.gov)

National Education Goals Panel (1999). *Reading achievement state by state, 1999.* Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents. (Available: http://www.negp.gov).

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education (4th ed.).* Boston: Pearson.

Noddings, N. (1995a). A morally defensible mission for schools in the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 365-368.

Noddings, N. (1995b). Teaching themes of care. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 675-679.

Noffke, S. (1997). Professional, personal, and political dimensions of action research. In M. Apple (Ed.). *Review of Research in Education, vol. 22* (pp. 305-341). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Norris, S. (1985). Synthesis of research on critical thinking. *Educational Leadership, 42,* 40-45.

Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality (2nd ed.).* Cumberland, RI: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J., Quartz, K., Ryan, S., & Lipton, M. (2000*). Becoming good American schools: The struggle for civic virtue in educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms.* New York: Basic.

Patrick, S. (2004). Invited commentary: Children, schools, computers, and the Internet: The impact of continued investment in educational technology under NCLB. *Education Statistics Quarterly, 5 (4). R*etrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_5/5_4/2_4.asp

Piaget, J. (1973). *The psychology of intelligence.* Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams.

Provost's Advisory Committee on the Functions and Values of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity and University and Community Service. (1992). *The California State University Long Beach Professoriate: Preparing for the Twenty-First Century.* Long Beach, CA: California State University Long Beach.

Rendon, L. & Hope, R. (1996). *Educating a new majority.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rolstad, K. Mahoney, K. & Glass, G. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English Language Learners. *Educational Policy, 19,* 572-594.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical thinking for social change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Slavin, R. & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(2), 247-284.

Slavin, R. & Fashola, O. (1998). *Show me the evidence! Proven and promising programs for America's schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Slavin, R. (1994). *Educational psychology (4th ed.).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tuijnman, A. C., & Van Der Kamp, M. (Eds.), (1992). *Learning process along the lifespan: Theories, research, policies*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Thorndike, E. (1962). *Selected writings* (G. Joncich, Ed.) New York: Teachers College.

U.S. Department of Education (2004). *National Education Technology Plan.* U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: Author. http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/plan/2004/site/edlite-default.html

U.S. Dept. of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved 5/9/06 from (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/execsumm.html).

U.S. Dept. of Education (1999a). *NAEP 1998 reading report card for the nation and states* (NCES 1999-500). Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents. (Available: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main1998/1999500.pdf).

U.S. Dept. of Education (1999b). (NCES 1999-462). Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents. (Available: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main1998/1999462.pdf).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, M., Haertel, & Walberg, H. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*, 249-294.

Warschauer, M. (2003). The allures and illusions of modernity. *Educational Policy Analysis, 11*(38).

Wells, G. (1994). *Changing schools from within: Creating communities of inquiry.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Wheatley, M. (1999). *Leadership and the new science.* San Francisco: Berret-Koehler Publishers.

Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research, 55,* 269-317.

Wittrock, M. (Ed.), (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.).* New York: Macmillan.