



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

## Conceptual Framework

The College of Education’s Conceptual Framework articulates the intellectual philosophy that serves as a foundation for the Key Ideas of our Vision and Mission.

**Vision:** Equity & Excellence in Education

**Mission:** The College of Education at CSULB is a learning and teaching community that prepares professional educators and practitioners who promote equity and excellence in diverse urban settings through effective pedagogy, evidence-based practices, collaboration, leadership, innovation, scholarship, and advocacy.

### Introduction: Promoting Equity and Excellence in Diverse Urban Settings

As a College, our commitment is to foster and enhance equity and excellence in diverse urban settings through the teaching and learning endeavors in which we engage with our candidates. We strive to create a college climate that fosters equity and excellence for ourselves, our candidates, and the populations whom they serve. Our staff demonstrate their commitment through their interaction with and support of our students. Our faculty demonstrate this commitment through their teaching, mentoring, research, and collaborative work with children, youth, adults, and communities. Together, we strive toward our vision of equity and excellence in education.

To support our candidates and engage our partners in co-constructing supportive learning environments, we commit to enacting the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ principles of Inclusive Excellence (2011). The first principle calls for us to focus on our candidates’ intellectual and social development. We honor the second principle of intentional allocation of organizational resources to support and promote candidates’ learning by carefully and collaboratively managing our institutional resources. The third principle acknowledges that our candidates’ and our own cultural heritage enhances educational and community learning environments. We honor the fourth principle by creating a community in which we rely on our collective diversity to engage in, and encourage, learning and development in ourselves, our candidates, and the populations with whom we all work. We respect and enact these four principles across the College through our use of effective pedagogies, evidence-based practices, collaboration, leadership, innovation, scholarship, and advocacy. In the following pages, we define these Key Ideas, which are founded on the core values of equity and excellence in diverse urban settings.

## **Equity**

We aim for our candidates to experience equitable educational outcomes regardless of personal characteristics such as race, class, language, ability, or sexual orientation. Our students are able to draw upon their racial, socioeconomic, linguistic, and other identities as sources of strength and knowledge (Noguera, 2008). The theories and practices we employ are informed by praxis—the alignment and cyclical relationship between theory and practice; as we teach about equity, we also co-construct a vision with our candidates regarding how to address inequities in classrooms, schools, clinics, postsecondary institutions, and other educational and community environments. Our candidates ought to leave our programs understanding that equity means fulfilling an “unmet American promise that education will be made available to all on equal terms, so that every member of this society can realize a productive life and contribute to the greater welfare” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 3).

## **Excellence**

Excellence is not simply an individual trait; rather it is linked to setting and context. Deeply connected to equity, this concept involves high expectations and transformative pedagogies and practices in which all of our candidates and the populations they serve are held to high standards of excellence (Ferguson, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2007, 2010; Reardon, 2011). In higher education, excellence has been defined as “high achievement in meeting core objectives...[which] are to educate large numbers of people to a high standard and simultaneously to advance and disseminate knowledge” (Bowen, Kurzweil, Tobin & Pichler, 2005, p. 39). Further, excellence becomes possible when diverse learning environments are inclusive (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2011). We believe that excellence can be achieved by connecting research, theory, and practice not only in the higher education environment, but also in the professional contexts in which our candidates work.

## **Diverse Urban Settings**

Faculty, staff, and students in the College are committed to preparing future teachers, counselors, leaders, educators, and other professionals to work toward equity and excellence in diverse urban settings, which may be in California, across the country, or in the international realm. We are committed to raising our candidates’ awareness of the world around them, which extends to their professional work in fostering equity and excellence in both local and global contexts.

Our candidates work with people whose personal characteristics vary greatly by race, class, language, ability, or sexual orientation. Our goal is for our candidates to be familiar with and sensitive to the pulls and presses of ecological risks (Rodriguez, 1997) such as poverty (Berliner, 2006), limited English proficiency (Dúran, 2008; Goldenberg, 2008; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000), undocumented status (Camarota, 2005; Capps et al., 2002; 2005; Chavez, 1991), disability (Artiles, Klingner, Sullivan, & Fierros, 2010; Deno, 1970; Greenbaum & Auerback, 1998; Morrison & Cosden, 1997), and challenging family environments (Stormont, Espinosa, Knipping, & McCathren, 2003; Zetlin, Weinberg & Shea, 2010). We strive for our candidates to develop the knowledge and skills to foster resiliency in the populations they serve. Thus, we

critically examine how we address diverse populations, aiming to ground our teaching in research-based methods for promoting the success of all individuals (De Jong & Harper, 2008; Dixon & Fasching-Varner, 2008; Echeverria, Vogt & Short, 2008; Edwards, Mumford, & Serra-Roldan, 2003; Grant & Sleeter, 1986; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Morse & Ludovina, 1999; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2009).

## **Seven Key Ideas**

### **Effective Pedagogy**

We promote research- and evidence-based pedagogic practices in our university environment and in the P-16 classrooms and community settings in which our candidates work. Faculty are mindful that their instruction of candidates not only demonstrates a variety of pedagogic practices, but also models effective instructional strategies. Faculty and staff are also mindful that their interactions with students both model and facilitate appropriate professional dispositions. Moreover, faculty and staff are committed to social justice and aim to provide and develop our candidates with the necessary skills and habits of mind to make a significant contribution to their professional settings and communities.

Our teaching is concretely aligned to clearly-articulated student learning outcomes that are made explicit and transparent to our candidates (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; Marzano & Kendall, 2006), and we prepare them to do the same. Instruction is designed to promote competence and excellence regarding both program and course outcomes. Competence and excellence are achieved through variable forms of instruction that uphold collaborative, contextual, experiential, and inquiry-based student learning (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2004; Cooper, 1990; Darling-Hammond, Bransford, LePage, Hammerness, & Duffy, 2007; Donovan & Bransford, 2005; Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Levesque, 2009; Weinbaum, Allen & Blythe, 2004). Candidate competence and excellence are demonstrated through varied and authentic forms of assessment that are designed to provide constructive feedback that further improves and deepens learning (Rule, 2006; Suurtamm, 2004). Our candidates are engaged in learning and inquiry, and through these activities they not only create, but also transmit knowledge with application to their professional environments.

Given our focus on teaching and learning, College faculty strive toward pedagogy that strikes the important balance between theory and practical application. Candidates are introduced to a wide variety of theoretical approaches relevant to their fields, and develop a historical sense of the disciplinarity and global scope of education and its affiliated disciplines (Cuban, 1993; Thelin, 2011; Zimmerman, 2005). Pursuant to their fields, candidates are also presented with a wide range of practical approaches from the effective pedagogical literature. We also promote the importance of candidate interdisciplinary understanding from affiliated disciplines such as sociology, psychology, and ethnic studies.

We also strive to advance the use of educational technology, and incorporate it within our theoretical and practical approaches to teaching and learning. The use of educational technology in the university classroom is modeled for its application in our candidates' professional environments. Candidates are introduced to means for discovering and evaluating

electronic resources and ethical practices associated with the use of electronic materials and educational technology (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000; Garner, 2005; McElroy, 2006). In our teaching, faculty advance and encourage candidates' critical thinking with an increasing emphasis on enhancing digital, information, and media literacy (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2010; Webster, 2002; Wilhelm, 2004).

Our faculty and staff also value teaching and learning through the lens of a global perspective, and are committed to internationalizing curricula and infusing global examples, materials, and contexts into our teaching and initiatives wherever appropriate (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Dolby & Rizvi, 2007; Spring, 2008; Stromquist, 2002; Suarez-Orozco, 2007). Promoting global awareness and perspective is an important objective for teaching and learning so that our candidates will succeed in local educational settings that are both more diverse and increasingly influenced by global forces and developments.

### **Evidence-based Practices**

Evidence-based practices (EBPs) grounded in various types of research—qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods—are central in our programs and coursework. We define EBPs as a program or collection of instructional practices with a proven record of success and a well-supported body of literature to demonstrate their efficacy with a given population. This evidence should be an accumulation of research on a particular practice. Although one research study of a particular practice may show that it is “research-based,” multiple studies must be conducted with generalizable effects in order to demonstrate that a practice is evidence-based (Cook, Tanskersley, & Landrum, 2009). In looking at the evidence to support a particular practice, in addition to the quantity of studies, we look for the methodological quality of the research. Studies should have methodological rigor and fidelity in order to be trustworthy (Cook et al., 2009). Additionally, studies should have enough information to be replicated by others, including detailed and clear participant and setting descriptions. Studies also need to show considerable and significant results (Cook et al., 2009) with specificity about for whom and in what context (Guralnick, 1999; Odom et al., 2005). Qualitative research can take many forms, including but not limited to, case studies, ethnographies, observations, interviews, field studies and archival research to name but a few. In qualitative research we analyze data looking for patterns and interconnections (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and make logical conclusions about the effects of a practice that can be combined with other studies to deepen our understanding of the larger population (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In quantitative research, we examine results for significant positive effects, and specifically in experimental and quasi-experimental designs we look for effect sizes that are at least .40 and therefore indicate educational or clinical significance (Forness, Kavale, Blum, & Lloyd, 1997; Walberg, 1986).

EBPs are critical to our work in order to address the historical gap between research and practice in education and related disciplines (Gersten, 2001; Levin & O'Donnell, 1999; Robinson, 1998;) that can only be remediated when researchers carefully understand concrete issues in practice and practitioners concomitantly understand research (Slavin, 2002). Therefore, we

draw upon research that is based on tangible problems in the field, that is conducted in the settings in which practitioners work (e.g., schools, universities, communities, clinics), and that will further practices that are evidence-based. In addition to a practice being “evidence-based,” we want to know that it can be used effectively in a variety of real world settings (Pincus & Sokka, 2006)—that is, does it have “practice-based evidence?” We value literature that contributes to practice-based evidence by including practitioner narratives on how a particular evidence-based practice is used effectively. The use of narrative along with data and theory is more influential to practitioners, and therefore can help close the research to practice gap (Smith, Richards-Tutor, & Cook, 2010).

We teach our candidates to read, understand, interpret, and apply high quality research. Additionally, we teach them to design and conduct their own forms of inquiry to examine effective practices in specific settings relevant to their fields, which contributes to the evidence on these practices (Campbell & Robinson, 1990; Gelso, 1979; Hubbard, & Power, 2003).

Finally, we acknowledge that in many areas the literature on effective practices is sparse, particularly with specific groups, such as African Americans (Gilbert, Harvey, & Belgrave, 2009), English Learners (August & Shanahan, 2006), and persons with significant disabilities (Odom et al., 2005). Therefore, we value research that indicates a practice is “promising” as there may not be sufficient publications on a practice to meet the evidence-based standards. We value studies that reflect the diverse urban setting where CSULB is situated. We encourage our faculty and candidates to conduct research that addresses effective practices for diverse groups.

### **Collaboration**

Prominent researchers in education and affiliated fields have defined the characteristics of collaboration. Friend and Cook (2010) define collaboration as a style for direct interaction between co-equal parties, who voluntarily engage in shared decision-making and work toward a mutual goal. Similarly, Kagan (1991) views collaboration as organizational and inter-organizational structures with shared resources, power, and authority among stakeholders to achieve common goals that would not be possible with a single individual or agency. Thus, collaboration entails a careful consideration of each stakeholder’s contributions in a relational system, and illustrates the kind of reciprocity that aims for balance and equity within this collaborative framework. This multidimensional stance requires ongoing transparency and negotiation of equity in an effort to promote trust and integrity in the relationships between individuals and systems (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Krasner, 1986).

Collaboration has become an integral part of today’s educational and community environments, and is essential to both the practice of effective professionals and the culture of effective learning contexts (Barth, 2006; Murray, 2004). Collaboration occurs on several levels and for varied purposes—within our own college and university, for school reform, for school-family partnerships, and through P-16 and community connections. Collaboration is the mechanism through which organizational and societal renewal is accomplished. We believe

that our faculty, staff, and candidates must have the tools to facilitate critical thinking about how they may contribute to creating a society oriented toward partnership and collaboration.

At the university and within our own programs, we use inclusive processes for governance, planning, and communication. We collaboratively develop policies and curricula, provide academic advising and support for our candidates, and engage in shared research projects and team teaching. In addition, many of our programs involve the support of faculty and staff from various disciplines outside the College. Drawing upon the knowledge and expertise of colleagues from across campus contributes to the development and the sustainability of our programs, scholarship, and governance. The collaborative practices in which we engage at the university level are reflective of our commitment to, and expectations of, our candidates for their professional practice.

Many current initiatives for school reform rely on collaboration as a chief mechanism through which change may be accomplished (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2003). With the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001), the call for collaboration is becoming universal. The defining reason to create partnerships is to help all students succeed in school and later in life (Friend & Pope, 2005; Levine & Marcus, 2007). In particular, preparing future school leaders to collaborate with others involves training them across disciplines, developing their expertise, and providing opportunities to put collaborative models into practice (Friend & Cook, 2010). It is through collaborative practices that we may address common barriers to change and societal challenges, in order to address structural and systemic school inequities together (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Meier, 1995, 2002).

School-family partnerships are another important form of collaboration. Such partnerships have the potential to improve school programs and school climate and increase parents' skills and leadership (Epstein, 1995: 2002). From a strength-based framework, collaboration is crucial as professionals work with their students' families and communities and challenge the traditional deficit lens of family involvement with schools (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Lightfoot, 2004; Tuck, 2009; Valdés, 1996). Ravitch and Tillman (2010) articulate that authentic school-family partnerships rely upon "...engaging [stakeholders] in the systematic deconstruction and interruption of the 'expert/learner' dichotomy and addressing asymmetrical power relationships that sustain this harmful binary; adopting a view of collaboration as a reciprocal and dialogic process..." (p. 5). We embrace this inclusive form of collaboration in our own university environment, and encourage our candidates to integrate these principles into their professional realms.

Multiple connections with P-16 partners and communities are also integral to our teaching, scholarship, and service, creating seamless and integrated ties with local educational organizations and communities. Although much of our work focuses on local collaboration, our partnerships also encompass the broad international context. We acknowledge the necessity to make linkages and connections internationally considering such issues as culture, language,

and educational philosophy rooted in the economic, cultural, social, and institutional structures of the partners invested in the collaboration.

## **Leadership**

We embrace a broad and expansive view of what is meant by “leader” and “leadership.” We also recognize leaders and leadership as present in diverse ways and believe that leadership must come from many sources and have many dimensions to meet today’s challenges. We believe leadership is grounded in the experience of distinct individuals—who may not hold formal leadership positions and who may come from within as well as outside of the educational environment. This concept of leadership employs multiple views, theories, and experiences, and entails drawing upon multiple and diverse individuals who understand the complex, multi-layered problems in educational and community environments (Simkins, 2005). Such leaders have broad, systemic views of education, society, and the world, in order to shape and support the success of students, clients, and citizens in the broader community. Educational leaders display a commitment to equal access to meaningful learning for all students and community members (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In this context, we are in a unique position to use contemporary research and innovative concepts to prepare leaders (teachers, administrators, and other professionals) who bring a critical lens and social consciousness to their work, together with a deep belief that all members of society can succeed. Effective leaders demonstrate a willingness to continually learn and grow, making strategic use of effective practices tied to teaching, counseling, management, and leadership.

We are leaders in education and its affiliated disciplines, our communities, and our professions, and cultivate our candidates to be leaders in these three arenas. Our conception of leadership involves displaying a commitment to change and ongoing improvement grounded in a sense of constructive criticality. This imperative does not entail embracing change uncritically merely for the sake of change, but rather involves having the ability and willingness to ask incisive questions about goals, priorities, practices, and outcomes in our educational institutions, and to work with others to take action based on the answers to those questions. Fullan (2002) describes this critical stocktaking as creating a “change culture,” built around the idea of coherent innovation for meaningful improvement to support the success of individuals and society.

Closely coupled with the idea of constructive criticality is the ability of transformative leaders to engage in ongoing reflection about policy and practice at multiple levels. We seek to be, and to prepare, transformative leaders who have the ability to engage in reflection, which is not merely an act, but a state of mind (Wright, 2009). Given the complex and interrelated nature of challenges in educational and community environments, effective leaders must be able and willing to promote change at multiple levels—including within the self, the organization, and society (Fullan, 2002).

With an appreciation for the sociopolitical and historical contexts in which they work, effective leaders recognize the evolutionary nature of the educational and societal system, the changing nature of the goals of that system, and the pressures and challenges the system faces. We

commit to exploring with our candidates the global and social context of education to engage in policy debates and gain ideas for effective practices for all members of society (Gorski, 2009; 2010; Oakes & Saunders, 2008; Provenzo, 2011).

We structure our programs around building a robust set of leadership skills so that our candidates can carry out their work and support success in diverse urban settings. Recognizing that immigrant populations arrive from diverse places of origin, leaders are challenged by traditional notions of race and ethnicity (Blommeart, 2007, 2010). Thus, our candidates must be trained and prepared to use a wide range of theories to understand problems, think in creative and multidisciplinary ways, and appreciate the importance of context in determining actions and solutions (Glatter, 2009; Simkins, 2005). Finally, effective leaders must be able to cross traditional organizational boundaries, build collaborative relationships with others, and use wisdom, intuition, and balanced judgment in decision-making in their daily practices.

### **Innovation**

Our society and campus community—made up of people with diverse backgrounds, experiences, interests, and aptitudes—is impacted by technology, globalization, and accountability. In order to lead effectively, College faculty, staff, administrators, and candidates need to understand, keep pace with, and apply innovative processes. Members of our College community define their roles within innovative processes, particularly as change agents who make and manage change. Drawing upon American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) policy (AACTE, 2011), we strengthen our programs and build their capacity to prepare educators and other professionals who are innovative in their leadership and can reach every individual effectively (NCATE, 2010). As educational leaders we model and enact core strategies that frame and support conditions for innovation, through sharing curriculum and instruction, facilitating reflective teaching and learning, developing policy, and fostering shared vision (Henderson, Finkelstein, & Beach, 2010). We understand the difference between being innovative in a given content area and being experts in managing the process of change (Fullan, 2001).

As change agents we strive toward the design and implementation of innovative teaching, candidate support, and scholarship that is motivating, inspiring, and effective. Students' motivation has been identified as one of the most important aspects of education. The new generation of students is globally connected, technologically savvy, and ready to apply technology and other innovations in their professional lives. New strategies serve to engage students and to improve the quality of education (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2010). To support the integration of innovations in our candidates' professional domains, we strive to promote, support, and model creative and critical thinking and inventiveness as suggested by the International Society for Technology in Education and the 2010 NCATE Blue Ribbon Report on Teacher Preparation (NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010).

We believe innovation and creativity with regard to technology, program and policy development, and teaching and learning are essential components to achieving the College's mission. Innovation involves ongoing experimentation, interaction, assessment, and decision-

making (Bennis, Benne & Chin, 1985). Therefore, our College provides resources and opportunities for all aspects of integrating technology and using creative endeavors in teaching, learning, assessment, administration, student services, scholarship, and program development.

We are committed to ensuring that our graduates have the skills and competencies necessary to compete internationally and positively change society. Specifically, our graduates should be able to utilize technology and other innovative strategies effectively to support teaching, learning, and other professional activities to enhance professional growth and productivity.

## **Scholarship**

As scholars, we ardently participate in various forms of inquiry that contribute to our own and our candidates' intellectual development. We step back from our teaching and our inquiries, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating this knowledge effectively. Our teaching and service link to our scholarship and intersect to constantly inform our practice and create an impetus for our scholarship. We pursue varied models of scholarship in the College, including multidisciplinary, collaborative, and experimental; our scholarship encompasses varied methodologies such as mixed methods, qualitative, and quantitative. As professionals in education and affiliated fields, we know our disciplines well and participate in professional development to keep informed and intellectually engaged. We prepare our candidates to support the next generation of citizens by actively utilizing scholarship in their fields of study and work, and participating in research inquiries and understanding the process associated with our scholarship.

Our scholarship links investigative efforts in developing new knowledge through our engagement in original inquiry. We are committed scholars engaged in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge that contributes to intellectual discussions within our respective fields and across the disciplines (Li, 2005, 2010). We seek grant opportunities to further our intellectual pursuits and to support new lines of inquiry. We share our excitement and discoveries with our candidates, and encourage them to participate in these active endeavors with us (Ratanasiripong & Rodriguez, 2011). Our programs provide opportunities for scholarly exploration through field experience, theoretical and policy studies, action research, basic research, and applied research projects.

Scholarship of application (Boyer, 1990) is at the heart of the College. Our responsibility goes beyond intellectual contributions. We encourage the transcendence of our acquired knowledge toward implementing practices that address social justice issues of great concern for our communities, whether in local (Xu, 2010), national, or global contexts (An, 2008; Liu & Qi, 2006). We pursue this application, in part, through a scholarship of engagement. This approach seeks to employ the intellectual and scholarly talents of our faculty in collaborative partnerships with the broader community and individual practitioners to examine and address issues of critical importance (e.g., access, success, effective practice). Scholarship of engagement can be reflected in our teaching, our research, and our service, and seeks to promote both the College's mission and goals as well as directly serving community needs and

the public good (Barker, 2004). In doing so, the goal is to collaboratively seek solutions to current challenges and advance the knowledge base of the field. Our scholarship of engagement reflects five practices: public scholarship, participatory research, community partnerships, public information networks, and civic literacy scholarship (Barker, 2004). Our scholarship addresses issues of concern to the community, thereby increasing our emphasis on social justice issues and collaborating on transforming our local communities. These efforts lead to integration of the campus within the community and to a deeper public understanding of academic scholarship, providing a connection between academics and the public (Center for P-16 Research and Collaboration, 2011; Cox, 2006) and countering the image of higher education as “apart” from the larger community (Anderson & Herr, 1999).

As with our own practice, our candidates are encouraged to apply their knowledge to their professional arenas in ways that contribute the advancement and well-being of the individuals and populations whom they serve. Our discoveries inform not only our fields of study, but also the broader intellectual communities across disciplines (Dumas, 2009). We share our findings in local, state, national, and global arenas through conferences, publications, books, technical reports and public networks. The public networks we create, because of our scholarship of engagement, make available the up-to-date advanced information to the public and assists with dissemination of our scholarship to the communities in need of the information. These opportunities to exchange ideas lead to new insights that we may also integrate into our teaching and continued work with our candidates. Our candidates play a central role in learning about and sharing new knowledge with their professional colleagues and the communities they serve (Ceglowski & Ratanasiripong, 2011) and graduate with an understanding of the civic engagement of our scholarship.

### **Advocacy**

Advocacy can be understood as taking a stand on behalf of others and oneself. By definition, advocacy involves intervening on some level, either in response to an immediate individual or community need, or more systemically through policy formation and implementation (Pillow-Price, 2009; Robinson & Stark, 2002). As a teaching and learning community committed to urban education, we are advocates for the many diverse communities—locally, nationally, and globally—for whom “urban” means home. We also foster this commitment through teaching our students to be advocates for the communities they serve and themselves (Anderson, 2009). More broadly, we also commit ourselves to being fierce advocates for our professions, and for public support of education and human development.

We believe the College’s initiatives and courses should challenge candidates, faculty, and staff to engage in the following: ask critical questions about who has the power to influence the formation and implementation of education policies, pedagogies, and everyday practices (Leonardo, 2004); read broadly about urban policy and politics, economic issues, various communities, youth cultures and subcultures, technology, globalization, and international approaches to social and educational issues; develop institutional structures and processes to facilitate broader, more democratic participation in school and community life (Anderson,

2009); advance equity and social justice privately and publicly, in interactions with educational personnel, policymakers, community leaders, and young people (Bemak & Chung, 2005); and understand education as a dimension of a larger context, which also includes the general health and welfare of the communities we serve.

Practicing advocacy is first and foremost about asking questions and stimulating alternative ways of thinking (Leonardo, 2004). The first stage of advocacy is beginning to see possibilities in the world. The second stage is sharing ideas with trusted colleagues in a familiar environment. The third stage is communicating ideas publicly, which carries significant risk. The public may not be receptive, and advocates must have courage and persistence to stay the course. The fourth stage is one of action and requires a strategy to be successful. Throughout this process, we commit to ongoing reflection on our practice, and engage in dialogue with a broad range of stakeholders, including our candidates, colleagues, other professionals, community members, and the populations we serve.

### **Conceptual Framework Editors and Authors**

#### **Co-editors:**

Corinne Martinez and Laura Portnoi (Co-chairs, Policy and Planning Committee)

#### **Equity, Excellence and Diverse Urban Settings Section Authors:**

Jessica Zacher Pandya and Angela M. Locks

#### **Effective Pedagogy Author:**

Timothy Keirn and Cara Richards-Tutor

#### **Evidence-based Practices Section Authors:**

Cara Richards-Tutor and Joan Theurer

#### **Collaboration Section Authors:**

Nat Hansuvadha and Joan Theurer

#### **Leadership Section Authors:**

Don Haviland and Olga Rubio

#### **Innovation Section Authors:**

Ali Rezaei, Felipe Golez, and Lesley Farmer

#### **Scholarship Section Authors:**

Ruth Piker, Leslie Reese, and Tina Arora

#### **Advocacy Section Authors:**

Michael J. Dumas and Charles Slater

## References

- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2011). *Making excellence inclusive*. Retrieved from [http://www.aacu.org/compass/inclusive\\_excellence.cfm](http://www.aacu.org/compass/inclusive_excellence.cfm)
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, (2011). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved from <http://aacte.org/index.php?/About-Us/Who-We-Are/who-we-are.html>
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2010). *21st century knowledge and skills in educator preparation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- An, S. (2008). Outsiders' view on Chinese mathematics education: A case study on US teachers' teaching experience in China An. *Journal of Mathematics Education*, 1(1), 1-26.
- Anderson, G. L. (2009). *Advocacy leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 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.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Artiles, A., Klingner, J., Sullivan, A., & Fierros, E. (2010). Shifting landscapes of professional practices: English learner special education placement in English-only states. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 102-117). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Barkley, E. F., Cross, P. K., & Major, C. H. (2004) *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. Edison, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 123-137.
- Barth, R. S. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 8-13.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. C. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(3), 196-203.
- Bennis, W., Benne, K., & Chin, R. (1985). *The planning of change*. New York: International Thompson Publishing.
- Berliner, D. (2006). Our impoverished view of school reform. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 949-995.
- Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, T. L., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 73*, 125-230.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Krasner, B. I. (1986). *Between give and take: A clinical guide to contextual therapy*. New York, NY: Burner/Mazel.
- Bowen, W. G., Kurzwell, M. A., Tobin, E., & Pichler, S. (2005). *Equity and excellence in American higher education*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Camarota, S. (2005). *Immigrants at mid-decade: A snapshot of America's foreign-born population in 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.cis.org/articles/2005/back1405.html>
- Campbell, C. A., & Robinson, E. H. (1990). The accountability and research challenge: Training future counselors. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25*, 72-79.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J., & Hernandez, S. H. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind act*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Capps, R., Ku, L., Fix, M., Furgieuele, C., Passel, J., Ramchand, R., McNiven, S., & Perez-Lopez, D. (2002). *How are immigrants faring after welfare reform? Preliminary evidence from Los Angeles and New York City—Final report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Ceglowski, J., & Ratanasiripong, P. (2011, August). *Family influences on body image: The impact of parental relationship and positive male role model*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Washington, DC.
- Center for P-16 Research and Collaboration. (2011). *Scholarship of engagement*. Retrieved November 17, 2011 from <http://p16center.educ.indiana.edu/sites/p16/research/Pages/ScholarshipEngagement.aspx>
- Chavez, L. (1991). *Shadowed lives: Undocumented immigrants in American society*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249-305.
- Cook, B., Tanskersley, M., & Landrum, T. (2009). Determining evidence-based practices in special education. *Exceptional Children, 75*, 365-383.
- Cooper, J. (1990). Cooperative learning and college teaching: Tips from the trenches. *Teaching Professor, 4*(5), 1-2.
- Cox, D. N. (2006). The how and why of the scholarship of engagement In S. Percy, N. Zimpher & M. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1990*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Third annual Brown lecture in education research—The flat earth and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. *Educational Researcher, 36*(6), 318-334.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York, NY: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., LePage, P., Hammerness, K., & Duffy, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Edison, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- De Jong, E., & Harper, C. (2008). ESL is good teaching “plus”: Preparing standard curriculum teachers for all learners. In M. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, culture, and community in teacher*

- education* (pp. 127-148). New York, NY: Routledge for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. *Exceptional Children*, 37, 229-237.
- Dixson, A., & Fasching-Varner, K. (2008). This is how we do it: Helping teachers understand culturally relevant pedagogy in diverse classrooms. In C. Compton-Lilly (Ed.), *Breaking the silence: Recognizing the social and cultural resources students bring to the classroom* (pp. 109-123). Newark, DE: IRA.
- Dolby, N., & Rizvi, F. (2007). *Youth moves: Identities and education in global perspective*. London: Routledge Press.
- Donovan, S., & Bransford, J. (2005). *How students learn: Science in the classroom*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Dumas, M. J. (2009). Theorizing redistribution and recognition in urban education research: How do we get dictionaries at Cleveland? In J. Anyon (Ed.), *Theory and educational research: Toward critical social explanation* (pp. 81-102). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dúran, R. P. (2008). Assessing English-language learners' achievement. *Review of Research in Education*, 32, 292-327. doi: 10.3102/0091732X07309372
- Echeverria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Edwards, O. W., Mumford, V. E., & Serra-Roldan, R. (2007). A positive youth development model for students considered at-risk. *School Psychology International*, 28(1), 29-45.
- Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 701-712.

- Epstein, J. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators for improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ferguson, R. F. (2007). *Toward excellence with equity: An emerging vision for closing the achievement gap*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Forness, S., Kavale, K. A., Blum, I. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (1997). Mega-analysis of meta-analyses: What works in special education and related services. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29*, 4-9.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for School professionals* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Friend, M., & Pope, K. L. (2005). Creating schools in which all students can succeed. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*. Retrieved from <http://www.kdp.org/publications/kdprecord/index.php>
- Fullan, M. G. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Fullan, M. G. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-20.
- Garner, S. (2005). *High-level colloquium on information literacy and lifelong learning*. Alexandria, Egypt: International Federal of Library Associations.
- Gelso, C. J. (1979). Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. *The Counseling Psychologist, 8*, 7-36.
- Gersten, R. (2001). Sorting out the roles of research in the improvement of practice. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16*(1), 45-50.
- Gilbert, D. J., Harvey, A. R., & Belgrave, F. Z. (2009). Advancing the Africentric paradigm shift discourse: Building toward evidence-based Africentric interventions in social work practice with African Americans. *Social Work, 54*(3), 243-252.

- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.
- Glatter, R. (2009). Wisdom and bus schedules: Developing school leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 29*(3), 225-237.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator, 32*(2), 8-44.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gorski, P. (2009). What we are teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 309-318
- Gorski, P. (2010). The scholarship informing the practice: Multicultural teacher education, philosophy and practice in the United States. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 12*(2), 1-22.
- Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Educational equity: Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 6*(2), 106-118.
- Greenbaum, C. W., & Auerback, J. G. (1998). The environment of the child with mental retardation: Risk, vulnerability, and resilience. In J. A. Burack, R. M. Hodapp, & E. Ziger (Eds.), *Handbook of mental retardation and development* (pp. 583-605). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Guralnick, M. J. (1999). Second-generation research in the field of early intervention. In M. Guralnick (Ed.), *The effectiveness of early intervention* (pp. 3-22). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes.

- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.
- Henderson, C., Finkelstein, N., & Beach A. (2010). Beyond dissemination in college science teaching: An introduction to four core change strategies, *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 39(5), 18-25. Retrieved from [wmich.edu/~7Echenders/Publications/HendersonJCST2009ChangeStrategies.pdf](http://www.wmich.edu/~7Echenders/Publications/HendersonJCST2009ChangeStrategies.pdf)
- Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (2003). *The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA). P.L. 108-446, 20, U.S.C. 1400-87.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1994). *Learning together and alone, cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Prentice-Hall.
- Kagan, S. L. (1991) *United we stand: Collaboration for childcare and early education services*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). Critical social theory and transformative knowledge: The functions of criticism in quality education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(6), 11-18.
- Levesque, S. (2009). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Levin, J. R., & O'Donnell, A. M. (1999). What to do about education research's credibility gaps? *Issues in Education, 5*, 177–229.
- Levine, T., & Marcus, A. (2007). Closing the achievement gap through teacher collaboration: Facilitating multiple trajectories of teacher learning. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 19*, 116-138.
- Li, X. (2005). A Tao of narrative: Dynamic splicing of teacher stories. *Curriculum Inquiry, 34*, 339-366.
- Li, X. (2010). Daoism and peace education. In J. Lin & J. P. Miller (Eds.), *Spirituality, religion, and peace education: Integrating our body, mind and soul for inner peace and world peace* (pp. 209-225). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Lightfoot, D. (2004). "Some parents just don't care": Decoding the meanings of parental involvement in urban schools. *Urban Education, 29*(1), 94-107.
- Liu, P., & Qi, C. (2006). Examining teacher preparation programs in P. R., China and the U.S.: A preliminary comparative study. *International Education, 35*(2), 5-26.
- Marzano, R., & Kendall, J. (2006). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- McElroy, M. (2006). *The new knowledge management: Complexity, learning and sustainable innovation*. Boston, MA: Elsevier Science.
- Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morrison, G. M., & Cosden, M. A. (1997). Risk, resilience, and adjustment of individuals with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 20*, 43-60.
- Morse, S., & Ludovina, F. (1999). *Responding to undocumented children in the schools* (ERIC Digest, No. EDO-RC-99-1). Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Murray, C. (2004). Clarifying collaborative roles in urban high schools: General educators' perspectives. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 36*, 44-51.
- NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education.
- Noguera, P. (2008). *The trouble with black boys: And other reflections on race, equity, and the future of public education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. P.L. 107-110.
- Oakes, J., & Saunders, M. (2008). *Beyond tracking: Multiple pathways to college, career, and civic participation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Odom, S., Brantlinger, E., Gersten, R., Horner, R., Thompson, B., & Harris, K. (2005). Research in special education: Scientific methods and evidence-based practices. *Exceptional Children, 71*, 137- 148.
- Pillow-Price, K. L. (2009). Influencing legislation—Advocacy basics. *Dimensions of Early Childhood, 37*(3), 18-23.

- Pincus, T., & Sokka, T. (2006). Evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence. *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology*, 2, 114-115.
- Provenzo, F. E. (Ed.). (2011). *The teacher in American society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ratanasiripong, P., & Rodriguez, A. (2011). Promoting wellness for Thai college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52, 217-223.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Tillman, C. (2010). Collaboration as a site of personal and institutional transformation: Thoughts from inside a cross-national alliance. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 8(1), 3-10.
- Reardon, S. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. M. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Social inequalities and educational disadvantage*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Robinson, A., & Stark, D. R. (2002). *Advocates in action: Making a difference for young children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Robinson, V. (1998). Methodology and the research-practice gap. *Educational Researcher*, 27, 17-26.
- Rodriguez, J. (1997, March). "At-risk": A measure of school failure in American education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Rule, A. C. (2006). The components of authentic learning. *Journal of Authentic Learning*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Simkins, T. (2005). Leadership in education: "What works" or "what makes sense?" *Education Management Administration and Leadership*, 33(1), 9-26.

- Slavin, R. E. (2002). Evidence-based education policies: Transforming educational practice and research. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 15-21.
- Smith, G., Richards-Tutor, C., Cook, B. (2010). Using teacher narratives in the dissemination of research-based practices. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 46, 67-70.
- Spring, J. (2008). *The globalization of education: An introduction*. London: Routledge Press.
- Stromquist, N. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Stormont, M., Espinosa, L., Knipping, N., & McCathren, R. (2003). Supporting vulnerable learners in the primary grades: Strategies to prevent early school failure. Early childhood research and practice: *An internet journal on the development, care, and education of young children*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v5n2/stormont.htm>
- Suarez-Orozco, M. (2007). *Learning in the global era: International perspectives on globalization and education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2009). Educating Latino immigrant students in the twenty-first century: Principles for the Obama administration. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(2), 327-340.
- Suurtamm, C. A. (2004). Developing authentic assessment: Case studies of secondary school mathematics teacher's experiences. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics & Technology Education*, 4(4): 497-513.
- Thelin, J. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409-428.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2010). *UNESCO Science Report 2010: The current status of science around the world*. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Walberg, H. J. (1986). Synthesis of research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 214-229). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Webster, F. (2002). *Theories of the information society* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge Press.
- Weinbaum, A., Allen, D., & Blythe, T. (2004). *Teaching as inquiry: Asking hard questions to improve practice and student achievement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wilhelm, A. (2004). *Digital nation: Toward an inclusive information society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wright, L. L. (2009). Leadership in the swamp: Seeking the potentiality of school improvement through principal reflection. *Reflective Practice*, 10(2), 259-272.
- Xu, S. H. (2010). *Teaching English language learners: Literacy strategies and resources for K-6*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Zetlin, A., Weinberg, L., & Shea, N. M. (2010). Caregivers, school liaisons, and agency advocates speak out about the educational needs of children and youths in foster care. *Social Work*, 55(3), 245-254.
- Zimmerman, J. (2005). *Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools*. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.