

# Professional Education Program Conceptual Framework





## Professional Education Program Conceptual Framework

### 4.1 Vision and Mission

*Stony Brook University's mission seeks to provide "education of the highest quality...to carry out research and intellectual endeavors ...that advance knowledge and have immediate or long range practical significance...[while] celebrating diversity and positioning the University in the global community."*

Stony Brook President Samuel L. Stanley, Jr. (2014)

Stony Brook University, the crown jewel in the SUNY system, is located in Suffolk County on the North Shore of Long Island, about sixty miles east of New York City. The university was established in 1957 as the State University College on Long Island for the preparation of secondary school teachers of mathematics and science. In the early 1960s, Governor Rockefeller and the chancellor and trustees of the State University designated Stony Brook as one of four University Centers and charged it with pursuing national prominence. Stony Brook is the only such research center in the Long Island/New York City metropolitan area, and is the largest single-site employer on Long Island. In 1995, the National Research Council ranked Stony Brook as the leading public research university in the northeast, and the Carnegie Foundation has identified Stony Brook as one of the nation's seventy leading research institutions. The Rise of American Research Universities ranked Stony Brook right after the University of California at Berkeley as one of the best public institutions of higher learning in the United States (Graham and Diamond, 1997).

Since its founding, the university has consistently grown in quality, intellectual breadth and stature, and it is now a world-class research university comparable to the flagship campuses of major state universities across the country. Stony Brook University is ranked one of the top 100 universities in the nation and one of the top 40 public universities by *U.S. News & World Report* and is included on their list of notable programs for undergraduate research/creative projects. In 2013, Princeton Review

named Stony Brook University as one of the best value colleges and praised the University for combining “affordability and excellence with academic prestige.”

Stony Brook is a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities (AAU) the invitation-only organization of the 62 best research universities in North America. Funding for Stony Brook's research programs has grown faster than at almost any other university, making it the major research campus in the SUNY system. As a highly regarded comprehensive Research I university, Stony Brook is recognized as one of the leading public universities in the United States with several of its departments, including Mathematics and Physics (which are home to several of our programs) consistently ranked among the most distinguished programs in their disciplines

Stony Brook is one of 10 universities given a National Science Foundation recognition award for integrating research and education. Its dramatic growth has enabled Stony Brook to consistently offer outstanding instructional programs in a broad spectrum of academic subjects. It has secured considerable outside funding to integrate research into undergraduate teaching/learning programs and its internationally renowned faculty members teach courses from the undergraduate to the doctoral level.

Stony Brook University reflects the diversity of its surrounding community. Suffolk County has experienced a dramatic growth in its linguistically and culturally diverse population and has become a microcosm of the growing diversity across the country. It has the largest Hispanic population in the state, outside of New York City, and its Asian population has more than tripled in recent decades. The population of English Language Learners has also increased dramatically across Long Island's 127 school districts making Suffolk County second in the country as a destination for incoming migrant students.

The University draws many of its students from the surrounding area and serves a highly diverse student body. In the fall of 2013, 6% of University students identified themselves as African American, 19% Asian American, and 9% Hispanic. 16% of the students are international representing 109 countries in the student body.

The mission that has guided the University during this period of growth has been to:

- Provide comprehensive undergraduate, graduate, and professional education of the highest quality;
- Carry out research and intellectual endeavors of the highest international standards that advance theoretical knowledge and are of immediate and long-range practical significance;

- Provide leadership for economic growth, technology, and culture for neighboring communities and the wider geographic region;
- Provide state-of-the-art innovative health care, while serving as a resource to a regional health care network and to the traditionally under-served;
- Fulfill these objectives while celebrating diversity and positioning the University in the global community.

### **The Stony Brook University Paradigm for Teacher Education**

As part of this strategic plan, Stony Brook has re-committed increased funding and resources to its original mission of teacher preparation. Stony Brook University's paradigm for teacher education and educational leadership diverges from that found in most other institutions. Its uniqueness and strength are inherent in its university-wide, distributed model that places its teacher education and educational leadership programs in their respective academic departments. This departmentally-based model ensures academic rigor in the discipline, the integration of pedagogical theory and practice, and close contact to faculty and research opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students, as proposed in the Boyer Commission Report on recommended enhancements in undergraduate programs located at Carnegie Category I Research Universities (Boyer, 1998). Education faculty appointments within their respective academic departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences provide fertile academic environments for research and scholarship. Faculty and teacher candidates engage in a range of department-based experiences that include research-based learning, scholarly investigations, broad use of technology and multimedia, and professional development activities with both colleagues and peers. Along with the pursuit of research and scholarship is participation in opportunities for campus and community collaborations, outreach and authentic experiences that encourage data collecting, observation and reflection.

Education faculty are also members of the Professional Education Program (PEP), which was established to coordinate the Stony Brook teacher education and educational leadership programs and to promote academic, professional, scholarly and intellectual excellence in the preparation of P-12 professionals.

PEP's purpose is to bring together the diverse educational units on our campus, each one a part of an academic department, and form them into a coherent unit with common principles, goals, outcomes and assessments. PEP promotes cross-disciplinary discourse, curriculum development, and collaborations bringing faculty and teacher candidates together for joint exploration of shared concerns, goals and visions

as well as encouraging the creation of innovative programs and workshops. PEP provides a forum for faculty to broaden the diverse disciplinary and pedagogical perspectives of their programs, and it creates opportunities for the cross-fertilization of pedagogic ideas and practices for both faculty and their teacher candidates.

The PEP paradigm for teacher education and educational leadership provides a framework that promotes professional excellence and growth for faculty and teacher candidates, fosters diverse disciplinary perspectives and learning communities, and cultivates lifelong inquiry and learning, leadership, and professional service. Each teacher education program brings forth its own unique disciplinary perspectives and approaches into PEP for joint research and investigation of shared concerns for teacher candidates and alumni. Our paradigm strengthens the integration of disciplinary content and pedagogy within and across departments. It enhances appreciation of diverse academic perspectives, and it strengthens collaborative partnerships on campus, in the community and with other higher education institutions. This is the context that drives our conceptual framework and our goals in building a united, yet inherently diverse, professional community that includes faculty, teacher candidates, alumni, educational personnel and P-12 students in partnering schools. PEP provides a unifying vision and philosophy; it fosters a cohesive approach to research-based curriculum design and assessment; and it ensures unified programs for fieldwork and clinical practice.

Our goal is to become a global leader in the professional development of educators by creating diverse learning environments that underscore the symbiosis of research, teaching, life-long learning, community service, and leadership. PEP's vision is rooted in three major themes that are deeply embedded within our practices and provide the principles that outline our structure. They provide the bases for our pedagogical research; they guide our reflective practices; and they support our partnerships, both within the university and within the broader community. Our three themes are:

**Professional Excellence and Growth:** Candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions essential for a successful career in the field of education. These skills include, but are not limited to, mastery of subject matter and pedagogical theory, instructional design and assessment, approaches for motivating learners, inquiry, reflective practice, leadership, classroom management strategies, and, for our leadership candidates, the ability to design and implement a strategic vision that involves all stakeholders in creating a positive learning environment in which all students can achieve their potential.

**Community and Diversity:** Candidates learn that students construct knowledge in a myriad of individual ways that are influenced by such factors as ability,

ethnicity, social environment of home and school, primary language, and gender. It is important for candidates to learn to recognize such individual student differences and adapt their instruction and strategic vision to individual student needs and to do so in a variety of diverse communities and classroom settings.

**Leadership and Service:** Candidates develop qualities that prepare them for further professional development and leadership roles in the school, profession, and community, where they will serve and act as advocates for all students. Faculty model professionalism and leadership by professional growth opportunities for students, teachers and other educational professionals.

PEP's vision has emerged from collaboration across disciplines through a meeting of minds, diverse academic perspectives, and cumulative professional expertise and experience. It encapsulates the diverse perspectives that forge our professional community and delineates our shared vision and goals that drive our practices at Stony Brook University. Our vision incorporates the knowledge and experience of our colleagues in P-12 schools, our alumni, and our candidates across disciplines.

To realize our vision, we have identified a number of concrete mission objectives:

- Provide discipline-based professional education of the highest quality for undergraduate and graduate teacher and leadership candidates.
- Integrate research and theories of the disciplines with diverse field experiences, and create educators who will continue to grow and synergistically combine evolving expert knowledge with pedagogy that exceeds state, national, and professional standards.
- Integrate diversity into the academic and clinical experiences to enhance the continuous cross fertilization of ideas.
- Build and strengthen partnerships within the University and with the regional community.
- Provide leadership and professional development for the educational community of the region and beyond.

### **Crafting and Aligning our Conceptual Framework**

*It is reasonable to expect teachers to be responsible stewards of the schools in which they teach. They and they alone are in a position to make sure that programs and structures do not atrophy—that they evolve over time as a result of reflection, dialogue, actions, and continuing evaluation of actions. Teachers*

*are to schools as gardeners are to gardens—tenders not only of the plants but of the soil in which they grow.*

(Goodlad, 1990, p. 44).

Our conceptual framework reflects Stony Brook’s diverse disciplinary and pedagogical perspectives. It represents a joint exploration of our shared concerns, goals, and visions. This document was crafted and has evolved through cross-disciplinary discourse and communication among Stony Brook faculty and stakeholders, including candidates, alumni, P-12 administrators and teachers. These meetings generated numerous discussions that also included our steering committees, task forces, PEP Advisory Board, faculty meetings, cooperating teachers and administrators, and candidates. Ideas, input, and the cumulative experiences of all involved have been integrated and are interwoven within this document. This conceptual framework was developed to guide our instruction and curricular reforms, and it will continue to evolve as we move towards the realization of our vision.

This conceptual framework is grounded in current research in pedagogy and in the disciplines. It is aligned with Stony Brook’s institutional mission, and New York State learning standards and Code of Ethics, as well as with the national standards established by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the benchmarks of the Association for Teacher Educators, and the disciplinary standards established by the relevant SPAs.

## **4.2 Philosophy, Purposes and Goals**

*Here you will find a place where students and professors work together to answer questions and solve problems that are facing the world today...where collaborations across academic disciplines...create discoveries that change lives.*

Stony Brook President Samuel L. Stanley Jr. MD, (January 2, 2015)

Our philosophy stems from the realization that the vision that educators instill in their students emanates from their own educational experiences and that this occurs at all levels. We believe that education is a continuing process and that educators must continue their own growth and education throughout their lives.

PEP's purpose is to ensure that Stony Brook University does an excellent job in all of its programs of preparing teacher education and educational leadership candidates for their careers.

In very broad outline, we see our three themes as the foundation on which we have built our pedagogical structure. We have identified three important pathways through which to realize each of these themes: research, reflection and partnership. We believe that educational practice must be informed by research, which is an ongoing process, with ever-changing results and ideas. We believe that educators at every level must be aware of their own selves, their own actions, their own thoughts, and must have the capacity to reflect on their own attitudes. And we believe that educators must be aware of the diversity, including but not limited to diverse populations regarding ability, culture, social, economic, and linguistic, backgrounds and styles of learning and take the lead in helping each of their students to find his or her own path of learning.

### **4.3 Knowledge Bases**

In "The Child and the Curriculum," John Dewey argued that the apparent antinomy between students and the curriculum--that is, between the natural interests and motivations of the student and the conceptual structures of the academic disciplines--could be resolved by translating them back into the lived experience from which these bodies of systematic knowledge had been abstracted in the course of human civilization. The aim of education was to enable students to recapitulate, and thereby to make their own, the cultural and intellectual labors that constituted the true history of the human species. The role of the teacher in this process was to design learning situations in which these structured learning outcomes would appear as--and where they would, in fact, become--the natural, unforced development of the innate capacities of the student, rather than lifeless intellectual constructs forced upon students who could not translate them back into their own lived experience (Dewey, 1964).

The challenge, though, is putting this idea into practice. Although students may well have what Eleanor Duckworth (1996) has dubbed "wonderful ideas" and be the "natural learners" described by Howard Gardner (1991), to pull off the delicate pedagogical balancing act described by Dewey without stifling this natural interest and curiosity, teachers must have, Dewey argued, deep knowledge not only of child and adolescent development and learning theory, but also of the fundamental concepts of the academic disciplines. Only such knowledge would, he insisted, put teachers in a position where they could anticipatorily intuit how the abstract ideas that give these bodies of thought their intellectual autonomy are latently contained, if only in a naïve,



unschooled manner, in children's expressions and thus put them in a position to create learning situations that would guide them through the infinitely complex chain of intermediate experiences and reflections through which they could then "construct" this knowledge as their own.

The history of educational theory in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has to a large degree been dominated by the search for a generic science of learning (Shulman & Quinlan, 1996). However, Lee Shulman (1986, 1987) has convincingly argued that learning takes place in essentially discipline-specific ways and that successful teaching depends on what he calls "pedagogical content knowledge," that is, the knowledge--itself grounded in a deep understanding of the conceptual field of a discipline--of the ways in which disciplinary knowledge is constructed and the practical ability to apply this knowledge to create motivations and situations that will result in the construction of discipline-specific theories, principles and concepts. This pedagogical content knowledge "lies at the intersection of content and pedagogy, in the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by students" (Shulman, 1987, 15). It embodies, Shulman continues, the aspects of content most germane to its teachability. Within the category of pedagogical content knowledge I include, for the most regularly taught topics in one's subject area, the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations - in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others . . . [It] also includes an understanding of what makes the learning of specific concepts easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them to the learning (Shulman, 1986, 9).

Shulman's ideas concerning the problems involved in achieving such a synthesis of content and pedagogical knowledge, and the benefits to be derived therefrom, have inspired a great deal of research that informs the pedagogical instruction in all of our programs (Grennon Brooks and Brooks, 1983; Fosnot, ed., 1996; National Research Council, 2005; Phillips, ed., 2000; Wineburg, 2001; Social Education, 1998; Ball, 1988; Hill, Rowan and Ball, 2005; Richardson 2003).

Building on these insights, our programs are committed in a broad, undogmatic sense to a constructivist approach to teaching and learning. This philosophy has been influenced by the work of a number of seminal thinkers, including Dewey (1916, 1964), Jean Piaget (1954, 1967, 1970), Lev Vygotsky (1962, 1970; Kozulin, et al., 2003; Moll, ed., 1990; Tharp and Gallimore, 1988), and Jerome Bruner (Bruner, 1960). However, the theories of cognitive and moral development that underlie the work of the latter three authors need to be qualified or expanded in two important ways.

In addition to our ongoing efforts to make our students aware of the theoretical foundations of classroom practice, this broad commitment to a constructivist pedagogy also impacts our instruction in a variety of specific ways. Our students learn to be attentive to the naïve reasoning of P-12 students and to be on the lookout for common misconceptions whose identification can serve as the springboard for exploring the basic principles of the discipline (Gardner, 1999). Facilitating this construction of disciplinary knowledge (and the reflection that enables learners to make what Dewey called the move from the psychological to the logical perspective) requires that our students learn to “teach for understanding” (Wiske, ed., 1998; Perkins, 1992; Gardner, 1999) and to organize their instruction using “essential questions” which address the same existential issues as the disciplines themselves and whose answers presuppose the ability to apply the fundamental concepts of the discipline (Sizer, 1996; Simon, 2002; Wiggins & McTighe, 1998).

The challenge, though, is connecting these intellectually sophisticated learning goals to the interests and abilities of the student. In “The School and Society” Dewey argued that this problem emerged with the separation of schooling from the practical life of the home, occupation and community that followed in the wake of the industrial revolution. In an earlier age children had had an intrinsic interest in learning because learning involved doing things and solving real problems that were immediately relevant to their lives. However, the development of formal schooling and the attendant abstraction of schooling from life had, Dewey argued, cut children off from this vital source of interest and motivation and forced the schools towards ever more artificial pedagogical and curricular tactics that were intrinsically incapable of connecting schooling with life. “No number of object-lessons, got up as object-lessons for the sake of giving information,” he argued, “can afford even the shadow of a substitute for acquaintance with the plants and animals of the farm and garden acquired through actual living among them and caring for them....[Such exercises are] somewhat remote and shadowy compared with the training of attention and judgment that is acquired in having to do things with a real motive behind and a real outcome ahead” (Dewey, 1964, 298-99).

Dewey’s argument here that intellectually sophisticated, intrinsically relevant learning presupposes forms of instruction and assessment that are quite different from those traditionally encountered in the schools has recently been rediscovered and popularized under the rubric of “authentic” instruction and assessment (Newman, Secada and Wehlage, 1995; Newman and Associates, 1996; Newman, Marks, and Gamorage, 1996; Sizer, 1996; Wiggins, 1998; Wiggins and McTighe, 1998), and these ideas have become another of the theoretical pillars of our program.

But the fact that the construction of knowledge is an essentially creative, dialogical act (Freire, 2000; Vygotsky, 1980) has a number of implications for our curriculum and teaching. We model, and thereby communicate the importance of, cooperative learning as an instructional strategy that creates the environment for learning in which students are required to engage in spirited, value-laden, socially-relevant discussion that requires them to define and defend the terms of their arguments, rather than to simply recall or apply ready-made information, while developing the social skills and dispositions on which such discussions--and citizenship and sociability more generally--depend (Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec, 1993; Slavin, 1991; Stahl, 1994). While this kind of dialogical activity also reinforces the importance of reflection (and of the importance of reflection for the continuing professional growth of our students), the need to develop the degree of mutual respect and tolerance on which such activity depends also has important implications for the philosophy of class management and discipline that we seek to model for our students (Rodgers, 2002).

In addition, teachers must also have a comprehensive knowledge base regarding students with exceptionalities and special needs. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 both require that schools provide a free and appropriate public education for students with disabilities. People with disabilities comprise approximately 18% of the U.S. general population, and it is critical that young people with physical or other disabilities have access to a quality education in the least restrictive environment. Despite this legislation, however, some schools, while abiding perhaps by the letter of the law but not its spirit, continue to stigmatize students with disabilities. Some teachers still hold low expectations for these students, and/or do not treat them as “normal,” thus truncating their learning. As some disability studies scholars argue (Groce, 1985; Davis, 1997; Linton, 1998; Bérubé, 1996) “disability” is to some extent a social phenomenon, with barriers to buildings (and to learning) a constructed feature of society rather than the “fault” of an individual. We work to make our students understand that classrooms and lessons must be designed in ways that do not exclude any member of the learning community. While we emphasize the importance of differentiated instruction (Tomlinson, 2000) in facilitating access to higher-order learning for all students, we also make our own students aware that they must continue to expand their knowledge base regarding disability law and be sensitive to the role teacher assumptions play in student learning. To this end, our core education and foundation classes, including human development, literacy, and special education classes, as well as pedagogy across the disciplines courses all address issues and strategies in this area.

A closely related issue is the problem of language acquisition and teaching English language learners. Similar to the rules governing the education of students with disabilities, New York State Education law mandates schools to provide a free, quality

education for English Language Learners regardless of their language abilities or their immigration status (NYS 2014). Designing powerful instruction also requires an understanding of the myriad factors that influence the acquisition of literacy. While traditionally literacy has been viewed as an autonomous, decontextualized process in which individual learners acquire skills that enable them to read and write proficiently, current scholarship places greater emphasis on the ways that the context and use impact language acquisition (Kucer, 2005). Literacy cannot be separated from the ways of thinking, believing, feeling, and acting expected by particular communities, and an important aspect of our students' knowledge base is understanding that school-based literacy is only one form among many (Gee, 2001). In particular, teachers must have a clear comprehension of academic language and literacy expectations, how these expectations differ from discipline to discipline, and how academic literacy can be taught in an additive manner so that secondary students do not experience education in a context in which their home literacies are devalued (Schleppegrell, 2004).

Issues of literacy acquisition are particularly critical when English Language Learners (ELLs) are considered. ELLs constitute a rapidly-growing population in U.S. public schools (especially in recent years, given the enormous influx of immigrants from Central and South America, and Asia) and understanding the nature of second language acquisition is a critical knowledge base for our students. Research suggests that the acquisition of academic literacy for ELLs can take from four to seven years (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). During this extended period, ELLs face challenges in the form of poverty, racism, limited access to English even in public school settings, underprepared teachers, and tracking, which current research suggests is a stronger predictor of academic attainment than language proficiency (Callahan, 2005; Olneck, 2004; Sharkey & Layzer, 2000). An important aspect of the knowledge base our students develop, then, is awareness of how ELLs fare in U.S. public schools and how instruction can be adapted to better serve them.

Educational technologies today have become increasingly diverse, going way beyond PowerPoint presentations and SmartBoards to support a wide variety of teaching strategies corresponding to differing learning styles and abilities (Smaldino, Lowther, & Russell, 2007; Abbott, 2007; Smith and Throne, 2008; Abshire et al, 2014). Over the past decade, technology has become increasingly ubiquitous in our society, with a majority of people comfortably using Smart phones, tablets, or other devices with instant access to interactive web-based social media platforms and applications such as Wordpress, Padlet, Jing, Wordle, Audacity, Instagram, Twitter, etc. Today's P-12 students, who are growing up surrounded by technology, no longer see such devices as novelties. In fact, they are surprised when they are not used in the classroom (Warletta, Lee, & Caplovitz, 2002; Oblinger, 2005), and one of our main goals in this

domain is to provide students with the opportunity to learn how to use the relevant technologies to enhance student learning (Adcock, 2008) and to create interactive educational environments in which students "develop technology-enriched learning environments that enable all students to pursue their individual curiosities and become active participants" in their own learning (ISTE Standards for Teachers, 2008). Today, students are not merely consumers, but creators of texts, images, blogs, and programs, which are often published to the web. Also, computer games can help students to understand the language, culture, and underlying concepts of a particular subject by immersing them in their roles (Gee, 2003; Shaffer, 2007). Our goals include helping students "navigate the benefits and pitfalls of a networked world" (Hicks and Turner, 2013, p. 64).

However, while knowledge of learning theory, learning styles, literacy and technology is important, understanding student individuality has another, equally important dimension. Schools are social institutions that are much more than the sum of their individual students, and success at the individual level in the classroom depends on teaching our students to understand how broader social forces shape individual student learning. These are the issues that normally fall under the heading of the history and sociology of education.

The basic issue here is to teach our students to understand both the changing conceptions of equality of educational opportunity as it has evolved in relation to race/ethnicity, language, gender, and handicap and the sometimes unintended, though always highly politicized, consequences of measures designed to ensure greater equality of educational opportunity--and, in recent years, of educational outcomes (Coleman, 1968; Jencks et al., 1972; Teachers College Record, 2005; Nelson, 2005; Ravitch, 1983). To be able to reason intelligently about these matters, students have to have a firm knowledge of how contemporary schools--with all of their promise and problems--have evolved historically through the interaction of social thought and social change (Tyack, 1974; Cuban & Tyack, 1995; Cremin, 1961; Ravitch, 1983, 2001; Fass, 1989; Angus & Mirel, 1999; Katz, 1971). But they also have to understand how contemporary debates over school reform are framed by both particular readings of this history and by philosophical differences over the aims of education and the nature of authority in the pedagogical domain (Labaree, 1997; Guttman, 1987/1997; Berliner, 1997, 2006; Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Apple, 2000, 2004, 2006).

Over the past decade increased attention has been focused upon the "achievement gap" (Jenks & Phillips, eds., 1998; Peterson, ed., 2006; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003) between white and minority students and the potential role of the No Child Left Behind Act in reducing these differences. We expect our students to be aware of the debate over the role of education in promoting social equality and ensuring the

reproduction of existing social inequalities (Bourdieu, 2000). The impact of class on schooling and social reproduction, i.e. the question of “how working-class kids get working-class jobs,” has long been the subject of scholarly analysis (Anyon, 1980; Willis, 1977; Dolby & Dimitriadis, 2004; Bettie, 2002; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Kozol, 1991). However, the problem of educational inequality cannot be reduced to a question of class, and there is also a growing body of literature that focuses on patterns of over- and underachievement among minority youth. This work focuses primarily on the diverse factors—including home environment, generational experience, English language competence, attitudes towards heritage language and culture, assimilation and the historical memory of the group—that are believed to be the cause of the alienation of these students from the schools, their academic underachievement, and their resulting “at-risk” behaviors, though it also includes works that ask why certain “model” minorities identify so strongly with schooling and assimilation and why they experience what is regarded as disproportionate academic success (Nieto, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999; Ogbu, 2003; Fordham, 1996; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; McNamara & O’Connor, eds., 2006; Lee, 2005; Lee, 1996; Staiger, 2006; Louie, 2004; McLeod, 1995; Morris, 2005).

Our faculty draw on this literature to help our students develop a more “culturally responsive” approach to teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Noddings, 2003; Gay, 2000, 2003; Nieto, 2005; Delpit, 1995) that will improve student learning by transforming “subtractive schooling” into something more “additive” or synergistic (Valenzuela, 1999). But our teaching has also been inspired by the work of Paulo Freire (Freire, 2000; Darder, 2002; McLaren and Lankshear, eds., 1994). The most important insight of the critical pedagogy that has developed out of Freire’s work is its claim that student alienation and academic underachievement are the more or less predictable results of the class, race, ethnic, and gender discrimination that they see as endemic in American society, and they draw on Freire’s theory of praxis to argue that, by transforming schools from mechanisms of social reproduction into engines for social reconstruction, critical pedagogy can overcome this alienation and thus enhance both the educational opportunity, the educational achievement, and the social advancement and equality of these disadvantaged groups (Darder et al., eds., 2002; McLaren, 1997; Giroux, 1992; Gutstein, 2006; hooks, 1994). But we also teach our students to consider the more specifically school-based sources of unequal educational outcomes, especially tracking (Oakes, 2005; Oakes, Wells and Jones, 1997; Burriss and Welner, 2005; Hallinan, 1996; Lucas 1999; Yonezawa, Wells and Sema, 2002; Loveless, 1999).

Lastly, if we expect our students to become informed advocates who can work effectively with all of the relevant stakeholders to improve the schools, then they have to understand both the assumptions underlying contemporary educational reform proposals and their potential impact on both students and their own professional

practice. These include not only the debates over school choice, charter schools and privatization, and the impact of the NCLB (Nichols & Berliner, 2007; Sadovnik, et al., eds., 2007; Fuller & Elmore, eds, 1996; Wolfe, ed., 2003; Chubb and Moe, 1990; Darder, 2005; Hess & Finn, 2004; American Educator, 2005; Rebell & Wolff, 2008; Gamoran, 2007; and Sunderman, 2005), but also the work of reform efforts, such as the Coalition for Essential Schools (Sizer, 1996) and the Central Park East Secondary School (Meier, 1995), whose approach to teaching, learning and educational reform is based on very different principles than the current rhetoric of standards and accountability.

There is a strong correlation between student achievement and effective school leadership (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005), and the central goal of our educational leadership programs is to help their students acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to translate into practice the vision of effective teaching described above. In order for educational leaders to function as “chief learning officers” (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001), not only do they need to master the four key roles of effective administrators: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Effective leadership also involves learning how to align curriculum and instruction to facilitate student learning, structure professional development and facilitate collaboration among teachers, and use research to make decisions (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1995; Blasé & Blasé, 1999).

As research has shown, the greatest challenge in achieving these goals is learning to inspire and manage change (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Capasso & Daresh, 2001; Reeves, 2006), and one of the main goals of our educational leadership programs is to train educational leaders who are able to engage all stakeholders while transforming their organizations in ways that will better meet the changing needs of students. We emphasize, on the one hand, the centrality of human resources and the need to develop moral purpose, strong relationships, a commitment to knowledge sharing, and the ability to connect new knowledge with existing knowledge while at the same time providing a supportive environment for risk taking (Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002). On the other hand, we also try to make our students aware that these goals cannot be achieved unless they take a broad, systemic view of the school and its environment (Senge, 1990). But successful educational leadership also depends on other factors, such as establishing culture for learning, effective communication, developing internal and external partnerships, mobilizing resources, and demonstrating ethical behavior, as well as developing a participatory or distributed leadership strategy (Schlechty, 1990; Andrews & Grogan, 2002; Elmore, 2000; Lashway, 2002; Crow & Glascock, 1995) to mobilize the energies and capacities of all members of the organization. The question, though, is how best to achieve these educational goals, and, like our teacher education programs, our

educational leadership programs are committed to a problem-based approach that uses real data in real-life settings to help students develop the knowledge and skills needed to become effective school leaders (New York State Board of Regents, 2003; Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2001; Capasso & Daresh, 2001; Morgan, Hertzog & Gibbs, 2002; Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001; Bartell, 1994; Hoachlander, Alt & Beltranena, 2001).

#### **4.4 Candidate Proficiencies**

*The educator, believing in the worth and dignity of each human being, recognizes the supreme importance of the pursuit of truth, devotion to excellence, and the nurture of the democratic principles. Essential to these goals is the protection of freedom to learn and to teach, and the guarantee of equal educational opportunity for all. The educator accepts the responsibility to adhere to the highest ethical standards.*

Preamble to the Code of Ethics of the Education  
Profession, National Education Association (1975)

An essential precondition for achieving our mission is to translate our vision into concrete measures or standards that can be used to inform our instruction and assess the achievements of our candidates and the effectiveness of our programs. However, to successfully operationalize these abstract principles, it is necessary to individualize them and adapt them to the specific needs of our candidates. PEP is divided into two broad sub-units—the one relating to teacher education, the other relating to the education of educational leaders and administrators—and we have developed two roughly parallel sets of candidate proficiencies that express a shared vision, but that do so in a way appropriate to the needs of each group. The teacher education candidate proficiencies are closely aligned with the Model Core Teaching Standards (2011) of the Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (InTASC).

The aim of our teacher education programs is to prepare candidates who:

1. Understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
2. Understand the individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.



3. Work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
4. Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) s/he teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
5. Understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
6. Understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
7. Plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
8. Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
9. Engage in ongoing professional learning and use evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the learning community), and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.
10. Seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth and to advance the profession.

The aim of our educational leadership programs is to produce candidates who:

1. Develop and demonstrate the skills needed to work with a board of education to facilitate the development of a vision of learning for a school district that promotes the success of all students.
2. Demonstrate the ability to plan programs to motivate staff, students, and families to achieve a school districts vision.
3. Demonstrate the ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders within the district and the larger community concerning implementation and realization of the vision.

4. Develop a sustained approach to improve and maintain a positive district culture for learning that capitalizes on multiple aspects of diversity to meet the learning needs of all students.
5. Demonstrate an ability to assist school and district personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning.
6. Collaborate with families and other community members.
7. Respond to community interests and needs.
8. Demonstrate a respect for rights of others with regard to confidentiality and dignity and engage in honest interactions.
9. Demonstrate the ability to combine impartiality, sensitivity to student diversity, and ethical considerations with their interactions with others.
10. Make and explain decisions based upon ethical and legal principles.
11. Espouse positions in response to proposed policy changes that would benefit or harm districts and explain how policies and laws might improve educational and social opportunities for specific communities.

Both sets of proficiencies are aligned with the PEP and Stony Brook University missions, the PEP themes, New York State standards, INTASC, NBPTS, ELCC, and ISLLC standards (respectively), as can be seen in the following table:

### Alignment of PEP Themes, Candidate Proficiencies, and National Standards

PEP Themes	PEP Teacher Candidate Proficiencies (Abbreviated) (InTASC Standards)	NBPTS Core Propositions	PEP Education Leadership Candidate Proficiencies	ELCC Standards	ISLCC STANDARDS
<b>Professional Excellence And Growth</b>	<p><b>1.</b> Understand how learners grow and develop</p> <p><b>3.</b> Work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning</p> <p><b>4.</b> Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s)</p> <p><b>5.</b> Understand how to connect concepts and use</p>	<p><b>Proposition 1</b> Teachers are committed to students and their learning</p> <p><b>Proposition 2</b> Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students</p> <p><b>Proposition 3</b> Teachers are responsible for managing</p>	<p><b>1.</b> Develop and demonstrate the skills needed to work with a board of education to facilitate the development of a vision of learning for a school district that promotes the success of all students.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Demonstrate the ability to plan programs to motivate staff, students, and families, to achieve a school districts</p>	<p><b>1.1.</b>Develop a vision</p> <p><b>1.2.</b>Articulate a vision</p> <p><b>1.3.</b>Implement a vision</p> <p><b>1.4.</b>Steward a vision</p> <p><b>1.5.</b>Promote community involvement in vision</p> <p><b>2.2.</b>Provide effective instructional program</p> <p><b>2.3.</b>Apply best practice to student learning</p>	<p><b>1A.</b> Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission.</p> <p><b>1B.</b> Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning.</p> <p><b>1C.</b> Create and implement plans to achieve goals.</p> <p><b>1D.</b> Promote continuous and sustainable improvement.</p> <p><b>1E.</b> Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans.</p> <p><b>2B.</b> Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program.</p> <p><b>2D.</b> Supervise instruction.</p> <p><b>2E.</b> Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress.</p>

	<p>differing perspectives to engage</p> <p><b>6.</b> Understand and use multiple methods of assessment</p> <p><b>7.</b> Plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals</p> <p><b>8.</b> Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies</p> <p><b>9.</b> Engage in ongoing professional learning and use evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice</p>	<p>and monitoring student learning.</p> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <p><b>4</b> Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from their experience</p>	<p>vision.</p> <p><b>3.</b> Demonstrate the ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders within the district and the larger community concerning implementation and realization of the vision.</p> <p><b>5.</b> Demonstrate an ability to assist school and district personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning.</p>	<p><b>2.4.</b> Design comprehensive professional growth plans</p> <p><b>3.1.</b> Manage the organization</p> <p><b>3.2.</b> Manage operations</p> <p><b>3.3.</b> Manage resources</p> <p><b>6.1.</b> Understand the larger context</p> <p><b>6.2.</b> Respond to the larger context</p> <p><b>6.3.</b> Influence larger context</p>	<p><b>2G.</b> Maximize time spent on quality instruction.</p> <p><b>2H.</b> Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning.</p> <p><b>2I.</b> Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program.</p> <p><b>3A.</b> Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems.</p> <p><b>3B.</b> Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources.</p> <p><b>3E.</b> Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.</p> <p><b>4A.</b> Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment.</p> <p><b>6B.</b> Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning.</p>
<b>Community and Diversity</b>	<p><b>2.</b> Understand the individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments</p> <p><b>6.</b> Understand and use multiple methods of assessment</p> <p><b>7.</b> Plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals</p> <p><b>9.</b> Engage in ongoing professional learning and use evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice</p>	<p><b>Proposition</b></p> <p><b>5</b> Teachers are members of learning communities</p>	<p><b>6.</b> Collaborate with families and other community members.</p> <p><b>7.</b> Respond to community interests and needs.</p> <p><b>9.</b> Demonstrate the ability to combine impartiality sensitivity to student diversity and ethical considerations with their interactions with others.</p>	<p><b>4.1.</b> Collaborate with families and other community members</p> <p><b>4.2.</b> Respond to community interests and needs</p> <p><b>4.2.</b> Mobilize community resources</p>	<p><b>4B.</b> Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources.</p> <p><b>4C.</b> Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers.</p> <p><b>4D.</b> Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners.</p> <p><b>6A.</b> Advocate for children, families, and caregivers.</p>
<b>Leadership and Service</b>	<p><b>9.</b> Engage in ongoing professional learning and use evidence to continually evaluate his/her</p>	<p><b>Proposition</b></p> <p><b>5</b> Teachers are members of learning communities</p>	<p><b>4.</b> Develop a sustained approach to improve and maintain a positive district culture for learning that capitalizes on</p>	<p><b>2.1.</b> Promote positive school culture</p> <p><b>5.1.</b> Acts with integrity</p> <p><b>5.2.</b> Acts fairly</p>	<p><b>2A.</b> Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations.</p> <p><b>2C.</b> Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students.</p> <p><b>2F.</b> Develop the instructional and</p>

	<p>practice</p> <p><b>10.</b> Seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning</p>		<p>multiple aspects of diversity to meet the learning needs of all students.</p> <p><b>8.</b> Demonstrate a respect for rights of others with regard to confidentiality and dignity and engage in honest interactions.</p> <p><b>10.</b> Make and explain decisions based upon ethical and legal principles.</p> <p><b>11.</b> Espouse positions in response to proposed policy changes that would benefit or harm districts and explain how policies and laws might improve educational and social opportunities for specific communities.</p>		<p>leadership capacity of staff.</p> <p><b>3C.</b> Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff.</p> <p><b>3D.</b> Develop the capacity for distributed leadership.</p> <p><b>5A.</b> Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.</p> <p><b>5B.</b> Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior.</p> <p><b>5C.</b> Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity.</p> <p><b>5D.</b> Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making.</p> <p><b>5E.</b> Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.</p> <p><b>6C.</b> Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--

## 4.5 Description of the System for Assessing Candidate Proficiencies

The PEP assessment system has evolved in conjunction with the drafting of our conceptual framework and the formulation of our candidate proficiencies.

Our assessment system serves multiple interrelated purposes. It is designed to:

1. Ensure that candidates admitted to our programs meet minimum standards necessary both for their own success and for the success of their future students;
2. Assess candidate learning analytically with respect to the individual candidate proficiencies and provide a holistic assessment of the teacher candidate's growth and development as he or she progresses through the program;
3. Integrate assessment and instruction so as to provide candidates with ongoing feedback to facilitate their own learning;
4. Provide candidates with multiple opportunities and modes of demonstrating the requisite proficiencies and with clearly defined criteria to guide their efforts;

5. Ensure the quality of candidate performance by requiring them to meet prescribed levels of proficiency at established gates in order to remain in good standing and to progress through the program;
6. Measure candidate impact on student learning
7. Ensure that program graduates who are recommended for certification meet or exceed all relevant unit, state, and professional standards;
8. Provide data that can be used for the continuous evaluation and improvement of program structure, faculty performance, and assessment system design.

Our system of candidate assessment is driven by our candidate proficiencies, which are described in Section 4.4. These proficiencies reflect PEP's educational philosophy and define the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that we believe prospective teachers and educational leaders must demonstrate. With respect to candidate assessment, our basic goal is to employ a limited number of well-designed, reliable and authentic assessments to yield meaningful information on critical candidate knowledge, skills and abilities, which can be used for formative and summative purposes. The results of candidate assessment play an integral role in the assessment of program quality and faculty performance. However, we also rely upon various sources of external evidence, including standardized test scores, feedback from program graduates, cooperating teachers, and administrators, and ongoing faculty research, to monitor and improve the quality of our programs. We have established procedures to ensure that the data gathered is used in a timely manner for all of these purposes.

To ensure that we achieve the goals described above, our assessment system includes the following components:

1. A review of the qualifications of students seeking admission to the program. Admission decisions are based primarily on program-specific GPA requirements, grades in specific content courses standardized test scores and recommendations, as well as GPA requirements established by New York State.
2. The ongoing assessment of candidate academic performance. Candidates must maintain program-specific GPAs (which are generally higher than University major requirements and which meet state standards) in their majors and pass all required courses with a C or better [B or better for graduate students and candidates in our leadership programs] in order to remain in good standing and progress through the program.
3. The use of standardized test scores, as well as grades in content courses, to demonstrate mastery of content area knowledge.
4. The continuous assessment of candidate development and performance in relation to unit standards. Here, we use a) instruments designed to track candidate development in relation to PEP proficiencies as they progress through the program;

- b)practicum observation forms aligned with the appropriate PEP candidate proficiencies; c)authentic assessments designed to assess and enhance the ability of our teacher and leadership candidates to effectively promote standards-based instruction and have a meaningful impact on student learning and d)instruments to assess candidate performance in relation to the content standards adopted by the relevant specialized professional associations.
5. The direct and indirect assessment of program quality by program completers, cooperating teachers and administrators, and the schools that employ our graduates.

All of the individual assessments are aligned with candidate proficiencies. Our system of candidate standards and standards-based performance assessments ensures that our graduates have mastered the requisite knowledge of content and pedagogy, that they display the proper dispositions, and that they are capable of applying this knowledge in diverse, authentic contexts to effectively promote P-12 student learning. This assessment-feedback loop between curriculum and instruction, candidate learning, and P-12 student learning is the basic mechanism for establishing accountability towards the public, employers, teacher candidates, leadership candidates, P-12 students, and ourselves.

New York State has recently adopted the edTPA, which was developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity, as the basic licensing test for beginning teachers. In 2003/2004, we designed a modified version of the teacher work sample developed by the Renaissance Partnership (Girod, 2002). In recent years we have revised and updated this and our other assessment instruments to include the skills required by the Common Core State Standards and more closely reflect the edTPA requirements relating to feedback, questioning, and the use of assessment to inform instruction.

New York State has also revised certification requirements for educational leaders, and to ensure that our candidate meet these requirements, our educational leadership programs have developed a comparable battery of authentic assessments, which are used to measure and improve the performance of leadership candidates during their internship. These include a portfolio assessment, a school improvement plan, and an assessment of their ability to apply scholarly research to effectively “steward a vision” of district-wide change.

Our system of internal assessments is complemented and validated by external assessments, which also help us to assess program quality and faculty achievement. Experienced cooperating teachers and administrators work closely with teacher and leadership candidates in developing their skills and assessing their performance.

Program quality is assessed in a variety of ways. While candidate scores on standardized tests provide one measure of program effectiveness, we also ask program completers, alumni, cooperating teachers and administrators, and the school districts that employ our graduates to evaluate the quality of our graduates, the structure of our program, and our effectiveness in preparing candidates to implement standards-based instruction in area classrooms. These surveys, together with the regular meetings of our Advisory Board, provide an important mechanism for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of our program and gauging the quality of our program relative to those of competing institutions. In addition to these various sources of external feedback, faculty research keeps us abreast of developments in educational theory and thus provides a benchmark by which we monitor and improve the quality of our programs.

Since our initial accreditation in 2004 and continuing accreditation in 2009, we have reviewed, modified, and updated our assessment instruments and rubrics in alignment with current knowledge base and standards. Our assessment system is closely integrated with the registrar and student records systems and, working in collaboration with the University's Division of Information Technology, we have made substantial progress in automating the collection and analysis of assessment data.

## **Changes to the Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework has been reviewed and updated in recent years to ensure alignment with revised state, national, and professional standards. Current knowledge bases have guided our emphasis on the role of pedagogical content knowledge and assessment, a focus that is implicit in our distributed model, and explicit in the pivotal role it plays in our practices across the disciplines.

The following web links provide additional information about the history of Stony Brook University as well as the most currently available institutional Facts & Figures.

<http://www.stonybrook.edu/sb/ataglace.shtml>

<http://www.stonybrook.edu/sb/fastfacts/>

<http://www.stonybrook.edu/offires/>

<http://www.stonybrook.edu/offires/students/fall2013/ethnic13.html>

<http://www.stonybrook.edu/offires/students/fall2013/internationalstudentsF13.pdf>

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, C. (2007). E-inclusion: learning difficulties and digital technologies, FutureLab Review, May 2007.
- Abshire, S.R., Cummings, C.D., Mason, D.R., and Abernathy, L.K. (2014). Teaching Literacy in the Digital Age. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).
- Adcock, P. (2008). Evolution of Teaching and Learning through Technology, Delta Kapa Gamma Bulletin, 74:4, Summer 2008, 37-43.
- American Educator (Spring 2005). Special issue on standards-based reform and accountability.
- Andrews, R. & Grogan, M. (2002). "Defining Preparation and Professional Development for the Future." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership.
- Angus, David and Jeffrey Mirel (1999). The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890-1995 (Teachers College Press).
- Anyon, Jean (1980). Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work. Journal of Education 162:1, 67-92.
- Apple, Michael (2000). Official Knowledge. Democratic Education in a Conservative Age, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Routledge).
- Apple, Michael (2004). Ideology and Curriculum, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Routledge).
- Apple, Michael (2006). Educating the "Right" Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality, 2nd ed. (Routledge).
- Ball, Deborah (1988). Knowledge and reasoning in mathematical pedagogy. Examining what prospective teachers bring to teacher education (Dissertation, Michigan State University).
- Bartell, C. A. (1994). "Preparing Future Administrators: Stakeholder Perceptions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Berliner, David (2006). Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform. Teachers College Record, 108:6, 949-995.
- Berliner, David (1997). Educational psychology meets the Christian right: Differing views of children, schooling, teaching, and learning. Teachers College Record, 98:3, 381-417.



- Berliner, David and Bruce Biddle (1995). The Manufactured Crisis (Addison Wesley).
- Bérubé, Michael (1996). Life As We Know It: A Father, A Family, and An Exceptional Child. New York: Random House.
- Bettie, Julie (2002). Women Without Class: Girls, Race and Identity (University of California Press).
- Bottoms, G. & O'Neill, K. (2001). "Preparing A New Breed of School Principals: It's Time for Action." Position paper by the Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis (1976). Schooling in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (Basic Books).
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2001). "Becoming A Principal: Role Transformation Through Clinical Practice." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration.
- Bruner, Jerome (1960). The Process of Education (Harvard University Press).
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2000). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction, in R. Arum and I.R. Beattie, eds., The Structure of Schooling: Readings in the Sociology of Education (Mayfield Publishing Company), 56-69.
- Bourgeois, Philippe (1995). In Search of Respect. Selling Crack in El Barrio (Cambridge University Press).
- Burris, Carol and Kevin G. Welner (2005). Closing the Achievement Gap by Detracking. Phi Delta Kappan, 86:8, 594-98.
- Callahan, R. M. (2005). Tracking and high school English learners: Limiting opportunity to learn. American Educational Research Journal, 42:2, 305-328.
- Capasso, R. L., & Daresh, J. C. (2001). The School Administrator Internship Handbook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Chubb, John and Terry M. Moe (1990). Politics, Markets and America's Schools (The Brookings Institution).
- Coleman, James (1968). The concept of equality of educational opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 38(1), 7-22.
- Cremin, Lawrence (1961). The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957 (Vintage).
- Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a New Conception of the Principalship. Journal of Educational Administration, 33:1, 22-43.
- Cuban, Larry and David Tyack (1995). Tinkering towards Utopia. A Century of Public School Reform (Harvard University Press).

- Darder, Antonia (2002). Reinventing Paulo Freire. A Pedagogy of Love (Westview).
- Darder, Antonia (2005). Schooling and the Culture of Dominion: Unmasking the Ideology of Standardized Testing, in Gustavo E. Fischman, et al., eds., Critical Theories, Radical Pedagogies, and Global Conflicts (Rowman & Littlefield), 207-22.
- Darder, Antonia et al., eds. (2002). The Critical Pedagogy Reader (Falmer).
- Daresh, J. (1995). Research Base on Mentoring for Educational Leaders: What do We Know? Journal of Educational Leadership, 33:5, 7-16.
- Davis, Lennard J., ed. (1997). The Disability Studies Reader. New York: Routledge.
- Delpit, Lisa (1995). Other People's Children. Cultural Conflict in the Classroom (New Press).
- Dewey, John (1916). Democracy and Education (Free Press).
- Dewey, John (1964). On Education. Selected Writings, ed. Reginald Archambault (Modern Library).
- Dolby, Nadine and Gregory Dimitriadis (2004). Learning to Labor in New Times (Routledge).
- Duckworth, Eleanor (1996). "The Having of Wonderful Ideas" & Other Essays on Teaching & Learning, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Teachers College Press).
- Elmore, Richard (2000). Building A New Structure for School Leadership. American Educator, 6-13.
- Fass, Paula (1989). Outside In. Minorities and the Transformation of American Education (Oxford University Press),
- Fordham, Signithia (1996). Blacked Out. Dilemmas of Race, Identity and Success at Capital High (University of Chicago Press).
- Fordham, Signithia and John Ogbu (1986). Black Students' School Success: Coping with the 'Burden' of 'Acting White'. The Urban Review, 18:3, 176-206.
- Formisano, Ronald (2004). Boston Against Busing. Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s, rev. ed. (University of North Carolina Press).
- Fosnot, Catherine (ed). Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, and Practice (Teachers College Press, 1996).
- Freire, Paulo (1998). Teachers as Cultural Workers (Westview Press).
- Freire, Paulo (2000). Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Continuum).
- Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a Culture of Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Fullan, M. (2002). The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fuller, Bruce and Richard Elmore, eds. (1996). Who Chooses? Who Loses? Culture, Institutions and the Unequal Effects of School Choice (Teachers College Press).
- Gamoran, Adam (2007). Standards-Based Reform and the Poverty Gap. Lessons for No Child Left Behind (Brookings Institution).
- Gardner, Howard (1991). The Unschooled Mind. How Children Think and How Schools Should Teach (Basic Books).
- Gardner, Howard (1999). The Disciplined Mind (Simon & Schuster).
- Gardner, Howard (1985). The Mind's New Science: a History of the Cognitive Revolution (1985).
- Gardner, Howard (1983). Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983).
- Gay, Geneva (2000). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, Geneva (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gee, J. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 44:8, 714-725
- Gee, J. (2003). What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux, Henry (1988). Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning (Bergin & Garvey Press).
- Giroux, Henry (1992). Border Crossings. Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education (Routledge).
- Graham, Hugh D. and Diamond, Nancy (1997). The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Grennon Brooks, Jacqueline and Martin Brooks (1993). In Search of Understanding, A Case for Constructivist Classrooms (ASCD).
- Groce, Nora Ellen (1985). Everyone Here Spoke Sign Language: Hereditary Deafness on Martha's Vineyard. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gutstein, Eric (2006). Reading and Writing the World With Mathematics: Toward a Pedagogy for Social Justice (Taylor & Francis).
- Guttmann, Amy (1987/1997). Democratic Education (Princeton University Press).

- Hakuta, K. Butler, Y.G. & Witt, D. (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? (Policy Report 2000-1). University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Available: <http://lmri.ucsb.edu/resdiss/tocresdiss.htm> .
- Hallinan, Maureen (1996). Track Mobility in Secondary School. *Social Forces*, 74:3, 983-1002.
- Hess, Frederick and Chester Finn (2004). Leaving No Child Behind? Options for Kids in Failing Schools (Palgrave).
- Hicks, T., and Turner, K.H. (2013). No longer a luxury: digital literacy can't wait. *English Journal* 102.6, 58-65.
- Hill, Heather, Rowan, Brian, & Ball, Deborah. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42:2, 371- 406.
- Hoachlander, G., Alt, M. & Beltranena, R. (2001). "Leading School Improvement: What Research Says. A Review of the Literature." Position paper by the Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA.
- Hooks, Bell (1994). Teaching to Transgress. Education as the Practice of Freedom (Routledge).
- International Society for Technology in Education (2008). *ISTE Standards for Teachers*.
- Jencks, Christopher, et al. (1972). Inequality; a Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (Basic Books).
- Jencks, Christopher and Meredith Phillips, eds. (1998). The Black-White Test Score Gap (Brookings Institution).
- Johnson, D. W., R. T. Johnson, and E. J. Holubec (1993). Circles of Learning. Cooperation in the Classroom, 4th ed. (Interaction Books).
- Katz, Michael (1971). Class, Bureaucracy and the Illusion of Educational Change in America (Praeger).
- Kozol, Jonathan (1991). Savage Inequalities. Children in America's Schools (Crown Publishers).
- Kozulin, Alex et al., eds. (2003). Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context (Cambridge University Press).
- Kucer, S. B. (2005). Dimensions of Literacy, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Lawrence Erlbaum).
- Labaree, David (1997). Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34:1, 39-81.

- Ladson-Billings, Gloria (1994). The Dreamkeepers. Successful Teachers of African American Children (Jossey-Bass).
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32:2, 465-91.
- Lashway, L. (2002). Trends in School Leadership (ERIC Digest No. 162).
- Lee, Stacey (1996). Unraveling the “Model Minority” Stereotype. Listening to Asian American Youth (Teachers College Press).
- Lee, Stacey (2005). Up Against Whiteness. Race, School, and Immigrant Youth (Teachers College Press).
- Linton, Simi (1998). Claiming Disability: Knowledge and Identity. New York: NYU Press.
- Louie, Vivian (2004). Compelled to Excel: Immigration, Education, and Opportunity among Chinese Americans (Stanford University Press).
- Loveless, Tom (1999). The Tracking Wars. State Reform Meets School Policy (Brookings Institution).
- Lucas, Samuel (1999). Tracking Inequality. Stratification and Mobility in American High Schools (Teachers College Press).
- MacLeod, Jay (1995). Ain’t No Makin’ It. Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-income Neighborhood (Westview Press).
- McLaren, Peter (1997). Revolutionary Multiculturalism. Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millennium (Westview).
- McLaren, Peter and Peter Leonard, eds. (1993). Paulo Freire. A Critical Encounter (Routledge).
- McLaren, Peter and Colin Lankshear, eds. (1994). Politics of Liberation. Paths from Freire (Routledge).
- McNamara, Erin Horvat and Carla O’Connor (2006). Beyond Acting White. Reframing the Debate on Black Student Achievement (Rowman & Littlefield).
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School Leadership That Works, From Research to Results. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Meier, Deborah (1995). The Power of their Ideas. Lessons for American from a Small School in Harlem (Beacon Press).
- Moll, Luis, ed. (1990). Vygotsky and Education. Instructional Implications and Applications of Sociohistorical Psychology (Cambridge University Press).
- Morgan, P. L., Hertzog, C. J., & Gibbs, A. (2002). Educational Leadership. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.

- Morris, Edward (2005). An Unexpected Minority. White Kids in an Urban School (Rutgers University Press).
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). Common Core State Standards. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C.
- Nelson, Adam (2005). The Elusive Ideal. Equal Educational Opportunity and the Federal Role in Boston's Public Schools, 1950-1985 (University of Chicago Press).
- New York State Board of Regents (2003). Growing Tomorrow's Leaders Today: Preparing Effective School Leaders in New York State.
- New York State Education Department (2014). Ensuring Equal Educational Opportunities for English Language Learners: Instructional Practices that lead to academic success for ELLs and Overview of Regulations. (Proposed amendments to Part 154 regulations).
- <https://www.engageny.org/resource/ensuring-equal-educational-opportunities-english-language-learners>
- Nieto, Sonia (1996). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education, 2nd ed. (Longman).
- Nieto, Sonia (1999). The Light in Their Eyes (Teachers College Press).
- Nieto, Sonia (2002/2003). Profoundly multicultural questions. Educational Leadership, 60:4, 6-10.
- Nieto, Sonia (2005). Public Education in the Twentieth Century and Beyond: High Hopes, Broken Promises, and an Uncertain Future. Harvard Educational Review, 75:1, 43-64.
- National Research Council, How Students Learn. History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom (2005).
- Newmann, Fred et al. (1996). Authentic Achievement. Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality (Jossey-Bass).
- Newmann, Fred, Secada, Walter, Wehlage, Gary (1995). A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards and scoring (Wisconsin Center for Education Research).
- Newmann, Fred & Associates (1996). Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality (Jossey-Bass).

- Newmann, Fred, Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. American Journal of Education, 104, 280-312.
- Nichols, Sharon and David Berliner (2007). Collateral Damage. How High-Stakes Testing Corrupts America's Schools (Harvard Education Press).
- Noddings, Nell (2003). Caring. A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (University of California Press).
- Oakes, Jeannie (2005). Keeping Track. How Schools Structure Inequality, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Yale University Press).
- Oakes, Jeannie, Amy Stuart Wells and Makeba Jones (1997). Detracking: The Social Construction of Ability, Cultural Politics, and Resistance to Reform. Teachers College Record, 98, 482-510.
- Oblinger, D.G. and Oblinger, J.L., eds. (2005). Educating the Net Generation. (Educause, 2005).
- Ogbu, John (2003). Black American Students in an Affluent Suburb. A Study of Academic Disengagement (Lawrence Erlbaum).
- Olneck, M. R. (2004). Immigrants and education in the United States. In J. A. Banks & C.A. Banks (Eds.), Handbook on Research in Multicultural Education (Macmillan), 381-403).
- Perkins, David (1992). Smart Schools: Better Thinking and Learning for Every Child. (The Free Press).
- Peterson, Paul, ed. (2006). Generational Change. Closing the Test Score Gap (Rowman & Littlefield).
- Phillips, D.C. (ed). Constructivism in Education (National Society for the Study of Education, 2000).
- Piaget, Jean (1954). The Construction of Reality in the Child (Basic Books).
- Piaget, Jean (1967). The Child's Conception of the World (Littlefield, Adams and Co.).
- Piaget, Jean (1970). The Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child (Basic Books).
- Putnam, Joanne, ed., (1998). Cooperative Learning and strategies for inclusion: Celebrating diversity in the classroom, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Brookes).
- Ravitch, Diane (1983). Troubled Crusade. American Education, 1945-1980 (Basic Books).
- Ravitch, Diane (2001). Left Back. A Century of Battles over School Reform (Simon & Schuster).

- Rebell, Michael and Jessica R. Wolff (2008). Moving Every Child Ahead: From NCLB Hype to Meaningful Educational Opportunity (Teachers College Press).
- Reeves, D. B. (2006). The Learning Leader: How to Focus School Improvement for Better Results. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Richardson, Virginia (2003). Constructivist Pedagogy. Teachers College Record, 105:9, 1623-40.
- Rodgers, Carol (2002). Defining Reflection. Another Look at John Dewey and Reflective Thinking, Teachers College Record 104:4, 842-866.
- Sadovnik, Alan et al., eds. (2007). No Child Left Behind and the Reduction of the Achievement Gap. Sociological Perspectives on Federal Educational Policy (Routledge).
- Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Leadership Imperatives for Educational Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). The Language of Schooling (Lawrence Erlbaum).
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Shaffer, D.W. (2007). How Computer Games Help Children Learn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sharkey, J. & Layzer, C. (2000). Whose definition of success? Identifying factors that affect English language learners' access to academic success and resources. TESOL Quarterly 34:2, 352-368.
- Shulman, Lee. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15:2, 4-14.
- Shulman, Lee (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform, Harvard Educational Review, 57:1, 1-22.
- Shulman, Lee and Kathleen Quinlan (1996). The Comparative Psychology of School Subjects, in David Berliner and Robert Calfee (eds). Handbook of Educational Psychology (Macmillan), 399-422.
- Silins, H. C., Mulford, W. R., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational Learning and School Change. Educational Administration Quarterly, 38:5, 613-642.
- Simon, Katherine (2002). "The Blue Blood Is Bad, Right?" Educational Leadership, 24-28.
- Sizer, Theodore (1996). Horace's Hope. What Works for the American High School (Houghton Mifflin).



- Slavin, Robert E. (1991). Student Team Learning. A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning (NEA).
- Smaldino, S.E., Lowther, D.L. and Russell, J.D. (2007). Instructional Technology and Media for Learning. Pearson.
- Smith, G.E. and Throne, S. (2009). Differentiating Instruction with Technology in Middle School Classrooms. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Social Education (1998), 1-34: Special issue on “Constructing Knowledge in Social Studies.”
- Stahl, Robert J. (1994). Cooperative Learning in Social Studies. A Handbook for Teachers (Addison-Wesley).
- Staiger, Annegret (2006). Learning Difference. Race and Schooling in the Multiracial Metropolis (Stanford University Press).
- Sunderman, Gail (2005). NCLB Meets School Realities. Lessons from the Field (Corwin Press).
- Tharp, Roland and Ronald Gallimore (1988). Rousing minds to life. Teaching, learning and schooling in social context (Cambridge University Press).
- Teachers College Record 107:9 (September 2005): Special issue on the legacy of Brown v. Board of Education.
- Thernstrom, Abigail and Stephan Thernstrom (2003). No Excuses. Closing the Racial Gap in Learning (Simon & Schuster).
- Tomlinson, Carol Ann (2000). “Reconcilable Differences? Standards-Based Teaching and Differentiation.” Educational Leadership 58:1, 6-11.
- Tyack, David (1974). The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education (Harvard).
- Valenzuela, Angela (1999). Subtractive Schooling. US-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring (SUNY Press).
- Vygotsky, Lev (1962). Thought and Language (MIT Press).
- Vygotsky, Lev (1980). Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Processes (Harvard University Press).
- Wartella, E.A., Lee, J.H. and Caplovitz, A.G. (2002). Children and Interactive Media: Research Compendium Update. Markle Foundation.
- Wiggins, Grant (1998). Educative Assessment. Designing Assessment to Inform and Improve Student Performance (Jossey-Bass).
- Wiggins, Grant and Jay McTighe (1998). Understanding by Design (ASCD).

- Willis, Paul (1977). Learning to Labor. How Working-Class Kids get Working Class Jobs (Columbia University Press).
- Wineburg, Samuel (2001). Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts (Temple University Press).
- Wiske, Martha ed., (1998). Teaching for Understanding (Jossey-Bass).
- Wolfe, Alan, ed. (2003). School Choice. The Moral Debate (Princeton University Press).
- Yonezawa, Susan, Amy Stuart Wells and Irene Sema (2002). Choosing Tracks: 'Freedom of Choice' in Detracking Schools. American Educational Research Journal, 39, 37-67.