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Refreshing our Conceptual Framework – The Journey

During the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and National Council for Teacher Accreditation Joint Accreditation visit in 2000, and then as a School of Education under the College of Human Development and Community Service, it was noted that our conceptual framework needed development and strengthening. The specific comment was that the unit's conceptual framework is not built on a theoretical base or informed by current research.

In 2002 and 2003, scattered efforts across the School of Education departments occurred with the intention of strengthening our conceptual framework (CF01, CF02). During this period, NCATE clarified its expectations for an education unit’s conceptual framework that were to include candidate proficiencies aligned with professional standards, a description of the assessment system, and data drawn from the assessment system for the purpose of improving program and candidate outcomes.

In July 2004, the College of Education was established. The following is taken from our 2004 Title II Report, addressing the establishment of a new College of Education and first steps to revisit our conceptual framework as a new college (CF03).

### Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

On July 1st, 2004, our five departments of education became a college. Previously, they were loosely organized in a “school” structure within the College of Human Development and Community Service. The process of becoming a college involved the entire university community throughout the spring semester of 2004, and received careful scrutiny at every step. The creation of the College of Education received support from the President, the Academic Senate, from other units on campus, and received a majority vote in a campus-wide vote by university faculty. Further, the university administration has provided financial support in fiscally challenging times to support the development of our new college. Becoming a college has provided many benefits: we now have a clear and distinct profile in the university and community; we are able to develop our own goals and purposes; we now have the equivalent structure and organization as the other large colleges of education in our university system of 23 institutions; we now have a dean and associate dean of education who facilitate clear and direct communication with the Chancellor’s Office, the state credentialing agency, the media, etc.

### Please indicate evaluations made to the unit’s conceptual framework (if any) …

First steps have been taken to draw faculty together this spring semester to examine ways to improve the college’s conceptual framework in ways that include a solid theoretical base which is informed by current research.

As a new college and under the leadership of a newly hired dean (acting) and associate dean, faculty were eager to see the college develop its own mark, and to forge its own path and direction.

### January – April 2005

The will of the faculty was to first develop our mission statement. We drew from existing department mission statements throughout the education unit (CF04, CF05). As the mission statement took shape, it went through several iterations with input from College of Education chairs, faculty, campus-wide colleagues involved in teacher preparation, and community advisory boards (CF06). The emails that provided input over a three-month period from many stakeholders indicate the enthusiasm and level of involvement in the process (CF07). The final version was approved in April 2005 (CF08).
March 2005
The next step was looking to strengthen other elements of our conceptual framework. A group of “seasoned” faculty members came together for an initial open-ended brainstorm on modifying and bolstering our existing conceptual framework. The group considered statements taken from Dottin’s *The Development of a Conceptual Framework* (2001) and the key elements of what a conceptual framework must include (shared vision, coherence, etc.). Two suggestions emerged from the initial meeting. The first was to consider developing metaphors as a way to plumb our philosophy and beliefs. Some faculty did not believe this approach would provide sufficient structure or capitalize on the existing mission statements, themes, and other material already in existence. The second suggestion was to reconvene and bring existing department and program material to address the conceptual framework’s key elements (CF09).

May 2005
In preparation for reconvening the group, each member read and brought elements from existing department documents. The group engaged in a literal “cut and paste” process (CF10). Then pairs of faculty wrote an overview of their assigned focus area (shared vision, coherence, etc.). This process did not prove to be productive (CF11).

July 2005
Five metaphors were developed and prepared for our faculty retreat (CF12).

August 2005
At the College of Education retreat, faculty responded to five metaphors in small groups. This proved to be a highly productive activity. Engaged faculty exchanged conversation and ideas in selecting the metaphor the group felt best captured “who we are.” Each group did a report-out on their conversation and preferred metaphor. This activity also generated the beginning of a vision statement (CF13).

September 2005
A four-page synthesis of the verbal and written comments from the metaphor activity was developed and broad faculty input was sought (CF14, CF15).

October 2005
From faculty input, seven value statements were developed. The Carr Fellows Advisory Board was the first group to see and respond to the education unit’s values and beliefs now condensed into seven core values. Carr Fellows are outstanding graduates from our master’s programs. Every year, each education department selects one graduating candidate who the faculty believe will have a significant impact on the field of education. The members’ feedback was invaluable given that these individuals had “lived” our programs and as such, were able to reflect on whether or not, and if so, how these values resonated with their educational experiences (CF16).

January through April 2006
The department chairs provided feedback on the seven core values and on iterations of the initial version of the vision statement, drawing from the August 2005 retreat (CF17). The chairs sought input from their department faculty. Broad education unit input and feedback were actively sought by visits to various faculty meetings across the education unit (CF18, CF19) and from deans across the institution at the All University Responsible for Teacher Education Committee. Input was also
sought from many other campus and community committees and boards such as the Secondary Education Cooperative for Teacher Education Preparation, the committee on Elementary and Special Education Undergraduate Programs, the Credential Programs Committee, and the Educational Partners Advisory Board, a broad based community group of school representatives (CF20). Through this broad exchange emerged various nuances of ideas, contributions, and responses to others’ input. This refining process brought about the development of our seven core values as they appear today.

March through July 2006
The education unit’s program outcomes were to be taken from the mission statement. However, the numerous phrases (“improve student learning, “make informed decisions” etc.) seemed unwieldy. Thus, three basic program outcomes were developed, with indicators for each outcome taken from phrases in the mission statement. Again, input was broadly sought, and revisions incorporated. The condensed form of the conceptual framework was ready for placement on all the education unit syllabi (CF21).

Programs and departments provided their knowledge bases from which to develop the unit’s broad knowledge base, based on the three program outcomes and their indicators (CF22). Also during this period, work was under way to align the education unit’s outcomes with professional standards from each program (CF23).

2006-07 Academic Year
A PowerPoint presentation on the conceptual framework was developed for all faculty to share with candidates for in-class discussion and reflection (CF24, CF25).

Final Statement
Our conceptual framework as it exists today appears to be very different from our conceptual framework as it existed in the past (CF26). It is important to note, however, that the beliefs and values that guide our work as an education unit are longstanding. As the 2000 version of our conceptual framework shows, we have long held that learning is ongoing and never ends; that teaching, learning, scholarly work, and service are intertwined; that we must collaborate and engage in team endeavors; that we uphold diversity as a strength; that we maintain professional guidelines and standards; and that we use assessment to provide direction for future growth (CF27).

The impetus and enthusiasm provided by our establishment as a new college compelled us to refresh and rejuvenate our conceptual framework. It is our shared vision for what guides us as a professional community.

The Education Unit Conceptual Framework
The College of Education is the nexus of the education unit that is comprised of departments and programs housed in four of the university’s colleges. Our core mission is to prepare professionals for the workplace, to engage in scholarship that informs the profession, and to serve the educational community through applied scholarship.

Our conceptual framework is rooted in seven deep-seated and enduring values that we live by as members of our professional community. We aspire to adhere to and model these in all of our
professional interactions. By experiencing these core values in their educational journey, we believe our candidates will embrace and in turn model them in their professional lives.

**Seven Core Values**

1. *We value learning as a lifelong journey that transforms us.*
   We believe learning is layered and ongoing. We are on a continuing path in acquiring and practicing new abilities and skills, synthesizing new knowledge, deepening our commitment to professional dispositions, and looking inward to reflect on what we learn and what we teach as part of the growth process.

2. *We value theory, research and the professional literature as guiding the learning process and informing professional practice.*
   These provide a compass to guide us along the educational journey. These are sources of growth, development, and new knowledge. We expect to accept and to create education innovations, and we continually look to these sources in seeking answers about the teaching and learning processes. Further, these sources create a common ground for professional practice and discussion.

3. *We value responsibility to self and to the group.*
   We have a responsibility to continually develop our talents and abilities, and to make positive contributions to the group. We believe that one’s virtuosity must be shared with and enhance the group. We believe that every individual must adhere to standards established by the whole group, taken in its broadest interpretation to include students, colleagues, and the professional community. We believe that every individual is responsible for maintaining commonly held wisdom that is embodied in professional and ethical standards.

4. *We value diversity because it enriches the whole.*
   We value and therefore seek diversity—diverse ideas, views, strengths, learning styles, talents, and abilities. Each individual’s gifts bring depth and richness to the whole, and help us develop understanding of individual complexity and appreciation for one another. Embracing diversity affords us opportunities to achieve consensus and build interdependence.

5. *We value multiple pathways to learning that includes the use of technology.*
   We value pathways that allow for choices. We believe in maps to learning that provide options in consideration of individual circumstances, the learning environment, and available resources. By providing multiple pathways to learning, every student can learn and progress given appropriate conditions, circumstances, and environment. We value technology as an indispensable tool in supporting multiple pathways to learning. Technology provides multiple ways to access knowledge, display information, share what we learn, and demonstrate knowledge. It supports critical thinking and inquiry, and collaborative and real-world learning experiences. Further, it permits us to guide and track progress, and improve upon accomplishments.

6. *We value critical inquiry and seeking necessary change.*
   We value critical inquiry as “standing in one’s truth” within ethical and professional guidelines for the purpose of improving knowledge, policy, access, and equity. We believe that the development of critical thinking and inquiry leads to “seeing what is not there,” what is missing, and then challenging the status quo to bring about change. We expect that a critical stance includes the responsibility for providing direction and leadership for the change one seeks.
7. *We value authentic and reflective assessment.*
We value tracking one’s educational journey via authentic and reflective assessment. These include logs, portfolios, reflections, and other assessments that we gather as evidence along the learning path. Evidence gathered along the way can mark progress as well as the need to “go back.” We value the use of assessment to improve student learning outcomes, curriculum, and programs.

**The Vision and Mission**
The encapsulation of our *vision statement* into a single phrase is: a *transformational journey toward educational advancement and achievement.* It is based on a journey metaphor, and is derived from our core values. Our vision statement embodies the ideal of what we strive for. It indicates forward motion that carries the education unit and its participants into the future. We seek continual renewal and transformation in striving for advancement and achievement in the educational milieu. The key ideas embodied in our core values, taken together with our journey metaphor lead us to this statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We envision our community, taken in its broadest sense, to include our students, our education partners, and ourselves, as being on an educational journey that transforms us. We are guided by questions, research, reflections, and discovery as we individually, collectively, and continually strive to transform and improve learning outcomes and advance educational achievement. We are on a transformational journey toward educational advancement and achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our *mission statement* is based on our unit’s core values and our vision statement.

| Our mission is to teach, to serve, and to engage in scholarship. We teach our students to be critical thinkers and lifelong learners. We prepare professionals who improve student learning, promote diversity, make informed decisions, engage in collaborative endeavors, maintain professional and ethical standards, and become change agents in their workplaces. We engage in scholarly work that informs the profession and we serve the educational community by providing applied scholarship. |

**Linking the Institution and Unit Mission Statements**
The common elements that are found in the institutional and the education unit mission statements center on learning, diversity, and preparing students for productive careers and lives. The key phrase in our *institution’s mission statement* is *learning is preeminent.* This fits well with the education unit’s mission statement phrases: *teaching students to think critically and to make informed decisions.* It also fits well with the education unit’s first core value: *learning is a lifelong journey that transforms us.* The institution mission holds to a *global outlook* while the education unit expressly describes the expectation that our students will promote diversity in their professional work. The institutional mission statement addresses *preparing students for challenging professions and for contributing productively to society.* Similarly, the education unit mission statement
expresses that our faculty prepare professionals who will become change agents in their workplaces.

Program Outcomes
Our core values, vision, and mission statements serve as the anchor for the education unit’s program outcomes. The unit utilizes three key outcomes to determine candidate competence. Each of the three outcomes is described by a set of indicators, which are phrases taken from our mission statement. Given that our mission statement describes the work we do, then it is appropriate to measure the effectiveness of our work. Each outcome and the supporting indicators are aligned with professional and state standards. They appear on all of the education unit’s syllabi, and they are linked to the learning goals for each course (Tables 1-4).

We expect that graduates of our programs are:

**Program Outcome 1: Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists who**
- a) demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge in their field of study
- b) demonstrate strong implementation skills in their field
- c) demonstrate the ability to use technology as a resource

**Program Outcome 2: Reflective and Responsive Practitioners who**
- a) promote diversity
- b) make informed decisions
- c) engage in collaborative endeavors
- d) think critically

**Program Outcome 3: Committed and Caring Professionals who**
- a) become change agents
- b) maintain professional and ethical standards
- c) become lifelong learners

This graphic represents the unit’s vision, mission, and program outcomes, and one’s educational journey into and through his or her professional life.
Knowledge Bases, Theories, Research, and Educational Practice and Policies

The program outcomes that we hold for our candidates are informed by knowledge bases, theories, research, and educational practice and policies. Below we address theoretical works, research, and state and professional policies that inform and are infused throughout our initial and advanced professional preparation programs. Rather than a thorough compilation, key resources are included here that assist candidates in initial and advanced programs in becoming knowledgeable and competent specialists, reflective and responsive practitioners, and committed and caring professionals. This section is organized and discussed around the three program outcomes and their indicators. (Knowledge bases particular to specific departments and programs are found in Exhibit CF22.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome 1: Our program graduates are knowledgeable and competent specialists who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge in their field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) demonstrate strong implementation skills in their field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) demonstrate the ability to use technology as a resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge in their field of study
Candidates in initial programs will have demonstrated content-specific knowledge in their undergraduate studies (bachelor’s degree) prior to candidacy for the initial credential. Prior to program admission, applicants to initial programs must take and pass a subject matter competence exam, the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET). CSET was mandated for compliance with NCLB. All candidates develop instruction based on the California K-12 Content Standards and standards from content-specific national professional organizations, as well as utilize resources available through these organizations (see list of professional organizations below.) Advanced candidates build on their understanding of the content areas through focused content area courses and continue to expand their knowledge of scholarly work and professional resources.

b) demonstrate strong implementation skills in their field
A clear grasp of professional and pedagogical knowledge in the field of study are critical to success as knowledgeable and competent professionals. For initial programs, The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) along with the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) are state professional education standards, and form the knowledge base for program design and evaluation. This knowledge base, coupled with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation Programs, provides the content and form for curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. Each candidate is required to demonstrate competence in the field, as assessed by two master teachers and two field supervisors, on all thirteen TPEs in order to be granted an initial credential. The following TPEs, professional standards established by the state, are directly related to Outcome One:

- TPE 1. Subject matter instruction
- TPE 2. Monitoring student learning
- TPE 3. Assessing students
- TPE 4. Making content accessible
- TPE 5. Engaging students
- TPE 6. Developmentally appropriate instruction
- TPE 9. Planning for instruction
- TPE 10. Use of instructional time
In advanced programs, candidates increase knowledge and sophistication in their field of study. (Refer to the knowledge bases for each program for a full explanation of sources used that assist candidates in becoming knowledgeable in their field of study.) Professional standards are included in all syllabi.

The professional standards that guide professional and implementation skills in advanced programs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</th>
<th>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership including the Ed.D.</td>
<td>California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Council for Exceptional Children &amp; NBPTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Disorders</td>
<td>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>International Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
<td>Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are required to explore scholarship and research that help them understand various perspectives on the learner and the learning processes such as constructivism, preferred learning styles, and multiple intelligences. The longstanding work of Bruner (1990), Piaget (1936, 1963), and Vygotsky (1978) are examined along with scholarly work on multiple intelligences, (Gardner, 1983), Kohlberg’s work on moral development (1981), learning styles (Dunn, 1999-2000), and the consideration of sociocultural influences on learning (Delpit, 1988; Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Understanding Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy of the levels of thinking, Shulman’s (1986) work on the importance of the teacher’s ability to relate subject matter knowledge to pedagogical knowledge, and Hunter’s (2004) mastery teaching are essential for successfully planning meaningful learning experiences for all students. Equally important for candidates’ understanding are the work of Marzano (2003) and Marzano et. al. (2001) that identify effective practices for increasing student achievement. These resources assist candidates in developing their ability to set objectives, provide meaningful feedback, use questions, cues and advance organizers, establishing safe and orderly learning environments, parent and community involvement, and collegiality and professionalism. Wiggins and McTighe’s (2000) work on backward design as a process for effective curriculum planning also informs candidates’ thinking and understanding about the importance of designing students’ learning experiences around the significance of their own questions as guides in the learning process.

Providing candidates with knowledge and understanding for the ways that classroom management and discipline support constructivist learning environments is an essential part of our programs. Faculty model and students study theories of management and discipline alternative to behaviorist models that focus on building classroom community and nourishing social participation (Charney, 2002; Wong & Wong, 2004). Candidates use theory based resources to assist in the advanced planning of classroom structures that promote student responsibility (Emmet et al., 2003), focus on positive language use (Kyle et al., 2002) and build intrinsic motivation (Kohn, 1999).

c) demonstrate the ability to use technology as a resource
Using technology as a resource is essential for both the educator and the learner for improving student learning, making informed decisions, and helping students engage in collaborative endeavors. Candidates are guided by the National Education Technology Standards for Teachers, (ISTE, 2006) in that are required to: demonstrate a sound understanding of technology operations
and concepts; plan and design effective learning environments and experiences supported by technology; implement curriculum plans that include methods and strategies for applying technology to maximize student learning; apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assignment and evaluation strategies; use technology to enhance their productivity and professional practice; and understand the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology in P-12 schools and apply those principles in practice. Texts such as *A Teachers’ Guide to Using Technology in the Classroom* (Ivers, 2003) assist candidates’ understanding and application of educational technology. Advanced candidates are required to understand cognitive flexibility theory, that is, the nature of learning in complex and ill-structured domains. The work of Spiro and Jehng (1990) and Spiro et al. (1992) are key readings for advanced candidates. In addition, Palloff and Pratt’s (1999) practical guide to developing virtual classrooms offers candidates helpful vignettes and case studies in developing their abilities to establish meaningful online instruction.

Program Outcome 2: Our program graduates are reflective and responsive practitioners who

a) promote diversity
b) make informed decisions
c) engage in collaborative endeavors
d) think critically

**a) promote diversity**
A critical component of being a reflective and responsive practitioner is the ability to plan, instruct, and assess so that all learners can succeed. The text by Vaughn, Bos and Schumm (2007) is used in methods courses to help candidates learn to plan instruction for students with special learning needs. Planning meaningful instruction for English learners is also a required element of professional preparation. Sources such as Peregoy and Boyle (2005), Cummins (1994), Echevarria et al. (2000), and Chamot and O’Malley (1994) are all used in our initial programs and assist candidates’ ability to plan meaningful instruction for English learners. Additionally, being knowledgeable about diversity in its’ broadest interpretation and capitalizing on diverse students’ strengths are foci in our professional preparation programs. Candidates read the work of Delpit (1988), Ladson-Billings (1995), Nieto (2004), and Sleeter (2005) to develop their understanding of the influences of one’s culture on the learning process. Two sources at the advanced level that help candidates understand multicultural and sociocultural aspects of learning and literacy are the works of Au (2000) and Gee (1996). It is our expectation that our graduates not only develop the professional capacity to teach all students, but actively seek ways to promote diversity in their workplaces.

**b) make informed decisions**
Key to becoming a reflective and response practitioner is the ability to make informed decisions and think critically about one’s practice. In addition to drawing from a solid content knowledge base (Outcome One), candidates are required to draw upon several other professional resources and knowledge bases.

For candidates in initial programs, the CCTC’s Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) particularly relevant to Outcome Two include:
Candidates are required to reflect on their planning and instruction through the lens of much of the work cited under Outcome One, such as: Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy of the levels of thinking; Shulman’s (1986) work on the importance of the teacher’s ability relate subject matter knowledge to pedagogical knowledge; and Hunter’s (2004) mastery teaching; Marzano (2003) and Marzano et. al. (2001) that identify effective practices for increasing student achievement; and Wiggins and McTighe’s work on (2000) backward design as a process for effective curriculum planning.

The ability to assess student learning is fundamental to making informed decisions. Kohn’s critical look at the dangers of over-emphasizing external testing practices (1999, 2000) provides a basis for understanding the need for student assessment to illuminate and enhance the learning process thorough the use of authentic assessment practices (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Herman, Aschbacher & Winters, 1992; Wiggins, 1993). The work of Wiggins and McTighe (2000) and Resnick & Resnick (1992) assist candidates in understanding the importance of developing assessments that measure student performance and align with constructivist teaching practices such as cooperative learning and use of multiple intelligences. Pieranglelo & Giuliana’s text (2006) provide candidates with an understanding of how to plan and conduct assessments that address special needs and ensure equity for all students. Texts used in advanced programs (Guskey & Bailey, 2001; Linn & Gronlund, 2003; Osterhof, 2001, 2003; Stiggins, 2005) build on this knowledge base and help candidates examine and enhance their assessment practices with a focus on the improvement of student learning.

c) engage in collaborative endeavors
Our candidates engage in collaborative endeavors that include promoting student collaboration in the classroom, as well as seeking collaboration with others in the profession and beyond to include parents and community. To this end, sources such as Johnson and Johnson (1988), Slavin (1990), and Vygotsky (1978) assist candidates’ understanding of the benefits of collaborative learning as well as specific ways to organize for meaningful student cooperative learning. Epstein (1991, 1995), Calabrese Barton (2004), and Berger Kaye (2004) provide a foundation in understanding the importance of parent engagement in the student’s learning process, and the power and benefit of service-learning. Collaboration and consultation in the school setting with language specialists and instructional aides are addressed by Law and Eckes (2000) and Vaughn, Bos, and Schumm (2007).

d) think critically
Dewey’s (1910) classic work How We Think and Bloom’s (1984) taxonomy of level of thinking are fundamental works in developing candidates’ knowledge about critical thinking. Highlighted throughout our programs is the understanding of a constructivist perspective as an important foundation of critical thinking (Bruner, 1990; Dick, 1991; Driver, Asoko, Leach, Mortimer, & Scott, 1994; Duffy & Jonassen, 1991; Piaget, 1929).

Following the constructivist tradition of learning, candidates in initial and advanced programs are encouraged to actively develop their own skills as critical thinkers. Candidates are required to develop an understanding of critical thinking theory from a variety of perspectives in relationship to teaching and learning. Expanding on the work of Dewey (1910; 1916) who focused on critical thinking as the active development of skillful reasoning to support beliefs, Glaser's work (1941)
provides the understanding that dispositions play an important part in becoming a critical thinker. More contemporary works such as that of Ennis (1981; 1987; 1996) and Paul (1993) assist candidates’ understanding that critical thinking goes beyond evaluating one’s own beliefs to include the development of reflective thinking skills that are essential to make evidence-based decisions, and the importance of meta-cognition in that process. As part of their development, candidates are guided in their practice and implementation of critical thinking skills as they work to examine the literature of teaching and learning and reflect on and improve their own practice in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome 3: Our program graduates are committed and caring professionals who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) become change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) maintain professional and ethical standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) become life-long learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) become change agents**  
Committed and caring professionals go beyond the basics of the profession. They lead others in bringing about changes to improve learning outcomes for all students, always with a focus on equity issues in schools. Becoming a change agent mirrors one of the core values that undergird our conceptual framework: *We value critical inquiry and seeking necessary change.* We expect that our graduates will seek to be agents of change, and provide direction and leadership for changes that improve learning outcomes for all students. Some faculty serve as models through participation in professional organizations that inform and influence policy and legislation. The work of Freire (1998, 2002) and Freire and Macedo (1989) offer critical perspectives, and challenge candidates’ thinking on bringing about change in their workplaces. In advanced programs, candidates are required to read and reflect on educational policy statements and legislation, write position papers, and conduct action research in their school settings. These are all means to help our candidates develop skills, a mindset, and educational practice that help them learn how to effect change.

**b) maintain professional and ethical standards**  
Candidates seeking an initial credential must demonstrate adherence to the relevant state professional standards in order to complete an initial credential. These are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPE 12 Professional obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPE 13 Professional growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advanced candidates must demonstrate adherence to national professional organizations, each of which calls for maintaining professional and ethical standards.

**c) become lifelong learners**  
Becoming life-long learners reflects another of the unit’s core values: *We value learning as a lifelong journey that transforms us.* To this end, initial and advanced candidates are introduced to the array of resources available through membership in professional organizations. Through sharing their research and publications with candidates, faculty model continual growth and professional contributions. Our geographical location affords candidates the opportunity to attend locally held national and international conferences, such as the National Educational Computing Conference.
(2006), National Science Teachers Association (2006), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2005), and the upcoming National Council for the Social Studies (2007). Finally, each of the national professional organizations on which our advanced programs are based includes standards or propositions that call for ongoing professional development and learning.

Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional, State, and Institutional Standards and Conceptual Framework Assessment of Program Outcomes
The education unit’s three program outcomes are derived directly from our mission statement. They have been aligned with state and national professional standards appropriate to each program. This alignment ensures that assessments of candidate competence for meeting outcomes identified by the unit also serve to demonstrate the mastery of proficiencies articulated by the professional organizations that guide their specific programs of study. Tables 1-4 (also seen in the Education Unit Assessment Document) outlines the alignment between program outcomes, professional standards, and the measurement of knowledge, skills, and dispositions as defined by NCATE standards for initial and advanced programs.

The reader is referred to the Education Unit Assessment System Document and Standard 2 for detailed descriptions and explanations concerning the types of assessments that the education unit uses, how the education unit ensures that assessments are accurate and consistent, and candidate performance expectations at each transition point for all programs.

Evidence of the Conceptual Framework Throughout the Standards
Our conceptual framework lives in our unit’s departments and programs in a variety of ways - in syllabi, in courses and candidate assignments, in fieldwork and clinical practice, and in candidate and program assessments. Here we provide specific examples of each of these elements throughout the education unit, drawing from segments of text found in this conceptual framework document, and implementation examples throughout our programs.

Shared Vision
Shared vision is evident in that (1) the key elements of our conceptual framework are found on all course syllabi in the education unit; (2) faculty discuss the three program outcomes and indicators with candidates, and link them to professional standards that are included in course syllabi; (3) candidates are expected to understand and discuss how the learning goals in their course of study relate to the unit’s program outcomes and indicators; and (4) candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate competence in the unit’s three program outcomes. Our conceptual framework was developed over time through a broad exchange that included

- The Credential Programs Committee (CPC)
- The Secondary Education Cooperative on Teacher Education Preparation (SECTEP)
- The All University Responsible for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC)
- The Elementary and Special Education Undergraduate Programs (EASEUP)
- The Carr Fellow Advisory Board (outstanding advanced program graduates)
- Faculty members from all departments and programs in the education unit
- The K-12 Education Partners Advisory Board

Our conceptual framework has been built through participation, input, and reflection from all of these groups. We have reached consensus and it represents our shared vision and purpose.
Table 1 Candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
Conceptual Framework Outcomes and Standards Alignment –Initial Programs

[ (T) indicates Advanced Program for Teachers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions</th>
<th>Elementary &amp; Bilingual Education (EDEL)</th>
<th>Secondary Education (EDSC)</th>
<th>Special Education (SPED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. KNOWLEDGEABLE &amp; COMPETENT EDUCATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credential—Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE)</td>
<td>Credential—Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE)</td>
<td>Credential—Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) &amp; Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Demonstrate a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>TPE 1A, 7, 9</td>
<td>TPE 1B, 7, 9</td>
<td>TPE 1A, 7, 9 CC 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Demonstrate pedagogical skill &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>TPE 3, 4, 5, 6A/B, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>TPE 3, 4, 5, 6B/C, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>TPE 3, 4, 5, 6A/B/C, 10 CC 4., 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demonstrate ability to use technology as a resource</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>TPE 2, 4, 9</td>
<td>TPE 2, 4, 9</td>
<td>TPE 2, 4, 9 CC 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REFLECTIVE &amp; RESPONSIVE PRACTITIONERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promote diversity</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>TPE 5, 7, 11</td>
<td>TPE 5, 7, 11</td>
<td>TPE 5, 7, 11 CC 3, 5, 6, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Make informed decisions</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>TPE 2, 3, 7, 8, 13</td>
<td>TPE 2, 3, 7, 8, 13</td>
<td>TPE 2, 3, 7, 8,13 CC 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Engage in collaborative endeavors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TPE 13</td>
<td>TPE 13</td>
<td>TPE 13 CC 5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Think critically</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13 CC 4, 5, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COMMITTED &amp; CARING PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Become change agents</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TPE 12</td>
<td>TPE 12</td>
<td>TPE 12; CC 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Maintain professional and ethical standards</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TPE 12</td>
<td>TPE 12</td>
<td>TPE 12; CC 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Become life-long learners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13</td>
<td>TPE 12; CC 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Conceptual Framework Outcomes and Standards Alignment—Advanced Programs (Part 1)

[(T) indicates Advanced Program for Teachers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions</th>
<th>Education Leadership Doctorate (EDD)</th>
<th>Educational Leadership (EDAD)</th>
<th>Elementary &amp; Bilingual Education (EDEL-T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. KNOWLEDGEABLE &amp; COMPETENT EDUCATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Demonstrate a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1, 2, 7, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,14,15</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Demonstrate pedagogical skill &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demonstrate ability to use technology as a resource</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11(j),12(j)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REFLECTIVE &amp; RESPONSIVE PRACTITIONERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promote diversity</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Make informed decisions</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Engage in collaborative endeavors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1, 4, 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Think critically</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COMMITTED &amp; CARING PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Become change agents</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Maintain professional and ethical standards</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Become life-long learners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Conceptual Framework Outcomes and Standards Alignment—Advanced Programs (Part 2)

[(T) indicates Advanced Program for Teachers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions</th>
<th>Human Communication Studies—Communicative Disorders (HCOM)</th>
<th>Reading (READ)</th>
<th>Secondary Education (EDSC-T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. KNOWLEDGEABLE &amp; COMPETENT EDUCATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Demonstrate a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>I, III-A, III-B, III-C, III-D, V-A, V-B</td>
<td>2,3, 6</td>
<td>C1 14,19 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demonstrate ability to use technology as a resource</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>III-C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C2 12 M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REFLECTIVE &amp; RESPONSIVE PRACTITIONERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promote diversity</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>III-D, IV-F, IV-G</td>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>C4 15,20 M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Make informed decisions</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>III-B, III-C, III-D, III-F, IV-C, IV-G</td>
<td>4,5,11</td>
<td>C3 16,18 M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Engage in collaborative endeavors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>IV-G</td>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>C4 15,20 M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Think critically</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>III-B, III-C, III-D, III-E, III-F, IV-B, IV-F, IV-G, V-A</td>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>C4 15,20 M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COMMITTED &amp; CARING PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Become change agents</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>IV-F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C5 13,17 M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Maintain professional and ethical standards</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>III-E, IV-G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C5 13,17 M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Become life-long learners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>III-B, III-C, III-D, III-F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C5 13,17 M5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 Conceptual Framework Outcomes and Standards Alignment—Advanced Programs (Part 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Science Education (SCED-T)</th>
<th>Special Education (SPED-T)</th>
<th>TESOL (TESL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching Science—MATS</td>
<td>Master of Science in Education National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS): Standards (1-14) for SPED only Core Propositions (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate &amp; Masters—Standards for Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESOL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **KNOWLEDGEABLE & COMPETENT EDUCATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Demonstrate a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Proposition # 2</th>
<th>Standards 1, 2, 5 Proposition # 2</th>
<th>1.a, 2.a, 3.a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Demonstrate pedagogical skill &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Proposition # 1, 3</td>
<td>Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 Proposition # 1, 3</td>
<td>1.b, 2.b, 3.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demonstrate ability to use technology as a resource</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Proposition # 2</td>
<td>Standards 7, 9, 11 Proposition # 2</td>
<td>2.b, 3.c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **REFLECTIVE & RESPONSIVE PRACTITIONERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Promote diversity</th>
<th>K, S, D</th>
<th>Proposition # 1, 3</th>
<th>Standards 4, 8, 12 Proposition # 1, 3</th>
<th>2.a, 2.b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Make informed decisions</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>Proposition # 4</td>
<td>Standards 2, 9, 11, 13 Proposition # 4</td>
<td>4.a, 4.b, 4.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Engage in collaborative endeavors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Proposition # 5</td>
<td>Standards 11, 12 Proposition # 5</td>
<td>3.a, 5.b, 5.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Think critically</td>
<td>K, S, D</td>
<td>Proposition # 4</td>
<td>Standards 2, 5, 9, 13 Proposition # 4</td>
<td>3.c, 4.c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **COMMITTED & CARING PROFESSIONALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Become change agents</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Proposition # 1, 5</th>
<th>Standards 13, 14 Proposition # 1, 5</th>
<th>5.b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Maintain professional and ethical standards</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Proposition # 5</td>
<td>Standards 13, 14 Proposition # 5</td>
<td>5.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Become life-long learners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Proposition # 5</td>
<td>Standards 1, 2, 5, 13, 14 Proposition # 5</td>
<td>5.c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coherence
The key elements of our conceptual framework are evident in coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice, in initial and advanced programs of study, and in candidate and program assessments. The indicators of the three program outcomes are taken from our unit’s mission statement. Candidates understand that through their coursework, fieldwork and clinical practice, they will be assessed in a variety of ways on their abilities to improve student learning, promote diversity, make informed decisions, engage in collaborative endeavors, maintain professional and ethical standards, and become change agents in their workplaces—all phrases from our mission statement. Several assessments are used to obtain data to help determine candidate and program effectiveness on these three outcomes. For example, initial candidates are assessed through the Teacher Performance Expectations, established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Advanced candidates respond to an education unit survey at mid-point and at program exit.

Professional Commitments and Dispositions
Evident in both our core values and mission statement, and embedded across our unit’s programs is the value that we place on preparing committed and caring professionals. The education unit’s Professional Dispositions Statement is broadly included in education unit documents, student handbooks, admissions statements, and on websites, and we expect candidates to uphold and adhere to these expressed values. Candidates are required to demonstrate commitment and professional dispositions as assessed by the Teaching Performance Expectations in initial programs. Advanced candidates are required to adhere to standards outlined in the professional organization that is appropriate for each discipline. Professional commitments and dispositions expected of our candidates are clearly outlined in program handbooks for candidates, supervisors, and school personnel. Policies and mechanisms are in place throughout the unit for alerting, and if necessary, removing candidates who do not demonstrate the ability to maintain professional commitment and dispositions.

Commitment to Diversity
One of our core values specifically addresses diversity: We value diversity because it enriches the whole. Further elements from our mission statement that serve as indicators of program success are that we expect our candidates to promote diversity and to become change agents to promote learning for all students. Our candidates also draw from and incorporate knowledge from the professional literature as discussed above in this document. Syllabi throughout the program contain statements indicating the unit’s intentionality and commitment to preparing candidates to work with diverse students. The education unit ensures that candidates in initial and advanced programs have multiple opportunities to practice, demonstrate and be assessed on their abilities to work with diverse students. This includes both coursework and fieldwork at the initial and advanced levels. Further, the education unit is committed to seeking and retaining faculty of diverse experiences and backgrounds, as well as recruiting and graduating candidates from a broad spectrum of backgrounds.

Commitment to Technology
One of our core values is multiple pathways to learning that includes the use of technology. The candidate’s ability to use technology as a resource is addressed in the first program outcome: Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists. It is also addressed above in this document, citing several professional sources used in our programs that help candidates develop an understanding of information organization and educational technology applications. The use of technology is an
integral part of all learning experiences within the curriculum. Evidence of this includes field and clinical settings in which faculty model and integrate technology throughout their coursework.

**Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards**

The expanded description of the unit’s core values, *we value responsibility to self and to the group* states that each individual “will adhere to standards established by the whole group that includes those established... by the professional community and ... [the] commonly held wisdom that is embodied in professional and ethical standards.” Additionally, coursework and fieldwork are aligned with professional standards from national organizations, and with the California Teaching Performance Expectations, Standards for Program Quality Effectiveness, and for initial programs, with state content standards, as seen in Table 1.

In conclusion, our conceptual framework is our shared vision for what guides our work as a professional community.
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