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The Conceptual Framework

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

At Central Washington University, the conceptual framework, as illustrated, is centered in constructivist philosophy, specifically embracing contextual, reflective, inquiry, and community based teaching and learning research, theory, and practice. Standards that include content, pedagogy, equity, and technology are measured through knowledge, skills, and dispositions, which are examined transitionally to inform efficacy. The framework is further defined through seven distinguishable but compatible components:

The first component is the professional commitments, dispositions, and beliefs that inform the program. This includes commitments, on the part of the university and the Center for Teaching and Learning, to support outstanding programs for the preparation of professional educators and shared beliefs about learning, generally, and professional educator preparation specifically.

The second component is the philosophy of the program. Typically, a unit will adopt a formal philosophy that encompasses a perspective about how learning occurs and how the teaching act influences learning. At Central Washington University, the philosophy is constructivism.

The third component is the program theme, a word picture that describes the program or its primary goal. Consistent with the professional commitments, dispositions, and values, and with the philosophy of constructivism, Central Washington University has chosen the theme “facilitators of learning in a diverse world” to emphasize what the faculty strive to be and what they encourage their candidates to become.

The fourth component is the knowledge base. The knowledge base identifies contemporary research, the wisdom of practice, and emerging educational policies and practices on which all other elements of the conceptual framework rest.

The fifth component is program competencies. The competencies describe major categories of performance indicators, which characterize initial or advanced level professional educators. Three developmental strands describe sequence and coherence of the initial preparation program. A fourth strand is introduced when candidates seek an advanced degree. Candidates progress through each strand as they learn how to become facilitators of learning in a diverse world. Strand I is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as an Expert learner. Strand II is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as Knowledge Specialist. Strand III is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as Master of Art and Science of Teaching and the fourth strand is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as a Teacher Specialist/Scholar.

The sixth component is field experience, in which the philosophy of and requirements for field-based application are described.

The seventh component is assessment. Consistent with the conceptual framework’s constructivist philosophy, the CTL assessment system has dynamically evolved over the past decade as a result of relevant and meaningful experiences, which include constituent and community feedback. Assessment data are used by individual faculty to assess their own instruction; by candidates to assess their own learning and development; by program faculty and coordinators to assess program effectiveness; and by the OREA to assess unit operations.

More detail about each component follows.
PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENTS, DISPOSITIONS, AND BELIEFS

Professional Commitments

• Acknowledging its legacy as a normal school, the university is committed to its Center for Teaching and Learning and all of its professional educator programs.

• Accepting its responsibility as the largest teacher preparation and school administrator program in the state, the university is committed to the CTL’s leadership role in working with schools.

• Acknowledging the value of diversity, the university together with the CTL is committed through strategic planning to enrich its diverse community.

• Through its support of the CTL, the university acknowledges the important role of shared governance, intellectual discourse, and reflection.

• Responding to the call for accountability, the university, together with the CTL, is committed to performance assessment for the purpose of improving teaching and learning.

• Taking advantage of its new facilities and equipment, the university and CTL are committed to bringing enlightenment to teaching and learning.

Dispositions

Professional educators, those who provide training and those who are trained,

• recognize their need to be self-reflective. They recognize their own strengths, challenges, values, and beliefs. They are reflective about the work they do and evaluate the effect of their work on learners. They know what they believe about how learners learn and the role of the teacher. They recognize that they are role models for learners.

• recognize their responsibility to support learners. They support personal growth, self-awareness, and positive self-concept in learners. They set high standards but then support learners in their achievement of them. They respect and value individual and cultural differences. They establish empathic, cooperative relationships with and among learners. They recognize the role of motivation in the learning act.

• recognize their responsibility to create life-long learners. They engage learners in exploration, critical and divergent thinking, and problem solving. They promote multiple and global perspectives in the activities they arrange. They use a variety of teaching strategies appropriate to learning goals. They individualize instructional procedures in keeping with the readiness of the learner.

• recognize that they are professionals engaged in a scholarly, collaborative pursuit: They participate in the community of scholars who devote their energies to improved educational opportunities for all learners. They remain current in their disciplinary fields and in the art and science of pedagogy. They behave professionally within the school environment and in the community.
Beliefs

- that the P-12 schools constitute the most important institution in our society.
- that the P-12 schools both reflect and define the community, and their health stands as evidence of a society’s support for democratic values.
- that all children can learn.
- that learning is an innate response of an organism to its environment.
- that teaching can be, should be, and often is facilitative of learning.
- that it is incumbent on professional educators to facilitate learning in all students.
- that strategies, which facilitate learning in one learner, may be ineffective with another learner.
- that knowledge is richer when it is created by the learner.
- that knowledge is more meaningful when it is related to prior knowledge.
- that knowledge is shaped by both the social and non-social environment and that the two are interactive.
- that knowledge is collaboratively established within a cultural milieu.
- that the learning act or knowledge construction is complex and only indirectly observable.
- that moment-to-moment interaction between professional educators and students are fundamentally critical to the learning act.
- that assessment serves as the primary link between curriculum and instruction, both for our own candidates and for the students they will teach.
- that education is a profession that has a knowledge base in its own right.
- that a program of professional preparation for educators must be guided by the art and science of teaching and learning.
- that a professional educator must possess a wide range of knowledge, abilities, attitudes, and skills to be successful.
- that the teacher must be a knowledge specialist, an instructional designer, and an assessment specialist and must mentor, give counsel, motivate, and manage the classroom.
- that expertise in reading, language arts, and mathematics is fundamental for the teacher at the K-8 level, as is an interdisciplinary worldview.
- that school administrators, school psychologists, and school counselors must understand the school culture and the work of the classroom teacher in order to serve their specialized roles.
- that content and pedagogy are equally important and that pedagogical content specialization adds a level of sophistication to the teacher’s ability to facilitate learning.
- that an educational program is incomplete absent diversity.
- that professional educator candidates must both value and experience diversity of all kinds in order to be able to work effectively with learners from diverse backgrounds.

(See, e.g., American Psychological Association Board of Educational Affairs, 1995).
THE PHILOSOPHY

Constructivism: The History, the Philosophy, and the Pedagogy

Constructivist philosophy is currently influential in psychology and education (Woolfolk, 2001) although it rarely leads to a single, unified interpretation. Rather, it can be viewed at multiple levels of analysis. Von Glasersfeld, (1997) describes it as “a vast and woolly area in contemporary psychology, epistemology, and education” (p. 204). Packer and Goicoechea (2000) assert that it is a philosophy with both epistemological (a way of thinking about knowing) and ontological (a way of thinking about development) assumptions. Phillips (1997) says, “One thing is clear: ‘Constructivism’ is the label or name given to a broad position that has now attained the status of political correctness; it is a position widely espoused in the contemporary educational research literature, and as early as the beginning of this decade five hundred articles with constructivist ideas as a focus were found” (p. 152). Constructivism also can be viewed in the context of larger historical and philosophic debates, and to do so, it is useful to review fundamental premises underlying modern and postmodern thought.

Premodern, Modern, and Postmodern Thought: During the Middle Ages, the premodern era, truth was thought to be revealed to individuals in authority in the church. Their interpretations were unquestioned, and church dogma became synonymous with “truth.” This unchallenged view of the authority of the church gave way to the more objective modes of inquiry that characterized the modern period. This period referred to variously as the enlightenment and the renaissance and occurring concurrently with the scientific and industrial revolutions, emphasized experience and reason as avenues to some objective truth.

Postmodernists included a group of philosophers, literary critics, social theorists, psychologists, and educators who were critical of these assumptions. The postmodern period can be traced at least to the writings of Hume and Kant in the 18th century. Both asserted the limitations of human rationality. According to Hergenhahn (2005), Hume argued that humans can never know the physical world with certainty because all we ever experience are the ideas created by that world. Kant argued that external reality can never be known because conscious experience always results from the interaction between sensory experience and the innate categories of thought. Similar views are found in the writings of the existentialists Kierkegaard, who asserted that truth is subjectivity (Kierkegaard, 1985/1845), and Nietzsche (Golomb, 1989). Within education, the progressive movement forwarded similar messages. John Dewey, a noted educator and philosopher, was chief among proponents of the progressive movement. According to Dewey (1916) who supported child-centered pedagogy…

…learning is active. It involves reaching out of the mind. It involves organic assimilation starting from within. Literally, we must take our stand with the child and our departure from him. It is he and not the subject matter, which determines both quality and quantity of learning (p. 9).

At the same time, the social reconstructionists opposed the tendency of schools in preserving and strengthening the existing social order. The social reconstructionists “stressed the role of the school, allied with other progressive forces, in planning for an intelligent reconstruction of US society where there would be a more just and equitable distribution of the nation’s wealth and the ‘common good’ would take precedence over individual gain” (Liston and Zeichner, 1991, p. 26). George S. Counts (1932), a major proponent, envisioned a school system that could become the public forum for the creation of a new and better social order.
Postmodernists believe that reality is created by individuals and groups within various personal, historical, and cultural contexts (Hergenhahn, 2005). The position is in opposition to the modernist belief that some objective truth awaits discovery. It aligns with the early views expressed by the sophists, who argued that there was not one Truth but many truths and with the views of the skeptics who discounted all claims of indisputable truth. Postmodernists, sophists, skeptics, romantics, existentialists, and humanistic psychologists all share the belief that “truth is always relative to cultural, group, or personal perspectives” (Smith, 1994, p. 408). For more detail on the postmodernist position, see also Kirshner (2000) and Bereiter (1994a).

**Constructivism:** Constructivism within psychology and education has its roots in Piagetian developmental psychology. To some degree, Piaget’s (1972) genetic epistemology was offered as an alternative to empiricism and nativism, both popular in the early 1920s and both having views that were troublesome to Piaget. He rejected the view of nativists (for example, Kant, 1965 and Chomsky, 1968, 1996) that ideas were inborn, but he agreed with them that experience created concepts that the learner imposed on the world to make sense of it. He disagreed with the view of empiricists (e.g., Locke, 1974/1706, 2000/1693 and Thorndike, 1929, 1931) that mere exposure to the world was sufficient for learning, but he agreed with them that learners come to respond to the regularity and structure of the world through experience. Although he was the first to write directly about constructivism, Piaget’s is not the only constructivist view among the early philosophers of education. Others whose names most often are associated with the position are Dewey (1916, 1969), Bruner (1966, 1996), and Vygotsky (1978, 1986).

According to Kirshner (2000), “prominent movements or trends within psychology that properly can be termed postmodern include social constructivism…” (p. 246). Indeed, constructivism as a movement in education shares a number of assumptions with the postmodernists, and its ascendancy in education parallels increased interest in the roles of individual experience and perspective that characterizes postmodernism (Hergenhahn, 2005). The most radical constructivists wholeheartedly adopt the postmodernist position. Radical constructivists assign a minor role to formal knowledge in a discipline, although few completely disregard formal knowledge. They typically oppose teacher telling or direct transmission of information, asserting that knowledge cannot be transferred from teacher to student simply by teachers putting it into words and students receiving those words (Joldersma, 2011), and that there are no correct answers and that meaning is more or less idiosyncratic to the individual (Richardson, 1997). Consistent with this position, radical constructivists are disenchanted with formal assessment, and, if they agree to assessment of any kind, insist on authentic and contextualized assessment.

A more moderate constructivist position takes into account the role of the individual and his context in the construction of individual knowledge, but maintains a role for formal knowledge. “Formal knowledge, as understood in signs and symbols, enters the learning situation as tools within the social interaction, and affects development or learning through activity engaged in by the learner” (Richardson, 1997, p. 8). Moll (1992) suggests that students “use essential ‘cultural tools’ such as reading, writing, mathematics, or certain modes of discourse, within the activities that constitute classroom life” (p. 21). Richardson (2003) acknowledges the social nature of formal knowledge development within an expert community, and of knowledge creation that can take place within a social grouping such as a classroom. This moderate view that spans modern and postmodern views of knowing is more characteristic of the popular constructivist view in the United States although proponents exist on either side of the moderate position.

When constructivists say that learners construct knowledge out of their own past experiences and current situation, they acknowledge that learning is individual, contextual, and historical. What one already knows or has experienced influences whether and how one will learn new
information or benefit from new experiences. What one person constructs from a situation is necessarily different from what another person constructs from the same situation.

At least three variants of constructivism can be inferred from the current literature. Constructivism is viewed:

- as a perspective on individual development (referred to here as developmental constructivism but also commonly referred to as cognitive constructivism (Piaget, 1972; Phillips, 1995, 1997),
- as a perspective on social transformation (referred to here as social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978; Vygotsky, 1986), and
- as a perspective on cultural-historical transformation (referred to here as sociocultural constructivism but sometimes referred to as emancipatory constructivism (Counts, 1932; O’Loughlin, 1992).

Phillips (1997) paints an interesting picture of these three (although in his account, he ultimately segments constructivists into only two primary groups) when he talks about the view of individual construction of knowledge as a) solitary inquirer; b) inquirer influenced by social factors; and c) inquirer saturated by social factors.

Developmental constructivism conforms most closely to the work of Piaget (1972). It is an extension of a biological analysis of the laws of nature, and values rational, individualistic, and decontextualized thinking as the goal of development. Piaget refers to his approach as genetic epistemology. The focus is on the individual and on his or her ability to make meaning and understand reality through experience. The theory is concerned with “how individuals build up certain elements of their cognitive or emotional apparatus; that is, they are concerned with the bodies of knowledge that individuals construct and store internally” (p. 13). In Piagetian constructivism, the individual is viewed as separate from his social context, and situational variables play only a minor role in predicting or interpreting the child’s development. In fact, much is made in a Piagetian analysis about the similarity of development across cultures, rather than about differences in development as a function of culture (Vadeboncoeur, 1997; Woolfolk, 2001). Social interaction does play a role, primarily as a catalyst for individual cognitive conflict (Fowler, 1994). Primarily, however, the focus of interest is “the individual psychological life of individuals” (Phillips, 1997, p. 153). The approach values discovery learning that is child-centered. The role of the teacher is a matter of some disagreement among developmental constructivists. Resnick and Klopher (1989) suggest that a Piagetian approach disallows direct instruction while DeVries (1997, 2006) argues that the teacher guides the learner’s discovery, but without imposing thoughts and values on the process. Debate continues on the role of the teacher as instructor, but there is general agreement about the teacher’s role as facilitator and as one who arranges a supportive learning environment.

Social constructivism and sociocultural constructivism represent two levels of interpretation related to the work of Vygotsky (1978, 1986). Social constructivism has the longest history; the emergence of sociocultural constructivism is more recent. In many accounts, the two are still combined, with different writers emphasizing characteristics of one or the other. For instance, Phillips (1997) focuses his discussion of social constructivism on sociocultural position, while Vadeboncoeur (1997) focuses her discussion of social constructivism on the role of the social context in shaping the individual construction of knowledge. Phillips (1997) and Hyslop-Margison & Strobel (2008) affirm the confusion and acknowledge two schools of thought. For the purpose of this discussion, the term social constructivists will be used to describe those who
are interested in the impact of members of the social group on the knowledge construction of the individual. The term sociocultural constructivism will be used to describe those who are interested in the development of public disciplines and formal knowledge and the social processes that influence that development.

Social constructivists, “knowledge exists in a social context and is initially shared with others instead of being represented solely in the mind of an individual” (Eggen & Kauchak, 2001, p. 293). Hyslop-Margison (2008) explains that knowledge is a socially negotiated product. Social constructivists continue to focus on the individual, but it is a contextualized individual. Individual development is seen not so much as biological as it is seen as sociological, inseparable from interpersonal relationships and social context. The sharing process results in each learner refining his or her own ideas while simultaneously shaping the ideas of others (Eggen & Kauchak, 2001). Vadeboncoeur (1997) asserts that “while for Piaget the direction of cognitive development moves from the individual to the social, the direction for Vygotsky is from the social to the individual” (p. 27). She concludes that while Piagetian constructivism centers the construction of knowledge in the learner’s action on the world, Vygotsky centers it in the learner’s interaction with the social world. Whereas Piaget asserts that cognitive forms develop somewhat independently from the social milieu, Vygotsky contends they develop as a function of social context. Vygotsky suggests that cultural symbols, tools, and values influence the child’s cognitive forms. Both Piaget and Vygotsky acknowledge that the learner is active, that knowledge is dynamic, that knowledge is transformed by the learner, and that knowledge cannot be transmitted whole. (See also Davydov, 1995; Garrison, 1995; and Hyslop-Margison & Strobel, 2008.)

Sociocultural constructivism also derives from the work of Vygotsky, but it is a more recent view that infuses an exploration of relationships of power into the discussion of individual development and knowledge construction. It is, more than either of the others, a macro-analysis that attempts to expose inequality and its impact on both the process and content of learning (Vadeboncoeur, 1997). As with social constructivism, the subject of study is a situated individual, but in this case, the situation is not only the immediate one, but also the larger socio-historical one. “Emancipatory constructivism is based on Vygotsky’s complete multilevel methodology: therefore, all four levels of development—microgenesis, ontogenesis, phylogenesis, and cultural and historical development—are analyzed together and in relation to each other” (Vadeboncoeur, 1997, p. 29). The approach values behaviors, qualities, and characteristics that reflect the culture and, at the same time, evaluates the impact of power and privilege on cognitive forms. This approach ventures further away from biological determinism toward cultural determinism. Sociocultural constructivism values the role of reflection, critical thinking, and social discourse in exposing relationships of exploitation and oppression, both of the individual and of ways of thinking. Learners are encouraged to explore and understand their own situation and their own participation in maintaining or overturning power relationships. Sociocultural constructivism values inclusiveness of many voices in knowledge construction and devalues the transmission model of pedagogy (Vadeboncoeur, 1997 and Yilmaz, 2008). In this approach, formal knowledge is dissected and inspected. The approach views formal knowledge not as an educational end, but as an educational tool that is useful in guiding social discourse toward shared understanding (Richardson, 1997, 2003). Skepticism is a fundamental tenet, and learners are encouraged to question and explore. Of the three variants of constructivism described here, this one is most consistent with the existential, postmodern view, suggesting that there is no single objective Truth that can be discovered through reason. (See also Bereiter, 1994b; Cobb, 1994; Cobb & Yackel, 1996; Confrey, 1995; Yilmaz, 2008.)

Although the philosophy of constructivism is not unified, common elements can be derived from all three major types of constructivism. First, “the individual knower or learner builds a personal understanding of the surrounding world; but bodies of knowledge (the disciplines, such as science
and math) also are constructed by humans” (Phillips, 1997, p. 158). Although most theorists and philosophers who ascribe to constructivism agree with both of these assertions, they do not believe that the same cognitive processes are at work in both. In fact, according to Phillips (1997), “there would seem to be a prima facie case that the two processes are different” (p. 158). He continues, suggesting that psychologists, particularly cognitive psychologists, have proposed mechanisms that may be in play in the individual construction of knowledge while anthropologists and sociologists have proposed entirely different mechanism related to the social nature of learning. While both sets of mechanisms may be of interest to educational pedagogy, research tends to focus on one of two questions: (a) How do individuals construct the knowledge that is stored in their head; or (b) How do public disciplines or bodies of socio-cultural knowledge develop (Phillips, 1997). A second commonly held position is that knowledge construction is influenced chiefly by human activity. It is not fed in by or imposed from the outside. External processes may select new ideas for survival or extinction, but the new ideas are the function of individual and group human activity.

Table 1: A Comparison of Developmental, Social, and Sociocultural Constructivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental (Cognitive) Constructivism</th>
<th>Social Constructivism</th>
<th>Sociocultural Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Attributed to Piaget</td>
<td>• Attributed to Vygotsky</td>
<td>• A derivative of the work of Vygotsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual development is viewed as biological</td>
<td>• Individual development is viewed as sociological</td>
<td>• Individual development is viewed as sociocultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses on the decontextualized individual</td>
<td>• Focuses on the contextualized individual</td>
<td>• Focuses on a situated individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses on the individual’s ability to make meaning from individual experience</td>
<td>• Knowledge construction is centered on the individual’s interactions with the social world</td>
<td>• Cognitive forms develop as a function of power relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cognitive forms develop independent of the social milieu</td>
<td>• Cognitive forms develop as a function of social context</td>
<td>• Formal knowledge is constrained by power relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional elements derived from each of the three variants of constructivism guide programmatic goals and pedagogical approaches (For more detail, see Gergen, 1997; Woolfolk, 2001; Hyslop-Margison & Strobel, 2008). The following tenets of developmental constructivism recognize the role of the individual learner in the meaning-making process:

• Knowledge is created actively by the learner. Brophy (1992) summarizes this belief that learners construct understanding in this way: “Current research…recognizes that students do not passively receive or copy input from teachers, but instead actively mediate it by trying to make sense of it and to relate it to what they already know (or think they know) about a topic. Thus, students develop new knowledge through the process of active construction” (p. 5). Yilmaz (2008) also notes that knowledge is constructed by individuals or groups making sense of their experiential worlds.

• Learners construct knowledge out of experience, information, and data. Learners tap a variety of experiences and resources in their struggle for understanding and personal knowledge. Said another way, the learner is not separate from the physical or social world.
• Current knowledge and past experience influence the impact of present experience on knowledge construction. Hunt (1997) suggests, “When a learner approaches a new situation, those schema that the learner already has will determine how he or she represents the new situations, and those representations… the new situation as interpreted by prior learning — will be what is learned” (p. 216). Yilmaz (2008) supports this approach, noting that learning is an active process of knowledge construction influenced by how one interacts with and interprets new ideas and events.

• Learners attempt to make sense of the world around them, constructing rules to explain their experiences. Learners deal with disparities between current knowledge construction and new experience. New learning does not occur in a vacuum. Instead, the learner is processing new information and experiences constantly, comparing them to prior learning, identifying discrepancies, and accommodating or assimilating information, as appropriate to the level of discrepancy and the source of information.

• Knowledge construction is necessarily individual. Each learner constructs knowledge in a way that is unique to current experience and history. Group membership may result in similar histories among members, but histories never are identical. The level and significance of the differences is difficult to determine. Certainly, through what Wittgenstein calls “language games”, we learn to communicate functionally with each other about common experiences. The real issue here, however, is that a teacher cannot “construct” knowledge for another person.

• Individual knowledge construction guides individual action. The learner acts on what he or she knows, not on what the teacher or another student knows.

The following tenets of social constructivism focus on the role of the social environment in meaning making and assert that:

• Knowledge constructs are shaped by and learning is facilitated by social interaction. Through social interactions, learners’ views are articulated, challenged, and broadened (Mason, 1998, Olsen, 1999). Richardson (1997) suggests that “knowledge is constructed by a person in transaction with the environment; that is, both the individual and environment change as a result of this learning process” (p. 7). (See also Yilmaz, 2008). It is in the social context that language is used and, according to Dewey (1916),

  …the use of language to convey and acquire ideas is an extension and refinement of the principle that things gain meaning by being used in a shared experience or joint action…When words do not enter as factors into a shared situation whether overtly or imaginatively, they operate as pure physical stimuli, not having a meaning or intellectual value (pp. 15 -16, quoted in Bredo, 1994, p. 30).

• Individual histories of learners are influenced by the experiences they share with groups to which they belong. Thus, similarities may emerge in the knowledge accounts of individuals who have shared histories and experiences.

• Members of a culture collaboratively establish knowledge. Members of a group working together refine understandings, generate new knowledge, and agree to beliefs that ultimately may validate a brand of knowledge that is unique to the group.

Last, some commonly held views that inform constructivist pedagogy derive out of sociocultural constructivism, notably that

• Knowledge constructs are sociohistorically situated, and as such are bound to the cultural confines in which they are constructed.
The Philosophy

- Formal knowledge is partial and positional, rather than foundational. Formal knowledge is not in an identity relationship with truth. Rather, formal knowledge represents the views of the dominant culture.
- Formal knowledge can, and often does, disguise relationships of exploitation and oppression. Not only is formal knowledge agreed to by the dominant culture, it is used to subjugate those who hold less power in the society. “Culture” is broadly defined here. Formal knowledge as adopted by parents may be used to subjugate children who have lesser power.
- Critical analysis, reflection, and social discourse necessarily must accompany knowledge construction in order to avoid the exploitation and oppression. All assertions, regardless of the regard in which they are held, are open to review and refute. Interestingly, this view is in common with the directive in the scientific method for skepticism.

Members of the Center for Teaching and Learning acknowledge that while constructivist philosophy informs pedagogy, it does not explicitly direct it. Common over-interpretations of constructivist philosophy often unduly constrain pedagogy in a way that cannot be either inferred, from original philosophers or later proponents. In the section that follows, some of these over-interpretations of the philosophy are presented, followed by restatements that are more in keeping with the fundamental tenets of constructivism, and that represent the views of members of the Center for Teaching and Learning at Central Washington University.

Table 2: A Comparison of Important Tenets of Developmental, Social, and Sociocultural Constructivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Constructivism</th>
<th>Social Constructivism</th>
<th>Sociocultural Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge is created actively by the learner.</td>
<td>• Knowledge constructs are shaped by social interaction.</td>
<td>• Knowledge constructs are sociohistorically situated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners construct knowledge out of experience, information, and data.</td>
<td>• Individual histories of learners are influenced by the experiences they share with groups to which they belong.</td>
<td>• Formal knowledge is partial and positional, rather than foundational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current knowledge and past experience influence the impact of present experience on knowledge construction</td>
<td>• Members of a culture collaboratively establish knowledge.</td>
<td>• Formal knowledge can, and often does, disguise relationships of exploitation and oppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners attempt to make sense of the world around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical analysis, reflection, and social discourse necessarily must accompany knowledge construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners construct rules to explain their experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners deal with disparities between current knowledge construction and new experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge construction is necessarily individual, although it may be socially mediated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual knowledge construction guides individual action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issue #1: Decomposition**

Some interpretations of constructivism hold that cognition cannot be analyzed into components, and that attempts at this type of decomposition constitute a dangerous educational practice, and should be avoided. The primary opposition is to reductionism and elementism. The interpretation appears to derive from the Gestaltist concern that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and that a microanalysis of components leads to an incomplete understanding of the whole. From the more recent research literature, a seminal article by Resnick and Resnick (1992) often is cited as evidence of this position, although this attribution appears to over interpret Resnick and Resnick’s point of view.

A more reasoned interpretation is articulated by other cognitive psychologists, Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1995). They suggest that assessing learning and improving learning methods require careful task analysis at the level of component skills, intimately combined with study of the interaction of these skills in the context of their composite application. Hyslop-Margison (2008) also shows that constructivism represents a multifaceted and contested epistemological mindset with important implications for classroom teaching, but it amounts to little more than an educational slogan in the absence of conceptual understanding and clarification. Thus, while these authors agree that learning must be approached from a composite view, they also suggest that such an approach is incomplete without a very clear understanding of the component elements, some of which may be independently instructed and constructed. Nonetheless, they conclude, as do many constructivist philosophers that a macro view in which elements are integrated also is necessary to complete the learning act. This tendency to take the holistic view as the starting point characterizes even the most moderate constructivist.

**Issue #2: Decontextualization, Situated Learning, and Abstraction**

Some interpretations of constructivism hold that all learning should be contextualized and that it never is appropriate to present information, data, or experience out of context. An even more strident approach is one that holds that action is grounded in the concrete situation in which it occurs. This approach holds that all knowledge is specific to the situation in which the task is performed, and knowledge that is more general cannot and will not transfer to real-world situations. It infers that knowledge does not transfer between tasks, and that training by abstraction is of little use. Real learning is thought to occur only or primarily in authentic situations.

Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1995) and Hylsop-Margison (2008) summarize the research in this area and agree that research and instruction should occur in contexts that are consistent with the scope of the skills currently under investigation. However, they also contend that knowledge does not have to be taught in the precise context in which it will be used. They predict that such a practice can create unduly context bound knowledge and risk “grave inefficiencies” in transfer. They assert that the degree of transfer is dependent on the relation of the material originally learned to the transfer material, the manner in which information is represented, where attention is directed during learning, and the degree of practice that characterizes learning. They also recognize that transfer varies from one domain to another as a function of the number of symbolic components that are shared.

Nonetheless, instructors are encouraged to use authentic tasks that mimic realistic situations. An authentic task is “a classroom learning activity that requires understanding similar to understanding that would be used in the world outside the classroom” (Eggen & Kauchak, 2001, p. 295. Needels & Knapp (1994) suggest that authentic tasks provide an opportunity for learners to think in ways that will serve them well in real-life situations and to identify gaps in knowledge that impair adequate performance in the real world.
With respect to abstraction, Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1995) conclude that while abstract instruction certainly can be ineffective, particularly if the content taught in the classroom is not required in real-life situations, it also can be quite effective. They contend that the teacher’s decision to prefer abstract or specific instruction should hinge on a balance among (a) the cost of general abstract training, (b) the cost of specific training, (c) the cost of supplemental training to ensure application, and (d) the range of situations for application.

**Issue #3: The Role of Instruction**

In a more radical interpretation of constructivist philosophy, proponents contend that knowledge cannot be instructed or transmitted by a teacher; it can only be constructed by the learner. In this account, the role of instruction is quite unclear and sometimes judged as unnecessary. More frequently, however, this view results in a prohibition of instructional methodologies that seem particularly transmittal in nature, for example, the lecture.

A more reasoned view suggests that while learning requires a change in the learner which can only be brought about by what the learner does, the teacher can facilitate both action and knowledge construction. In this more reasoned account, the role of the teacher as facilitator is clearer. The teacher designs a series of experiences for students (which might include, for example, reading, listening to a lecture, working with a group, doing an activity) that will enable them to learn efficiently and effectively and will motivate their learning. In the end, though, the teacher’s primary role is to determine if, in fact, learning has occurred and to modify instruction to ensure that learning does occur.

What is to be learned varies: sometimes it is content and sometimes it is process. In both cases, what is to be learned is and remains open for debate, and content that is made available for learning always is open to inspection and dispute. Nonetheless, the teacher’s role is to provide an instructional environment in which learning of agreed on content and process does occur and in which the learner routinely reflects on his own learning and what he has been asked to learn. Therefore, while constructivists indeed do assert that knowledge is not transmitted whole from one learner to another, they do not diminish the role of instruction in the construction of knowledge.

**Issue #4: The Role of Practice**

A common over interpretation of constructivist philosophy is that practice stifles creativity, turns learners into automatons, and dooms their ability to learn. Practice sometimes is referred to in this account as “drill and kill,” and the exception that is taken to practice appears to hinge on a belief that memorization impairs critical thinking. Indeed, there is mounting evidence that some learners memorize but do not understand and constructivist philosophy places a high premium on understanding and on making sense. However, there is no evidence that the two are negative correlates of each other.

In fact, Byrnes (2001) concludes, “the suggestion that practice is somehow inimical to meaningful learning is unfounded” (p. 41). Byrnes suggests that all primary theories/philosophies of learning emphasize the role of practice and repetition, but the purpose of practice varies across the positions. For constructivists, it “helps students internalize skills and form meaningful abstractions” (p. 41).

Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1995) agree. They conclude that “nothing flies more in the face of the last 20 years of research than the assertion that practice is bad….All evidence…indicates that real competence only comes with extensive practice. In denying the critical role of practice one is
denying children the very thing they need to achieve competence” (p. 12). (See also Gordon, 2009).

There are and will continue to be debates about the content or process for which automaticity is appropriate, but except for the most radical constructivist interpretation, practice is the primary means to fluency. It is not a substitute for “making sense” of one’s world, but it sometimes can and often does enable sense making, transfer, and knowledge adduction for the purpose of solving new problems or seeing new relationships.

**Conclusion:** Constructivist philosophy is complex and its variations do not fit comfortably under one roof. Each variant informs pedagogy somewhat differently but none dictate exactly how one should teach. Some basic pedagogical principles align with the most commonly held views of constructivism, and it is on these principles that an approach can be built. A constructivist view make it incumbent on the teacher to deal with each learner as an individual, to value diversity of perspective, and to recognize that the learner’s behavior is a direct reflection of his or her life experiences. It also makes it incumbent on the teacher to understand issues of power and authority and their role in deciding what constitutes the formal knowledge in a field of study; to understand the role of sociocultural variables in establishing shared meaning; and in recognizing the extraordinary effort that is required to make “school knowledge” learned in the very special context of the school into “life knowledge” that informs action in everyday contexts. Among commonly held views by constructivist teachers, generally, and by the faculty in the Center for Teaching and Learning are the following:

- Learning opportunities are best when active engagement with tasks characterize them.
- Formal knowledge is valued and made available to the learner, but the learner is encouraged to reflect on it and be skeptical about it, rather than accept it thoughtlessly.
- Multiple examples and a variety of representations of content enable learners to derive meaning.
- Critical thinking, reflection, and problem solving are prized and encouraged.
- Interaction and conversation with others in the learning community can improve the learner’s ability to state her case, can widen perspective, and can motivate learning.
- Learning is facilitated when content is connected to the real world.
- Multiple and authentic measures of assessment provide richer insight into the learner’s construction of knowledge.
- Verbal explanations can and should be supplemented by experiential learning.
THE THEME

“Facilitators of Learning in a Diverse World”

The Center for Teaching and Learning adopted a program theme to serve as a visible reminder to faculty and students of what we are trying to become. We agreed that both our faculty and our graduates should be facilitators of learning. The term facilitator was chosen because of its consistency with the constructivist philosophy. The term reflects the view of the professional educator as one that encourages personal reflection and construction of knowledge, who enables students in the construction of knowledge, and who provides insights about formal knowledge, but who does not dictate the knowledge that will be constructed. It shifts the focus from what the professional educator does to what the student achieves. It reminds us that the success of our endeavor is measured not in seat time or credits earned but in knowledge, skills, and values acquired. Thus, we see ourselves and we want our students to see us and themselves as facilitators of learning.

By adopting this theme, the faculty wanted to emphasize that our role as facilitators extended to all learners. Just as our candidates were becoming more diverse, they also were being asked to teach in environments of changing cultural balance, of increasing numbers of children living in poverty and facing health problems, homelessness, and disrupted family lives, and of increasing language diversity. Faculty were finding that tried and true methods were less effective than they once had been, and candidates were reporting that they felt under prepared and overwhelmed to address the needs of the children they encountered in the P-12 schools. As the framework was modified to reflect multicultural and global perspectives in all aspects of the program, the theme also was extended to emphasize this important aspect of our programs. Thus, we wanted to be and to prepare facilitators of learning in a diverse world. The theme is intended to remind all of us—candidates, university faculty and administrators, and cooperating professionals—in the field to which we subscribe:

- A focus on learning as the important product of teaching, and the teacher’s role as a facilitator of learning; and
- An emphasis on individual differences and the impact of the racial, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic diversity of children on how to facilitate learning.

The CTL logo, adapted from a Pendleton Blanket “The Circle of Life or Elders Blanket,” represents our mission of “preparing facilitators of learning in a diverse world.” The design honors wisdom keepers who hand down knowledge to the next generation. It illustrates that people are interrelated and an equal part of the whole. The colors represent all humankind, mother earth, the sun, the stars, and the four directions of life. The spiral represents our constructivist acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, which evolve from meaningful experiences as assessed within the CTL’s programs as well as throughout life. This ancient symbol from America’s indigenous people best represents the CTL’s professional commitments, values, and beliefs.
Each aspect of the conceptual framework depends on and arises out of a knowledge base that is informed by contemporary research, the wisdom of practice, and emerging educational policies and practices. This three-part scholarly foundation of the conceptual framework is one of balance.

Professional commitments and dispositions arise out of personal and shared beliefs; nonetheless, historical precedent and current understanding of the foundations and pedagogy of the discipline of professional education influence them. Thus, when we say that we believe that all children can learn, the statement represents not only our personal beliefs but also the reality that all children do learn, the strong research support that stands as testimony to the important role of the teacher as a facilitator of learning in all children, and the remarkable evidence that learning is the natural response of organisms to their environments. Therefore, while much of what we assert as professional commitments and dispositions represents statements of value, they are not unstudied.

Similarly, the philosophy, the theme, the competencies, the program structure and the role of internships, assessment, and evaluation are informed by historical understandings, contemporary research, the wisdom of practice, and emerging educational policies and practices.

The bibliography provides a synopsis of the rich literature in education that has informed the choices that are reflected in the program at Central Washington University.
THE COMPETENCIES

The conceptual framework includes, in addition to the philosophy and theme, a series of statements of desired results for candidates. Faculty in the unit have agreed to these statements, and use them as a guide for the development of coursework and assessment. The statements are informed by state and national standards, by the literature related to teaching and learning, and by the input from professionals in the field. Although the competencies have been reviewed and adjusted over time, they have remained fairly stable across the past decade. Primary statements follow below.

Facilitator of Learning in a Diverse World

Program Goals and Objectives

To determine that graduates have achieved each of the characteristics necessary to be facilitators of learning in a diverse world, the Center will expect them to attain the following standards as demonstrated by the related competencies.

I. Facilitator of Learning as Expert Learner

CTL 1.5 Candidates demonstrate a positive impact on student learning:

1. Demonstrates a repertoire of techniques for the development and implementation of assessment and evaluation of instruction, reflecting diverse theories of learning and instructional design to represent the best and most current research on good practice. Includes frequent use of formative assessment, using appropriate monitoring, adjusting teaching methods, and integrating meaningful learning experiences, resulting in a positive effect on all students (Barell, 2006; Bennett, 2011; Ching, Wang, Shih, & Kedem, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Ernst & Monroe, 2004; McTighe & O’connor, 2005; Shepard, 2000; Tauber, 2007; Watkins, 2005; Weld & Funk, 2005).

2. Practices classroom management strategies to encourage democratic classroom interaction and promote independent learning, positive self-esteem, and provide a consistent and positive learning environment, while recognizing and considering cultural, gender, and family backgrounds or needs (Cutri, Rogers, & Montero, 2007; Darder, 1997; Grossman, 2003; Le Roux, 2001; Milner & Tenore, 2010; Robinson & Kakela, 2006; Rodriguez, Jones, Pang, & Park, 2004; Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2004).

CTL 1.4 Candidates reflect dispositions expected of professional educators:

1. Professional educators – those who provide training and those who are trained – recognize the need to be self-reflective (Giovannelli, 2003; Houston & Warner, 2002; Jennings & Potter-Smith, 2002; Kienzler & Smith, 2005; McCaughtry, Cothran, Kulinna, Martin, & Faust, 2005; Mills & Satterthwait, 2000; Nolan, 2011; Risko, et al., 2002; Warren, 2007; Whipp, 2000).

2. Recognize their responsibility to understand and support learners (Gay, 2000; Johnston, 2003; Tomlinson, 1999/2000).


4. Recognize that they are professionals engaged in a scholarly, collaborative pursuit (Smith 2001; Tsang, 2010; Warren, 2007).
5. Through independent analysis and research contributes significantly to the professional knowledge base in a way that benefits his or her own professional growth and growth of students (Adalbjarnardottir, 2010; Reis-Jorge, 2007; Warren, 2007).

6. Becomes conversant with the basic foundations of education as a profession, including the philosophy, legal, psychology, history, and sociology of education and research foundations of the field (Gardner, 2007; Ornstein, Levine, & Gutek, 2011; Soltis, 1990).

7. **II. Facilitator of Learning as Knowledge Specialist**

   **CTL I.1** Candidates demonstrate subject matter knowledge in areas of endorsement

   1. Demonstrate competency in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking and calculating as a means of achieving knowledge, making decisions, solving problems, and perceiving possibilities (Bullough & Gitlin, 2001; Hooks, 2010; Taconis, van der Plas, & van der Sanden, 2004).

   2. Exhibit a broad understanding of the various and dynamic communities of knowledge to include the humanities, the physical and natural sciences, the social sciences, and they demonstrate knowledge of the state goals and requirements (WAC 181-78A-264). Furthermore, candidates show an understanding of the interaction of the forces which characterize those communities (Blackburn, Cleland, Collins, Cruikshank, Marimon, Postema, Valentini, & Vandenberghe, 2010; Huang, 2006; Kincheloe, J.L., Raymond, H.A., & Steinberg, R., 2007).

   **CTL I.2** Candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of pedagogical content knowledge:

   1. Understands the integration of subject specialization and pedagogical knowledge, such as taking into account the diverse needs and perspectives of students, when representing and organizing material for teaching (Bennett, 2005; Crutchfield, 2003, Enyedy & Mukhopadhyay, 2007; Garza, 2007; Koehler, Mishra, & Yahya, 2007, Shulman, 1987; Love, 2010).

   2. Possesses and responsibly applies the informational, conceptual, practical, and methodological knowledge of each specialization (Bintz, 2004; Flanigan & Greenwood, 2007, 2010; Nokes, Dole, & Hacker, 2007).


   4. Demonstrates competence in the appropriate uses of educational technology (Koehler, Mishra, Yahya, 2007; Kritt & Winegar, 2007; Pohan & Dieckmann, 2005; Selwyn, 2010).

   5. Develops reflective teaching while integrating theory about instruction with self-knowledge and knowledge of the world of practice to facilitate learning within concrete learning situations (Ghaye, 2011; Lightner, Bober, & Willi, 2007; Wallace, Abbott, & Blary, 2007).
6. Reflects critically on professional issues, taking into account a variety of perspectives and achieving a responsible, informed, and independent position (Franz, Hopper, & Kritsonis, 2007; Vairo, Marcus, & Weiner, 2007; Warnick & Silverman, 2011).

7. Analyzes and evaluates his or her own teaching behavior and effectiveness and implements change based on those observations (Kienzler & Smith, 2005; Rockoff & Speroni, 2011; Weld & Funk, 2005)

III. **Facilitator of Learning as Master of the Art and Science of Teaching**

1. **CTL I.3 Candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills:** Explains how culture, ethnicity, gender, personality and disability may affect the learning situation and demonstrates ways in which the academic and social challenges presented by diverse learners can be effectively accommodated (Garza, 2007; Ginsberg, 2007; Hasslen & Bacharach, 2007; Robertson & Miller, 2007; Rodriguez, Jones, Pang, & Park, 2004; Veletsianos, 2010).

2. Demonstrates competence in integrating content across the curriculum (Bintz, 2004; Brewer, 2006; Gelineau, 2012; Olness, 2007; Rothstein & Rothstein, 2007; Spencer & Guillaume, 2006).


5. Develops strategies for effective communication with various constituencies of the schools to include colleagues, parents, students, and community members (Butin, 2007; Mitchell, Winter, & Martin, 2007; Robertson & Miller, 2007; Sanders, 2007).

IV. **Facilitator of Learning as Teacher/Specialist Scholar**

The standards cited below are common guide-posts for all advanced programs of the unit that adhere to this conceptual framework. Each program measures standards associated with their respective national professional association. While each of the unit’s advanced programs refer to the standards of this strand in designing curriculum, the outcome measures are specifically defined by the standards associated with each program’s respective professional community or discipline standards. For example, The Principal and Program Administrator Program use ISLLC standards to guide assessment. While, the Master Teacher Program has designed assessment outcomes direct associated with the standards identified below. Advanced programs illustrate the relationship between these CF standards and their respective professional standards by creating an alignment matrix.

**Advanced Candidates**

1) A successful candidate will demonstrate critical pedagogic skills that make learning meaningful and provide evidence of student learning.
2) A successful candidate will demonstrate highly developed oral and written communication skills.

3) A successful candidate will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to integrate technology into instruction.

4) A successful candidate will demonstrate knowledge of the evolving social transformation of the education profession.

5) A successful candidate will demonstrate proficiency in reading, critiquing, applying, and contributing to the professional educational knowledge-base.

6) A successful candidate will demonstrate the ability to identify and address issues of diversity that affect teaching and learning.

7) A successful candidate will demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to connect assessment, measurement and evaluation with instruction and curriculum practices.
FIELD EXPERIENCE RATIONALE

The framework includes a rationale for field experience, and field experiences are an integrated part of the professional education program both at the initial and at the advanced level. First, the inclusion of a clinical experience is in keeping with the belief structure that underpins the programs in the Center for Teaching and Learning. Educators are viewed as professionals and the tri-part model that characterizes the preparation of other professionals—for example, in medicine, clinical psychology, engineering, and law—is viewed as equally valid for professional educators. This model typically includes coursework or explicit study, clinical experience, and examination or competency assessment.

The rationale, for field experience as part of the preparation of professional educators, also is grounded in the constructivist philosophy of the program. It emanates out of the work of John Dewey and the progressive education movement he spearheaded, it is informed by the research base in teacher education, and it is validated in the findings reported in a number of national reports that have called for improved preparation of professional educators in the context of educational reform efforts.

Constructivism emphasizes reflection and the role of context in decision-making. It accepts that learning is facilitated through an active process of inquiry within a learning community. In their excellent review of the place of field and laboratory experiences in the preparation of teachers, McIntyre, Byrd, and Foxx (1996) assert that “the constructivist philosophy emphasizes the growth of the prospective teacher through experiences, reflection, and self-examination.” Situational variables are seen as critical in the reflective process, and the teacher’s eventual skill as a decision-maker is seen as heavily reliant on an understanding of these situational or contextual variables.

The inclusion of and beliefs about field experience also reflect an understanding that, in any applied field of study, knowledge is both declarative (knowing about) and procedural (knowing how). Educators must acquire both to be successful. College classrooms can be argued to be an adequate learning environment for declarative knowledge, although even in this arena, it sometimes is difficult to provide experiences that are sufficiently meaningful to ensure learning and remembering. These difficulties are compounded in the case of procedural knowledge. The most skillfully crafted simulations typically fall short of providing a realistic venue in which to demonstrate that one can do the complex tasks of the professional educator.

In addition, educators must conform their knowledge to the special environments in which they will practice their craft. The school environment and the classroom is an increasingly complex place that calls upon professional educators to integrate knowledge, apply knowledge and procedures moment-to-moment in time, and manage multiple tasks simultaneously. The realities and complexities of the classroom and school often befuddle even the best-prepared educational theoretician. Multiple demands in the school environment require the professional educator to respond to multiple audiences simultaneously. Issues that raise ethical questions are commonplace and difficult to resolve. To develop the level of fluency and automaticity required to actually carry out their role expectations, candidates require adequate practice across many and varied circumstances.

In the school setting, candidates are able to understand already learned concepts in new, different, and generally deeper ways. Knowledge becomes more contextualized and operational. Often, didactic learning is somewhat compartmentalized, but the realities of the school and classroom are not. Thus, it is in the field experience that the candidate is called upon to integrate knowledge,
to make connections, and to conform his or her behavior to the multiple contingencies that exist in any moment in the school day.

For many candidates, the internship is a much more culturally rich experience than the college environment. The public schools serve all students in the culture, much more so even than those colleges that have made tremendous strides in achieving diversity. It is in these culturally diverse environments that students experience, first-hand, the varying expectations of students and parents that arise out of individual and group histories.

Professional educators must work together to achieve the goals of the public schools. Although some level of autonomy exists in the daily life of each professional educator, some goals require collaboration and cooperation among school staff who serve different roles. College classrooms can be a venue for teamwork, but the outcomes often are manufactured. In the school environment, the impetus for teamwork is real-world problems, often serious ones.

The work of a professional educator often appears in the abstract to be more romantic than it is in reality. Candidates who are perfectly capable of acquiring the theoretical and even procedural skills to be professional educators may learn that they do not enjoy the work once they enter the schools. It is important for this discovery to occur before candidates have committed to the profession through expensive and extensive study.

Field Internship in Initial Programs: Three types of field-based experiences characterize all initial preparation programs: an early field experience, practicum experience attached to coursework, and a culminating student teaching experience. The nature of the practicum varies according to discipline. For example, candidates preparing for special education and early childhood education certification complete a full quarter of practicum in a school setting before student teaching.

- The early field experience exposes students to the organization of schools, to their roles in society, to professional expectations, and to the sociocultural richness of schools. It provides an opportunity for students to reflect on their calling, to develop a context for later course-based learning, and to understand school culture.

- Practicums, typically in a content area, serve as a clinical experience in the NCATE sense of the term: These typically are carefully planned activities for which one or more specific objectives exists and in which student performance and improvement is assessed. The experience might include micro teaching clinics, participation experiences, case studies, curriculum development activities, and the like.

- Student teaching is the culminating field experience. Student will have completed 75% of their coursework in their disciplinary area and the large majority of courses in the master of the art and science of teaching before entering student teaching. In student teaching, students are expected to meet very specific objectives at a level of mastery consistent with expectations for a beginning teacher.

At the initial level, the unit employs a group of mostly full-time, field-based supervisors. These faculty members work in collaboration with campus-based faculty to define program competencies, to develop evaluation techniques, and to ensure that the field experience is coherent with the didactic course requirements. Field-based faculty identify areas of strength and weakness in candidates, recommend additional program goals and objectives, and serve as the most consistent interface between campus-based activities and the world of practice.
Field Internships in Advanced Programs: At the advanced level, students in the school psychology, school counseling, and school administration programs also participate in the tri-part model: coursework, clinical experience, and examination or competency development. Typically, they complete practicum and internship experiences as part of their program.

Practicum experiences are designed to familiarize students with the public school setting, to emphasize legal and ethical standards in the Washington Administrative Codes as well as the ethical practices of professional bodies, and to practice their specialty skills within the culture of the schools. Most students who complete specialists program previously have worked in the schools or currently are working in the schools. In the two programs that do not require school experience for program entry, school counseling and school psychology, students complete practicum in the university’s training clinic, where direct observation, videotaping, and intensive supervision provide opportunity to hone basic interviewing skills prior to implementing these skills in the school setting. For students who have school experience, school-based internships provide an opportunity for them to become familiar with their new roles and the expectations that accompany them. Practicum is accompanied by opportunities for candidates to share their experiences, discuss possible outcomes, relate experience pertaining to specific course criteria and receive feedback and direction from the instructor. Feedback, both written and verbal, also is solicited from the field based supervisor.

Students also complete an end-of-program internship. The internship is a collaborative effort between the university program and site supervisors to provide an effective learning experience for individuals who have completed their coursework. Sites are selected to meet the specific interests of candidates and the preparation requirements of the program. An internship plan is developed among the candidate, the program director, and a representative of the district. It specifies experiences that must be completed during the internship, and on which evaluation will be based. Certified specialists within the host district serve as the site supervisors. In each specialization area, full-time faculty member supervises the practicum and internship experiences of candidates.
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Consistent with the conceptual framework’s constructivist philosophy, the CTL assessment system has dynamically evolved over the past decade as a result of relevant and meaningful experiences, which include constituent and community feedback. The latest edition is comprehensively designed to be purposely redundant in the measurement of new standards, flexible enough to meet specific program requirements, and robust enough to provide unit wide analyses for the purpose of improving program and unit (CTL) operations, including the evaluation of the system. Multiple assessment measurements are conducted using a transitional timeline. Data are collected, aggregated, and reported both at the program level and unit level for both initial and advanced programs using CTL, state, and national standards as criteria for the measurements. Data reports and summaries are used by individual faculty to assess their own instruction; by candidates to assess their own learning and development; by program faculty and coordinators to assess program effectiveness; and by the OREA to assess unit operations. Summaries are also shared, discussed, and reported in numerous ways at each level of the unit’s governance organization, and are made public through the CTL/OREA web sites. Feedback is sought at every level: candidate, faculty, PEAB, administration, as well as the public.

Table 3: Residency Teacher Assessment Transition Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Standard Elements</th>
<th>I Admission</th>
<th>II Endorsement Preparation</th>
<th>III Student Teaching</th>
<th>IV Certification</th>
<th>V Graduation Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK</td>
<td>WEST B GPA</td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>WEST E GPA</td>
<td>WEST E Pass GPA STE</td>
<td>1. Program Completer Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCK</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td>2. 1st Year Teacher Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td>3. 3rd Year Teacher Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td>4. EBI Teacher Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK a-k</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td>5. EBI Principal Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET l-v</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD w-y</td>
<td></td>
<td>LiveText Rubrics Grades/GPA</td>
<td>FSTE-LTR PPA</td>
<td>STE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disposition Inventory Faculty Referrals</td>
<td>Disposition Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Application Checklist Admissions Assessment</td>
<td>Student Teaching Checklist</td>
<td>Certification Checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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