

Loyola Marymount University  
School of Education  
Conceptual Framework  
March 30, 2009

*Introduction*

The conceptual framework, or knowledge base, is an on-going, living document that undergirds all of our credential, degree, and certificate programs. The LMU School of Education Conceptual Framework is informed by the University and School of Education's Mission and Goals statements, and national and state standards including the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) 2002 standards, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) 1992 standards, and other program standards. Our Conceptual Framework focuses on educational success for all learners through respect, education, advocacy, and leadership. On-going, formative assessment provides critical support for the LMU School of Education students, staff, and faculty to become well-rounded educators in the service of others, and is the vehicle for program improvement. Our assessment system includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that educators need to fulfill our mission of creating a more equitable education for all. The professional dispositions we value and assess as educators are derived from our Mission and Goals. We strive to be, and to educate professionals to be, educators who:

- Respect and Value all Individuals.
- Educate by Integrating Theory and Practice.
- Advocate for Access to a Socially Just Education.
- Lead in Order to Facilitate Transformation.

We have identified seven important tenets as being clear manifestations of our knowledge base which support each of our professional education programs: social justice; integration of theory and practice; sociocultural/constructivist perspective; culturally responsive pedagogy; technology, community collaboration; and leadership. The seven tenets of our Conceptual Framework integrate theory and practice, inform one another, and are not mutually exclusive. The tenets are operationalized into Unit Candidate Outcomes (which are the same as our Professional Dispositions) and Division Proficiencies, which allow us to assess the Conceptual Framework. The following is a brief discussion of our beliefs as they relate to each of the above tenets, followed by the Candidate Outcomes and Proficiencies.

Loyola Marymount is a Catholic university in the Jesuit and Marymount educational traditions. These traditions are based on the spiritual philosophy of Ignatius of Loyola, and are referred to as *Ignatian Spirituality*. This spiritual worldview has influenced an international set of secondary and tertiary schools for the past 450 years. The educational philosophy that guides these schools is referred to as the Ignatian educational tradition. This tradition can be described by six major characteristics that are central to Jesuit education: (1) a pervading philosophy, (2) a personal concern for the whole life of each student, (3) a striving for excellence, (4) an emphasis on critical thinking and effective communication, (5) development of a broad liberal education, and (6) a commitment to a faith that does justice (McGovern, 1988, pp. 31-33). The LMU School of

education embraces its Ignatian heritage and Jesuit and Marymount traditions as it provides a fundamental context for its mission and vision.

### *Social Justice*

We recognize that as humans, we have duties toward one another. That society is not perfect in this regard is apparent. There are many people in the United States and in the world who lack the basic necessities of life. Unjust social structures are a major reason for inequities and social stratification. Throughout history, human beings have constructed systems marked by institutionalized inequality, prejudice, and discrimination that serve to benefit some members of society and to keep others from fully developing or obtaining their place in the social structure. We consider education to be a powerful force for both understanding and responding to social inequities and historical forces of oppression. Furthermore, we believe that the classroom is a “vital public space” that is crucial to the development of a “democratic public sphere” (Giroux, 1988), offering for many oppressed people, the only possible hope for authentic social change (hooks, 1994). Therefore, as educators we are committed to the concept of social justice and to just practices in education as part of our mission.

Our commitment to social justice has two principal sources: our religious/spiritual tradition as a Catholic, Jesuit/Marymount University and the critical educational tradition that is not necessarily explicitly religious. Our spiritual traditions encourage us to participate in creating social conditions which facilitate justice. Justice in the United States is often conceived as principally a procedural matter in which fair rules are established in order to ensure just results. However, the religious traditions that inform our practice, based in biblical notions of justice, encourage us to conceive justice differently: as “the establishment of shalom, a community of peace where right relationships are restored” (Himes, 2001, p. 42). In education, the Marymount and Jesuit traditions emphasize the importance of working for justice as a concrete way to respond to the stewardship relationship we have with our students. This takes the form of addressing injustice in our own lives and work, and also in the lives of our students. We educate our students to be women and men both for and in solidarity with others, students who have not only the intellectual capabilities to keenly analyze the nature of injustice in society but also the personal convictions to work for positive social change (Kolvenbach, 2000). We join our voices with those who have in the tradition of the Church’s social teaching repeatedly urged individuals and policymakers to place higher priority on meeting the needs of the poor rather than on satisfying the wants of the comfortable; that is, we commit ourselves to a *preferential option for the poor* (Massaro, 2000).

In terms of the educational tradition of social justice, as educators we recognize the truth of Martin Luther King Jr.’s words that humanity will either learn to live together as brothers and sisters or we will die together as strangers (King, 1963). What happens to any individual in the human family affects us all, and the true greatness of a society is measured by the way its weakest members are treated. We also agree with Paulo Freire that education is not a neutral act but rather one that empowers or disempowers (Freire, 1970). We adopt as our own the Freirian notion that, though education should be available for all people and empower them, educators must be especially concerned about individuals and groups that have been historically

disempowered by unjust social structures. In this light, we make use of the work of Antonio Gramsci (1971), to assist us in challenging the ideological structures that limit the life chances of so many students. Thus, we value the role authentic education plays in building up a society that is free of every form of discrimination and hatred, including racism, sexism, homophobia, lingualism, and ableism.

### *Integration of Theory and Practice*

The faculty of the LMU School of Education are reflective practitioners who integrate theory and practice in order to prepare graduates who will work for a more just and equitable society. We recognize and believe that effective educators are reflective and scholarly practitioners. They question their own aims, assess their practice and outcomes, and monitor the effects of their practice upon each student (Moallem, 1997). The foundation for this belief is congruent with the concepts and goals of Jesuit education that include critical inquiry, social responsibility and value-oriented reflection. These principles provided direction for the first education courses taught at the University in the 1930s.

In addition to the Jesuit concepts and goals, education courses have also been influenced by the work of John Dewey and his ideas related to reflective practice. Faculty have encouraged students to be in a “state of questioning” and in the “act of searching” (Dewey, 1933). Along the way, candidates have been “disposed to reflect,” knowing that knowledge alone is not sufficient but that it must be accompanied by “a desire to apply” (Dewey, 1933, 1938). Wanting to expand on the beliefs of Dewey, the faculty of the School of Education began to incorporate the work of Schön (1983) into its practice. Courses attempted to integrate Schön’s message of combining “professional knowledge” with “zones of practice.”

As reflective practitioners ourselves, we recognize that the purpose of theory is to assist in the organization of information and knowledge so that it can better inform practice. The integration of theory and practice is a dynamic and reciprocal process involving reflection and dialogue. Believing that knowledge is socially constructed, courses in the School of Education have incorporated the principles of sociocultural/constructivist theory (Applefield, Huber, & Moallem, 2001; Poplin, 1988; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, Del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995), in addition to presenting other theories relevant to various disciplines represented in the School of Education which graduates can incorporate as part of their professional practice. The application of sociocultural/constructivist theory in courses and fieldwork models an approach for future teachers, counselors, psychologists, and administrators which they can apply in their practice, making learning for students more relevant and applicable to their everyday lives. To apply the sociocultural/constructivist theory and to enable candidates to be reflective practitioners, courses are structured so that they incorporate a variety of strategies. Examples include cooperative learning, reflective journals/portfolios, the use of students’ funds of knowledge, multicultural education, and authentic assessment.

As we move to providing experiences that enable candidates to integrate theory and practice, we are also developing a performance assessment system that both facilitates teaching and learning and reveals the distinctive achievements of individual candidates (Eisner, 1999). Assessment of

performance, including application of various theories presented throughout the programs, will provide systematic feedback that enables candidates to develop knowledge and skills which are more authentic and related to the context of the schools in which they will be professionals.

### *Sociocultural/Constructivist Perspective*

We use theory to guide practice in all areas of our work. While we use a multitude of theoretical perspectives, including critical theories, in the preparation of educators, two educational traditions that inform our teaching and learning are the sociocultural and constructivist perspectives. We recognize that differential achievement among students is a serious concern for educators. Because there are various factors affecting school achievement, including social, cultural, and school-related influences, we utilize sociocultural (Cole & Scribner, 1974; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, Del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995) and social constructivist (Kukla, 2000; Poplin, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978) theoretical perspectives concerning teaching and learning to understand and respond to differences in children's, families', and communities' histories of engaging in particular endeavors (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003).

There is strong conceptual similarity in the literature between sociocultural and constructivist theories (Díaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Erickson, 1987). We purposefully merge these two concepts because combined they provide a powerful construct that helps inform our mission as a School of Education.

The sociocultural/constructivist perspective highlights the following:

- Thinking and learning are social processes, not merely individual processes;
- Learning is an active process fueled by the desire to regulate cognitive dissonance experienced in everyday learning tasks. Through assimilating and accommodating new information, individuals restructure their thinking and experience cognitive growth;
- Learning requires active participation and engagement in which individuals construct knowledge, not only passive processing;
- Meaningful learning is situated in the context of everyday teaching and learning settings and in everyday problem-solving activities—these vary by cultural context, socioeconomic status, and other sociocultural and sociopolitical factors;
- School failure is a product of the interaction of several factors—including the environment, the relationship between the student and the teacher, the teacher's cultural and pedagogic competency, and school leadership—not just the student (Martin, 1996).

The socio-cultural/constructivist perspective implies that teachers, counselors, psychologists, and administrators seek to understand the views and experiences of students, engage them in actively co-creating knowledge, and make learning relevant and applicable to real world situations. A further implication is that evaluation and assessment must be authentic and linked to school improvement and student achievement. We believe that socio-cultural and constructivist approaches are compatible with well-formulated standards-based instructional systems, and we are committed to assisting educators who struggle with the apparent incompatibility of direct instruction programs and the socio-cultural/constructivist paradigm.

### ***Culturally Responsive Teaching***

We recognize the need to create a culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000); also referred to as culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994) that promotes equitable learning for *all* students and closes the differential achievement gap. The critical components of such a pedagogy are centered on the notions that educators create learning environments in which *all*: “(a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and experience cultural competence; and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order” (Banks & Banks, 1995, p. 160).

We recognize the continuous growth of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in schools and the contributions of their heritage, languages, and cultures in the formation of a pluralist society in the United States. Schools, institutions, and educators must consciously embrace and implement policies and practices that adequately respond to the unique needs, interests, and lives of students. Cochran-Smith (1993) defines such practices as being “locally appropriate” and cautions that culturally responsive pedagogies must be constructed from students’ lived experience. Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) refer to the latter as *funds of knowledge*, an approach that “involves understanding the sociopolitical and economic context of the households and analyzing their social history” (p.133). This new transformative and comprehensive vision of students’ cultures refutes the deficit model that has permeated the entire school system, and advocates a vision of cultural diversity that involves recognition of the sociopolitical and economic contributions of culturally and linguistically diverse families, and the knowledge their children bring to the classroom. An important consideration in culturally responsive pedagogy is that, as educators, we must understand and come to terms with how our own values, assumptions, and socialization experiences reaffirm or disregard the funds of knowledge of the learners.

We recognize that there are educational practices in the United States that promote inequity and ethnocentrism. Darder (1991) notes that such educational practices as testing, ability grouping, tracking and low teacher expectations for minority students perpetuate “values and social relations that produce and legitimate the dominant worldview at the expense of a vast number of citizens” (p. 19). We recognize that it is imperative to examine the educational systems that work against those that are marginalized by social class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, exceptionality, language, and gender. Additionally, we recognize that it is “virtually impossible to understand the classroom behavior and performance of economically disadvantaged [sic.] and minority students without understanding their history as an oppressed group, cultural frames of reference, and their everyday social practices” (McLaren, 1994, p. 207). In order to work against these practices, we strive to prepare educators by giving them analytic tools to see social inequalities and how educational systems can participate in their reproduction. In our classrooms, we facilitate discussions among teachers, counselors, administrators, and school psychologists that provide opportunities for them to address, create, and implement educational models that are inclusive of a systematic analysis of schooling and students’ subjugated knowledge.

## *Technology*

The School of Education at LMU believes that technology can be a catalyst for creating a more equitable society. “New technologies offer opportunities for empowerment to individuals and communities” (Schwab, 2001). Technology provides access to information that potentially allows individuals to make informed decisions about their lives and the lives of others. Equal access to information provides a way for including different voices in conversations on education, religion, economics, globalization, politics, etc.

Technology is a tool that allows all educators to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently. We believe the purpose of using technology in education is not only to “automate” but to “informat” as well (Zuboff, 1988). Technology can be an asset to make better decisions about the educational experiences of various educational stakeholders. Thus, we strive to develop educators who will be proactive leaders for the integration of technology in schools and will strive to use technology as a tool to make connections to the communities they serve. Furthermore, technology contributes to scholarship through efficient data collection and research. However, technology can never replace personal interaction and we are committed to ensuring that technology preserves and enhances, rather than replaces, human interaction.

Harnessing the potential of technology means not only increasing access but also improving student learning through creative thinking and planning. We share the view of Jonassen (2005) who believes that technology is a “mind tool” that supports students’ knowledge construction process. Students not only learn from technology, they learn with technology.

As educators, we need to prepare counselors, administrators, and teachers to adequately address the needs of the generation of students that have grown up in a digital world. We acknowledge digital native learn differently because they “come to view technology as just another part of their environment...For many kids, using the new technology is as natural as breathing” (Tapscott, 2009, p. 18). We believe in creating a learning environment that meets the needs of digital learners who learn by discovery, collaboration, and interaction.

We recognize that whatever promises technology offers relative to improving student learning, there still exists a digital divide. Over time, this digital divide has developed not only into a divide of access to equipment, but also to a lack of access to achievement enhancing technology education. (Kelly, 2008) Educators must understand how decisions and actions using technology can promote the common good and how technology can maintain social inequities. We are committed to closing the gap that defines the digital divide by providing the necessary tools for educators to look critically at educational policy related to technology, by creating proactive leaders who can find ways to support technology in schools, and by encouraging future educators to provide students of various gender, ethnic, ability, and language backgrounds with engaging technology learning experiences.

The educational community must also ponder the ethical considerations of technology. “Computer ethics deserve special attention because of our rather human ability to view our actions in the intangible, virtual world of information technologies as being less serious than our

actions in the real world” (Johnson, 1998). As the dialogue on integrating technology in educational communities continues around the globe, students, staff, and faculty of the School of Education are committed to being essential participants in discussions on the ethical and pedagogical considerations of learning, teaching, assessment, research, and leading with technology.

### *Leadership*

The School of Education, operating within a Catholic university, embraces public, charter, private and Catholic school communities and prepares leaders to serve all people through inclusive, diverse, and multicultural dimensions (Banks, 2000). The Catholic university’s dynamic presence in our pluralistic society, and responsibility for shaping future educational leaders, is faithful to the best in our intellectual tradition, when it provides a voice that leaves no educational constituency out of the conversation of educating our youth (Buckley, 1998).

Lowney (2003) described self-awareness, ingenuity, love, and heroism as Four Pillars found in the Society of Jesus which should be cultivated in all leaders. He portrayed such leaders as men and women who “understood their strengths, weaknesses, values, and worldview; confidently innovated and adapted to embrace a changing world; engaged others with a positive, loving attitude; and energized themselves and others through heroic ambitions” (Lowney, 2003, p. 9). These leadership values and qualities find a natural home in a school of education at a Catholic university in the Jesuit tradition. This is particularly true as we strive to educate *reflective practitioners*, a concept that echoes the teachings of St. Ignatius Loyola who encouraged his followers to spend regular time in prayer contemplation, reviewing their experience with a view toward ongoing renewal and personal improvement. We believe that strong educational leaders develop good introspective skills which in turn they are able to bring to others and then to larger organizations (Wheatley, 2002).

We recognize and believe that leadership is an important component of all learning organizations and complex systems, necessary to forge synergy and coherence and transform education (Fullan, 1999, 2003). We believe leadership must be shared across communities, as members are empowered to capture the vision and mold plans to serve the common good. We believe leaders must practice their craft in an exemplary way, espouse social justice values, and demonstrate an ethic of care (Noddings, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2001). “Leaders with strong values translate these into organizational vision,” (Evans, 2000, p. 291). To be a leader one must be a servant, a change facilitator, an advocate for youth, and a guardian of the community (Fullan, 2001; Sergiovanni, 2000). We believe leaders accomplish this by following, serving, reflecting, knowing, assessing, and inviting others to share in the process of leadership (Ryan & Bohlin, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994). “To exercise leadership today, leaders must institutionalize their leadership”(Gardner, 2000, p. 12).

Effective leaders express what they value, extend what they value, and learn to manage change (Fullan, 2001). “Spelling out their basic assumptions and discovering their authentic core helps leaders develop strategic biases for action to guide their work and shape the implementation of change” (Evans, 2000, p. 305). Effective change facilitators are adept at framing problems in

ways that connect to the different audiences, understand the transformational power of collaboration, and ground their work in a results-driven collective focus (Marsh, 2000; Schlechty, 1997).

As Senge (1990) describes, a learning organization involves people at all levels who collectively and continually enhance their capacity to create the environment and outcomes they want. All leaders, whether teachers, public administrators, elected officials, students, or parents, must be equipped with the basic disciplines of systems thinking, personal mastery, and shared vision (Odden & Odden, 1995; Senge, 2000). We believe twenty-first century leaders require knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the following areas: systemic reform; reflective practice; ethical, moral, and collaborative decision-making; diversity and inclusion; critical inquiry; advocacy for technology and its accessibility to all stakeholders; and assessment/research methodology.

We encourage leaders to create learning organizations by incorporating shared vision, strategic planning, authentic assessment, and reflection in their practice. “It is only by attending to context and feedback while planning and performing that excellence is achieved”(Wiggins, 1998, p. 28). Leaders must understand ways to collaboratively develop ongoing professional development as the natural result of an exemplary systemic assessment process. To this end, leaders will help to transform schools/systems into knowledge and capacity-building organizations guided by a culture of professional accountability, self-regulation, and advocacy (Darling-Hammond, Aness, & Falk, 1995).

“Leaders must be deeply reflective, actively thoughtful and dramatically explicit about core values and beliefs,” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 432). It is a typical characteristic of a Jesuit education in general and found in particular at a Jesuit university to value regular reflection. It is from contemplation of research, theories, and discussion that improvement is made and action is taken (Lowney, 2003). Leadership starts with individual actions, and moves beyond to influence the system in which actions occur (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000). In fact, we believe the process of becoming a leader is the same as the process of becoming an integrated human being. “For the leader, as for any integrated person, life itself is the career, discussing the process in terms of leaders is merely a way of making it concrete” (Bennis, 1989, p. 4).

### *Community Collaboration*

One premise guiding school-community collaboration is an acknowledgment that a school cannot be separated from the context of the community in which it exists. Loyola Marymount University, and particularly the School of Education, recognizes the importance of the community in helping to carry out the university's mandate to foster the development of the whole person. This would necessarily involve a learning experience grounded in the community, in addition to the more generic wish to make a substantive contribution to the community.

The ever-expanding task of education requires the linkage between schools and community agencies forging connections that foster learning. Programs that strategically link elements of community agencies with schools will ultimately contribute to improved learning outcomes

(Honig, Kahne, & McLaughlin, 1999). The partnerships formed between educational institutions, families, and community agencies create an environment that enhances the educational climate, with higher impact partnerships allowing teachers to learn about their students and the community it serves. “Children now live and develop in a postindustrial age in which technology, travel, distance, and disintegrating communities have exacted a heavy toll . . .” (Haynes & Comer, 1996, p. 501-507). Schools are no longer institutions solely for academic learning, but have become small communities within broader communities and are supporters of the community, supported by the community.

We recognize the funds of knowledge parents bring to schools (Moll et al., 1992). Hence, parental involvement in education is recognized as central to the optimal developmental and educational outcomes for their children, and as a catalyst for school reform. Yet, consistent and meaningful collaboration with parents is not evident at many schools and at all levels of education. We are committed to helping our candidates understand and mitigate the myriad of proximal and distal social systems (Hoolver-Demsey & Sandler, 1997) that work to limit or enhance the involvement of families in the education of their children. Coursework is designed not only to assist our candidates to understand the processes underlying parents’ thinking, decision-making, and behaviors that lead to school involvement, and the significant impact that political, economic, and social events may have on family-school relations, but also to identify the systemic barriers that prevent meaningful parental involvement.

The overall goal of community collaboration is to develop a sense of community where people feel invited, valued and empowered to come together and transcend individual differences. Community-building is ultimately to provide greater educational access and equity for all. While the primary manifestation of our efforts in community-building are most often seen at the local and national levels, in terms of collaboration and partnerships, the needs of the global community must also inform our efforts in this area.

## Appendices

### *Shared Vision and Coherence*

The LMU Conceptual Framework represents a shared vision for the Education Unit. Although the vision has guided the SOE for years in a general way, it was first articulated as a conceptual framework in our initial 1998 NCATE accreditation. The design of the 1998 Conceptual Framework involved multiple stakeholders and was done through a year long process of reflection and discussion on the professional literature in light of the Mission and Goals of the University and the School of Education. The faculty gave input during a 1996 weekend faculty retreat that was geared toward the development of the Conceptual Framework. After the retreat, full time faculty members all committed to months of reading and discussion of educational literature as part of the process of developing the Conceptual Framework. The resulting document truly articulated a shared vision for the Unit. Because the Conceptual Framework is a living document, our school community has re-visited the document several times as part of our continuing accreditation process. During the Fall 2001 semester, the tenets of the Conceptual Framework were assigned to a small group of faculty members for revisions and updates which were finalized at the Fall 2001 faculty retreat.

During the Fall 2002 faculty retreat, the development of Unit Outcomes, Candidates Proficiencies, and Professional Dispositions were added to the document. This step was necessary to operationalize the Conceptual Framework in a form that could be formally measured and evaluated and this version was finalized in January 2003. This version guided the work of the School of Education until 2007.

In 2007-2008, a task force was formed and charged with reviewing and updating the Conceptual Framework as a result of the new SOE department structure which grew from two departments to six. The task force met several times using online strategies and face to face meetings. The new document was reviewed by the Department Chairs, SOE Council, University Supervisors, Faculty, Staff, students, and the Board of Visitors. The current Conceptual Framework describes the vision and purpose of the LMU School of Education in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools. The Unit Outcomes, Candidates Proficiencies, and Professional Dispositions provide a clear system for ensuring coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessment across a candidate's program and reflect a total alignment with the Conceptual Framework. The Conceptual Framework has been shared with all stakeholders, is based on the educational literature, and aligned with the University's Mission.

We are committed to implementing the above understanding of social justice, integration of theory and practice, socio-cultural/constructivist perspective, culturally responsive pedagogy, technology and community collaboration. Candidates receive the knowledge, skills and dispositions via courses, instruction, fieldwork and clinical practice. Candidates demonstrate mastery of knowledge, application of skills and competence in dispositions through a rigorous formative and summative assessment and tracking system. These are clearly stipulated in the candidate unit outcome and proficiency chart which follows.

*LMU School of Education Candidate Outcomes and Proficiencies*

UNIT OUTCOME 1: Respect and value all individuals and communities	
<i>Proficiencies for Teacher Candidates</i>	<i>Proficiencies for Other Professional School Personnel</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate knows, values, and integrates the diversity of students and their communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate knows, values, and integrates the diversity of students and their communities</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate promotes a culture of high expectations for all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate promotes a culture of high expectations for all</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate engages learners using inclusive teaching strategies and practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate engages learners using inclusive professional strategies and practices</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate uses multiple resources to better understand and serve learners and their communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate uses multiple resources to better understand and serve learners and their communities</li> </ul>

UNIT OUTCOME 2: Educate by integrating theory and practice	
<i>Proficiencies for Teacher Candidates</i>	<i>Proficiencies for Other Professional School Personnel</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate demonstrates knowledge of historical, philosophical, socio-political, economic, and legal influences on education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate demonstrates knowledge of historical, philosophical, socio-political, economic, and legal influences on education</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate uses a critical lens to evaluate and deliver subject matter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate uses a critical lens to evaluate and support the delivery of content knowledge</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate reflects on personal experience of self and others to inform educational practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate reflects on personal experience of self and others to inform professional practice</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate knows and models exemplary professional practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate knows and models exemplary professional practices</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate utilizes multiple research methodologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate utilizes multiple research methodologies</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate integrates content and pedagogical knowledge, academic skills, and technology in professional practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate integrates theory, skills, and technology in professional practice</li> </ul>

<b>UNIT OUTCOME 3: Advocate for access to a socially just education</b>	
<i>Proficiencies for Teacher Candidates</i>	<i>Proficiencies for Other Professional School Personnel</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate demonstrates effective communication and collaboration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate demonstrates effective communication and collaboration</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate promotes academic excellence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate promotes academic excellence</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate uses pedagogical skills to implement principles of equity and empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate uses pedagogical skills to implement principles of equity and empowerment</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands and actively responds to issues related to the preferential option for the poor and marginalized groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands and responds to issues related to the preferential option for the poor and marginalized groups</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate advocates for and critically uses technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate advocates for and critically uses technology</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate demonstrates a commitment to ongoing professional development including participation in professional organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate demonstrates a commitment to ongoing professional development including participation in professional organizations</li> </ul>

<b>UNIT OUTCOME 4: Lead in order to facilitate transformation</b>	
<i>Proficiencies for Teacher Candidates</i>	<i>Proficiencies for Other Professional School Personnel</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate practices effective, ethical, and moral leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate practices effective, ethical, and moral leadership</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate shares and collaboratively constructs an inclusive vision with learning communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate shares and collaboratively constructs an inclusive vision with learning communities</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate seeks, reflects upon, and responds to constructive feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate seeks, reflects upon, and responds to constructive feedback</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands the factors and utilizes the processes that lead to systemic change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands the factors and utilizes the processes that lead to systemic change</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands and promotes equitable and effective assessment and evaluation systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate understands and promotes equitable and effective assessment and evaluation systems</li> </ul>

### **References**

- Applefield, J., Huber, R., & Moallem, M. (2001). Constructivism in theory and practice: Toward a better understanding. *High School Journal*, 84(2), 35-54.
- Banks, C. A. M. (2000). Gender and race as factors in educational leadership and administration. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 217-256). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Banks, J., & McGee-Banks, C. (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Becker, H. (2000). Who's wired and who's not: Children's access to and use of computer technology. *The Future of Children*, 10(2), 44-75.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. California: Addison-Wesley.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Buckley, M. (1998). *The Catholic university as promise and project: Reflections in a Jesuit idiom*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1993). *Color blindness and basket weaving are not enough: Confronting the dilemma of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education*. Presented at the Seminar on Teachers for the 1990's and Beyond, Los Alamitos, CA.
- Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1974). Culture and cognition: Trees in search of a forest. In *Culture and thought: A psychological introduction*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Aness, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. New York: Heath and Co.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: McMillan.
- Diaz, S., Moll, L., & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in Instruction: A context specific approach. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 187-230). California State University, Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

- Eisner, E. (1999). The uses and limits of performance assessment. *Phi Delta Kappa International*, 80(9), 658-665.
- Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 335-356.
- Evans, R. (2000). The authentic leader. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 287-308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M.B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed.)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of student leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gardner, J. (2000). The nature of leadership. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 3-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. (Q. Hoare & G. N. Eds. & trans.). Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19-25.
- Haynes, N., & Comer, J. (1996). Integrating schools, families, and communities through successful school reform: The school development program. *School Psychology Review*, 25(4), 501-507.
- Himes, K. (2001). *Responses to 101 questions on Catholic social teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hoffman, D., & Novak, T. (1999, November). The growing digital divide: Implications for an Open Research Agenda. Available: <http://www.ecommerce.vanderbilt.edu/papers.html> (Accessed July 10, 2001).

- Honig, M., Kahne, J., & McLaughlin, M. (1999). School-community collaboration for learning and teaching: Findings from research and practice. *New Designs for Youth Development*, 15(4).
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoolver-Dempsey, K., & Sandler, H. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Education Research*, 67(1), 3-42.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue. Available: <http://www.ccsso.org/intascst.html> (Accessed October, 26, 2001).
- Jesuit Secondary Education Association. (1987). *Go forth and teach: The characteristics of Jesuit education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Jezreel, J. (1997, November). Why the preferential option for the poor is not optional. *U.S. Catholic* [Online]. Available: <http://www.usccatholic.org/1997/option.html> (Accessed October, 23, 2001).
- John Paul II. (1987). *On social concern*. Boston: Daughters of Saint Paul.
- Johnson, D. (1998). Developing an ethical compass for worlds of learning. *Multimedia Schools* [Online] 5(5). Available: <http://ehostvgw21.epnet.com/> (Accessed November 20, 2001, from EBSCO database).
- Jonassen, D., Peck, K., & Wilson, B. (1999). *Learning with technology: A constructivist perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Jonassen, D. H. (2000) *Computers as Mindtools for Schools: Engaging Critical Thinking*, 2/E. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kelly, A. (2008) *Changing Software Development: Learning to Become Agile*. John Wiley and Sons Publishers.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1963). *Strength to love*. New York: Harper-Row.
- Kolvenbach, P-H. (2000, October) *The service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education*. Paper presented at the conference on Commitment to Justice in Jesuit Higher Education, Santa Clara University, CA.
- Kukla, A. (2000). *Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Science*. New York: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lowney, C. (2003). *Heroic leadership*. Chicago: Loyola Press.
- Marsh, D. (2000). Educational leadership for the twenty-first century: Integrating three essential perspectives. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 126-145). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Martin, S. P. (1996). *Cultural diversity in Catholic schools: Challenges and opportunities for Catholic educators*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.
- Massaro T. (2000). *Living justice: Catholic social teaching in action*. Franklin, WI: Sheed and Ward.
- Mayo, P. (1999). *Gramsci, Freire, & Adult Education*. New York: Zed Books.
- McGovern, A. F. (1988). Jesuit education and Jesuit spirituality. *Studies In the Spirituality of Jesuits*, 20(4).
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- Milligan, M. (1993). The Marymount tradition in higher education. Unpublished Manuscript, Loyola Marymount University.
- Moallem, M. (1997). The content and nature of reflective teaching: A case of an expert middle school science teacher. *Clearing House*, 70(3), 143-151.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory in Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1986). Economic justice for all: Pastoral letter on Catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy. Washington, DC: Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Odden, A., & Odden, E. (1995). *Educational leadership for America's schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Ogawa, R., & Bossert, S. (2000). Leadership as an organizational quality. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 35-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Poplin, M. (1988). Holistic/constructivist principles of the teaching/learning process: Implications for the field of learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21*, 401-416.
- Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. (2000). Building a community of virtue. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 309-336). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schlechty, P. (1997). Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform. In *Jossey - Bass education series*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwab, K. (2001, July). Don't ignore the global digital divide. Available: <http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,2788694,00.html> (Accessed July 20, 2001).
- Senge, P. (2000). Give me a lever long enough . . . and single-handed I can move the world. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 13-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2000). Leadership as stewardship: Who's serving who? In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 269-286). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tapsott, D. (2009) [\*Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing the world\*](#), McGraw-Hill.
- Tharp R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- United States Catholic Conference. (1995). Political responsibility: Proclaiming the gospel of life, protecting the least among us, and pursuing the common good. Washington, DC: Author.

United States Department of Commerce. (1999). Falling through the net: Defining the digital divide. Available: <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fttn99/contents.html> (Accessed September 16, 2001).

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

Wertsch, J., Del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (Eds.). (1995). *Sociocultural studies of the mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wiesenberg, F. (1999). Teaching on-line: One instructor's evolving theory-of-practice. *Adult Basic Education*, 9(3), 149-162.

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve students' performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wilson, G. (2001, September). The promise of on-line education: El Dorado or fool's gold? *The Educational Technology Journal* [Online] 11(1). Available: <http://www.fno.org/sep01/online.html> (Accessed September 16, 2001).

Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the age of the smart machine: The future of work and power*. New York: Basic Books.