

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 421

SP 033 252

AUTHOR Soled, Suzanne Wegener; Yinger, Robert J.
 TITLE Developing a Theoretical Framework for Faculty Planning and Collaboration.
 PUB DATE 91
 NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; Program Development; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs
 IDENTIFIERS *Knowledge Base for Teaching; Professional Development Schools; *University of Cincinnati OH

ABSTRACT

The College of Education at the University of Cincinnati agreed to examine its teacher education programs and initiate program changes within the broad framework provided by the Holmes initiatives. Those involved began by developing a conceptual framework for pursuing planning and implementation efforts in the college. Rather than proposing a master plan for teacher education reform, they agreed upon six principles of implementation which guided process planning: patterns, organic order and change, local decision making, individual program growth, evaluation, and coordination. The framework developed is grounded in the notion that a central component of expertise in a practical undertaking like teaching is a "language of practice." Since there was no language of practice for teaching, the researchers developed their own--a pattern language which embodies the goals and means for the program design and implementation. This paper discusses these process principles and the pattern language as a model for developing a theoretical framework for restructuring the university's teacher education programs. (Author/IAH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED337421

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Developing a Theoretical Framework
for Faculty Planning and Collaboration

Suzanne Wegener Soled and Robert J. Yinger

University of Cincinnati
Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0002
(513) 556-3617

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne W. Soled

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In N. L. Zimpher (Chair), Models of Collaboration in
Teacher Education for Faculty, Teachers and Schools.
Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Chicago, 1991

Running head: DEVELOPING A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC
033 252

Abstract

When the College of Education and the University of Cincinnati agreed to examine its current teacher education programs and initiate program changes within the broad framework provided by the Holmes initiatives, we began by developing a conceptual framework for pursuing planning and implementation efforts in the college. Rather than proposing a master plan for teacher education reform, we began by agreeing upon six principles of implementation which guided our process of planning. The framework we have developed is grounded in the notion that a central component of expertise in a practical undertaking like teaching is a "language of practice." Since there was no language of practice for teaching, we began by developing our own, a Pattern Language which embodies the goals and means for our program design and implementation. This paper discusses these process principles and pattern language which we have developed as a model for developing a theoretical framework for restructuring our teacher education programs.

In their review of more than fifty institutional reform efforts, Yinger and Hendricks (1990) report that nationally the greatest amount of interest and activity regarding restructuring teacher education is in the area of teacher and school collaborations. At the University of Cincinnati, the processes of examining our current teacher education programs and initiating program changes have resulted in collaborations among faculty, teachers and schools. This paper describes the model we have used for developing a theoretical framework for faculty planning and collaboration in order to restructure our teacher education programs.

In the Spring of 1986, the University of Cincinnati became one of the charter members of the Holmes Group, a consortium of approximately 100 colleges of education in comprehensive research institutions dedicated to improving teacher education. During the subsequent year, representatives from our institution attended the national and regional meetings of the Holmes Group and our faculty set about the task of learning more about the reform initiatives proposed by the Holmes Group.

Acknowledged early in the work was the fact that faculty and student resistance to the reform initiatives at a number of Holmes institutions was due to the top-down, non-participatory nature of their planning process. In response to these reactions that appear often in program development work, two general working assumptions were made: (1) the planning work was to be

one of idea exploration, taking advantage of the window of opportunity provided by the reform initiative, not to be approached as policy or program implementation relying solely on the Holmes or Carnegie reports; (2) those responsible for and most effected by teacher education programs (faculty, students, school collaborators) should be most deeply involved in policy decision and planning undertaken by the College. These assumptions guided the development of the theoretical and process frameworks for the redesign of the teacher education programs.

To ensure that our work truly was a re-envisioning of teacher education, instead of a re-packaging of existing programs, we started with a basic question: How might we best describe the knowledge and skill of the experienced practitioner? We started deliberations with the goal of understanding effective practice, rather than trying to identify existing problems and to discover solutions.

In August 1987, a task force appointed by the Dean of the College of Education began identifying the planning issues in our work. The major work of the task force was to develop the conceptual framework for pursuing planning and implementation efforts in the college. It was composed of representatives from each of the departments in the College of Education, College administrators, and school practitioners.

The first activity of the Task Force was to propose a planning process for the design and implementation of our new

teacher education programs. This planning process, which was eventually approved through a College-wide vote of all faculty, included two major components: principles of implementation and a commitment to develop a comprehensive design framework called a Pattern Language.

To guide our planning efforts, we purposefully chose not to identify a master plan for teacher education program reform. Rather we attempted to identify a planning process which would be sensitive to change. We began by developing a conceptual framework for pursuing planning and implementation efforts in our teacher education programs. This resulted in six principles of implementation. The focus of these principles should not be at an individual level but as a whole, for to change any principle would change the process. These six principles are:

1. The principle of patterns

All design and implementation will be guided by communally developed and adopted teaching and learning frameworks called patterns. College-wide deliberations will determine a set of patterns to embody the mission, goals, and primary means by which teachers would be educated at U.C. These central patterns will frame curricula and pedagogy and become criteria by which program effectiveness would be judged.

2. The principle of organic order and change

Planning and implementation will be guided by a process

that allows this whole to emerge gradually from local acts. Rather than imposing a master plan on the College, the nature of teacher education at U.C. will progressively and responsively emerge from the design work of faculty and students in local program areas. The process guiding this work is defined by the six principles of implementation.

3. The principle of local decision making

Decisions about what to do and how to do it will be initiated and made by those members of the community most effected. Not only will design work be focused locally but decision making about program form and content will be localized in the faculty, students, and school collaborators who are closest to the work of educating teachers.

4. The principle of individual program growth

The design undertaken in each evaluation/implementation period will be weighed overwhelmingly toward local program areas. All programs will not be expected to change in the same ways at the same pace. Growth and change will be most heavily weighted toward local projects rather than toward College-wide initiatives. It is expected that this process will provide the freedom for faculty to explore alternative ways to define programs and program responsibility.

5. The principle of evaluation

The well being of the whole will be protected by a biennial evaluation which explains in detail which program area activities are working and which are not, according to the patterns adopted by the community. Program evaluation and change will be conducted on a two-year cycle to provide adequate time for self-examination and planning. The focus of the evaluation work is to provide an opportunity for local participants to examine the effectiveness of program activities and experiences and the degree to which they are aligned with program and College goals.

6. The principle of coordination

The deliberate emergence of organic order in the whole will be assured by an open process that assesses current program status and regulates proposed program changes. A process open to the College and University communities will be established to coordinate the local work of educational programs according to the core set of patterns and to provide a means by which patterns may be modified or added.

(Preamble and introduction, The Cincinnati Initiative, pg. 7-8)

This planning process has a highly participatory nature that allows all of those involved in the teacher education programs to be a part and that encourages the decision making by those

individuals closest to the implementation.

The other component of our planning efforts was the development of a language of practice (Yinger, 1987) which was the conceptual framework guiding our teacher education program reform. Developed during year two, A Pattern Language for Teaching refers to the ways of thinking and acting employed by teacher education professionals to function effectively, as well as to the vocabulary they use within the profession. In developing a communal Pattern Language for teaching, we were attempting to identify the goals and means for our teacher education program design and implementation.

We view the concept of a pattern to be an activity with a set of goals or motives which occurs repeatedly in the context of teaching. The 89 patterns we have developed to date (see Figure 1) describe the activities and experiences we believe to be important in the education of the teachers in our programs. The description of each pattern includes a rationale, a prescriptive statement related to implementation, a list of specific activities which provide indicators that the pattern is implemented, and a list of other patterns related to the particular pattern. The development of this Pattern Language is an ongoing effort. It provides both a theoretical framework for the practice of teaching as well as a guide for the implementation of our program design.

In the second year, 1988-89, the planning efforts became

widespread involving more than fifty faculty, virtually all of those directly involved in the preparation of teachers at the University of Cincinnati. The amount of effort and energy expended by many individuals during this year was very high with a number of faculty devoting at least twenty percent of their work load to this activity.

During year two, the concept of local groups was operationalized as a way to achieve Principle #3: The principle of local decision making. Several local groups emerged during the planning process: early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education, special education, health education, student support services, and educational studies. It was through the local groups that the most intense collaborations occurred. While some of the local groups, such as special education, were comprised of faculty solely from a particular area, the majority of groups were comprised of faculty from two or more areas. The Elementary Education local group members included educational foundations and special education in addition to the elementary education faculty. The Student Support Services local group was composed of faculty from school psychology, counseling, educational administration and special education.

Other special task forces were formed during this time on General Education, Admissions, and Professional Development Schools. These groups were composed of members from diverse

areas across the College of Education, across the University to include the College of Arts and Sciences, and included teachers, administrators and other professions from school districts.

Many of the issues addressed have been issues across programs such as Professional Development Schools, public relations and recruitment, student services center, cultural and individual diversity, and developing physical resources. Such issues have been discussed in either retreats or forums where all of the teacher education faculty meet together for a half day up to two days. These settings allow faculty across programs to work with one another to identify, debate and resolve problems and issues important for all programs.

In the third year of planning, 1989-90, the specifics of the teacher education programs became finalized. Votes were conducted through the appropriate governance bodies at the levels of the individual programs and departments, the College of Education Senate, and the entire College of Education faculty. Teacher education is now a five year program with students jointly enrolling in the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences and earning two bachelor degrees. Ninety quarter hours of general studies in English, foreign language, natural science, mathematics, history, literature, behavioral and social science, and humanities and a disciplinary major in a concentrated area of study will lead to a bachelor's degree in Arts and Sciences. A bachelor's degree in education and

certification from the College of Education will be earned through educational studies in the areas of learning, development, history and politics of education, cultural and individual diversity, language and communication, and measurement and evaluation and professional studies focusing on developing the skills of design, performance, reflection, inquiry, and collaboration as well as professional values, ethics, and personal characteristics. Fifteen hours of graduate credit will be earned the fifth year, which can be applied to an eventual master's degree and advancement on school salary scales.

In the fourth year of planning, 1990-91, we are moving from a planning to an implementation stage. A newly formed Teacher Education Council, a larger and more broad based group than the Task Force, has been voted into our College by-laws as the primary College-wide body for the coordination of the decision making and policy recommendations related to teacher education. Consisting of representatives from each teacher education program, the office of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, collaborating school districts, and the College of Arts and Sciences, its function is to facilitate and coordinate the planning and implementation of teacher education programs in the College.

Other activities during this year include the planning of a systematic way to collect program research and evaluation through a tri-phase decision based model involving information related to

inputs, process, and outcomes; conducting district-wide planning in four districts to result in the formation of pilot Professional Development School sites; the development of a comprehensive plan for the construction and remodeling of the physical facilities to house the new programs; examination and modification of admissions policies to address issues related to enrollment levels, admissions criteria, a commitment to affirmative action, and transfer students; discussions with the College of Arts and Sciences related to program coordination and design.

An important component of the new NCATE accreditation standards is the demonstration of a systematic knowledge-base supporting all teacher education programs. The College is currently undergoing a second revision and elaboration of the Pattern Language to determine what changes are needed in order for it to represent our knowledge base. Suggestions for new patterns as well as recommendations about revisions to or deletion of existing patterns are under discussion.

These new teacher education programs will result in major changes in faculty commitment from our previous teacher education programs. For example, under the previous programs, the educational foundations courses were taught by six faculty. Under this new model, nearly all of the fourteen faculty in this department will be involved in undergraduate teacher education. Under the old teacher education programs, courses were taught by

individual faculty members, each taking individual responsibility for content and pedagogy. With the new programs, faculty will work in cohorts formed across departments, in planning and implementation of the courses.

The road for accomplishing the restructuring of our teacher education programs has not been smooth. It is interesting to note that not everyone is in agreement about the what has taken place. For example, some of our colleagues described the process of the last three years at a recent conference in a very different way that we have presented here, saying that the initial development work was done by the scholars and research based faculty in the College as compared to the practitioners who later took control. Others argue that the way in which planning occurred beginning in the second year with the local groups, that this is absolutely not true.

We believe that critical to the success of this planning effort and in its ultimate implementation, is an environment that has supported and will continue to support this kind of dialogue. The process principles help negate the isolation and lack of trust frequently encountered in a top-down planning process because it requires the participation of many and the decision making to be made by those "closest to the action." The role of the pattern language is critical in providing the conceptual framework to guide our teacher education program planning and implementation. It continues to serve as a basis for confidence

building by encouraging an environment which fosters openness and trust and by providing opportunities to talk to one another resulting in feelings of being invested in the process and products.

The commitment to continue this work is strong. One of the reasons it has been successful so that is the we have been allowed to operate in an atmosphere which is unusual for an University. The University has made a commitment to increasing our College resources by 12-15% over the next six years. Our Provost has bought into our idea that we are working under a different collaborative model. For example, the Provost pledged \$400,000 for funding of school based faculty (professionals appointed by the College and collaborating school districts to take leadership roles in Professional Development Schools with primary responsibility for counseling, instruction, and guidance of professional practice in professional development schools) prior to our obtaining commitments from school districts to become Professional Development Schools. There are expectations that not only will we implement these programs, but that we will do it at a high level of quality. The teacher education faculty are committed to meeting together on a regular basis to discuss and continue this work.

There are major implications for how faculty will engage in the planning and delivery of instruction within our new model. Closer and more integrated cooperation and collaboration will be

needed. Faculty cohorts will need to be formed and meet on a regular basis. Time allotments will need to be figured into faculty loads to allow for integrated planning sessions. As we prepare for our first incoming class of students admitted into our restructured teacher education programs, we recognize that these plans are ambitious and will require the support of many if we are to succeed.

References

- Yinger, R.J. (1987) Learning the language of practice.
Curriculum Inquiry, 17:3, 292-318.
- Yinger, R.J. & Hendricks, M.S. (1990) An overview of reform in
Holmes group institutions. Journal of Teacher Education,
41(2), 21-26.

COLLEGE CORE PATTERNS

- * 1. STUDY OF TEACHING
- * 2. MULTICULTURAL FOCUS
- * 3. LIBERAL EDUCATION
- * 4. LIFE LONG LEARNING
- * 5. URBAN MISSION
- * 6. INQUIRY ORIENTATION
- * 7. ACTION ORIENTATION
- * 8. LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION
- * 9. COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS
- *10. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OUTCOMES

PROFESSIONAL WAYS OF KNOWING

- *11. PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE
- 12. PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE
- 13. KNOWLEDGE OF LEARNERS
- 14. KNOWLEDGE OF CONTEXTS
- 15. KNOWLEDGE OF SELF
- 16. CURRICULAR KNOWLEDGE
- *17. CONCEPTION OF TEACHING

PROFESSIONAL WAY OF DOING

- *18. DESIGN
- 19. PLANNING INSTRUCTION
- 20. SETTING GOALS
- 21. INTEGRATING INSTRUCTION
- 22. EVALUATING LEARNING
- 23. DESIGNING LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS
- *24. PERFORMANCE
- 25. PRESENTING
- 26. MODELING
- 27. SCAFFOLDING
- 28. DEMONSTRATING
- 29. DISCUSSING
- 30. LEARNING IN GROUPS
- 31. MANAGING CLASSROOM ACTIVITY
- 32. INTEGRATING INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY
- *33. REFLECTION
- *34. INQUIRY
- *35. WRITING
- *36. COMMUNICATING VERBALLY AND NON-VERBALLY
- *37. COLLABORATION
- *38. PROBLEM ASSESSMENT AND INTERVENTION

PROFESSIONAL WAYS OF BEING

- *39. TEACHING CHARACTER
- *40. EXPLICIT GOALS, VALUES, AND ETHICS
- 41. CONSCIENCE OF CRAFT
- 42. COMMITMENT TO EACH STUDENT
- 43. RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY
- 44. SOCIAL CONSCIENCE
- 45. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION

PROFESSIONAL STUDY PATTERNS

KNOWLEDGE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

- *46. STUDY OF SUBJECT MATTER
- *47. STUDY OF LEARNING
- *48. STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT
- *49. STUDY OF CULTURE AND SOCIETY
- *50. STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS
- *51. STUDY OF TEACHING PROFESSION
- *52. INQUIRY PROJECT
- *53. CASE STUDY

KNOWLEDGE-RELATED STRUCTURES

- *54. FIVE-YEAR INTEGRATED PROGRAM
- 55. GENERAL EDUCATION
- 56. DISCIPLINARY MAJOR
- 57. EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
- 58. PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
- 59. GRADUATE STUDY
- *60. PROGRAM EVALUATION
- *61. PROGRAMMATIC CONCEPTIONS AND THEMES
- *62. STUDENT COHORT
- *63. LINKING SEMINAR
- *64. CLINICAL EXPERIENCES
- *65. FACULTY COHORT
- 66. MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEACHING TEAM
- *67. RECRUITMENT, ADMISSIONS, AND RETENTION
- *68. STUDENT SERVICES CENTER

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE PATTERNS

PRACTICE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

- *69. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
- *70. APPRENTICE TEACHING
- 71. CONSTRUCTING AND EVALUATING CURRICULA
- 72. TEAM PLANNING AND TEACHING
- 73. DEVELOPING PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS
- 74. COMMUNICATING WITH FAMILIES
- *75. ANALYSIS OF TEACHING
- 76. OBSERVATION OF TEACHING
- 77. CASE CONFERENCE
- *78. PROFESSIONAL INDUCTION
- 79. EARLY PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION
- 80. MENTORING

PRACTICE-RELATED STRUCTURES

- *81. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL
- *82. SCHOOL-BASED FACULTY
- *83. MASTER TEACHER
- *84. PROFESSIONAL TEAM
- *85. TEACHING ASSOCIATE
- *86. TEACHING INTERN
- 87. TEACHING RESIDENT
- *88. PROFESSIONAL SEMINAR
- *89. PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO

Figure 1. Overview of patterns in A Pattern Language for Teaching