The
MERN
Journal

Message from the Editor

As the new editor of *The MERN Journal*, it is my pleasure to welcome you to volume 6, a celebration of MERN forum presentations during the 2012-13 school year. Our cover design and format have changed from previous volumes, but we are striving to continue the tradition of excellence in publication that Thomas MacNeill (retired assistant professor, Brandon University) established in volumes 1-5 from 2007 to 2012. Beginning with volume 6, manuscripts are vetted through Heather Hunter, MERN director (heather.hunter@mern.ca). We welcome papers based on MERN forum presentations, both past and current.

I am honoured to contribute to MERN's practice of sharing research and best educational practices in Manitoba. As a Brandon University professor with prior teaching and researching experience in public school and in adult and post-secondary institutions, I am now privileged to teach writing and research courses to graduate students. I also edit our *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, and I coordinate our annual Graduate Student Research Colloquium. After serving as a peer reviewer for other journals, editing *The MERN Journal* offers me another opportunity to serve the field of education in a capacity that suits my training and experience. I want to serve you well.

The MERN Journal features articles that bridge the gaps between research and practice in a variety of educational settings: K-12 and adult/post-secondary schools, classrooms, and administrative offices; government and other community service agencies; etc. The MERN affiliates listed on the next page represent different languages and cultures that we are blessed to serve in our province. *The MERN Journal* is dedicated to promoting best practices in education by sharing the expertise and experiences of forum presenters with various experiential backgrounds.

Read further, and you will be delighted by what our authors impart about teaching, learning, and researching in Manitoba. If you attended their forum presentations, you will be reminded of their wisdom. If not, this volume is a unique opportunity to catch up on what you missed at the forums in 2012-13. Volume 6 also includes three articles based on prior forum presentations that were not included in volume 5.

For more information about MERN and its other publications and services to the field of resarch and education in Manitoba, visit the following website: www.mern.ca

– *Marion Terry*

MERN

Manitoba Education Research Network

The Manitoba Education Research Network receives support from Manitoba Education, the five faculties of education, and education partner organizations in the province. Now in its ninth year, the Network has an established agenda of annual events and research activities that respond to provincial educational priorities in the context of continuous school improvement and professional development.

MERN's purpose is twofold:

1. to disseminate Manitoba-based education research, and
2. to support partner research activities that aim to strengthen Manitoba education as a field of knowledge.

2012-13 Research Affiliates

Aboriginal Education Directorate
Brandon University
Council of School Leaders of the
    Manitoba Teachers' Society
Manitoba Association of Parent Councils
Manitoba Association of School Business
    Officials
Manitoba Association of School
    Superintendents
Manitoba Association for Supervision and
    Curriculum Development
Manitoba Education

Manitoba First Nations Education
    Resource Centre
Manitoba Metis Federation
Manitoba School Boards Association
Manitoba School Improvement Program
Manitoba Teachers' Society
Red River College
Treaty Relations Commission of
    Manitoba
Université de Saint-Boniface
University College of the North
University of Manitoba
University of Winnipeg

THE MERN JOURNAL

Volume 6, 2012-13

MERN

Manitoba Education Research Network

Spring Forum

"Education Leadership: Doing the Right Thing"

Friday, April 27, 2012

University of Manitoba
Faculty of Education

Hosted by
Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

EMBRACING THE OTHER:
RECONCILING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE NARRATIVES

Randy Kroeker
University of Winnipeg

Abstract

As educators, contributing to positive social change entails empowering students to discover their voices, individually and in concert with others. Empowerment is developed through discordance as much as harmony, with psychological and educational theories providing guidance, but not certainty. In personal growth and social change pursuits, we are often drawn to the seductively harmonious and avoid that which is different, and that which we may fear. And yet, engaging the "Other" may be the process through which we learn to embrace our vulnerabilities, and thereby encounter the most potential for authentic and enduring personal and social change. This paper is an elaboration of the theoretical prelude to a Manitoba Educational Research Network workshop that included having participants engage in individual and social constructivism through utilizing personal reflection, dialogue, and social concept mapping – in effect, manifesting an experiential analogue to the theory presented.

Embracing the Other:
Reconciling Personal and Social Change Narratives

"If you're 20 years old and you're not a socialist, you have no heart.
 If you're 30 and you're not a conservative, you have no brains."

– My father, directing some pointed words of wisdom at me as a 30 year-old, in paraphrasing an old adage that has been attributed variously to George Bernard Shaw, Francois Guisot, Georges Clemenceau, and Winston Churchill, among others.

Post-World War Two was a tumultuous time for many North American baby boomers to come of age in a sociocultural cauldron of psychological, educational, and spiritual questing. My father and I had numerous political battles, which could have served as a microcosm of the social change tensions that were occurring in families, schools and communities across the country. Although not an educator, he was certainly trying to instill some guidance into his willful and free-spirited son. The quote that he directed at me, seemingly on a monthly basis, embodied several implicit educational principles: that engagement with the world and social issues could and should be enhanced through one's maturational development, and that development embodies a process of utilizing both one's affective and cognitive capabilities. Also implied is that maturation involves a recognition and integration of personal, interpersonal, and societal polarities.

The obverse of the seemingly socially-conscious post-war generation is captured by the epithet that has often been cast upon the questing boomers as being the self-centered "Me Generation," juxtaposed in stark contrast to the self-sacrificing values of the older generation that had survived depression-era hardships and the barbarism of World War Two. Our generation engaged, with a heady mix of rock and roll swagger and self-righteousness, in personally and socially relevant causes such as feminism and the peace movement. Rebelling against society's mores felt like an affiliative badge of honour, and an authentic "doing the right thing."

But consider this: Is there a wrong way to do the right thing?

Despite the significant and positive changes that have been produced by many social movements, I wonder whether change efforts in general might be enhanced if more emphasis were placed on recognizing, respecting, and integrating perspectives that may appear on the surface to be anathema to a particular cause. I remember the simmering violence amid the dispiriting process of activists utilizing abusive power in isolating dissenting voices, contrary to the stated purpose of promoting inclusion and diversity. Social movements have often unleashed the worst of humankind in becoming breeding grounds for True Believers (Hoffer, 1951), even when the cause itself seems beyond reproach. Many talented, thoughtful (although perhaps contrary) people have exited social change activities because of these exclusionary tactics. Perhaps the people and ideas that seem to threaten the functioning of any particular social movement are the ones that need to be acknowledged and integrated into that movement's philosophy and agenda, which could then contribute to more authentic and enduring change.

As an educator now, I often struggle with how to promote citizenship and social action in my students without imposing my own values and belief system on them. I want to model enthusiasm for engagement, but also provide a nonjudgmental and facilitative context that allows students to determine their own perspectives, free from the potential repercussions of being labelled a human rights misfit if their ideas don't conform to the prevailing group's shared identity. I also believe, based on my work as a psychotherapist, that one's personal growth and social change narratives are often intertwined, with similar processes at work. My goal in this brief theory paper is not to be pedagogically prescriptive, but simply to identify some educational challenges, and to offer what I believe is a useful shift in orientation to enhance this process.

Boundaries, Polarities, and the Change Process

Educational objectives should include the promotion of democratic principles (De Tocqueville, 1946) and socially-engaged citizenship (Kroeker, 1989, 2003), while providing inclusive contexts for students to safely experience and celebrate their diversity in fostering human rights and social justice (Taylor, 2011). This process reflects a core educational principle, that developmental maturity follows a trajectory from self-centeredness to other-centeredness (Kohlberg, 1984; Wilber, 2000), with personal growth ultimately contributing to social interest and engagement (Maslow, 1954).

Piaget's theory of cognitive development (1952) can be fruitfully adapted to this personal growth/social engagement continuum. Piaget posited that one's cognitive capabilities to construct personal understanding develop through an equilibration process that assimilates new information into existing conceptual frameworks, or that provokes an accommodative move towards a "higher" order of thinking. In other words, a provocation of some sort, whether experiential or conceptual, is essential for maturing to a higher order of functioning. This assimilation/accommodation trajectory may contribute to transformative personal (individual constructivism) and collective (social constructivism) world views and sense-making (Kroeker, 2008). The transition to higher order thinking has been described in some psychotherapeutic contexts as a second-order change (Bateson, 1972; Kroeker, 1987), and in collective social and political change contexts as a paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1962).

In our individual and social constructivist quests, we are often confronted by ideas that discomfort and perhaps even repel us. As individuals, we have particular, sometimes rigid, beliefs about who we are and how society should function, and we often take extreme psychological measures to repress or deny these contrary indicators (Perls, 1971). We often create impregnable boundaries between ourselves and the "Other," whether the Other is an idea, a facet of our personal identity, or an actual individual.

The Other: whether it is through psychotherapy (Mahoney, 1991, 2003; Perls, 1971), personal growth explorations of Jungian archetypes (Progoff, 1975), or imbuing relationships with respectful sanctity (Buber, 1966/1970), the prescription for healthier development often includes recognizing boundaries as that which not only create intra- and interpersonal divisiveness, but also provide the opportunity for internal and relationship connections and unity. Rather than rejecting the fearsome Other and projecting onto other people what we fear in ourselves, we can learn to embrace polarities as that which can make us whole. Embracing the Other contributes to developing compassion (Welwood, 2000), and ultimately to more authentic and mature social engagements: "Only when we know our own darkness well can we be present with the darkness of others" (Chödrön, 2002, p. 50).

Embracing the Other: Towards a Shared Epistemology

Whether it is learning to acknowledge one's own repressed vulnerabilities, or to engage respectfully with someone who holds diametrically-opposed beliefs and values, we typically find that the maturation process is arduous, challenging, and sometimes downright unpleasant. Individually and collectively, an inexorable tension exists between the process of change and the content of change. Within educational contexts, it may be useful to welcome this disequilibrium in all its painful glory; not just in task, but in existential self-discovery, to reconcile and re-conceptualize intra- and interpersonal conflict as that which embraces the Other in an epistemological necessity for personal and social change. Several educational strategies (already used by many teachers, although perhaps not under the rubric of a unified "Embracing the Other" epistemology) are beneficial to this process.

Personal Change: Learning to recognize inner vulnerabilities and polarities and to develop psychological insights through the use of reflection, journalling and other mindfulness strategies (Greenspan, 2003; Progoff, 1975; Schön, 1987; Shapiro, 2004; Tart, 1994).

Relationship Change: Learning to acknowledge and respect differences between people, and to resolve conflict in healthy, productive ways (Perls, 1971; Rogers, 1970).

Social Change: Learning to acknowledge and respect disparate social change values and strategies through engagement in social and community discourse, with concomitant training in group facilitation and leadership skills (Ram Dass & Bush, 1992; Ram Dass & Gorman, 1987).

In effect, process-oriented skills that are already familiar to many educators in helping students to develop metacognition, self-efficacy, and self-determination can be utilized in pursuit of reconciling and enhancing both personal and social change narratives. A key, additional element is to help develop an epistemology, for ourselves and our students, that values conflict, challenge, and occasionally wildly disparate provocations to one's personal and social status quo in a shared process of discovery and socially constructed wisdom (Fowler & Keen, 1985; Huang & Lynch, 1999; Kroeker, 2008).

References

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind.* New York: Ballantine.

Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Scribner's. (Original work published 1966)

Chödrön, P. (2002). *The places that scare you: A guide to fearlessness in difficult times.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Fowler, J. W., & Keen, S. (1985). *Life maps: Conversations on the journey of faith.* Waco, TX: Word.

Greenspan, M. (2003). *Healing through the dark emotions: The wisdom of grief, fear and despair.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer: Thoughts on the nature of mass movements.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Huang, C. A., & Lynch, J. (1999). *Tao mentoring: Cultivating collaborative relationships in all areas of your life.* New York, NY: Marlowe.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages.* San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Kroeker, R. (1987). Facilitating second-order change in the counseling encounter. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 25*(4), 150-154.

Kroeker, R. (1989). Personal growth and social change values among humanistically-oriented students: An exploratory study. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 25*(4), 114-121.

Kroeker, R. (2003). Exploring citizenship within the psychotherapeutic encounter. *Communique, 4*(1), 10-11.

Kroeker, R. (2008). Meta-mentoring: Reflecting on the shared experience. In K. Lamoureux, K. W. McCluskey, A. C. Wiebe, & P. A. Baker (Eds.), *Mentoring in a Canadian context* (pp. 123-133). Winnipeg, MB: Institute of Urban Studies.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Mahoney, M. J. (1991). *Human change processes: The scientific foundations of psychotherapy.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Mahoney, M. J. (2003). *Constructive psychotherapy: A practical guide.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Maslow, A. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Perls, F. (1971). *Gestalt therapy verbatim.* New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (M. Cook, Trans.). New York, NY: Norton.

Progoff, I. (1975). *At a journal workshop: The basic text and guide for using the intensive journal process.* New York, NY: Dialogue House Library.

Ram Dass, & Bush, M. (1992). *Compassion in action.* New York, NY: Bell Tower.

Ram Dass, & Gorman, P. (1987). *How can I help?* New York, NY: Knopf.

Rogers, C. R. (1970). *Carl Rogers on encounter groups.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, S. B. (2004). *Case studies in reflective inquiry: Conversations to explore significant issues in life and work.* Suffolk, UK: Arima.

Tart, C. T. (1994). *Living the mindful life: A handbook for living in the present moment.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Taylor, C. (2011). "What won't I do today?" Education's calculations and social justice. *The MERN Journal, 4,* 92-97.

Tocqueville, A. de. (1946). *Democracy in America.* London, England: Oxford University Press.

Welwood, J. (2000). *Toward a psychology of awakening.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (2000). *A theory of everything.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

LEADERSHIP EDUCATION THAT IMPACTS STUDENT OUTCOMES MATTERS

Connie Allsopp
University of Victoria

Abstract

*Does leadership education matter? This article examines principals' perceived understandings of the relationships between their participation in leadership education and improvements in student outcomes as the result of their changes in knowledge, skills and dispositions, and leadership practices. Ten principals reported on their leadership education experiences in either a master's degree in education (M.Ed.) with specialization in educational administration or a non-degree professional development (PD) certification program. Leithwood and Levin's (2008) conceptual framework was used in constructing the interview protocol. The protocol also considered insights from Hoyle and Torres's (2008) habits of scholarship; Robinson and Timperley's (2007) leadership practices; Downey, Steffy, English, Frase, and Poston's (2004) walkthrough practices; and Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth's (2006) student outcomes. The 10 principals who were interviewed represented schools that spanned kindergarten to grade 12: five men and five women from different regions, who generally had 10 to 20 years of teaching experience and 5 to 10 years of administrative experience.
The seven M.Ed. graduates reported 5 to 11 changes to practice, and the three non-degree PD graduates reported 8 to 9 changes to practice, with a common practice being the provision of educational direction. Principals reported a shift from top-down leadership to shared leadership and their need to find a new role within learning communities through leadership education. Generally, principals perceived their changes in leadership practices had a positive effect on student engagement, participation, and achievement. Allsopp (2012) confirmed that leadership education that attends to student outcomes does matter.*

Leadership Education That Impacts Student Outcomes Matters

Does leadership education (LE) matter? Given one key thrust in education addresses "how is each child doing" and the development of personalized learning, leadership education that impacts student outcomes matters. Ascertaining what knowledge, skills, dispositions and leadership practices arise after participating in LE, and their effects on student outcomes, is a critical theme in the field (Allsopp, 2012). Young (2011) summarized that it is really about "the relationship between preparation (education) and student learning, and the relationship between preparation and effective leadership practice" (p. 6).

Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) stated that of more than 2,000 empirical studies from 1975 until 2002, only 3% investigated administrators' preparation programs. Robinson and Timperley (2007) identified only 18 studies from 1985 to 2006 that reported links

between leadership and student outcomes. This significant gap was reported until the *International Handbook of Leadership Education* and the *USA Handbook on LE* were respectively published in 2008 and 2009. Internationally, a flurry of activity arose in the scholarly community: Levine (2005); Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr (2007); Hoyle & Torres (2008); Leithwood & Levin, 2008; Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi (2010); and Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa (2009) all provided new insights; and Young's (2011) review summarized this last decade.

While the Canadian and Manitoba (MB) Context from 2001 to 2012 shifted focus to better understand how LE influence changes for improved student outcomes. Canadian studies included Wallace, Foster, and De Costa's (2007) findings on the organization of leadership preparation and development programs and school leadership, government legislation and policy shaping school administrator preparation programs in Canadian universities, and discussions of challenges and future directions. The Manitoba Context 2001 to 2011 was also summarized to better understand provincial activity in LE (Allsopp, 2006, 2012).

This article examines LE and reports findings from an exploratory study conducted in 2010 with ten MB principals' telling their LE stories. Two broad research questions narrowed the field of inquiry: What do Manitoba public school principals report as changes to their KSDs and practices as a result of leadership education programs undertaken while already in their professional careers? and What were their perceptions of the effects of their new leadership capabilities and practices on student outcomes in their schools? The data collection process entailed interviews with ten principals who were awarded an M.Ed. with specialization in Educational Administration (EA) or non-degree PD route 1997 through 2008. The interview centred on – Part A: demographics; Part B (M.Ed.) & Part C (non-degree PD), each with seven sections to discuss the conceptual framework variables used by Leithwood and Levin (2008). It is important to note that the Manitoba Certification Process for Level 1 – School Administrator and Level 2 – Principal Certificate were also considered along with the M.Ed. EA.

Leithwood and Levin's (2008) framework provides a comprehensive conceptual model for studying LE with a focus on improved outcomes for students. The interview protocol and structure of this research was modeled from Hoyle and Torres' (2008) study of six top-ranked doctoral programs in EA to report on U.S. universities. Design consideration was given to the changing role of school leaders, as "Leadership is widely regarded as a key factor in accounting for differences in the success with which schools foster the learning of their students" (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 1). Two significant areas were noted: instructional, shared, and distributed leadership; and a focus on student learning outcomes (MECY, 2006).

Narrowing the variables for the MB context was one contribution to the literature:

- Leadership preparation, expanded to education & development of principals
- Participant satisfaction as relevant for MB schools

- Changes in knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSDs) , and habits of scholarship (Hoyle & Torros, 2008)
- Changes in leadership practices, as noted by Downey, Steffy, English, Frase & Poston (2004) and Robinson & Timperley (2007)
- Altered classrooms, schools & communities, as important to consider for a MB context
- Student outcomes as engagement, participation & achievement; MECY (2006)

These principals were ten Manitoba public school leaders from six rural areas, two northern and two metro school divisions. The five males' and five females' age ranges were as follows: ten (30-39), five (40-49), and three (50-59). Seven of the principals reported primarily on their M.Ed. experiences, while three commented on their non-degree PD experiences. According to the Manitoba School Leaders certification process (2009), for the Level 1 – School Administrator (SA), the educator must teach for three years in a classroom, hold a MB teacher certificate, and complete 120 hours of LE; and for the Level 2 – Principal, the educator must hold the level 1 certificate, serve two years as a principal or vice principal, and complete 180 hours of LE. Alternatively, the school leader's choice would be to enroll and complete an M.Ed. with specialization in educational administration to obtain the Level 1 and Level 2 certificates.

Leadership practices examined the work of Downey et al. (2004), who explained direct instructional leadership practices for classroom walkthroughs, identified by Allsopp (2005) as SWICE. Principals' attention in general is drawn to various aspects of the classroom, such as emotional and physical safety (S), wall postings (W), instruction strategies (I), curriculum alignment (C), and engagement (E) of students with each other and the teacher. Robinson and Timperley (2007) also identified school-wide leadership practices as establishing goals and expectations; strategic resourcing; planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum; promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment. These 11 practices provided a comprehensive exploration for the principals to consider as they gave testimonies about their participation in leadership education and subsequent changes.

The next section notes findings as reported by the principals' responses to five questions from the interview protocol. First, what were the principals' recollected LE experiences? Those from the M.Ed. programs reported that cohorts were excellent and provided opportunity to collaborate with colleagues, although there was limited recall of specific courses; they had good experience with research work, coursework with flexible timeframes was helpful, case studies related to schools were effective, and the M.Ed. "stretched your thinking thus changes you as a person." For the non-degree PD programs, principals commented that school management ideas were great, Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL) was good, connection with guest speakers was excellent, "conferences provided networking opportunities," and there were "great mentorship" opportunities.

Second, what were the reported changes that the LE held for the principals' knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSDs)? The M.Ed. participants reported the following. For knowledge, system theories, learning about social dynamics, scholarly writing, "plan, think, plan," and democratic learning were significant. For skills, they reported designing surveys, and facilitation and collaboration skills. For disposition, they reported that confidence building, creating conditions for learning, and risk-taking were new insights. In contrast, the non-degree PD participants reported the following for knowledge: looking more at the larger context, "keeping your foot out of your mouth," and more leadership ideas. For skills, they reported that cognitive coaching, creating conditions for learning, and goal setting were important. For dispositions, they reported noted personality matters more than skills, "resiliency is critical as leaders," and celebrating diversity and cross-cultural awareness were critical.

Third, what changes did the principals make to their leadership practices as a result of the LE? The M.Ed. route principals ranged from 5 to 11 changes in leadership practices, while the non-degree PD participants reported having made 8 to 9 changes. More specifically, the M.Ed. participants added other leadership practices that included the following: learning what is evidence, creating intentional PD, understanding how systems work, not allowing excuses for why change did not happen, every child learns policy, innovation projects undertaken with the staff, and a school-wide renewal of the school plan. In contrast, the non-degree PD route participants reported that thinking about student energy as a positive and learning how to channel this energy within the school, walking the talk as a role model and providing wait time for others to respond to questions, PD continuous growth models, and cognitive coaching to help others learn to come up with their own useful solutions were critical. The latter leadership practices were the findings reported from the principals' own experiences within their school contexts.

Fourth, how relevant was the LE for the principals' school context? The principals from the non-degree PD route felt less satisfied than the M.Ed. route principals, and reported that they had less time to apply their practices with the support of colleagues in a course program. Participants reported a wide range of perspectives from one very relevant to four totally irrelevant, with the only significant value being the networking with colleagues at the seminars.

Fifth, what effects did these changed leadership practices hold for student outcomes? In the M.Ed. program, the principals reported the following for students: **Participation –** "giving students voice," "great sense of community with buddies," and "kids coming to me to help plan a school-wide event"; **Engagement –** "surveys to gain understanding," oral conferences for goal setting, advocate for self, and performance and demonstration; and **Achievement –** "students were asked their skill level and their level of challenge with activities," and sharing exemplars. The principals representing the non-degree PDs reported the following for students: **Participation –** welcoming school environment for all coming to the school, and full service model; **Engagement –** "buy in is needed by all," out-of-school suspensions down, individualized programs, and "connections" or

relationship with families; and **Achievement –** "skills assessed, need other results," and "our scores are consistently 5-10% higher in the school division.

Reporting the differences between these two programs entailed reports from the principals: LE participants preferred the M.Ed. over the non-degree PD routes. Principals believed that their regions were well served by learning cohorts and local school division programs. Reflections about gender included that men were more strategy based, while women tend to be give relational responses for practices. Age facts revealed that men often enter administration earlier.

This section now summarizes general reflections from the principals about the M.Ed. and non-degree PD routes to certification. They offered recommendations for leadership programs offered by the universities, professional organizations, and government partners. Six themes emerged: access, portability, cohort programs, learning communities, principal succession, and new lenses for student outcomes. A discussion of each theme was summarized and reports further research potential: **Access –** to leadership education; **Portability –** across the country by M.Ed.; **Cohort programs –** learning support; **Learning communities –** with all partners; **Principal succession –** mentoring, coaching; and **Student outcomes –** add demonstrations, performance, connections, and well-being.

The Manitoba recommendations are further noted as the following changes. Certification for VPs needs to be considered and teacher leaders need the opportunity to learn school leadership. Consideration should be given to finding a way to put "teeth" into the certification process for hiring, promoting, and remuneration; and the M.Ed. EA should be required for all principals. Continuous learning opportunities need to be implemented along with ongoing conversation for application within schools, such as mentoring, peer-assisted learning, cohorts, and e-networks. In conclusion, the Leithwood & Levin (2008) conceptual framework was a good model to study leadership education (LE).

In my research reflections, I believe that a revised professional model and a culture of co-responsibility shared by school leaders – to create the context for physical, intellectual, spiritual, and emotional growth of leaders – would be critical for improved student outcomes. Participants reported examples of changes for student learning outcomes in engagement, participation, demonstration, attendance, achievement, performance, and connection as the result of changes in their KSDs and leadership practices. Although Hoyle and Torres (2008) offered an invitation to seek answers to the question, "Do our doctoral programs prepare individuals who can lead schools and school districts to high performance for every student?" (pp. 36-37), and even though their work pertained to Ph.D. programs, I believe that M.Ed. programs with specialization in educational administration may also serve to develop high quality leadership for schools, with one consideration.

Students and the collective community would benefit from highly qualified school leaders who have attended LE programs focused on improving students' learning outcomes. The

development of this advanced training for school leaders, made readily available for theory into practice experiences and financially supported, would benefit our communities. Findings from the study show that advanced training for school leadership does matter and, given the complexity of the changing role of principal requirements for principal certification, hiring and leadership education programming must remain current with technology, research, and practice, in order to provide high quality school programs for all students. Concurrently, another researcher, Oplatka, reported that as of 2010, the field still lacked sufficient research. The challenge that I fully support was noted by Kraft (2010), "I implore you as a leader to take who you are, along with the things you've learned and experienced, and invest in other potential leaders and influence on a personal level" (p. 144).

References

Allsopp, C. (2005, November). *Principal presence*. Paper presented at the COSL special area workshop, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

Allsopp, C. (2006). *On standards and the death of professionalism? A discussion of the Council of School Leaders (COSL) professional standards development and school administrators' certification in Manitoba: From government policy to professional practice (2000 to 2005).* Unpublished manuscript, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

Allsopp, C. (2012). *Manitoba principals' perceived changes to their knowledge, skills, dispositions, and practices after partaking in leadership education, and the effects of these changes on student outcomes: An exploratory study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1993/5089

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 8(1). Retrieved from www.epaa.asu/edu/eppa/v8nl

Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K., Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J., & Torres, M. (2008). *Exploring the link between school leadership preparation and practice: An analysis of former students' impressions on the relevance of their doctoral experience at six elite institutions.* College Station: Texas A & M University.

Kraft, D. (2010). *Leaders who last*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.

Leithwood, K., & Levin, B. (2008). Understanding & assessing the impact of leadership development. In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *The international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 280-300). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(5), 671-706.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of the evidence linking leadership to student learning.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders.* New York, NY: Education School Project. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Embargoed_Report_050315.pdf

Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth. (2006). *Rethinking classroom assessment with purpose in mind*. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis.* Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Oplatka, I. (2010). *The legacy of educational administration: A historical analysis of an academic field*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Robinson, V., & Timperley, H. (2007). The leadership of the improvement of teaching and learning: Lessons from initiatives with positive outcomes for students. *Australian Journal of Education, 51*(3), 247-262.

Wallace, M., Foster, R., & de Costa, T. (2007). A survey of exiting school leadership preparation & development programs. In J. Burger & C. Webber (Eds.), *Intelligent leadership constructs for thinking educational leaders* (pp. 183-200). New York, NY: Kluwer & Springer.

Young, M. (2011). From the director: Quality assurance in educational leadership preparation. *UCEA Review, 52*(2), 6-9. Retrieved from www.ucea.org

Young, M., Crow, G., Murphy, J., & Ogawa, R. (2009). *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders.* New York, NY: Routledge.

A PROGRAM MODEL FOR THE INDUCTION OF INNER CITY TEACHERS

Kathy Collis
Winnipeg School Division

Thomas Falkenberg
University of Manitoba

Francine Morin
University of Manitoba

Abstract

This article describes the Winnipeg School Division's Induction Program Model for New Inner City Teachers, designed and implemented by the Director of its Professional Learning Centre newly established in 2008. A participatory action research approach drawing upon multiple methods was used to increase understandings and evaluate initial impacts of the program involving 88 teacher participants (42 mentors and 46 mentees) during the first two years of the pilot stage. Findings related to the core components examined are presented: the mentoring component, the action research component, the job-embedded learning component, and the professional development sessions. Early evaluation data are generating strong evidence of positive program design and impacts that can be used to further inform and refine the model.

A Program Model for the Induction of Inner City Teachers

This article is based upon a presentation made at the conference *Educational Leadership: Doing the Right Thing,* organized by the Manitoba Education Research Network in spring 2012. In our presentation, we outlined the Winnipeg School Division's induction program[1] for early service teachers working in inner city schools, and findings of an evaluation of the program designed to provide information and recommendations for key decision makers and funders about the program and its impact. In the first section of this article, we set the context for the work of the newly created Professional Learning Centre situated centrally in the division's Inner City District. The second section offers a description of the induction program, section three details the program evaluation design, and the fourth section deals with what has been learned from the program evaluation. Finally, the fifth section addresses the question of the future of the induction program.

Setting the Context

Leaders within the Inner City District of Winnipeg School Division have historically offered professional development opportunities comprised of multiple learning sessions that intentionally address the unique inner city school context of participating teachers.

Under the direction of Superintendent Pauline Clarke[2], a proposal was completed in spring 2008 to create a Professional Learning Centre (PLC) for the Inner City District, with the goal of launching a three-year induction program for both early service teachers (teachers new to the Inner City District) and early service school leaders (new vice principals). However, this article reports only on work with teachers (Collis & Clarke, 2008). This idea would be relatively new terrain for school divisions across the province.

Therefore, the proposal was grounded in Canadian and international research on induction programs elsewhere, including the work of the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz, California (Strong, 2005; Strong & St. John, 2001), experiences in the United Kingdom (Department of Education, 2012), and the Toronto District School Board's mentoring program for beginning teachers (Strachan, 2009/2010). In some ways, the proposal was our organizational response to prevailing notions within the professional literature that "improving student learning, especially in high-need, low-income schools, requires increasing the professional capacity of schools" (Moore Johnson, 2009).

As a prelude to program planning, focus group meetings with new teachers, school leaders, and community members were held in 2006 and 2007. Armed with the input and knowledge of induction programs elsewhere, the Inner City District induction program was created to address the local context through job-embedded learning with an eye on promoting effective teaching practices in urban schools. The intent was to emphasize reflective practice while delivering relevant curriculum within learning partnerships. Plans were made to extend early service teachers' knowledge of the socio-cultural context and low income neighbourhoods, so they would be better equipped to serve and advocate for the needs of inner city families and children using strengths-based approaches. Furthermore, teacher cohorts were established to foster a networked learning community across the district (Wenger, 1998).

Two other notions were important as we proceeded with the planning and implementation of the new induction program. First, paramount to the design was the knowledge that in-depth mentor training should be a critical feature of any professional development model aimed to facilitate adult learning and teacher transformation (Strong, 2009). This perspective is based upon evidence gleaned from the research literature on effective mentoring programs and division leaders' first-hand experiences at a summer institute conducted by Laura Lipton. Second, we knew that ongoing program evaluation would be essential to understanding and improving the practice and the impact of the induction program. Therefore, assistance was invited from two outside program evaluation consultants who, in partnership with us, helped to design and implement a program evaluation plan for the initial two years.

---

[2] Pauline Clarke was the Inner City Superintendent during the proposal development and first pilot year. She is currently the Chief Superintendent of the Winnipeg School Division. Karin Seiler is presently the Inner City Superintendent.

The evaluation plan was custom designed to fit our program and context, and was envisioned to be participatory in nature. The participatory approach to the program evaluation also provided mentorship on planning and conducting program evaluation to the PLC director, professional staff, and participants, allowing the participants to undertake ongoing program evaluation on their own once the externals' work was completed. The evaluation plan included teacher reflection by program participants within the more systematic context of action research (Stringer, 2008), with the idea of making a potentially greater degree of professional awareness and transformation possible. Indeed, we wanted to honour the image of teachers as capable professionals and not simply technicians, and we did not want to practise "mentorship light."

The Induction Program Model

Good mentors are central to engaging early service teachers in a rich set of learning experiences that can result in more effective teaching practices and student achievement (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). With an aim to develop good mentors, the program provided each of the mentors up to five days of release time for each of the first two years. For four of these ten days, mentors received intensive training specifically for developing mentoring skills. The training was initially led by the program director in the first year and then by Laura Lipton in the second year, co-author of *Mentoring Matters* (Lipton & Wellman, 2003), a text resource used in the program. The training was designed to develop strong growth agents who learn to skillfully conduct learning-focused conversations with beginning teachers for the purposes of enhancing their ability to critically reflect and think deeply about teaching and learning. The mentorship training supported mentors in learning to shift stances fluidly between consulting, collaborating, and coaching, based upon what their mentees needed, as well as a host of communication patterns that could build trust and rapport as they worked to increase the teaching capacities of their mentees.

The mentors – called Advanced Skills Teachers in the program – attended overview sessions outlining the goals and elements of the program, which were followed up with sessions for meeting and beginning work with their learning partners. Together with their mentees, mentors also attended networking sessions that afforded opportunities to learn from other district educators, or community members and agencies, about practices and programs that fit with the overriding themes of the induction program, such as Aboriginal Education, school-family relationships, responsive teaching practices, assessment for learning, student engagement, inclusion, and teaching for understanding. Mentors and mentees spent time devoted to job-embedded learning (JEL), that is, "teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning" (Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, & Powers, 2010, p. 2). To support JEL, four to six half-days of release time were provided for learning partners to plan curriculum collaboratively, conduct classroom observations and visitations, converse, give and receive feedback, conduct inquiries and action research, engage in reflective talk and problem solving, and

focus on supporting student learning through quality program planning for complex urban classrooms.

The research tells us that educational leaders must also address teacher isolationism and fragmented efforts when working to improve teaching practice and learning outcomes, and that mentoring programs have contributions to make here (Heider, 2005; Johnson & the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, 2004). Especially in highly challenging school contexts, teaching needs to be viewed more as a collective than an individual responsibility. To address this insight, the program provided ample opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively and to co-construct knowledge. While such opportunities send a strong message that teachers need to be up-standers for each other, and not working alone, the program worked in ways that personalized the needs of teachers as adult learners. For this reason, it is important to note that the program was informed by principles of social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978) and adult learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Mezirow, 1991). These principles suggest that adults are goal oriented, relevancy oriented, autonomous and self-directed social learners who are also pragmatic meaning seekers. The program leaders were also mindful about making connections to the prior pedagogical and curricular knowledge and experiences that the adult participants brought to the program.

A unique feature of the induction program is that it is built on structures, human resources, and relationships already existing within the Inner City District of 21 schools. Mentors were drawn from the district and volunteered for their roles through an open application process. Learning support teachers, working in clusters of three inner city schools, also functioned as mentors where they were already engaged in learning relationships with teachers. The program then afforded them more time and resources with which to augment their work. Schools in clusters were already meeting and networking around common educational issues. Therefore, whenever possible, mentors were sought from schools already established in clusters or across clusters. Planners also kept the needs and similar interests of learning partners in mind. In other situations, mentors performed a service to district colleagues who were working in different schools. By design, learning partnerships were to extend over three years, in order to provide consistency and to enhance relationship building. In some cases, adjustments were made due to changes in the workplace: promotion, study leave, re-assignment, parental leave, transfer, sick leave, retirement, and so on.

Program Evaluation Design and Procedures

A participatory program evaluation design was employed for the induction program, which involved division leaders working in concert with two external colleagues who were experienced in conducting educational research and program evaluation. The internal program review drew upon the action research paradigm, which enables professionals to study and improve their own practice (Hendricks, 2009; Stringer, 2008). In this particular project, the program evaluators were positioned as outsiders working in collaboration with insiders (Anderson & Herr, 2005).

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide information and recommendations for decision-makers and funders about the induction program model and its impact on early service teacher practice. The following questions guided the evaluation:

- What are participants' perceptions of the mentoring process, the job-embedded learning component, the action research component, and the professional development sessions?
- What impact is the program having on mentees' learning and their teaching practice?
- What impact is the program having on mentors' learning and their mentoring practice?
- What are participants' perception of the program overall?

Multiple data sources and collection procedures were employed to address the evaluation questions and to allow program evaluators to practice triangulation. To assess the impact of the different program components, as well as the program overall on mentees and mentors, the following tools were used: year-end questionnaires, year-end focus group interviews, observations of mentoring sessions, written reports of action research projects, and written feedback on professional development sessions.

Qualitative data gleaned from focus groups and open-ended questionnaires and survey items were analyzed and themed using the interpretive strategies suggested by Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011) and Stringer (2008). Quantitative data generated from participant responses to fixed items on questionnaires and surveys were analyzed using basic descriptive statistical methods (Elliot & Woodward, 2007). Content analysis (Busch et al., 2005), coupled with a scoring rubric, were applied when assessing teachers' written action research reports. Finally, the mentor-mentee learning conversations were examined using interaction analysis methods (Rex, Steadman, & Graciano, 2008), through a particular analytic lens. For this data set, the analytic framework encompassed 18 specific skills and tools that were targeted during the mentoring training and identified in the supplementary text resources (Lipton & Wellman, 2003; 2007).

Discussion of Findings

This section discusses core findings of the program evaluation of the initial two years for early service teachers and their mentors. Overall, 88 teachers were involved in the induction program, 42 mentors and 46 mentees. Teacher participation rates in the program evaluation activities varied by type of assessment tool, cohort group, and program year; and ranged from 50% to 80%. Overall, very good sub-group representation and response rates were achieved, which contributes to the trustworthiness of the findings. As mentioned above, a number of questions guided the program evaluation, and we will discuss the findings by question.

Participants' Perceptions
of the Mentoring Process and the Job-Embedded Learning Component

Mentor and mentees found the mentoring a strong component of the program, which echoes findings of other mentoring program evaluations and research (Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, & Cowan-Hathcock, 2007; Strong, 2009). Mentees were satisfied overall with the mentoring that they received, and mentor and mentees generally strongly endorsed the mentor-mentee matches. In cases where mentor and mentee were not located in the same school, it was considered by those involved to be a logistical problem affecting their opportunities to meet, a finding that is not uncommon in the research literature (Johnson & The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, 2004). The effectiveness of the mentoring process was impacted by the fact that a large group of the mentoring partners in both teacher cohorts met only minimally (once or twice) in the second year. In general, the learning-focused interactions in the mentoring process (Lipton & Wellman, 1999) seemed to shift from being primarily consultative in the first year to a more collaborative and coaching approach in the second year.

Participants' Perceptions
of the Action Research Component

Overall, the majority of the participants judged the action research project to be a strong feature of the induction program. Assessments of the submitted action research reports showed that participants' understanding of the action research process was by and large mixed. While key elements were generally discerned, participants found it difficult to employ data analysis strategies that matched their chosen research questions and the data to be gathered. The action research process was notably easier for participants who were engaged in action research for the second time. These findings are in line with Peraro's (2005) research, which suggests that at least 5 years are needed for the process of teacher research to become a well-developed, natural, and habitual part of an educator's practice. Participants identified some common challenges and concerns associated with the action research process: data collection, lack of focus, lack of time, increased workload, the formality of process, difficulty comprehending research language, impingement on time available to address other pressing needs, and requirements for additional support. The most prominent challenge that mentees and mentors encountered with their action research projects was time: time to meet with their mentor and mentee, respectively, as well as time to complete the project.

Overwhelmingly, the research on professional development suggests that educators need to be "afforded the time, space, structures, and support" (Croft et al., 2010, p. 8) to engage in professional learning. Almost all teacher mentors said that their engagement with the project made them better mentors. This finding is in line with research on the benefits of action research: developing strong mentor-mentee relationships (Levin & Rock, 2003), increasing confidence, empowerment, and self-efficacy (Bradley-Levine, Smith, & Carr, 2009; Farrell, 2003), augmenting professional learning (Capobianco & Joyal, 2008), and developing teacher identity (Burn, 2007).

**Participants' Perceptions
of the Professional Development Sessions**

The teacher mentors judged the topics of the PD sessions as being helpful to their role as mentors, and almost all of the participants were satisfied with the number of PD sessions offered through the program. As the feedback solicited after each PD session suggested, those who attended a particular PD workshop considered the workshop professionally challenging and stimulating, although most reports of contemporary research on professional development (see, for instance, "Professional Development," 2011) indicate that single PD sessions on various topics lack continuity and coherence and are not particularly useful to participants. A possible explanation for this finding might be that these sessions were planned with participant input and aimed to address needs expressed by focus group discussants held prior to the start of the program.

There was overwhelming evidence that advanced skills mentors were applying the skills that they had learned at the Lipton workshop, confirmed through the observational data gathered. The highest level of usefulness of the PD sessions was expressed by sub-groups for whom the PD sessions had immediate applicability. Attendance at the PD sessions offered as an integral part of the program and for which release time was provided was strong. Supplementary after-school sessions were also offered, but were not particularly well-attended. The timing of these PD sessions – after school – was identified as a challenge by about half of the participants, which probably explains the relatively low attendance rate across almost all cohorts.

**Impact of the Program
on Mentees' Learning and Teaching Practice**

There was general agreement across all teacher mentor and mentee cohorts that the mentees improved their practice significantly through the mentoring component of the program, although half of the year two teacher mentees felt that their involvement in the program did not have a significant impact on their teaching practice. It was interesting to note that there was somewhat of a mismatch between how the teacher mentors described the impact of the program on their mentees' teaching practice and how their mentees themselves described the impact.

Early service teachers reported the following positive impact: increased competence, confidence, comfort, independence, willingness to take risks, and overall professional satisfaction, as well as decreased anxiety and stress, and evidence of positive changes in their students' learning, progress, and behavior. Tangible evidence of positive changes in mentees' learning, as reflected in their pedagogical thinking and practice, was also provided to some degree. Teacher mentors substantiated the claims of their mentees by making similar observations and by pointing to positive changes in their mentees' teaching and their students' learning. Teacher mentors made reference to

actual observations of their respective mentees' teaching practice as evidence of their mentees' changed practice.

**Impact of the Program
on Mentors' Learning and Teaching Practice**

Defining the roles of both mentors and mentees in the program, and ensuring that mentors are formally trained through targeted professional development, were both acknowledged by the participants as key to effective mentoring, which is a finding that aligns with the work of West and Saphier (2009). The PD sessions that focused specifically on developing and improving mentoring skills for advanced skills teachers emerged as most useful in the judgment of the participants. There was overwhelming evidence that advanced skills teachers were applying the skills that they had learned at the Lipton PD workshop. There was evidence gathered during observations of a sample of mentoring sessions of the use of all 18 skills identified through the PD training sessions on developing learning-focused relationships and leading learning-focused conversations. Most skills were visible in each of the observed mentoring sessions.

**Participants' Perceptions
of the Program Overall**

All teacher groups recommended that the mentoring and action research elements of the program should continue. For the teacher mentees, the mentoring relationship was the most important feature of the program. For the teacher mentors, the PD sessions, in particular those on learning-focused conversations, were the most important feature of the program. They also recognized that the process of professional development needs to be ongoing, long term, and sustained, which provides credence for the three-year timeframe of the program. There was no prominent problem with the program design identified by the teacher mentors, while half of the second year mentees identified a mismatch between mentor and mentee (different teaching assignments and located at different schools) as problematic. All participants acknowledged the need for increasing the time for professional development. Prioritizing, advance planning, and fixed scheduling were viewed by teacher mentors as critical ways to facilitate increased time and commitment for participation in professional development programming by all involved in the program.

Looking to the Future

Data provided through comprehensive program evaluation reporting (Morin, Falkenberg, & Collis, 2009; Morin, Falkenberg, Collis, & Smith, 2012), ongoing review of the related literature (e.g., Totterdell, Bubb, Woodroffe, & Hanrahan, 2004), and conversing about our professional development with critical friends inspire us to continue the important work of building strong teacher partnerships and networked learning communities in the Inner City District, Winnipeg School Division. We intend to continue our exploration of job-embedded learning and action research as vehicles for teacher inquiry and theory-

generation about teaching practices that are most effective in supporting inner city learners' academic achievement. Our work with Laura Lipton around learning-focused relationships will continue, as evaluation findings showed robust evidence that division mentors have been positively impacted by the training and are successfully acquiring and applying the mentoring skills so critical for supporting the transformation and growth of early service teachers. Program leaders will provide supplementary training to reinforce and amplify mentoring skills of "committed listening" and "other mindedness" discovered to be so crucial in leading learning interactions with mentees.

As we look to the future and the complex reality in which we work as inner city educators, our agenda only gets broader and more ambitious. Fortunately, to assist with the long road ahead and to support the growing cadre of program participants (now six teacher and two school leader sub-groups), an additional teacher has been added to the professional team at the PLC. We plan to maintain focus first and foremost on effective teaching and other topics pertinent to our context, such as assessment for learning, teacher reflection, diversity, and formal and informal leadership. Attention must be given to the many facets of education for social justice, such as community advocacy, strength-based approaches, and understanding of low income circumstances. In our view, it is important for the program to take on more of a community focus, extending professional learning into inner city neighbourhoods so that teachers experience the district first hand as our children and families experience it. Indeed, we want to sustain our collaborative partnership with outside program evaluators and secure stable funding. Finally, we are eager to share the insights from this experience with the larger educational community.

References

Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Queen, A. J., & Cowan-Hathcock, M. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of their induction program experiences. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas, 80*(3), 137-143.

Anderson, K, & Herr, G. L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bradley-Levine, J., Smith, J., & Carr, K. (2009). The role of action research in empowering teachers to change their practice. *Journal of Ethnographic and Qualitative Research, 3*(3), 152-161.

Burn, K. (2007). Professional knowledge and identity in a contested discipline: Challenges for student teachers and teacher educators. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(4), 445-467.

Busch, C., De Maret, P. S., Flynn, T., Kellum, R., Le, S., Meyers, B., Saunders, M., White, R., & Palmquist, M. (1993-2013). Content analysis. *Writing@CSU.* Department of English, Colorado State University. Retrieved from http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/content/contrib.cfm

Capobianco, B., & Joyal, H. (2008). Action research meets engineering design: Practical strategies for incorporating professional development experiences in the classroom. *Science and Children, 45*(8), 22-26.

Collis, K., & Clarke, P. (2008). *Proposed Professional Learning Centre for inner city educators*. Winnipeg, MB: Professional Learning and Leadership Centre, Winnipeg School Division.

Croft, A., Coggshall, F. G., Dolan, M., Powers, E. (with J. Killion). (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What is it, who is responsible, and how to get it done well.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf

Department of Education. (2012). *Induction for newly qualified teachers (England). Statutory guidance for appropriate bodies, head teachers, school staff and governing bodies.* Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/deployingstaff/ b0066959/induction-newly-qualified-teachers/

Elliot, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. (2007). *Statistical analysis quick reference guidebook with SPSS examples.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Farrell, J. B. (2003). *Empowering beginning teachers through action research.* Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association.

Heider, K. L. (2005). Teacher isolation: How mentoring programs can help. *Current Issues in Education*, *8*(14). Retrieved from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume8/number14/

Hendricks, C. (2009). *Improving schools through action research: A comprehensive guide for educators* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Education Research, 81*(2), 201-233.

Johnson, S. M., & The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers. (2004). *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult and human research development* (6th ed.). Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Levin, B. B., & Rock, T. C. (2003). The effects of collaborative action research on pre-service and experienced teacher partners in professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(2), 135-149.

Lipton, L, & Wellman, B. (with C. Humbard). (2003). *Mentoring matters: A practical guide to learning-focused relationships* (2nd ed.). Sherman, CT: Mira Via.

Lipton, L., & Wellman, B. (2007). *Learning-focused relationships: Consulting, collaborating & coaching for professional excellence.* Sherman, CT: Mira Via.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moore Johnson, S. (2009, October). Briefing paper #249. How to best add value? Strike a balance between the individual and the organization in school reform. *Economic Policy Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/publication/bp249/

Morin, F., Falkenberg, T., & Collis, K. (2009). *The Professional Learning Centre*

program for inner city teachers and school leaders: Year 1 program evaluation report. Winnipeg, MB: Winnipeg School Division.

Morin, F., Falkenberg, T., Collis, K., & Smith, C. (2012). *The Professional Learning Centre program for inner city teachers and school leaders: Year 2 program evaluation report.* Winnipeg, MB: Winnipeg School Division.

Peraro, M. (2005). Developing a professional learning community through action research. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*, AAI3192257.

Professional development. (2011). *Education Week, 32*(30). Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/professional-development/

Rex, L. A., Steadman, S., & Graciano, M. (2006). Researching the complexity of classroom interaction. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore, (Eds.). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 727-772). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Strachan, J. (2009/2010). *Building effective mentoring relationships.* Toronto, ON: Toronto District School Board. Retrieved from http://schools.tdsb.on.ca/asit/standards/btstart/btnmentor.pdf

Stringer, E. (2008). *Action research in education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Strong, M. (2005). Does new teacher support affect student achievement: Some early research findings. *Research Brief, 6*(1). Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center @ UC Santa Cruz.

Strong, M. (2009). *Effective teacher induction and mentoring: Assessing the evidence.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Strong, M., & St. John, L. (2001). *A study of teacher retention: The effects of mentoring for beginning teachers.* Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center @ UC Santa Cruz.

Totterdell, M., Bubb, S., Woodroffe, L., & Hanrahan, K. (2004). *The impact of newly qualified teachers (NQT) induction programs on the enhancement of teacher expertise, professional development, job satisfaction or retention rates: A systematic review of research literature on induction.* London, England: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education. Retrieved from http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/3129/1/Totterdell2004Theimpact.pdf

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

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

West, L., & Saphier, J. (2009). How coaches can maximize student learning. *Phi Delta Kappa, 91*(4), 46-50.

MERN

Manitoba Education Research Network

Winter Forum

"C-21: Re-Visioning Education"

Friday, January 25, 2013

Frontier School Division and Four Area Sites:
Winnipeg, Cranberry Portage, Dauphin, Norway House, Thompson

Hosted by
Frontier School Division

EDUCATING FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: AN ILLUSIVE QUEST

Lloyd Kornelsen
University of Winnipeg

Abstract

According to scholarly literature, there exists an enigma at the centre of global citizenship. On the one hand, global citizens recognize a common humanity, and hence appeal to a universal sense of justice. One the other, global citizens have an open predisposition, being able to see the world through the lens of people who are different from them. Political philosophers, who are sympathetic to notions of world citizenship, contend that successful cosmopolitanism rests in being able to reconcile this tension. But how does one educate for this, for global outlooks that are at once critical and curious?

This article examines the nature of this pedagogical conundrum and the challenges of helping young people navigate the enigma of world citizenship. It is determined that just as there is a paradox at the center of global citizenship – being open and critical at once – there exists a teaching dilemma in helping students navigate that paradox: knowing when to let be and when not. Several implications for teachers and teaching practice follow: be reflective of global ethics and education's moral purpose, be mindful of your whole teaching self, and know and care about your students.

The article's underlying questions originate from the author's 20 years of teaching high school social studies and are explored through a particular and memorable teaching-learning event. The findings are derived from his recently completed Ph.D. dissertation research project.

Educating for Global Citizenship: An Illusive Quest

> *The event of meeting lies in the between-ness, in the space that must reverently be left there, between one being and another.* – Elise Boulding

In recent years, global citizenship has become a familiar and oft-used catch phrase. It is immersed in popular culture, almost to the point of ubiquity, whereby the term has come to mean different things to different people, and serve a variety of purposes. However, a review of scholarly literature suggests that at the heart of the idea of global citizenship exists an enigma. On the one hand, global citizens recognize a common humanity, hence appealing to a universal sense of justice and caring about the human and environmental dimensions of global injustices. On the other, global citizens have an open predisposition, being able to see the world through the lens of people who are different from them, hence respecting and valuing social and cultural diversity. Political philosophers, who are sympathetic to notions of world citizenship, people like Kwame

Appiah (2008), Derek Heater (2002) and Martha Nussbaum (1997), contend that successful cosmopolitanism rests in being able to reconcile this tension. As Nussbaum (1997) stated, to be global citizens we must –

> cultivate within ourselves the capacity for sympathetic imagination that will enable us to comprehend the motives and choices of people different from ourselves, seeing them not as forbiddingly alien and other, but as sharing problems and possibilities with us. (p. 85)

It is not easy.

The Challenge

In a world of profound and sometimes violent cultural differences, the concept of global citizenship envisages a common global community in which all humanity shares membership. But what is that community to look like? what is to be shared? how is the common to be found? More importantly, how do we educate for this, for perspectives that reconcile two global outlooks, a universal sense of justice and a sympathetic imagination of the different – for mindsets that are critical, yet curious and imaginative? How do we do so without, as Maxime Greene (1995) feared, "regressing or mythicizing?" (p. 197). In addition to being an academic conundrum and educational dilemma, it is a pressing pedagogical concern. Citizenship in a global context is a core concept in the K-12 Manitoba social studies curricula ("Social Studies," 2013). Teachers, province wide, are expected to explore concepts of world citizenry and nurture perspectives of global citizenship, including navigating the enigma at its centre. And it is this with which this paper is concerned. Through revisiting a personal and memorable high school teaching experience, the pedagogic dilemmas and long-term consequences associated with helping students to reconcile this tension are explored. My perspective, analysis, and suggestions for practice arise from 20 years of teaching high school social studies.

A Case Study

In 2003, as part of a global citizenship practicum course, a colleague and I took a group of grade 11 and 12 students to Costa Rica for two weeks to live and work in the village of Pedrogosso. On the second morning after we arrived, two students came to us, confused and scared. They did not know what to make of a situation at their home-stay. There was a man in the backyard, locked in a cell-like structure, who was keeping them up at night, howling like a wolf. He was their host mom's older brother, who had been brain damaged in a car crash several years earlier.

Jayne and Lily[3] were confused and scared and they were looking for help, guidance, and advice. What were they to do, or think? Adrienne and I were not sure how to respond or

---

[3] Pseudonyms have been used to protect individual identities in this article.

what to say. On the one hand, we needed to keep our students safe and healthy and not overwhelmed; on the other, we wanted them to respect their hosts and to be open to cultural difference and difficulty. What exactly were our teacherly responsibilities (moral and pedagogic), and what were the implications for cultivating global perspectives? Did this situation call for critique or curiosity, for security or challenge? Where was the balance between letting Lily and Jayne interpret their own experience and offering our guidance and judgement?

Adrienne and I ended up doing little. We visited the home-stay the next afternoon and had tea with Lily, Jayne, and their "Baba." (All seemed well. No mention was made of the man in the backyard.) But was that enough? Was that the right thing to do? Should we have done more, or should we have done nothing at all?

These questions have lingered. The perspective of two respected experiential learning philosophers only accentuates the dilemma. John Dewey (1997) stated that freedom is a pre-requisite for students to get to know themselves and their relationship to the world; "*however, it is part of the educator's responsibility to see that the problems encountered . . . are within the range of the capacity of students* [emphasis added]" (p. 79). According to Dewey, for students to learn, they must be free, yet teachers are obliged to ensure that students' freedom is commensurate with their ability. Similarily, Paulo Freire (2007) contended, "Dialogical theory requires that the world be unveiled. No one can, however unveil the world for another. *Although one Subject may initiate the unveiling* [emphasis added] . . . the others must become Subjects of this act" (p. 169). According to Freire, only when learners are Subjects can they unveil the world, and only for themselves; however, other Subjects may help initiate the unveiling. And so the questions: Ought we to have helped Jayne and Lily interpret their experience, to initiate the unveiling? Was the "caged man in the backyard" within the range of Jayne and Lily's capacity to understand, interpret, and make sense?

Last summer, eight years after the event, I had an opportunity to pose these questions to Lily and Jayne. As part of my Ph.D. thesis research, I interviewed former participants of the 2003 Costa Rica practicum. Jayne and Lily were among them. They had not forgotten the 'caged man'; In fact, he was uppermost in their minds. What they said about that experience, how they remembered it, and what sense they made of it, spoke to the challenges of helping students understand and reconcile global citizenship's central paradox.

> Jayne: I still can't make sense of it. And, yeah, I'll never forget (it). I'll never forget the image of the cell because the union of love and imprisonment were and still are difficult for me to understand
>
> Lloyd: What sense did you make of it at the time? You still remember it.
>
> Jayne: Remembering how we had been prepared that we were supposed to be very open to the places that we were going, and the cultural differences. There was

always a big emphasis put on, 'this is a cultural . . . . you're going into a different culture.' And I think Lily and I both didn't really know what to do with it. So we responded in as 'OK, we understand', but being pretty confused as to wanting very much to talk to you or Adrienne because we didn't know . . . . I don't know you just meet these people so how do you know. What do you compare it to? I'd never seen that before.

Lloyd: Do you think we should have done more, Adrienne and I?

Jayne: No. I think that would have made us feel like it was wrong. Like it wasn't really supposed to happen that way, but that would imply an expectation or preconceived notion of this experience and we weren't supposed to have any of those . . . . I think Lily and I laugh about it now. Or I laugh about it, because it probably was pretty shocking, more than I probably know.
Lloyd: I remember at the time how it bothered you, not quite knowing what to do with it yourself.

Jayne: Yeah, and now when I look back on it I don't think about that part of it. And I wonder whether if that's because I feel like it was treated like it was OK. Maybe it's not OK; maybe I'm wrong. Maybe I'm still terribly confused and I'm only realizing that now. But I guess, had you guys come in and said and tried to walk us through it I think that would have been different because we kind of had to deal with . . . So, I don't know, it was our experience. And I'm glad that it was left that way.

(Kornelsen, 2013, pp. 220-221)

Jayne's recollections speak of the challenges of reconciling sensitivity to injustice with openness to motivations of people different from us – the global citizen's dilemma. Furthermore, they speak of the power of teachers: Whether or how teachers respond in these situations may shape the meaning that students ascribe to those situations years later.

The Lily-Jane episode demonstrates the pedagogical dilemmas of balancing challenge with capacity, of cultivating open minds and critical perspectives. In addition, it reminds of the moral call on teachers for judgment: knowing when to "let be" and be quiet, when to engage and speak. These are challenges in most teaching-learning situations, whether experientially focused or classroom based. The implications for teaching practice are considerable, because experiences that challenge students' understanding of the world may reverberate for a lifetime.

Implications for Global Educators

There are a myriad of situations and circumstances – arising daily in the shared lives of students and teachers – that call for thoughtful interpretation and critical response. Often, they are unanticipated and more complicated than previously conceived; they

never arrive neatly presented or packaged. They call for making judgments in the moment. In these situations, previous consciousness-raising is important, but so are the discriminating abilities (practical judgment) of teachers. Several truisms apply:

First, since a global educator's personal convictions about global ethics and about education's moral purpose are the ground from which they are able to guide and engage students, they need to, as Graham Pike (2000) suggested, engage in personal reflection at unusually sophisticated levels. So that, for example, when students on a global citizenship practicum discover a caged man in their hosts' backyard, their teachers have the wherewithal to respond with insight and integrity, and to help these students who have "called" them teachers, to make sense of their world.

Second, global educators need to know and care for their students. Teachers who care about their students, who have a nuanced sense of their capacities and limitations, and who trust and are trusted will have a clearer sense of when and whether to intervene, and when and whether students should be free to interpret their experience, unveil their own worlds. Exemplary educators have an instinctive sensibility for knowing when to do what, and how. It comes from experience, intuition, and training, but most significantly it is rooted in an abiding understanding of and care for students (Kornelsen, 2006).

Third, since global educators, wittingly or not, mediate student experience, they need to be mindful of their "presence," a presence that emanates from their "whole self." As Martin Buber (2006) stated,

> Only through his whole being, in all his spontaneity can the educator truly effect the whole being of his pupil . . . His aliveness streams out to them and affects them must strongly and purely when he has no thought of affecting them. (p. 125)

Educators' whole beings – including their enthusiasms, cares, convictions, and attitudes toward students – are seen and felt, and affect how students see themselves and their relationship to the world. For example, as Peggy McIntosh (2005) concluded,

> In school, sometimes it is the heartfelt trust of a teacher in the worth of a student in a completely local situation that produces a faith within the student that he or she is connected to the world in a way that matters, and that the world is worth caring about. . . . The global sense for belonging and making spaces for all to belong can be developed close to home by teachers bringing the wholeness of their emotions and capacities into classrooms. (pp. 38-39)

Conclusion

Educating for global citizenship can be illusive, for just as there is a paradox at the center of global citizenship – being open and critical at once – there is a teaching dilemma at the heart of helping students navigate that paradox – knowing when to let be and when not. It is a teaching sensibility that is cultivated by reflecting on global ethics

and education's moral purpose, being mindful of one's whole teaching self, and knowing and caring for students.

References

Appiah, K. A. (2008). Education for global citizenship. In D. L. Coulter & J. R. Weins (Eds.), *Why do we educate? Renewing the conversation* (pp. 83-99). Malden, MA: National Society for the Study of Education.

Boulding, E. (1990). *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Buber, M. (2006). *Between man and man.* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). London, UK: Kegan Paul.

Dewey J. (1997). *Experience and education.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* (30th anniv. ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts and social change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Kornelsen, L. (2006). Teaching with presence. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *Authenticity in teaching* (pp. 73-82). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kornelsen, L. (2013). *Remembering Costa Rica 2003: Exploring the influence of a high school global citizenship practicum through the memories, meanings, and lives of its participants eight years later (*Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada.

McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22-39). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.

Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(2), 63-73.

Social studies. (2013). *Manitoba Education.* Retrieved August 19, 2013, from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/index.html

TEACHER EDUCATION AS AGENTIC, COLLABORATIVE, AND CONNECTED

Paul Betts
University of Winnipeg

Lee Anne Block
University of Winnipeg

Abstract

"Who cares about what we learn in education courses at the university?" was an invitation for us to listen to the disenchanted voices of teacher candidates and embark on an ongoing re-imagining of teacher education. We have implemented a pilot alternative that responds to the disconnectedness inherent in common structures of teacher education programs. There are three key elements to this restructuring: (1) nested professional learning communities, (2) connecting school-based and university-based learning experiences and connecting ideas across courses, and (3) collaboration, partnerships, and shared responsibility among all stakeholders and participants. The enchanted voices of teacher candidates within this alternative suggested an educative experience that is agentic, collaborative, and connected. The associations or social interactions that teacher candidates experience within the alternative program emerge both from the program structure and from the teacher candidates' individual and collective commitments to the process. Their agency is expressed through the associations that they form with their cohort, instructors, teaching partners, partner school cooperating teachers, faculty supervisors, and students. Further, we interrogate a linear and one-directional relationship between educational theory and teacher practice. Rather, experiences are structured so that teacher candidates have opportunities to apply theory to practice, and use theory to interpret practice, as well as build and refine their personal theories of teaching. This article chronicles some of our efforts to impact the voices of teacher candidates and to re-imagine teacher education, in order to construct a context in which teacher candidates individually and collectively co-construct their teaching identities.

Teacher Education as Agentic, Collaborative, and Connected

Our imaginings of teacher education position the teacher candidate as an associate in a collaborative, personal, and professional process across landscapes of learning. This positioning is a problematizing of any conception of teacher education that privileges knowledge acquisition, ignoring the situated and identity-making experiences of learning to teach. Rather, teacher candidates are viewed as agentic and participatory, impacting on their own learning and those of others. Landscape is a metaphor that points toward a place to explore. Learning about teaching is a personal and professional searching and re-searching. Interestingly, these spaces have already been explored as children in schools and other locations, but now the focus changes from learner of learning to learner of teaching. This experience base, this commonplace, is a starting point of familiarity in a difficult place, but also a hindrance in that the commonplaces are the status quo. Teacher education can cultivate meaningful associations within which

individuals' understandings, wisdom, and experiences are valued, through collaboration on the shared project of learning to teach and teaching to learn. We value teacher candidates' potential to shape their teaching identities in response and in resistance to their experiences within a teacher education program.

In this article, we attempt to unpack and construct our imaginings of teacher education. To do so, we briefly describe common structures of teacher education, and quote the disenchanted voices of teacher candidates who participated in these common structures. We are motivated to construct an alternative teacher education program through acknowledging the disenchantment of teacher candidates and responding to current teacher education research. We theorize about teacher candidates' learning, considering personal and professional knowledge landscapes, teacher candidates as associates in their learning, and a nuanced understanding of the connections between educational theory and teaching practice. We bring forward some enchanted voices of teacher candidates as evidence that our imaginings of an agentic, collaborative, and connected teacher education program are realizable.

A Common Structure of Teacher Education

A well-developed theme in the teacher education research literature is a disconnect between educational theory and teaching practice (Zeichner, 2010; Falkenberg & Smits, 2010). Professors expound upon educational theory within university courses. Teacher candidates are left to understand and apply these theories to their teaching practice during practicums (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985). We have good reason to believe that it is common for teacher candidates in our program to experience the relationship between theory and practice, not as one applied to the other, but as unconnected and even unrelated ways of knowing.

A "traditional" teacher education program entails the telling of theory by university instructors to teacher candidates, after which the candidates practise teaching under the supervision of an experienced teacher (LeCornu & Ewing, 2008). Although LeCornu and Ewing (2008) argued that traditional teacher education has been transformed, shifting toward a professional experience model, Bullock and Russell (2010) claimed that this supposed shift is, in reality, largely rhetorical, that traditional teacher education programs remain resistant to reform. Our two-year after-degree program has the following structure: during year one, teacher candidates are told how to teach in K-4 in theory (also spending one day per week in a practicum placement), do a practicum block, take more courses, and do a second practicum. This model repeats in year two, except the focus is grades 5-8. A "wash-rinse-repeat" model of teacher education, this coursework-practicum-repeat structure is common in many Canadian teacher education programs (Falkenberg & Smits, 2010).

During practicum, teacher candidates practise the doing of teaching, presumably to master various teacher behaviours that are supported by educational theory. In practice, of course, the situation is much more complex than teaching theory would seem to

suggest on the surface, given the contextual and intersubjective complexities of teaching and learning. "Experience" (while practising teaching in school) has greater potential to impact on teacher candidates' development than "expertise" (of university professors) (Bullock & Russell, 2010; Munby & Russell, 1994). Thus, it is not surprising that teacher candidates experience teacher education as a disconnected set of ideas and experiences.

Disenchanted Voices of Teacher Candidates

Scholarly critiques of teacher education aside, the voices of teacher candidates are also important to our imaginings of teacher education. The following quotes suggest a common set of experiences during their tenure as teacher candidates:

- "Who cares about what we learn in education courses at the university?"
- "This assignment did not help me in my practicum."
- "That prof. has no idea what it is like in the real world of teaching."
- "I only see other teacher candidates at the university."

These quotes illustrate disenchantment among teacher candidates concerning their educational coursework. This disenchantment appears to emerge from perceived disjunction between coursework and practicum.

This disenchantment is also evident for those students who attach some value to educational theory. For example,

> I feel that the courses were helpful in understanding children, but I just don't feel prepared to actually implement the theories we have learned about. In the actual classroom there is just not enough time to test and try the theories.

What is clear from this quote is that applying theory to practice is an incomplete formulation for the relationship between educational theory and teaching practice.

As well as feeling disenfranchised by their course work experiences, teacher candidates are able to begin imagining how learning to teach could be more potent:

> The classes that I was taking in the first term of this year gave me no methods that I could apply to the classroom that I am in. These classes had nothing to do with the type of classroom that I was placed in. The practicum setting is a huge source of learning, and I would much rather learn hands-on in the practicum, than learn nothing in class. 90% of assignments that we are given can be completed in the first week of class. They take much longer than that to complete, but we do not need to be in class for more than a day to be able to competently complete them. This makes the whole term a complete waste of time (and very stressful). Assignments should be geared towards preparing us for our blocks. Allow us to plan our units, assignments, daily plans, etc. This

would be way better. I do not know if it would be beneficial to come to the university during the block, but it would be nice to meet with students within my practicum school, or at least in the school division (rural) to discuss our experiences. Even if we met once a week, or every two weeks, this would be helpful. If students were placed in schools in pairs (2 from each major), then they could continually meet with each other and give one another support and help.

The quote above suggests that learning about teaching should be grounded in practice and supported by peers. This is not to suggest that educational theory is useless, and that university instructors have nothing to offer to the learning experiences of teacher candidates. Teacher candidates need opportunities to situate their practicum experiences within ongoing, reflective, and critical discussion with peers and instructors. These teacher candidate voices suggest only that current structures of teacher education seem to disenchant, and alternative approaches are worth investigating.

An Alternative Structure of Teacher Education

We developed and implemented an alternative structure intended to acknowledge the disenchanted voices of teacher candidates, as well as respond to current recommendations within the teacher education literature. This alternative structure is being piloted for the EY/MY after-degree cohort, and involves a restructuring of coursework and practicum experiences for year one of a two-year program (year two reverts to the normal program). There are three key elements to this restructuring: (1) nested professional learning communities, (2) connecting school-based and university-based learning experiences and connecting ideas across courses, and (3) collaboration, partnerships, and shared responsibility among all stakeholders and participants.

Professional learning communities (PLCs) can foster teacher learning if they form a collaborative space that allows both safety and risk-taking while encountering and discussing educational issues (Betts, 2011; Borko, 2004). In our program, these communities are populated by teacher candidates, co-operating teachers, faculty supervisors, university instructors, and other educational professionals. They are intended to support the learning of teacher candidates through peer-peer and peer-mentor interactions. There are three nested layers of professional learning communities.

First, two teacher candidates are paired with a co-operating teacher (CT), unlike the traditional model wherein there is one student teacher per co-operating teacher (Bullough et,al., 2002). This triad is expected to collaborate on the task of practising various teaching tasks within a classroom, whereby the CT mentors their joint efforts. Beginning experiences often focus on a pair of teacher candidates working with a small group of children. Teacher candidates are encouraged to plan and implement activities jointly, and to experience with their CT various team teaching models. Learning experiences often include peer and mentored support to reflect on their teaching practice.

The second layer of a professional learning community is formed by the collection of all teacher candidates at a host school and their faculty supervisor. These PLCs meet regularly to dialogue on their learning and teaching experiences, with the specific purpose of facilitating opportunities for teacher candidates to develop their ability to reflect personally and professionally on their teaching practice. The content of these PLCs is linked to the content of a university course on general education. They also sometimes include the input of expertise within the host school, such as co-operating teachers, administrators, and learning support teachers. This expertise articulates the educational theory embedded in what is practised at the host school. For example, a meeting might illuminate the school-wide positive behavior management program practiced at the school, or programs for supporting the learning needs of EAL children.

The third layer of a professional learning community is formed by the cohort of teacher candidates participating in the program and their university instructors. This cohort takes all university courses together, and is articulated with the first two layers. The third PLC layer facilitates the sharing of ideas and experiences across various educational settings (within the host schools), thus encouraging direct and explicit analysis of the contextualized ways that educational theory could be enacted.

The three layers of PLCs are nested so that they can mutually sustain each other. Layer one supports layer two at the school, which supports layer three at the university. The university layer is able to feed back into the school and classroom-based PLCs because of specific connections between the university and school (to be discussed shortly). Further, several university instructors are also faculty supervisors, who facilitate the school-based PLCs, thus fostering stronger ties between the PLCs.

The second key element to our restructuring of the program concerns connecting school-based and university based learning experiences and connecting ideas across university courses (Darling-Hammond, 2006). This key element is accomplished by ensuring that the activities of practice in schools and educational theories considered at university are frequently connected. There are multiple opportunities for teacher candidates to recognize that an activity experienced during school can be further understood by connecting it to an educational experience, and for educational theories to be recognized within practicum experiences. A major mechanism for accomplishing these connections between educational theory and teacher practice is within course assignments. Rather than write a lesson plan for an imaginary or idealized classroom based on curricular outcomes, teacher candidates plan an activity that is actually implemented and then discussed based on outcomes, learning theories, and other educational issues. Rather than comprehend an educational theory, teacher candidates are guided to notice a specific aspect of teaching practice and then reflect on this aspect in ways that include the noticing of educational theory.

Further, university work (content, assignments) across courses is interrogated in terms of complementary and overlapping material (Darling-Hammond, 2006). University instructors in the alternative program consult regarding topics that can repeat in several

courses, to ensure that ideas are developed, consolidated, and reinforced without becoming repetitive. Unit planning, for example, is taught in many methods courses. We decided to introduce universal design in a general methods course, which provided a base for further development of unit plans in the science and social studies methods courses. This consultative process included sharing resources, course content, and teaching methods. Connecting ideas across university courses also recognizes the interplay between specific and general content. A learning theory, for example, could be revisited in terms of its implications for teaching a specific subject such as mathematics. These connections are accomplished by collaboration and partnerships among the university instructors.

The third key element to our restructuring of the program is collaboration, partnerships, and shared responsibility among all stakeholders and participants (Darling-Hammond, 2006). We cannot accomplish the first two key elements without considerable partnership and collaboration among all participants and stakeholders. We regularly work with the schools to articulate PLCs and university-school work. University instructors for this cohort share course work planning and implementation. Co-operating teachers, faculty supervisors, and university instructors regularly exchange ideas and share stories concerning the planning and implementation of activities associated with the program. We work to accomplish what Zeichner (2010) referred to as a hybrid space, wherein partnership and collaboration mitigates against the artificial binary between practice-based and theoretical knowledge. Expertise from all stakeholder locations contributes to the education of teacher candidates, with a rejection of any hierarchical separation of knowledge or the location/source of knowledge that informs learning about teaching.

Connections

For us, a key aspect of teacher education is for teacher candidates to make connections among understandings of teaching through reflection (Schön, 1987). We interrogate a linear unidirectional relationship between theory and practice, such that educational theory is applied to practice. This is not to say that teacher candidates do not or should not have opportunities to experience the application of theory to practice. Rather, application is an incomplete description of the ways in which teacher candidates could experience connections between theory and practice. We believe that there are three distinct, nonhierarchical and mutually emerging ways that teacher candidates can experience the connections between educational theory and teaching practice (Betts & Block, 2013). These three ways are (1) applying theory to practice, (2) using theory as a lens for interpreting practice, and (3) building/refining personal theories of teaching based on practice. The first is common and taken for granted in teacher education, so only the second two ways are considered below.

Teacher candidates can experience theory as a lens for interpreting practice. This means that educational theory is used to make sense of an event in their teaching practice, which, in a way, is the reverse of applying theory to practice. A teacher

candidate, for example, may observe a child working to learn a math concept using manipulatives and interpret this using mediated learning and the zone of proximal development, based on Vygotsky's learning theory.

Based on our understanding of teacher candidates as agentic, we seek to provide opportunities for teacher candidates to build and/or refine their theories of teaching. This process emerges from engaging in and reflecting on practice. A well-developed concept in the teacher professional learning literature is personal professional knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995), whereby teachers co-construct narratives of their practice informed by their practice and their take-up of educational ideas. In other words, learning to teach is an act of identity making, grounded within and emerging from a social milieu. To build and refine personal theory, then, is to co-narrate lived experience of learning to teach. Consider how the theory of relationship building between teachers and their students is communicated in teacher education. Any educational stakeholder would take the idea as true without critique, as if it were trivial to come to understand this idea. However, when a teacher candidate faces a situation with a particular student, and recognizes the place of relationship in navigating that situation, the educational theory of relationship building enlarges; reflecting with peers and mentors on that situation points toward the co-narrating of a personal understanding by the teacher candidate. The teacher candidate comes to understand some aspect of the experience in a way that is personally relevant – in a way that matters to his or her own sense of agency and to his or her own identity as an emerging teacher.

We see the connections between theory and practice – applying theory to practice, interpreting practice with theory, and personal theory building/refining – as a foundational landscape for learning about teaching. They are indeed a transcending of the supposed knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for teaching because the identities and intersubjectivities of those who participate are valued.

Teacher Candidates as Associates

"Associate" is a purposeful choice in our description of teacher candidates, reinforcing our understanding of teacher education as a collaborative process. The teacher candidate in the alternative program is an associate in a collaborative, personal, and professional process. This process resists individualism as a core value:

> The "I" becomes an "I" only among a "we," in a community of speech and action. Individuation does not precede association; rather it is the kinds of associations which we inhabit that define the kinds of individuals we will become. (Benhabib,1992, p. 71, as cited in Brydon & Coleman, 2008, p. 3)

Structuring a teacher education program focused on building community through connecting speech (theory) and action (practice) is fundamental. The associations or social interactions that teacher candidates experience within their program emerge both from the program structure and from the teacher candidates' individual and collective

commitments to the process. Their agency is expressed through the associations that they form with their cohort, instructors, teaching partners, partner school cooperating teachers, faculty supervisors, and students. Thus, teaching identities are grounded in collaboration and community and in an ongoing interrogation of the boundaries between theory and practice. This collaborative process amplifies individual inquiry into teaching.

Landscapes of Learning About Teaching

Teacher candidates' individual and collaborative inquiry occurs across landscapes of learning. The metaphor "landscapes," integral to our description of teacher education, is intentional. Landscapes can include personal and professional experiences. Landscapes can contain both theory and practice. Landscapes are not territories: their boundaries are permeable, not legislated. Institutional boundaries structure the after-degree alternative program. However, within that structure, choices can be made to construct landscapes or milieu within which teacher candidates can explore the teaching and learning process. More precisely, we advocate for a co-construction of the landscapes with teacher candidates. As instructors and faculty supervisors, we value teacher candidates' personal professional knowledge and their agentic potential to shape their teaching identities in response and in resistance to their experiences in the alternative program (Betts & Block, 2013).

The alternative program is located in both the field and the university. Increased across-location-interactions are fostered by program structures. An example is having course instructors also serve as faculty advisors. This physically locates program professors in both landscapes and generates linkages between experiences in the field and in the university. An example of this linkage is the assigning of specific observations for weekly practicum visits, related to the topics in a general education course. Another example is students planning a social studies unit in their methods course in consultation with their co-operating teacher and contextualized with their practicum students. Within these landscapes of learning, curriculum is experienced as interactive, produced through the interaction of students and teachers within specific contexts or places.

Enchanted Teacher Candidates

It is difficult for us at this time to provide rigorous data that support our imaginings of an agentic, collaborative, and connected teacher education program. Our experience so far suggests that teacher candidates in the alternative program often perceive their teacher education program in ways that we hope and imagine. Three examples below are used to suggest our hopefulness.

The first example considers the import of the following exclamation by a teacher candidate to an instructor, "Oh yeah, I remember from the math course . . ." We interpret this quote as a student making connections among university courses, and seeing the material as valuable to his or her learning, at university, about teaching practice. But the statement happened at a school-based PLC in the winter term and the math course was

completed in the fall term! In fact, the teacher candidate had just noticed that a child's learning about social studies could be further understood using an idea from theory of learning math. The teacher candidate, via reflection emerging from a collaborative milieu, had noticed a connection between theory and practice.

The second example considers a connection between ideas in two university courses. In a social studies methods course, teacher candidates are given class time to journal about their weekly practicum experience. Sometimes journal entries are discussed in class. One teacher candidate described an event at the school and added, "And this is reflection-in-action . . ." Reflection-in-action is a concept developed in a general education course. This teacher candidate understood that the concept did not belong or fail to belong in a particular course, but was available for consideration across the landscapes of teacher education.

We suggested in a previous section that learning is cyclical and that we reinforce and consolidate learning throughout the program, while trying to avoid repetition. In our third example, an instructor considers it important to revisit the concept of interactive curriculum regularly. During a school-based meeting, a teacher candidate stated, "I didn't really understand when you explained it in class, but now I get it." Experiencing the instructor – and the instruction – in both locations, university and practicum, has amplified learning. The example also reveals an agentic experience of this teacher candidate as she reflected on an aspect of teaching.

We believe that teacher candidates in the alternative program are experiencing personal and professional knowledge landscapes, wherein they connect university course work and practicum experience. Within these landscapes, teacher candidates experience agency as they collaborate to develop their teaching and learning.

Closing Thoughts

The mantra of real estate agents is location-location-location. Our imaginings of teacher education are located in practicum schools and university courses. This physical bifurcation of the location of teacher education is something we work against vis-à-vis the structures of our alternative program. A third location emerges, a hybrid space, an alternative to bifurcation, where we imagine teacher education lives. Teacher education is not done to teacher candidates. Rather, we collaborate with teacher candidates as associates. We explore dynamic and living connections between educational theory and teaching practice. We acknowledge the agency of all participants. Thus, our location-location-location mantra is collaboration, connectedness, and agentic experience.

Our final thought is to interrogate "enchantment." Positioning teacher candidates as associates, and agentic within landscapes of learning, necessitates a shifting of our role from guardians of knowledge to mentors of learners. Thus, we must be ready to value teacher candidates' potential to critique their educational experiences, both in theory and in practice: a democracy of education whereby experts (e.g., university professors) are

not positioned and do not position themselves as warrantors of effective teaching. Our role is not to enchant, but to construct a context in which teacher candidates individually and collectively co-construct their teaching identities.

References

Betts, P. (2011). The emergence of professional collaborations among teacher candidates participating in an alternative practicum experience. *The Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www.infonomics-society.org/LICEJ/Published%20papers.htm

Betts, P., & Block, L. (2013). Reimagining teacher education: Our ongoing story. In L. Thomas (Ed.), *What is Canadian about teacher education in Canada? Multiple perspectives on Canadian teacher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 402-419). Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BwVGDOGBDzJdOVdJYmNFRl9KYm8/edit?pli=1

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3-15.

Brydon, D., & Coleman, W. D. (Eds.). (2008). *Renegotiating community*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Bullock, S. M, & Russell, T. (2010). Does teacher education expect too much from field experience? In T. Falkenberg & H. Smits (Eds.), *Field experiences in the context of reform of Canadian teacher education programs* (Vol. 1, pp. 91-100). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., Young, J., Erickson, L., Birrell, J. R., Clark, D. C., Egan, M. W., . . . Smith, G. (2002). Rethinking field experience: Partnership teaching versus single-placement teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 68-80.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.

Falkenberg, T, & Smits, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Field experiences in the context of reform of Canadian teacher education programs* (Vols. 1-2). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record, 87*(1), 53-65.

LeCornu, R., & Ewing, R. (2008). Reconceptualizing professional experiences in preservice teacher education . . . reconstructing the past to embrace the future. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1799-1812.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*(2), 86-95.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89-99.

TEACHING GRAMMAR AND PUNCTUATION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Marion Terry
Brandon University

Abstract

My MERN forum presentation was grounded in four principles: (1) teaching writing is important, (2) grammar and punctuation are important to writing, (3) the best way to teach writing is within the context of students' own writing, and (4) teachers can learn the conventions of writing while they learn to teach these skills to their students. I used possessive apostrophes as a teaching example. Interested readers are invited to consult my book, *Teaching Grammar and Punctuation in the Twenty-First Century* (scheduled for release by Oxford University Press in January 2014), for more ideas to teach grammar and punctuation in grades 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12.

Teaching Grammar and Punctuation in the Twenty-First Century

Four principles guide my approach to teaching pre-service (and other) teachers how to teach writing: (1) teaching writing is important, (2) grammar and punctuation are important to writing, (3) the best way to teach writing is within the context of students' own writing, and (4) teachers can learn the conventions of writing while they learn to teach these skills to their students. In this MERN forum presentation, I used possessive apostrophes as a teaching example.

1. Teaching writing is important.

Writing is important. Not just in English language arts classrooms, but in all subject areas regardless of a student's age or grade level, writing partners with speaking, listening, and reading as a primary vehicle for communication. It is the means by which most learning is validated, and it is a skill that students take with them into the real world.

2. Grammar and punctuation are important to writing.

Grammar and punctuation are essential writing conventions. They are the "good table manners of written language" (Culham, 2003, p. 214), and they are too important to leave to chance. Simply writing more often is not enough, because "practice makes permanent" any errors that are not corrected through purposeful instruction (Williams, 2005, p. 119). Therefore, grammar and punctuation must be actively taught (Bromley, 2007) within a writing process that includes constructive feedback (Nitschke, 2005) and teacher-led lessons (Blanchfield, 2005). The success of this instruction, as evidenced by evaluative procedures (Dudley, 2005), relies on the teacher's ability and willingness (Baines & Kunkel, 2010) to engage students (Pressley, Mohan, Fingeret, Reffitt, & Raphael-Bogaert, 2007) when they are ready to learn (Chapman & King, 2003).

3. The best way to teach writing is within the context of students' own writing.

Writing instruction is an integral part of the writing process and should be treated as such (Donoghue, 2009). The goal is to create confident, independent writers who experience incremental increases in complexity in all aspects of their writing, including grammar and punctuation. Teachers and students become partners in a reiterative process that gradually releases responsibility to the student writers (Coker, 2007), because "real writers" write independently (Parr & Campbell, 2007, p. 410).

Classroom writing contexts include both content-based assignments and writing for self-expression. Cross-curricular writing based on content reading focuses on acquiring knowledge (Bromley, 2007), developing higher order thinking skills (Newell, Koukis, & Boster, 2007), and honing writing skills (Parr & Campbell, 2007). At the same time, we also value writing that is more personal and psychologically engaging, wherein writing may become the "horse" that precedes the "cart" of reading (Elbow, 2004, p. 9). Whether content based or purely for self-expression, the writings that students produce – at whatever stage of completion – are most aptly stored in some form of portfolio (a binder, file folder, duo-tang, etc.), in order to facilitate easy access for future instruction.

If students are to develop a self-image as writers, they need to write outside the classroom as well as in it. Younger students, especially, need to experience writing in the home. Parents may not always understand your teaching methodology, especially when they see drafts of their children's writing with errors that have not been marked in red ink (Culham, 2003), but they can be strong writing advocates. Even parents with limited writing skills can involve children of all ages in family writing activities such as shopping lists, captioned photo albums, and records of important events (Paratore, Krol-Sinclair, Chacon, & Banados, 2005). Other relatives can also be enlisted to help students proofread school-based writing assignments (Parr & Campbell, 2007).

Regardless of the context for their writing, we want students to take risks as they experiment with different writing forms (Romano, 2004) and try out new skills (Portalupi & Fletcher, 2004). Teachers must accept the reality that the more risks students take in their writing, the more mistakes they will make (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2007). Instead of curbing their enthusiasm by demanding "absolute correctness" (Culham, 2003, p. 213), we should "stand in awe of their genius" when they come up with unconventional structures and patterns (Mack, 2008, p. 7). This does not mean that we do not teach them the "conventional" rules of writing; it means that we teach them these rules at an opportune time in the writing process.

The Writing Process

The writing process is recursive (Fleischer, 2004), as students engage in prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and polishing (Unger & Fleischman, 2004). What happens during the revising stage depends on the individual teacher (Baines & Kunkel, 2010) and

the readiness of his/her students to learn specific skills (Chapman & King, 2003). For example, some teachers lump clarity, precision, and emphasis together with grammar and punctuation (Henderson, 2011), while others focus solely on rethinking for clearer expression of meaning (Crimi & Thompkins, 2005). This is the stage for writing conferences with teachers and peers (Perchemlides & Coutant, 2004), to discuss changes that would make the writing easier or more interesting to read (Romano, 2004).

Grammar and punctuation definitely belong in the editing stage of writing. Teacher-assisted editing occurs during meetings with individual students and small groups (Costa-Smith, 2005). Classroom editing stations can facilitate teacher, peer and self-editing (Crimi & Thompkins, 2005). Regardless of how the editing occurs, teachers need to make judicious decisions about which skills to target. Students can focus on only one or two new skills at a time (Culham, 2003), but they should also be held accountable for skills that they have learned previously (Nitschke, 2005).

Depending on the purpose for writing, the process may end with revising, instead of continuing through the publishing stage. In this stage, the student does a final proofreading check to polish the final draft before releasing it to an audience (Unger & Fleischman, 2004). Except when a student is writing solely for self-expression, the audience is important because it gives the student a reason to write (Karle, 2005). When this audience is outside the scope of the classroom, such as parents and other community members (Mack, 2008), the teacher may decide to do an extra proofread to make the writing error free (Jamison Rog, 2011), but when the audience includes just the student's teacher or peers, the proofreading should include only those errors with which the student is familiar (Nitschke, 2005).

Constructive Feedback

Constructive feedback by teachers (Unger & Fleischman, 2004) and peers (Crimi & Thompkins, 2005) is a critical part of teaching writing, including the conventions of grammar and punctuation. Praise and critique are critical partners in the feedback process. Praise tells students that their writing successes are not just "a happy accident," but are skills worthy of recognition, and that they "can do it again and again" (Culham, 2003, p. 13). Critique points out potential areas for improvement (Pressley et al., 2007). Constructive feedback serves two purposes: it checks that students have internalized the lessons on the writing process and conventions (Crimi & Thompkins, 2005), and it alerts teachers to the need for such instruction (Costa-Smith, 2005).

Verbal conferences are arguably the most effective form of constructive feedback. Conferences between student writers and their teachers or classmates tell the students that their writing is important and that other people want to read it (Romano, 2004). Teacher-student conferences should not take a long time: 5 to 10 minutes may suffice (Costa-Smith, 2005). Peer conferences may take longer, because the students often read their writing to each other (Tompkins, 2005) before discussing potential revisions such as choosing "more interesting words" (Pressley et al., 2007, p. 19) and grammar

and punctuation errors (Peterson, McClay, & Main, 2010). Peer reviews are valuable because they create a "real" audience for student writing (Bromley, 2007, p. 251).

Teacher-Led Lessons

Students need direct instruction in writing skills (Bromley, 2007). When these lessons are tied to students' writing, they can have the same immediacy as constructive feedback (Blanchfield, 2005). Grammar and punctuation, especially, should not be taught in isolation (Mack, 2008). The most effective lessons on grammar and punctuation tell students that these conventions are important while tempering formal rules and terminology with a focus on more user-friendly applications (Donoghue, 2009).

Contextual learning is particularly important for the skills of grammar and punctuation. Teaching these skills in isolation, with practice applications such as worksheets instead of real writing, is not only ineffective (Jamison Rog, 2011), but can actually do more harm than good (Graham & Perin, 2007) because it "goes against the way the brain acquires language" (Mack, 2008, p. 5). Grammar skills such as building better sentences (Crimele, 2005) and identifying parts of speech (Parr & Campbell, 2007), and punctuation skills such as quotation marks, commas, and end punctuation (Bromley, 2007) are easier and more effectively learned within the context of students' own writing.

Mini-lessons are especially useful for teaching discrete skills in grammar and punctuation. When the teacher models writing to demonstrate "target practice" with a particular skill (Rickards & Hawes, 2004, p. 68), he/she is perceived as "a real writer alongside students" (Parr & Campbell, 2007, p. 411). When a skill requires more instruction time, the lesson may be divided into more than one class session in order to avoid turning the mini-lesson into a "maxi lesson" (Jamison Rog, 2011, p. 5).

Teaching grammar and punctuation does not necessarily mean teaching formal rules and terminology. It means taking what students already know about verbal expression, and translating it into a written form that is understandable by a reader (Kolln, 2003). Regardless of the extent to which the writing needs to conform to "book language" standard English (Jamison Rog, 2011, p. 461), memorizing rules is counterproductive (Bromley, 2007). The conventions of grammar and punctuation need to be learned less formally at all grade levels, within the context of student writing (Donoghue, 2009).

Timing

Knowing when to teach grammar and punctuation is just as important as knowing how. Students cannot learn progressively more advanced writing conventions until they have the prerequisite writing maturity to do so (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2007), but teachers also have a responsibility to teach whatever skills are required to meet grade level expectations (Culham, 2003). Thus, although "writing is individual" (Baines & Kunkel, 2010, p. 4), particularly in today's diverse classrooms (Chapman & King, 2003), we

expect certain skills to be taught at certain age/grade levels regardless of individual readiness to learn (Donoghue, 2009).

Most children come to grade 1 with a verbal awareness of English grammar, and by the time they are in grade 3 or 4 they "know the system as well as they will ever know it" (Donoghue, 2009, p. 321). The teacher's task is therefore to help these children's writing skills catch up to their verbal skills (Coker, 2007). When they are in grade 4, children begin to use prepositional phrases and subordinate conjunctions in their writing (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2007). By the time they are in grade 5, we expect students to use common punctuation marks correctly (Pressley et al., 2007), and by the time they are in grade 6, we expect them to writie in logical paragraphs (Jamison Rog, 2011).

In about grade 7, students' writing skills begin to outperform their verbal skills (Flood, Lapp, & Ranck-Buhr, 2005). They use sentence structures and grammatical conventions that are more sophisticated than they normally speak (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2007). When they read their own writing aloud, they can often correct common errors in grammar and punctuation (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2007), but the sudden changes that characterize early adolescence may also render them oblivious to many skills that they have already learned, such as commas and verb tenses (Flood et al., 2005).

By high school, we expect students to express complex ideas in meaningful ways, using correct grammar and punctuation. This juxtaposition of higher-order thinking and lower-order conventions can be "satisfying and mind-expanding" for students who have the prerequisite writing skills, but it is "frustrating and even aversive" for students who lack those skills (Perin, 2007, 242). As in all grade levels, rubrics can provide guidelines for writing, but it is the constructive feedback and teacher-led lessons that will help students to develop their writing skills to meet grade level expectations (Pressley et al., 2007).

Evaluation

Teachers evaluate their students – and themselves – all the time. Diagnostic (Wray & Medwell, 2001), formative (Elwood, 2006), and summative (Black, Harrison, Hodgen, Marshall, & Serret, 2010) assessment permeates our teaching practices. Individual teachers choose the writing skills to evaluate – and when and how – on the basis of their own experiences (Hunter, Mavenga, & Gambell, 2006), their students' skill sets (Chapman & King, 2003), and prescribed age/grade expectations (Culham, 2003).

The types of diagnostic and formative evaluation mirror the types of constructive feedback that teachers give, such as verbal remarks (Peterson et al., 2010) and written rubrics (Saddler & Andrade, 2004), comments (Culham, 2003), and other markings on student writing (Rickards & Hawes, 2004). Numerical marks or letter grades typify summative evaluation (Baines & Kunkel, 2010). However, the standardized tests that contribute to summative evaluation have met with resistance by both teachers and students. Teachers complain that they end up teaching to help their students give better test answers instead of writing better in general (Slomp, 2008). Students report acquiring

the notion that writing is "a fill-in-the-blanks response to particular genres" instead of "a powerful tool for thinking and expressing ideas" (Luce-Kapler & Klinger, 2005, p. 157).

When rubrics are used to evaluate writing skills, they can facilitate an assessment that correlates with grades (Dudley, 2005). Rubrics commonly include four to six sequential levels, each with clearly stated and measurable criteria for performance (Jamison Rog, 2011). Whether created by individual teachers (Rickards & Hawes, 2004) or published in a provincial curriculum document (e.g., Ontario Ministry of Education, 1999), rubrics provide scores that can be used to track individual student performance or compare students with each other or with an age-grade standard (Parr & Campbell, 2007).

4. **Teachers can learn the conventions of writing while they learn to teach these skills to their students.**

Before they can teach children how to write, teachers need to possess these skills themselves. Pre-service teachers' skill levels affect not only their abilities to teach, but their attitudes toward the conventions of writing (Benevides & Peterson, 2010).

Apostrophes for Possession

In my MERN forum presentation, I used possessive apostrophes as a teaching example. I divided the instruction into four lessons. The first three are suitable for grades 4-6, and as refresher lessons for grades 7-0. The fourth lesson is suitable for grades 10-12.

Lesson 1 = possessive words

First, students learn whether what follows an "—s" person or thing is someone or something. If so, then the "—s" word is possessive because it owns the following word.

If your students have learned that a person or thing is called a noun, name these words as nouns. If not, now would be a good time to teach this grammar term.

- My <u>moms rules</u> are stricter than the <u>rules at</u> my <u>friends homes</u>.

o   Is "rules" a person or thing? – yes
Then "moms" is possessive.

o   Is "at" a person or thing? – no
Then "rules" is not possessive.

o   Is "homes" a person or thing? – yes
Then "friends" is possessive.

Lesson 1 is really important. Students who do not master it tend to put an apostrophe in every word that ends in "s" – and that habit is very difficult to break.

Lesson 2 = apostrophes in possessive words

Second, students learn whether to put the possessive apostrophe before or after the "s" in the "—s" word. If the "s" was added to make the word possessive, then the apostrophe goes before the "s." If the "s" was already there and no new "s" was added, then the apostrophe goes after the "s."

- My <u>moms rules</u> are stricter than the rules at my <u>friends homes</u>.

    o Do the rules belong to "mom" or "moms"? – mom
      Was an "s" added to make the word possessive? – yes
      Then the apostrophe goes before the "s" = mom's rules.

    o Do the homes belong to "friend" or "friends"? – friends
      Was an "s" added to make the word possessive? – no
      Then the apostrophe goes after the "s" = friends' homes.

Never refer to an apostrophe as a comma. You may say that it <u>looks like</u> a comma floating in the line of print, but do not call it a comma.

Lesson 3 = <u>no</u> apostrophes in possessive pronouns

We do not use apostrophes in the little general words that take the place of specific things and people. That is, we do not use apostrophes in possessive pronouns:

      ours   yours   his   hers   its   theirs

There is no easy way to explain this rule. It just "is."

- <u>Ours</u> is the best classroom in the school.
- We all thought that the motorcycle was <u>hers</u>.
- Each car had <u>its</u> own parking spot in the garage.

The most difficult possessive pronoun is "its." Now may be a good time to teach apostrophes for contractions, which would include teaching "it's" as a short form of "it is."

Lesson 4 = hyphenated words and individual versus joint possession

In a hyphenated compound, the apostrophe goes after the last word.

- Sally's <u>sister-in-law's motorcycle</u> is beautifully decorated with flaming pink hearts.

In a compound subject, the nouns show individual possession when they own separate things. Only the last noun shows joint possession when the subjects share ownership of the same thing.

- My mother's and my brother's bedrooms are upstairs.
- Abigail and Trudy's bedroom is downstairs.

Conclusion

The conventions of grammar and punctuation have not gone out of style with modern teaching practices, but remain integral to good writing. Like it or not, "adults and students alike are judged on the quality of their written work" (Crimi & Thompkins, 2005, p. 99). How well we teach these conventions depends on our own levels of proficiency in using them. Some pre-service (and other) teachers may need to relearn or review skills in preparation for teaching the skills to their own students.

I wrote *Teaching Grammar and Punctuation in the Twenty-First Century* because I am impassioned about teaching grammar and punctuation, and because I want to share my zeal with pre-service (and other) teachers who work with children's writing. The teaching ideas in my book work with students of all ages and skill levels – including post-secondary students who wish to improve their skills. Regardless of how proficient you are (or are not) in the conventions of grammar and punctuation, I promise that you will find this book to be a valuable teaching resource.

References

Baines, L., & Kunkel, A. (2010). *Going bohemian: How to teach writing like you mean it.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Benevides, T., & Peterson, S. S. (2010). Literacy attitudes, habits and achievements of future teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*(3), 291-302.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Hodgen, J., Marshall, B., & Serret, N. (2010). Validity in teachers' summative assessments. *Assessment in Education: Principles, policy and practice, 17*(2), 215-232.

Blanchfield, C. (2005). Explicit instruction: Teaching grammar during editing. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic writers* (pp. 47-49). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Bromley, K. (2007). Best practices in teaching writing. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 243-263). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Chapman, C., & King, R. (2003). *Differentiated instructional strategies for writing in the content areas.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Coker, D. (2007). Writing instruction for young children: Methods targeting the multiple demands that writers face. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 101-118). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Costa-Smith, K. (2005). Conferences: Encouraging students to talk about their writing. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 18-21). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Culham, R. (2003). *6 + 1 Traits of Writing: The Complete Guide Grades 3 + Up.* New York, NY: Scholastic Professional Books.

Crimele, K. (2005). Creative models: Writing haiku poetry. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 29-30). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Crimi, F., & Thompkins, G. (2005). Editing stations: Enhancing the readability of writing. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 37-40). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Donoghue, M. R. (2009). *Language arts: Integrating skills for classroom teaching.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dudley, M. (2005). Assessments rubrics: Evaluating in small groups. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 4-7). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Elbow, P. (2004). Writing first! Educational Leadership, 62(2), 8-13.

Elwood, J. (2006). Formative assessment: Possibilities, boundaries, and limitations. Assessment in Education, 13(2), 215-232.

Fleischer, C. (2004). Professional development for teacher-writers. Educational Leadership, 62(2), 24-28.

Flood, J., Lapp, D., & Ranck-Buhr, W. L. (2005). Middle school writing: Nine essential components model. In R. Indrisano & J. R. Paratore (Eds), *Learning to Write, Writing to Learn: Theory and Research in Practice* (pp. 120-136). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Henderson, E. (2011). *Writing by choice* (2nd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press Canada.

Hunter, D., Mavenga, C., & Gambell, T. (2006). Classroom assessment tools and uses: Canadian English teachers' practices for writing. *Assessing Writing, 11*(1), 42-65.

Jamison Rog, L. (2011). *Marvelous minilessons for teaching intermediate writing: Grades 4-6.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Karle, C. L. (2005). Unlocking the mystery of writing. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 1-3). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Kolln, M. (2003). *Rhetorical grammar: Grammatical choices, rhetorical effects* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Luce-Kapler, R., & Klinger, D. (2005). Uneasy writing: The defining moments of high-stakes literacy testing. *Assessing Writing, 10*(3), 157-173.

Mack, N. (2008). *Teaching grammar with perfect poems for middle school.* New York, NY: Scholastic.

Newell, G. E., Koukis, S., & Boster, S. (2007). Best practices in developing a writing across the curriculum program in the secondary school. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 74-98). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Nitschke, F. (2005). In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 11-14). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1999). *The Ontario curriculum exemplars: Writing.* Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Paratore, J. R., Krol-Sinclair, B., Chacon, A. M., & Banados, C. (2005). *Writing in immigrant families: Parents and children writing at home.* In R. Indrisano & J. R. Paratore (Eds), *Learning to Write, Writing to Learn: Theory and Research in Practice* (pp. 97-118). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Parr, M., & Campbell, T. (2007). *Teaching the language arts.* Mississauga, ON: John Wiley & Sons Canada.

Perchemlides, N., & Coutant, C. (2004). Growing beyond grades. *Educational Leadership, 62*(2), 53-56.

Perin, D. (2007). Best practices in teaching writing to adolescents. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 242-264). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Peterson, S, S., McClay, J. K., & Main, K. (2010). Teaching writing in Canadian middle grades classrooms: A national study. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 5*(2), 77-90.

Portalupi, J., & Fletcher, R. (2004). *Teaching the qualities of writing: Ideas, design, language, presentation.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pressley, M., Mohan, L., Fingeret, L., Reffitt, K., & Raphael-Bogaert, L. (2007). Writing instruction in engaging and effective elementary settings. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 13-27). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Pritchard, R. J., & Honeycutt, R. L. (2007). Best practices in implementing a process approach to teaching writing. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 28-49). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Rickards, D., & Hawes, S. (2004). Raising writers: The teacher's role. *Educational Leadership, 62*(2), 68-71.

Romano, T. (2004). The power of voice. *Educational Leadership, 62*(2), 20-23.

Saddler, B., & Andrade, H. (2004). The writing rubric. *Educational Leadership, 62*(2), 48-52.

Slomp, D. H. (2008). Harming not helping: The impact of a Canadian standardized writing assessment on curriculum and pedagogy. *Assessing Writing, 13*(3), 180-200.

Tompkins, G. (2005). Writing workshop: Implementing the writing process. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 152-153). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Unger, J., & Fleischman, S. (2004). Is process writing the "write stuff"? *Educational Leadership, 62*(2), 90-91.

Williams, J. (2005). Sentence banks: Modeling sentence variety. In G. E. Tompkins & C. Blanchfield (Eds.), *50 ways to develop strategic* writers (pp. 119-122). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Wray, D., & Medwell, J. (2001, July 1-4). *What can teachers of literacy learn from a study of effective teachers?* Paper presented at the 12th European Reading Conference, Dublin, Ireland.

MERN

Manitoba Education Research Network

Spring Forum

"Working Together: Schools and Community"
"L'école en partenariat avec sa communauté"

Friday, April 12, 2013
Le vendredi le 12 avril 2013

Université de Saint-Boniface

Hosted by
Faculty of Education, Université de Saint-Boniface

ÉCOLE/COMMUNAUTÉ :
UN OUTIL DIDACTIQUE ÉLABORÉ À PARTIR D'UN CORPUS DE FRANÇAIS ORAL

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY LEARNING:
AN EDUCATIONAL TOOL DEVISED ON THE BASIS OF A SPOKEN FRENCH CORPUS

Sandrine Hallion
Université de Saint-Boniface

François Lentz
Université de Saint-Boniface

Abstract

At the end of the 2000s, we compiled a corpus of over 24 hours of interviews with Francophones in four rural municipalities in Manitoba in the framework of a research project carried out under the aegis of the Alliance de recherche universités-communautés sur les identités francophones de l'Ouest canadien[4] (ARUC-IFO)[5]. While the analysis of the oral data representing these communities provides a treasure trove of examples to enrich our knowledge of the particularities of le français d'ici[6] (Manitoba French), this corpus also constitutes an invaluable resource for teaching French based on "authentic discourse" (understood in the sense, which has become well-established in the field of Language Didactics, as discourse that has not been fabricated for educational needs). This resolutely local corpus also opens the door to the study of linguistic variation through a contrastive approach with other varieties – in particular, geographical and stylistic varieties – of French. It is from this perspective of giving value to forms of linguistic expression found in Manitoba that the didactic tool Le français de chez nous : on en parle ![7] was devised. Built through a very close partnership involving two community educational institutions – Université de Saint-Boniface and La division scolaire franco-manitobaine – to be used in secondary schools of this school division, this tool, which is designed primarily for use by teachers (in most cases, teachers of French) at the secondary level in the Division scolaire franco-manitobaine, has one major objective: to emphasize spoken French in a scholastic culture that still values writing and mastery of writing to a large extent as a (socially significant) indicator of linguistic competency.

The didactic tool contains 15 oral documents. Each of these constitutes an excerpt from an interview out of the corpus of interviews. These documents are arranged according to three topics: the lives of young people; French in Manitoba; and cultural practices and lifestyles. Each of the 15 documents comes with pedagogical proposals followed by the

---

[4] *Translation*: Alliance for university and community research on francophone identities in Western Canada.

[5] This research was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

[6] *Translation*: The French spoken here.

[7] *Translation*: *Le français de chez nous:* It's making people talk!

transcription of the corresponding oral document. Underlying the pedagogical proposals is a three-stage pedagogical process. These three stages are: pre-listening, listening, and post-listening. These proposals present listening tasks that lead the students to interpret the oral discourse and to react to it. They also aim to develop in the students an ability to be attentive to the (sociolinguistic, contextual, and identity-defining) dynamics that underlie language use.

The purpose of giving value to le français d'ici *(Manitoba French) is to make students aware of the stylistic and identity-defining importance of vernacular varieties and to restore their confidence in a style of speech that is often stigmatized in the context of a francophone minority. It is also, in this setting, to emphasize the identity-defining function of oral French. And by teaching students to listen attentively to the vernacular and community-based oral data that surrounds them, we can bring them to an ability to hear and appreciate their own language and to discover and build their own voice and speech patterns. The oral corpus also constitutes a medium for engaging the students to reflect on the phenomenon—always present in a minority context—of the contact between two languages. Finally, by working on oral language in tandem with identity-building, we can help to empower the students to take action in regard to the discourse of others, in regard to their own discourse, and in regard to their sense of self. This is a necessary condition, among others, for fostering in the students the ability to embrace their role as the builders of the French-speaking spaces of tomorrow.*

École/communauté :
un outil didactique élaboré à partir d'un corpus de français oral

L'outil didactique présenté dans cet article illustre trois facettes d'un partenariat école/communauté : des données orales recueillies dans des communautés francophones du Manitoba et utilisées en contexte scolaire; deux instances éducatives communautaires s'associant pour construire un outil didactique à partir de ces données; un travail pédagogique sur l'oral marqué d'enjeux communautaires et identitaires en contexte francophone minoritaire.

Mise en context :
d'un corpus de français oral à un outil didactique

L'outil didactique intitulé *Le français de chez nous : on en parle !* dont la présentation fait l'objet de cet article, s'inscrit dans le cadre des recherches menées sous l'égide de l'Alliance de recherche universités-communautés sur les identités francophones de l'Ouest canadien[8] et, plus particulièrement, dans le volet linguistique de celle-ci.

---

[8] Ce programme de recherche a reçu le soutien financier du Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada.

Les chercheurs de ce volet se donnent comme principal objectif de fournir aux communautés francophones de l'Ouest canadien un portrait des pratiques langagières des individus qui la composent. Leurs études abordent, selon différents points de vue, les particularités des variétés de français de cette région et des communautés où elles sont en usage; elles touchent aussi aux attitudes et aux représentations linguistiques des locuteurs du français dans l'Ouest.

Pour recueillir des données sur les variétés de français en usage dans l'Ouest canadien, des enquêtes de terrain ont été réalisées pour constituer plusieurs corpus de français oral : ainsi, au Manitoba, un corpus de plus de 80 heures a été enregistré, entre l'automne 2008 et le printemps 2010, par une locutrice d'origine franco-manitobaine auprès de 80 francophones de quatre localités rurales de la province : La Broquerie, Notre-Dame-de-Lourdes et la localité voisine de Saint-Claude, Saint-Jean-Baptiste et Saint-Lazare.

Dix participantes et dix participants, qui se répartissent à peu près également dans deux tranches d'âge, celle des 30 à 60 ans et celle des plus de 60 ans, dans chacune de ces localités lui ont accordé une entrevue. Bon nombre d'entre eux sont impliqués – ou l'ont été lorsqu'il s'agit de retraités – dans une activité professionnelle reliée à l'agriculture; les autres sont enseignants ou employés dans des organismes de service.

Les données orales communautaires ayant été recueillies sous l'égide d'une Alliance de recherche universités-communautés (c'est-à-dire une dynamique valorisant les échanges entre les chercheurs universitaires et les communautés sur lesquelles portent leurs recherches), l'idée de « redonner » à la communauté ce matériau sous une forme permettant son utilisation pédagogique en contexte scolaire est à l'origine de cet outil didactique.

Si l'analyse linguistique du corpus recueilli permet d'enrichir nos connaissances sur les particularités du « français d'ici », son exploitation constitue également une ressource inestimable pour un enseignement du français basé sur du « discours authentique » (voir notamment Detey, Durand, Laks, Lyche et Nouveau, 2007, pour les enjeux liés à l'utilisation d'un tel matériau dans le cadre du projet *Phonologie du français contemporain – PFC*) – expression entendue, au sens désormais classique en didactique des langues, de discours qui n'a pas été fabriqué à des fins d'enseignement.

Ce corpus oral, résolument local, permet d'étudier la variation linguistique par une approche contrastive des autres variétés du français, notamment géographiques et stylistiques. C'est dans une telle perspective de valorisation de cette forme d'expression langagière et de la « couleur » qu'elle revêt au Manitoba que cet outil didactique a été élaboré. Cette prise en compte, en milieu scolaire, de « l'oral d'ici » a pour vocation de sensibiliser les élèves à l'importance stylistique et identitaire des variétés vernaculaires et de leur redonner confiance en une parole bien souvent stigmatisée en contexte minoritaire.

L'outil didactique a été élaboré par une équipe composée de trois membres du personnel de la Division scolaire franco-manitobaine et des deux signataires de cet article, de l'Université de Saint-Boniface, au sein d'un partenariat étroit entre ces deux instances éducatives communautaires.

Publics vises

L'outil didactique est principalement destiné aux enseignants, de français surtout, au cycle secondaire de la Division scolaire franco-manitobaine. Cet outil peut également être utilisé dans d'autres disciplines que le français, dès lors que l'on considère que la préoccupation du développement langagier chez les élèves est transversale aux diverses disciplines scolaires.

L'outil peut également être exploité dans divers contextes de formation, universitaire et professionnelle, ou dans des sessions de leadership.

Un objectif majeur :
l'oral, envisagé comme un objet d'apprentissage

L'outil didactique met l'accent sur l'oral dans une culture scolaire, qui valorise encore largement l'écrit et sa maîtrise comme un indice, socialement marqué, de la compétence langagière (voir par exemple Bertucci, 2008; Delamotte-Legrand et Penloup, 2007; Perrenoud, 1991). L'outil permet de sensibiliser les élèves à la diversité des pratiques orales, celles d'ici mais également celles d'ailleurs, et à la dynamique des registres de langue. Il permet également de susciter une réflexion sur la place de l'oral dans une dynamique de travail pédagogique qui vise l'élargissement du répertoire langagier des élèves. Enfin, l'outil vise à contribuer à instaurer chez les élèves une éducation au langage axée sur la conscientisation : ainsi, les dynamiques constitutives et différenciatives du code oral et du code écrit et l'emploi de ces deux codes en contexte; la dimension historique de l'élaboration de normes linguistiques; les représentations linguistiques; la légitimité et l'illégitimité des variétés d'une même langue; le pouvoir d'attraction des langues et les rapports entre langue et pouvoir. D'une manière large, une telle orientation vise à déconstruire chez les élèves une image de la langue restreinte à l'univers de la scolarisation.

Contenu :
quinze documents oraux agencés thématiquement
et des propositions pédagogiques

L'outil se compose de 15 documents oraux, qui sont, chacun, constitués par un extrait d'une entrevue du corpus recueilli. Ces documents sont agencés en trois regroupements thématiques, présentés dans le tableau 1. Une citation de l'extrait donne son titre à chaque document, qui porte sur un sous-thème indiqué entre parenthèses.

Regroupement thématique 1 : la vie des jeunes
Document 1 : « *Le fameux cellulaire* » (la vie aujourd'hui)
Document 2 : « *C'était beau dans l'ancien temps* » (la vie dans « l'ancien temps »)

Regroupement thématique 2 : le français au Manitoba
Document 3 : « *T'as pas besoin d'avoir peur de ta langue* » (l'interdiction du français à l'école)
Document 4 : « *Je suis forcée de parler l'anglais à mes petits-enfants* » (la transmission du français)
Document 5 : « *C'est une belle langue le français* » (la transmission du français)
Document 6 : « *Ça fait partie de notre héritage* » (les variétés de français)
Document 7 : « *Si tu veux garder ton français, tu fais un effort à tous les jours* » (la pratique du français)
Document 8 : « *'Je veux avoir tes coordonnées'* » (la correction linguistique)

Regroupement thématique 3 : les modes de vie et les pratiques culturelles
Document 9 : « *Une petite démocrate* » (les déplacements)
Document 10 : « *Je sais pas si tu sais ce que c'est des 'cabousses'* » (les déplacements)
Document 11 : « *Dans ces années-là il y avait plus de neige que maintenant* » (les déplacements)
Document 12 : *« Les machines à battre* » (les métiers et occupations)
Document 13 : *« Faire du vrai théâtre* » (le théâtre)
Document 14 : *« Parle-moi pas des vêpres!* » (la religion)
Document 15 : « *Ils faisaient la lessive seulement une couple de fois par année* » (les pratiques domestiques)

Tableau 1. Agencement des documents en regroupements thématiques

Chaque document oral est accompagné de propositions pédagogiques. Aucun parcours n'est prédéterminé et plusieurs points d'entrée dans l'outil sont possibles (par regroupement, par document, ou en fonction de combinaisons entre documents à construire) : l'outil didactique offre donc la flexibilité la plus large pour son utilisation.

Une démarche pédagogique

Les propositions pédagogiques sont sous-tendues par la démarche pédagogique à trois temps : pré-écoute, écoute et post-écoute (Lafontaine, 2007). La pré-écoute établit la situation d'écoute : elle met en place une contextualisation à l'écoute, en sollicitant en particulier les expériences des élèves sur le contenu thématique du document à écouter; elle présente également le document et les tâches d'écoute qui seront proposées. Quant à l'écoute, elle se déroule en deux temps : la première écoute porte sur le contenu du document oral; la seconde est plus ciblée puisqu'elle a trait, selon le document, à divers

aspects du discours oral lui-même ou à certains éléments spécifiques de contenu. La post-écoute, enfin, élargit la situation d'écoute en proposant aux élèves d'explorer certains aspects du document oral, soit de contenu, soit du discours oral proprement dit; cette exploration débouche souvent sur des prises de parole, elles-mêmes associées la plupart du temps à des prises de conscience.

Les tâches d'écoute

Les tâches d'écoute proposées visent à placer les élèves dans une posture de compréhension qui les conduit à interpréter le discours oral et à y réagir; elles visent également à les placer dans une posture d'analyse, souvent critique, de la dynamique même d'une communication orale (Lafontaine, 2007 et 2011). Ces tâches, souvent construites à partir des caractéristiques propres au document sur lequel elles portent, ne prétendent pas conduire à une compréhension exhaustive des documents oraux; elles visent plutôt à engager les élèves dans une compréhension active de certaines dimensions des documents, tant de contenu que du discours oral proprement dit.

De manière plus large, les tâches d'écoute visent à attirer l'attention des élèves sur le fonctionnement même de la communication orale, sur le message véhiculé comme sur la formulation de celui-ci et sur les effets créés par une prise de parole. Ces tâches visent également à développer chez les élèves une conscientisation aux dynamiques (sociolangagières, contextuelles, identitaires) qui sous-tendent une pratique langagière.

La transcription des documents oraux

Chacun des 15 documents oraux est accompagné de sa transcription. Le protocole de transcription utilisé privilégie la lisibilité : l'orthographe en est donc la plupart du temps normative. Une graphie conventionnelle est toutefois adoptée pour certaines formes non standard dont l'emploi est récurrent.

Quel statut pédagogique accorder à la transcription lors de l'écoute des documents? Sans doute ni « tout le temps » ni « jamais », mais plutôt un usage modulaire en fonction du document lui-même et de l'intention d'écoute mobilisée; ainsi, lors de la seconde écoute de certains documents portant sur certaines dimensions de la formulation même du discours oral, le recours à la transcription pourrait s'avérer utile dans la mesure où une telle écoute requiert une attention plus précise aux dimensions linguistiques et discursives de la prise de parole. Dans de telles situations, la transcription pourrait constituer un tremplin pour faciliter la prise de conscience d'une double dynamique dans la communication orale : comment on parle et comment on s'écoute.

Langue orale et construction identitaire

Recueilli auprès d'individus de la communauté francophone du Manitoba, le corpus, utilisé en contexte scolaire, donne lieu à un travail pédagogique qui a été construit en

fonction d'une préoccupation certes communautaire mais également identitaire. En effet, valoriser en contexte scolaire « l'oral d'ici », c'est aussi, en milieu francophone minoritaire, établir des rapports entre langue orale et construction identitaire, c'est mettre de l'avant la fonction identitaire de l'oral : placer l'élève, dans son écoute de données orales vernaculaires et communautaires, dans une démarche d'observation et de découverte, c'est l'amener à s'entendre, à se conscientiser à l'impact de sa parole, à se (re)connaître, à se voir, à s'apprécier; c'est l'amener également à construire sa parole, à se produire, à se dire comme personne, à découvrir sa propre voix.

Une telle mise en relation entre langue orale et construction identitaire est ainsi un moyen d'intervention en contexte scolaire sur l'insécurité linguistique, qui caractérise souvent le comportement langagier de bien des élèves francophones minoritaires (voir, par exemple, Dalley, 2003; Duquette, 1999; Heller, 1998 et 1999). Par ailleurs, le corpus de données orales communautaires constitue un support pour intervenir avec les élèves sur le phénomène, omniprésent en contexte minoritaire, du contact entre deux langues. Dégagée d'une polarisation affective entre le fatalisme résigné face à la présence de l'anglais et le repli crispé sur la pureté linguistique du français, une telle intervention permet de mettre en place chez les élèves une prise de conscience de l'alternance codique dans un espace où deux langues coexistent, du phénomène des emprunts entre deux langues et des pratiques langagières liées au bilinguisme. Une telle perspective permet de construire chez les élèves une conception plus complète du bi (voire du pluri) linguisme et de sa richesse, en écho à l'objectif fondamental de l'école francophone en milieu minoritaire : former des citoyens francophones, bilingues.

Plus largement enfin, travailler la langue orale en articulation avec la construction identitaire, c'est développer chez les élèves un pouvoir d'action sur le discours de l'autre, sur son propre discours et sur soi :

- pouvoir de communiquer, pour se dire efficacement;
- pouvoir de comprendre, de raisonner, de réfléchir, de questionner, pour mieux se dire;
- pouvoir se dire, pouvoir dire son histoire, pouvoir dire les autres, pouvoir de devenir et d'agir, pour pouvoir se dire pleinement.

Pouvoir se dire apparaît, par bien des côtés, comme une condition nécessaire, entre autres, pour que les élèves puissent pleinement être, et se percevoir comme tels, les bâtisseurs de l'espace francophone de demain. Car tel est bien, semble-t-il, l'enjeu fondamental de l'intervention éducative en milieu francophone minoritaire : développer chez les élèves la conscience de pouvoir agir dans – et sur – l'espace francophone d'aujourd'hui et de demain (Buors et Lentz, 2011). Dans cette perspective, l'école francophone constitue la connexion nécessaire, parce qu'elle représente le lieu social par excellence de conscientisation, entre la communauté francophone actuelle et celle de demain, à construire.

Références

Bertucci, M.-M. (2008). Quelles descriptions de la langue parlée à l'école ? *Le Français aujourd'hui, 162*(3), 59-70.

Buors, P., & Lentz, F. (2011). La programmation éducative en milieu francophone minoritaire : penser autrement pour agir différemment. Dans J. Rocque (dir.), *La direction d'école et le leadership pédagogique en milieu minoritaire : considérations théoriques pour une pratique éclairée* (pp. 259-285). Winnipeg, MB : Presses universitaires de Saint-Boniface.

Dalley, P. (2003). Le rôle de reproduction sociale de l'enseignante et de l'école : deux paradoxes en classe de première année en Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick. Dans H. Duschesne (dir.) *Recherche en éducation francophone en milieu minoritaire : regards croisés sur une réalité mouvante* (pp. 1-22). Winnipeg, MB : Presses universitaires de Saint-Boniface.

Delamotte-Legrand, R., & Penloup, M.-C. (2007). Intérêt et usages des documents PFC en langue première. Dans S. Detey & D. Nouveau (coord.), *PFC : enjeux descriptifs, théoriques et didactiques* (pp. 55-64). PFC, Bulletin n° 7.

Detey, S., Durand, J., Laks, B., Lyche, C. & Nouveau, D. (2007). Voix de la francophonie, éducation langagière et corpus numérisé : PFC-EF, des ressources pour la didactique du français. Dans Detey & D. Nouveau (coord.), *PFC : enjeux descriptifs, théoriques et didactiques* (pp. 11-29). PFC, Bulletin n° 7. Duquette, G. (1999). *Vivre et enseigner en milieu minoritaire. Théories, recherches et interventions professionnelles en salle de classe,* Sudbury, ON : Presses de l'Université Laurentienne.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography,* London, England, et New York, NY : Longman.

Heller, M. (1998). Quelle norme enseigner en milieu minoritaire ? Dans A. Boudreau & L. Dubois (dir.), *Le français, langue maternelle, dans les collèges et les universités en milieu minoritaire*, Actes du colloque dans le cadre du 3e Congrès de l'ACREF (pp. 11-20). Moncton, NB : Les Éditions d'Acadie/CRLA.

Lafontaine, L. (2011). *Activités de production et de compréhension orales : présentations de genres oraux et exploitations de documents sonores*. Montréal, QB : Chenelière Éducation.

Lafontaine, L. (2007). *Enseigner l'oral au secondaire : séquences didactiques intégrées*. Montréal, QB : Chenelière Éducation.

Perrenoud, Ph. (1991). Bouche cousue ou langue bien pendue ? L'école entre deux pédagogies de l'oral. Dans M. Wirthner , D. Martin & Ph. Perrenoud (dir.) *Parole étouffée, parole libérée. Fondements et limites d'une pédagogie de l'oral* (pp. 15-40). Neuchâtel, Switzerland, et Paris, France : Delachaux et Niestlé.

FOUNDING MANITOBA'S FIRST DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL: DREAMING THE CHANGE WE WISH TO SEE IN EDUCATION

Scott Durling
University of Winnipeg

Abstract:

The principal objective of this article is to demonstrate a need for change in the current education system and offer a thoughtful solution through the democratic schooling model. With reference to renowned scholars in the field of education, sustainability, and psychology, historical context behind the current state of our school system and areas requiring growth are presented. Personal research, experience, and exploration in the fields of education and sustainability are referred to throughout, providing personal context to the piece. Though in the early phase of development, the goal is to create a learner-centred, people-friendly, community-based school that will model best practice in environmentalism, wellness, sustainability, and education.

Founding Manitoba's First Democratic School: Dreaming the Change We Wish to See in Education

In 2011, some of the first words my professor said were "All of you are illiterate, ignorant and uninformed." Not exactly the uppity, get-you-pumped, kind of start you want in a three-month educational psychology night course. As I sat in a state of shock for the next three-hour lecture in Lockhart Hall at the University of Winnipeg, I had no idea that this professor, that sentence, and the resulting course would open my eyes and change my entire view on education. It would lead me to having endless conversations about alternative education with teachers, parents, students, professors, divisional superintendents, politicians, and my teaching colleagues, Dave Law and Tanis Westdal. It would eventually steer me to a History of Inner City Education course with Dr. Heather Hunter, to presenting at the MERN's 2013 Spring Forum and writing this article. It was the awakening in that three-hour lecture that brought me to developing my personal and professional "dream project" – building a democratic school in Winnipeg.

Contextualizing the Vision

While I have many differing views from that psychology professor's own understanding of education, I think the two of us could agree that learners require substantially more self-direction for truly meaningful learning experiences. I took to the idea of self-direction after his course and began developing my own understanding of education by exploring scholars such as A. S. Neill (1960), Carl Rogers (1959), Brené Brown (2012), and Ken Robinson (2006). Grasping the works of these scholars led me to see the needs of various entities, including the environment, the education system, local communities, teachers, young people, and society. What emerged was a strong personal philosophy

on education that slowly progressed into my dream project, which for lack of a better name is called the Unity Learning Centre (ULC).

I think it is important that my reader understands where I am coming from, in terms of how I presently view education, and the gap that could be filled by this democratic, junior to senior high school, concerning the needs of young people, society, the environment, and education. Being a history major, I am inclined to incorporate a historical approach, so that is where I will start.

In April 2013, I attended the Growing Local Conference held by Food Matters Manitoba, as food security is an area of great interest to me. One workshop was on the topic of changing community economic dynamics, held by the Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CED). The presenter discussed how the economy has shaped communities throughout history. After reflection, I realized this had a lot of validity for my growing philosophy. Economy has certainly shaped communities in a physical sense, especially how and where people work. In agrarian society, one's workplace was where one lived; in today's world, it exists as a twenty-minute commute from suburbia to the city centre. The economy has also shaped communities through food. Our grandparents (or great-grandparents for some of us younger folk) once grew, canned, and preserved most of their food with backyard or community gardens. Accessibility to foods from across the world is now conveniently placed ten minutes by car in a massive warehouse. After considering these ideas, with the help of John Taylor Gatto (2009), I became aware that similar economic pressures have molded schools.

Economic coercion on education is apparent just by looking at school buildings' physical orientation and design principles. When public schooling started to become common in the nineteenth century, North America was in an industrial age. Its economy was knee deep in encouraging efficiency, industry, and production (Scott-Webber, 2004). School buildings were typically single-room rectangular houses, designed for a teacher-oriented classroom wherein the teacher was front and centre, and the students faced this "possessor of knowledge." School bells were introduced as a way to train students for the expectations of an industrial workplace. The industrial age in North America continued through to the Great Depression and World War Two.

When soldiers eventually returned home after the war, life turmoil settled down and the global economy sped up. The first of the Baby Boomers entered public schooling shortly after, creating a large influx of students that could not be housed by schools. New schools were constructed based on the teacher-oriented model assumed to be legitimate for fast, efficient, and effective education. The original single-room schoolhouses were stacked together, creating a structural design commonly referred to as the factory model (Scott-Webber, 2004). School buildings resembled a production line, as raw materials (students) entered a classroom every hour, continued down the assembly line ingesting knowledge directed by the teacher, and then emerged as products (graduates). This structural model survives as the design norm for nearly every elementary, secondary, and post-secondary learning institution.

It is difficult to change the physical structure of schools, but teaching styles and philosophies can more easily adapt to accommodate research findings and models of best practice. Nevertheless, I am unconvinced that schools have changed their methods since one-room schoolhouses. Although I have no experience of what things were like a hundred years ago, I do know what many "modern" classrooms are like – an archaic teacher-oriented model. In my five years of being in dozens of classrooms and my twelve years as a student in the public school system, I have yet to see a classroom that does not use a production-based, teacher-oriented, possessor-of-knowledge model. While this method has produced many learners, including me, with the ability to find successes during and after public schooling, many students drop out, or simply become unmotivated and disengaged from society and life. I strongly believe that this disengagement has affected our society's ability to be socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable.

To expand on the ideas of motivation and engagement, I have to turn to Daniel Pink (2009). Pink researched motivation in business settings, which I believe schools essentially are: a service-based business. What he found was that businesses that use process-driven, intrinsic motivation techniques are thriving compared to the "do this, and if you do it well, you will be rewarded" models. It is unfortunate, and frankly ridiculous that schools still use this business model as a design for success. I imagine schools as a restaurant: the teachers as servers, the students as patrons, and the food as potential learning. The role of the server (teacher) is to gain insight into taste preferences and guide the patrons (learners) to selections suitable for their palates (interests) relative to what dishes are available (curriculum). In other words, the role of a teacher is to serve the needs of students by matching their interests to curricular outcomes. Sadly, today's schools are structured more like a restaurant in which the patrons are given minimal to no choice of dishes, and are then ranked numerically on how well they finished the dish. Motivated, engaged learning is highly related to how much ownership and freedom individuals believe that they have (Pink, 2009). The model that I propose would implement exactly this -- a complete inquiry-based, freedom-of -learning approach, what John Dewey (1903) called democratic education.

Foundations of the Unity Learning Centre

The Unity Learning Centre (ULC) model can be divided into four sections: learner-centred, democratic, sustainable, and community-based. Each section can be further split into two portions: the educational principles and operations of the school, and the physical design of the building. The learner-centred section is critically important to the model and underpins the rest of the school's structure, so I will begin there.

Learner-Centred

The learner-centred content is founded on some of my own life experiences, as well as segments from works such as *Daring Greatly* by Brené Brown (2012), *Altered Destinies* by Gene Maeroff (1999), *Motivation and Personality* by Abraham Maslow (1954) and

several of Sir Ken Robinson's TED talk presentations (Robinson, 2006). A significant aspect of being learner centred is that every individual in the school is a learner, staff included. Each of these learners should understand that all others are engaged in the same learning process, but at different stages.

I came across this concept while working as an education assistant in a grade 7/8 classroom. The teachers, Dave Law and Tanis Westdal (my current colleagues), were conducting an inquiry-based project on ancient Egypt. The engagement level of many of those students was remarkable, which resulted in exceptional academic success for their age group. The students taught me aspects of Egyptian life that I had never remotely heard of. I discovered two things from this experience: when given the chance to explore information, individuals are amazingly capable, and the internal process that they undergo is extremely valuable to both their learning and the learning of others, whether peers, teachers, or support staff.

This is why I emphasize the learner-centred approach. The tenet at the ULC is to focus on the needs of learners, individually and collectively, whether academic or cognitive ability, emotional and psychological stability, or self-actualization. Learning is far more than discovering content, but includes discovering interests, the self, and how one learns. It is an inside-out approach, in essence, the opposite strategy of current public schooling. I am convinced that successful education is not about working with content and by chance learning something about oneself along the way. Developing self-actualization and exercising it in intrinsically meaningful subject matter is successful education. In other words, I believe that education must be people focused, and people friendly.

Having "people friendly" as a school's primary principle is great, but there needs to be a physical design structure to support it. Social interaction with peers and adults is a large component of self-actualization and inquiry-based learning. Many public schools lack physical areas suitable for informal discourse: comfortable, inviting, and modular for different group sizes. The Cristo Rey Jesuit High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, made the people-friendly idea a reality (CEFPI, 2009). They included features like comfortable, movable furnishings, natural light, and an open concept, capable of being modular from retractable garage door walls. Buildings that are meant to foster learning should be conducive to the people or process for which they are intended. Through this design, students and teacher-facilitators have the ability to determine the size of space required for the activity, from small intimate classroom settings to large communal environments.

Democratic

I envision considerable individual freedom in the ULC, which is one of the reasons that my colleagues and I have called it a democratic school. The model considers democracy in a few capacities in addition to freedom in learning, such as understanding individual rights and expression, the power of voting, political and social equality, and civic

engagement. One of my motivators for including democracy in the model was A. S. Neill's *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing* (Neill, 1960). At Summerhill in Leiston, England, students and teachers have one vote of equal power for a variety of happenings in the school, ranging from day-to-day operations and rules, to philosophical directions of the entire campus. As previously described, ownership plays a significant role in engagement. If learners have a stake in their educational platform, they will be involved, participatory individuals and consequently engaged citizens -- a quality that politicians seem to want out of students and young people during elections. If adults want young people engaged and participating in democracy, it seems to me that we should allow them to experience and learn it in a first-hand way.

Sustainable

It is difficult to reference sustainability in education, mainly because there seems to be little scholarship pertinent to my purposes. Some works that I have found relevant are John Hardy's (2008) TED talk on Green School, *Making Good* (Aujla & Parish, 2012), and *Your Brain on Nature* (Selhub & Logan, 2012). Relevant to sustainable structural design (which can be searched on the Internet), I look to Winnipeg's Manitoba Hydro Building, the David Suzuki Public School in Ontario, the Cristo Rey Jesuit High School in Minneapolis, and the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED, n.d.). These examples have solidified my conviction that education must address sustainability as a fundamental approach to living in the twenty-first century. The ULC views sustainability in a holistic way, which means factoring in the long-term management of social, economic, and environmental issues on local, regional, national, and international levels. The result of taking such a position is that all activity done within the ULC is founded in the thought "Is this locally and globally sustainable for the long term?"

Sustainability has the unique capacity to give students hands-on work, whereby individuals can make tangible differences in their lives and the surrounding community. These changes may be actualized through an idea called the vertical farm (Despommier, 2011). The vertical farm is essentially a self-contained, sustainable, vertical greenhouse for urban areas, being tested and researched internationally. The idea originates from the realization that agriculture and the environment will be stressed by increasing use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers in coming decades. The vertical farm enables urban areas to produce year-round, fresh local food at a higher yield with fewer inputs, through hydroponics and aeroponics. If a vertical farm were built as a part of the ULC, the school could harness academic elements such as biology, chemistry, physics, human rights, history, sustainability, and other subjects related to technological food production. The school's production of its own food would facilitate social connections between students, families, and community members by learning about growing, processing, and cooking whole foods, while increasing the economic capacity of the community through potential produce sales.

Community-Based

The theme of community also underlies the learner-centred, democratic, and sustainable sections of the ULC model. Dr. Heather Hunter's (2000) article, "In the Face of Poverty: What a Community School Can Do," influenced my understanding of what community means in an educational setting. She explained the model of William Whyte School and how the school became involved with the surrounding community, an area harshly impoverished both economically and socially. The William Whyte model demonstrates that schools can and should be more than just a place to learn academia, but an area for individuals to engage in socialization, skill-building, recreation, and fun. The ULC uses this concept wholly, establishing itself as a both a community centre and a school. I envision this model incorporating a public library, open gym space, and a small café for use by students, seniors, and other community members. It is by combining the two structures of community centre and school that I believe student and community engagement will experience a transformation, creating a platform for not only student learning, but also community learning and connectedness.

Conclusion

Before reading the conclusion, I recommend that my reader watches the YouTube video "A Pep Talk from Kid President to You" (Montague, 2013). I concluded my MERN forum presentation with this video not only for its humour, but because Kid President's message embodies the philosophy of the Unity Learning Centre. The final line, "Create something that will make the world awesome," is an idea that I want to instill in the learners who attend this school. As a society, we wish for many things in our future: individualized freedom and expression, democracy, consideration of sustainable principles, and a greater sense of connectivity and community. Schools must reflect what we want to see in our society, which is why "learner-centred," "democratic," "sustainable," and "community-based" are the four sections of the ULC's guiding principles. Kid President recites, "Two roads diverged in the woods and I took the one less traveled" (from "The Road Not Taken" poem by Robert Frost). I relate this quote to how I view the ULC model. The less traveled road of creating a school with the ULC philosophy and structure is a difficult undertaking and will be incredibly demanding for the stakeholders. However, I believe that this is the way education must go – we must be the change that we wish to see.

References

Aujla, D., & Parish, B. (2012). *Making good: Finding meaning, money and community in a changing world.* Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead.* New York, NY: Penguin.

Council of Educational Facility Planners International (CEFPI). (2009, October 18). *Designing schools for 21st century learning*. Retrieved August 3, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ur7gp6cB-Zo

Despommier, D. (2010). *The vertical farm.* New York, NY: Thomas Dunne Books.

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in education. *The Elementary School Teacher*, *4*(4), 193-204.

Gatto, J. T. (2009). *Weapons of mass instruction: A schoolteacher's journey through the dark world of compulsory schooling.* Gabriola , B.C.: New Society.

Hardy, J. (2010, November). My green school dream. *TED: Ideas worth spreading.* Retrieved August 3, 2013 from http://www.ted.com/talks/john_hardy_my_green_school_dream.html

Hunter, H. (2000). In the face of poverty: What a community school can do to poverty. In J. Silver (ed.). *Solutions that work: Fighting poverty in Winnipeg* (pp. 111-125). Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Manitoba.

LEED. (n.d.). *Canada Green Bulding Council.* Retrieved August 2, 2013*,* from http://www.cagbc.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Programs/LEED/default.htm

Maeroff, G. (1999). *Altered destinies: Making life better for school children in need.* New York, NY: St. Martin Griffin.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York, NY: Harper.

Montague, B. (2013, January 24). A pep talk from Kid President to you. *SoulPancake .* Retrieved August 3, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l-gQLqv9f4o

Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing.* New York, NY: Hart and Brothers.

Pink, D. (2009). *Drive: The suprising truth about what motivates us.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Robinson, K. (2006, June). How schools kill creativity. *TED: Ideas worth spreading.* Retrieved August 2, 2013, from http://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity.html

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.). *Psychology: A study of science* (pp. 184-256). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Scott-Webber, L. (2004). *In sync: Environmental behavior research and the design of learning spaces.* Ann Arbor, MI: The Society for College and University Planning.

Selhub, E. M., & Logan, A. C. (2012). *Your brain on nature: The science of nature's influence on your health, happiness and vitality.* Mississauga, ON: John Wiley and Sons Canada.