The Loyola Marymount University (LMU) School of Education (SOE) Conceptual Framework (CF) is informed by the University and School of Education’s Mission and Goals statements, and national and state standards including the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and California Commission of Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) standards, and other program standards. Our Conceptual Framework serves as a knowledge base for degree, credential, and certificate programs and focuses on educational success for all learners. On-going, formative assessment provides critical support for the LMU School of Education students, staff, and faculty to become well-rounded educators in the service of others, and is the vehicle for continuous improvement (CI). Our assessment system includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that educators need to fulfill our mission of creating a more equitable and just education for all. The professional dispositions we value and assess as educators are derived from our Mission and Goals. We strive to be, and to educate professionals to be, educators who:

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

The School of Education promotes Inclusion in all our programs. The Loyola Marymount University School of Education, grounded in the Jesuit and Marymount traditions and aligned with the Ignatian Pedagogy Paradigm (IPP), believes inclusion to be at the core of its purpose: to support the whole person and to provide access and equity so that all learners contribute and participate in their education. To accomplish this, the LMU SOE community will collaborate and evaluate opportunities for access and equity to promote inclusion at LMU and in the educational systems and communities we serve.

The Conceptual Framework identifies six important tenets, each infused with the role of inclusion and technology, as being clear manifestations of our knowledge base which supports each of our professional education programs: social justice; integration of theory and practice; sociocultural/constructivist perspective; culturally responsive pedagogy; leadership; and community collaboration. The six tenets of our Conceptual Framework integrate theory and practice, inform one another, and are not mutually exclusive. The tenets are operationalized as
LMU School of Education Learning Goals and Outcomes (which are the same as our Professional Dispositions) which allow us to assess the Conceptual Framework. The elements of the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm serve as the framework guiding our work and ensuring candidate success: context, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation (Kroth, 2008).

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

The following is a brief discussion of our beliefs as they relate to each of the above tenets and lead to candidates moving beyond knowledge to action, followed by the LMU School of Education Learning Goals and Outcomes.

Social Justice

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

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

In terms of the educational tradition of social justice, as educators we recognize the truth of Martin Luther King Jr.’s words that humanity will either learn to live together as brothers and sisters or we will die together as strangers (King, 1963). What happens to any individual in the human family affects us all, and the true greatness of a society is measured by the way its weakest members are treated. We also agree with Paulo Freire that education is not a neutral act but rather one that empowers or disempowers (Freire, 1970). We adopt as our own the Freirian notion that, though education should be available for all people and empower them, educators must be especially concerned about individuals and groups that have been historically disempowered by unjust social structures. In this light, we make use of the work of Antonio Gramsci (1971), to assist us in challenging the ideological structures that limit the life chances of so many students. Thus, we value the role authentic education plays in building up a society that is free of every form of discrimination and hatred, including racism, sexism, homophobia, linguisticism, and ableism.

**Integration of Theory and Practice**

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

In addition to the Jesuit concepts and goals, education courses have also been influenced by the work of John Dewey and his ideas related to reflective practice. Faculty have encouraged students to be in a “state of questioning” and in the “act of searching” (Dewey, 1933). Along the way, candidates have been “disposed to reflect,” knowing that knowledge alone is not sufficient but that it must be accompanied by “a desire to apply” (Dewey, 1933, 1938). Wanting to expand
on the beliefs of Dewey, the faculty of the School of Education began to incorporate the work of Schön (1983) into its practice. Courses integrate Schön’s message of combining “professional knowledge” with “zones of practice.” Further research has indicated that “students learn in a multitude of settings and in a variety of ways: intellectually, emotionally, physically, and simultaneously” (Fried, 1999). Indeed, students do not tend to compartmentalize their rather complex lives. Consequently, to achieve maximum learning potential, teaching should provide a means to connect students’ living with their learning. Combining different forms of scholarship (namely, research and application) into a cohesive and complementary whole, is further supported by the multidimensional UniSCOPE model of scholarship (Hyman et al., 2001). This model which bridges together of research and application to further the conventional definition of “scholarship” by including diverse learning experiences, which incorporate varied mediums of delivery to distinctive audiences. This concept of learning places students at the forefront of an active education by providing students with the opportunity to use newly acquired skills in real-life situations in their own communities, as befitting LMU’s mission to encourage learning, primarily through critical thinking.

As reflective practitioners ourselves, we recognize that the purpose of theory is to assist in the organization of information and knowledge so that it can better inform practice. The integration of theory and practice is a dynamic and reciprocal process involving reflection and dialogue. Believing that knowledge is socially constructed, courses in the School of Education have incorporated the principles of sociocultural/constructivist theory (Applefield, Huber, & Moallem, 2001; Poplin, 1988; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, Del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995), in addition to presenting other theories relevant to various disciplines represented in the School of Education which graduates can incorporate as part of their professional practice. The application of sociocultural/constructivist theory in courses and fieldwork models an approach for future teachers, counselors, psychologists, and administrators which they can apply in their practice, making learning for students more relevant and applicable to their everyday lives. To apply the sociocultural/constructivist theory and to enable candidates to be reflective practitioners, courses are structured so that they incorporate a variety of strategies. Harnessing the potential of technology means not only increasing access but also improving student learning through creative thinking and planning. We share the view of Jonassen (2005) who believes that technology is a “mind tool” that supports students’ knowledge construction process. Students not only learn from technology, they learn with technology.

We cannot solely rely on developing a provocative but ultimately contextless and abstract argument from outside the social space of education. Theory and practice must be equally acknowledged, validated, and employed –particularly in such a “hands-on” profession such as education. As such, the faculty continuously strive to merge theory with practice by their presence at various school sites and engage in a reciprocal learning process. This allows for faculty to engage in a reflective inquiry process and assess if we are continuing to meet our own benchmarks.

Our Jesuit, Marymount, and Catholic intellectual traditions lay the foundation for learning how to learn by engaging learners in the skills and techniques of reflection, whereby learners exercise
the best course of action in route to becoming men and women for others (Duminuco, 1993). Moreover, we commit to enhancing and extending learning by allowing the learner to be fully open and affected by the context at hand. Thus, bridging theory and practice in such a way that it allows for the exploration of the whole human experience of learning. This provides opportunities for faculty to foster relationships of mutual trust and respect that set a climate for discussion and growth.

As we provide experiences that enable candidates to integrate theory and practice, we are also developing a performance assessment system that both facilitates teaching and learning and reveals the distinctive achievements of individual candidates (Eisner, 1999). Assessment of performance, including application of various theories presented throughout the programs, will provide systematic feedback that enables candidates to develop knowledge and skills which are more authentic and related to the context of the schools in which they will be professionals.

**Sociocultural/Constructivist Perspective**

Theory guides practice in our work as educationalists and academicians. In the preparation of educators a multitude of theories and paradigms are used, including critical theories and other sociocultural and constructivist frameworks. Because there are various factors affecting the individual, including social, cultural, and school-related influences, we utilize sociocultural (Cole & Scribner, 1974; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, Del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995) and social constructivist (Brotherton, 1996; Kukla, 2000; Poplin, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978) theoretical perspectives to understand and respond to pressing issues concerning children, families, and communities (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003). Sociocultural and constructivist educational paradigms are harmonious with other important principles, namely inclusive education and the traditions of Ignatian pedagogy. The interplay of diverse educational approaches and paradigms is recognized in the SOE as a strength.

There is strong conceptual similarity in the literature between sociocultural and constructivist theories (Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Erickson, 1987). Consequently, the two concepts were merged, providing a powerful construct that helps inform our mission as a School of Education.

The sociocultural/constructivist perspective maintains:

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

The socio-cultural/constructivist perspective implies that teachers, counselors, psychologists, and administrators seek to understand the views and experiences of students and clients, engage them in actively co-creating knowledge, and make learning relevant and applicable to real world situations. A further implication is that evaluation and assessment must be authentic and linked to improvements in student/client achievement and well-being. We believe that socio-cultural and constructivist approaches are compatible with well-formulated standards-based instructional systems.

**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

We recognize the need to create culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000), also referred to as culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994) that promotes equitable learning for all and helps close differential gaps based on culturally relevant factors. The critical components of such a pedagogy are centered on the notions that educators create learning environments in which all individuals (a) experience successes academically, personally, professionally, and otherwise; (b) develop and experience cultural competence; and (c) develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the social status quo (Banks & Banks, 1995).

We recognize the continuous growth of culturally and linguistically diverse populations and the contributions of their heritage, languages, and cultures in the formation of a pluralist society in the United States. Much like the principles of Ignatian pedagogy and inclusive education, culturally responsive teaching maintains that schools, institutions, and educators must consciously embrace and implement policies and practices that adequately respond to the unique needs, interests, and lives of diverse individuals. Cochran-Smith (1993) defines such practices as being "locally appropriate" and cautions that culturally responsive pedagogies must be constructed from the lived experience of students or individuals. Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) refer to the latter as funds of knowledge, an approach that “involves understanding the sociopolitical and economic context of the households and analyzing their social history” (p.133). This transformative and comprehensive vision of cultures refutes the deficit model and advocates a vision of cultural diversity that involves recognition of the sociopolitical and economic contributions of culturally and linguistically diverse individuals and their families. An important consideration in culturally responsive pedagogy is that, as educators, we must understand and come to terms with how our own values, assumptions, and socialization experiences reaffirm or disregard the funds of knowledge of the learners.
We recognize that there are educational practices in the United States that promote inequity and ethnocentrism. Darder (1991) notes that such educational practices as testing, ability grouping, tracking and low teacher expectations for minority students perpetuate “values and social relations that produce and legitimate the dominant worldview at the expense of a vast number of citizens” (p. 19). We recognize that it is imperative to examine educational systems and professional settings that work against those that are marginalized by social class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, exceptionality, language, gender, and a host of other socially ordered factors. Additionally, we recognize that it is “virtually impossible to understand the classroom behavior and performance of economically disadvantaged [sic.] and minority students without understanding their history as an oppressed group, cultural frames of reference, and their everyday social practices” (McLaren, 1994, p. 207). In order to work against these practices, we strive to prepare educators and counselors by giving them analytic tools to see social inequalities and how educational systems can participate in their reproduction. In our classrooms and professional settings, we facilitate discussions among teachers, counselors, administrators, and school psychologists that provide opportunities for them to address, create, and implement educational models that are inclusive of a critical analysis of knowledge.

**Leadership**

The School of Education engages public, charter, private, and Catholic school communities and prepares leaders to serve all people through inclusive, diverse, and intercultural dimensions in global times (Banks, 2000, 2008, 2017). Our Catholic university’s context and dynamic presence in our pluralistic society embraces the responsibility for educating future leaders in our intellectual traditions ensuring that no educational constituency is excluded from the dialogue on educating our youth (Buckley, 1998).

We recognize and believe that leadership, broadly defined, is an important component of all learning organizations and complex systems, necessary to forge synergy and coherence needed to transform education (Fullan, 1999, 2003, 2016). We believe leadership must be shared across communities, as members are empowered to share the vision and mold plans to serve the common good. We believe leaders must practice their craft in an exemplary way, espouse social justice values, and demonstrate an ethic of care (Noddings, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2001, 2007; Wheeler, 2012). “Leaders with strong values translate these into organizational vision” (Evans, 2000, p. 291). To be a leader one must be a learner, a servant, a change facilitator, an advocate for youth, and a guardian of the community (Fullan, 2001, 2016; Northouse, 2016; Sergiovanni, 2000). To grow as an authentic leader, as aligned with the Ignatian Pedagogy Paradigm, we promote ongoing reflection for leaders to focus on self-awareness, moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency (Korth, 2008; Northouse, 2016). We believe leaders accomplish this by following, serving, reflecting, knowing, collaborating, assessing, and inviting others to share in the inclusive and liberating process of leadership (Lambert, Zimmerman, & Gardner, 2016; Ryan & Bohlin, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994, 2007).

Effective leaders express what they value, extend what they value, and learn to manage change (Bridges & Bridges, 2016; Fullan, 2001, 2016). Living and becoming their most authentic self
helps leaders move from reflection to action to guide their work and shape the implementation of change (Bennis, 2009; Evans, 2000; Korth, 2008). Effective change facilitators are adept at framing problems in ways that connect to the different audiences, understand the transformational power of collaboration, and ground their work in a results-driven collective focus (Marsh, 2000; Schlechty, 1997). We believe twenty-first century leaders require knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the following areas: systemic reform; reflective practice; ethical, moral, and collaborative decision-making; diversity and inclusion; critical inquiry; advocacy for technology and its accessibility to all stakeholders; and assessment/research methodology (Northouse, 2016; Odden & Odden, 1995; Senge, 2000).

We cultivate self-awareness, ingenuity, love, and heroism in all leaders, as men and women who “understood their strengths, weaknesses, values, and worldview; confidently innovated and adapted to embrace a changing world; engaged others with a positive, loving attitude; and energized themselves and others through heroic ambitions” (Lowney, 2003, p. 9). These leadership values and qualities find a natural home in the context of our School of Education at Loyola Marymount University in the Jesuit, Marymount, and Catholic traditions. This is particularly true as we strive to educate reflective practitioners, a concept that echoes the teachings of St. Ignatius Loyola who encouraged his followers to spend regular time in contemplation, reviewing their experience with a view toward ongoing renewal and personal improvement. We believe that strong educational leaders develop introspective skills that they bring to others and then share with larger organizations as they move to action in service with and for others (Korth, 2008; Wheatley, 2002).

We encourage leaders to create inclusive learning organizations by incorporating shared vision, strategic planning, authentic assessment, and reflection in their practice. Leaders must understand ways to collaboratively develop ongoing professional development as the natural result of an exemplary systemic assessment process (Wiggins, 1998). To this end, leaders will help to transform schools/systems into knowledge and capacity-building organizations guided by a culture of professional accountability, self-regulation, and advocacy (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Ancess, & Falk, 1995).

Leaders must be deeply reflective, actively thoughtful, and dramatically explicit about core values, vision, and beliefs (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Northouse, 2016). It is through reflection on research, theories, and discussion that improvement is made and action is taken (Lowney, 2003). Leadership starts with individual actions, and moves beyond to influence the system in which actions occur (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000). In fact, we believe the process of becoming a leader is the same as the process of becoming an authentic, integrated human being. “For the leader, as for any integrated person, life itself is the career, discussing the process in terms of leaders is merely a way of making it concrete” (Bennis, 1989, p. 4).

**Community Collaboration**

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

The ever-expanding task of education requires the linkage between schools and community agencies forging connections that foster learning. Programs and partnerships that strategically link elements of community agencies with schools will ultimately contribute to improved learning outcomes (Honig, Kahne, & McLaughlin, 1999). The partnerships formed between educational institutions, families, and community agencies create an environment that enhances the educational climate, with higher impact partnerships allowing teachers to learn about their students and the community. “Children now live and develop in a postindustrial age in which technology, travel, distance, and disintegrating communities have exacted a heavy toll...” (Haynes & Comer, 1996, p. 501-507). Schools are no longer institutions solely for academic learning, but have become small communities within broader communities and are supporters of the community, supported by the community.

We recognize the funds of knowledge parents bring to schools (Moll et al., 1992). Hence, parental involvement in education is recognized as central to the optimal developmental and educational outcomes for their children, and as a catalyst for school reform. Yet, consistent and meaningful collaboration with parents is not evident at many schools and at all levels of education. We are committed to helping our candidates understand and mitigate the myriad of proximal and distal social systems (Hoolver-Demsey & Sandler, 1997; Sue & Sue, 2015) that work to limit or enhance the involvement of families in the education of their children, and also the access to a range of social-emotional support services. Coursework is designed not only to assist our candidates to understand the processes underlying parents’ thinking, decision-making, and behaviors that lead to school involvement, and the significant impact that political, economic, and social events may have on family-school and client-counselor relations, but also to identify the systemic barriers that prevent meaningful parental and client involvement.

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

Shared Vision and Continuous Improvement Process

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

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

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

In 2016-2017 the School of Education faculty and staff entered into a refresh of the Conceptual Framework. The Continuous Improvement Committee was charged with beginning the review process. The Committee in collaboration with the Leadership Council and Department Chairs decided to integrate Inclusion, Ignatian Pedagogy Paradigm (IPP), and Technology throughout the Conceptual Framework. SOE constituents including Leadership Council, Departments,
SOE Alumni Board, and Board of Visitors will review the Conceptual Framework.

We are committed to implementing the above understanding of social justice, integration of theory and practice, socio-cultural/constructivist perspective, culturally responsive pedagogy, and community collaboration. Candidates receive the knowledge, skills and dispositions via courses, instruction, fieldwork and clinical practice. Candidates demonstrate mastery of knowledge, application of skills and competence in dispositions through a rigorous formative and summative assessment and tracking system. These are clearly stipulated in the LMU School of Education Learning Goals and Outcomes, which follows.
In accordance with the Mission of Loyola Marymount University, the faculty, staff, and students of the School of Education understand and declare our purpose to be the encouragement of lifelong learning and academic excellence, the education of the whole person, and the promotion of service and justice for all. We commit ourselves to serving public and private education by fostering excellence inspired by the Jesuit and Marymount traditions of Catholic education.

The following four broad learning goals are intended to express the expectations for how all candidates will achieve the mission of the School of Education. Under each goal are corresponding candidate learning outcomes that express specific ways in which candidates should be able to demonstrate fulfillment of each goal.

**Unit Goal 1: Candidates will respect and value all individuals and communities.**
- **Diversity:** Candidates will know, value, and integrate the diversity of students and their communities
- **Culture of high expectations:** Candidates will promote a culture of high expectations for all
- **Inclusion:** Candidates will be able to use inclusive strategies and practices
- **Community:** Candidates will be able to gather and use multiple resources to better understand and serve their community

**Unit Goal 2: Candidates will integrate theory and practice.**
- **Knowledge:** Candidates will be able to demonstrate knowledge of historical, philosophical, socio-political, economic, and legal influences on education
- **Critical Lens:** Candidates will be able to use a critical lens to analyze and share content knowledge
- **Reflection:** Candidates will be able to reflect on personal experience of self and others to inform practice
- **Disposition:** Candidates will understand and model exemplary professional practices
- **Research:** Candidates will be able to use multiple research methodologies
- **Pedagogical Technology:** Candidates will be able to integrate content and pedagogical knowledge, academic skills, and technology in professional practice

**Unit Goal 3: Candidates will advocate for access to a socially just education.**
- **Communication and Collaboration:** Candidates will be able to effectively communicate and collaborate
- **Academic Excellence:** Candidates will promote academic excellence in the field
Equity: Candidates will be able to use pedagogical skills to implement principles of equity and empowerment

Social Justice: Candidates will be able to understand and respond to issues related to the preferential option for the poor and marginalized groups

Technology: Candidates will be able to advocate for and critically use technology

Lifelong Learning: Candidates will demonstrate a commitment to ongoing professional development and involvement in professional organizations

Unit Goal 4: Candidates will lead in order to facilitate transformation.

Ethics: Candidates will be able to practice effective, ethical, and moral leadership

Shared Vision: Candidates will be able to share and collaboratively construct an inclusive vision within professional learning communities

Performance Evaluation: Candidates will be able to seek, reflect upon, and respond to constructive feedback

Systemic Change: Candidates will understand and use the elements, processes, and technological advances that lead to systemic change

Assessment: Candidates will understand and promote equitable and effective assessment and evaluation systems
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