Investing in communities of scholar-practitioners

Margaret Macintyre Latta,* Sabre Cherkowski, Susan Crichton, Wendy Klassen, and Karen Ragoonaden

University of British Columbia Okanagan, Canada

The decision to renew our Bachelor of Education program was prompted by opportunity for change and innovation in relation to recent developments at UBC Okanagan. The need to find fiscal efficiencies within the Faculty of Education alongside institutional priorities committing to a research culture, served as catalysts to redesign our teacher education program accordingly. Historically and currently, teacher education programs worldwide struggle with being understood by the greater university community as conducting and generating research (Wideen & Grimmett, 1995; Ziechner, 2010). The question of whether or not teacher education programs belong within research-oriented university campuses is woven into this history, surfacing again and again, reflecting limited understandings of teaching as an applied practice (Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Villegas, Abrams, Chavez Moreno, Mills, & Stern, 2016). Drawing across both the historical and contemporary research on teacher education there is, of course, much support for orienting away from such apprenticeship models of teacher education (Dewey, 1904; Grimmett, & D'Amico, 2008). But, in doing so, the turn is toward professional growth as an ongoing pursuit for educators that respects the concrete realities of their practices, fosters agency, voice, and accountability concerning their professional identity, and rethinks practitioner knowledge and the ways we cultivate and advocate for learners and learning. Research necessarily becomes a habit of all educators' daily practices as they seek productive ways to proceed within the given particularities of their classrooms concerning students, context, and content, furthering learners and learning (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Lieberman, 2009; Strong Mackaiau, Ching-Sze Wang, Ragoonaden, & Leng, 2016). Grappling with how to prompt these considerations and orientations is very much reflected in our renewed program efforts. Over multiple years, faculty committees with ongoing consultation with our school district partners and organizational bodies have delved into the program features, conditions, resources, and supports. So, as we prepare to meet our first cohort of prospective educators in the fall 2017, we are increasingly cognizant that we have been on a research journey together; one in which we have challenged and gained insights from each other, and that has invigorated our collective identity as a program, substantively contributing to the research culture on campus and within the greater community.

Drawing on self-study of teaching and teacher education research literature, the roles of reflective practice insisting on the continual study of self in relation to the program design as it takes shape, situates our inquiry on an ongoing basis (Bullock, 2014). This program-envisioning terrain has been bumpy at times, but a shared language generated through process comes to characterize our renewed program, fostering capacities on an individual and collective basis to learn in and from practice. It is this notion of a relational self, valuing personal sense-making alongside collective sense-

* Email: Margaret.Macintyre.Latta@ubc.ca

making that is embraced within the self-study tradition, continually elucidating the given complexities of teaching and learning, calling into question undergirding assumptions, values, and beliefs, and grappling with lived practices and policies within pedagogical reasoning (Loughran, 2002). So, in what follows, the cultivation of this shared programmatic language is re-traced; re-membering the research journey we have taken, thus, re-storying what our teacher education program entails, so all involved can articulate and envision their roles, fostering the potential within its conduct. It is potential we have seen and felt forming a vital pedagogical medium that we are experiencing as lived language, embodying and strengthening the roles of education, holding much potential for all involved within participating institutions, communities, and beyond.

Re-tracing: Undergirding assumptions and beliefs

A cohering conception forming the heart of our renewed teacher education program design at the University of British Columbia Okanagan (UBC Okanagan) is an educator identity characterized by the notion of a scholar-practitioner (Jenlink, 2005). This conception did not just fall out of the air. We trace it back to the strengths and resources of our current campus and greater community, the strengths and resources of our current programs, faculty, students, the strong relationships cultivated with the field, and the diverse expertise of all involved. It seems a fitting identity, characterizing the scholar practitioner as a continuous student of learning, cultivating an adaptive expertise, drawing across multiple teaching strategies, techniques, methodologies, traditions, perspectives, disciplines, and so on—interdependent with the needs of situation, the particulars of students and the givens of contexts. There are many ways to be a scholar-practitioner. But, it is an educator identity that is interdependent with living it; depending on responsive enactment. Programmatic features alongside our faculty, our students, and our extended community, need to navigate how this conception permeates and characterizes our program in action. Such enactment will be the glue providing coherence and continuity. So, the scholar practitioner:

- Embraces the journey of professional growth. Professional knowledge is formative with educators understood to be students of learning at all stages of careers (Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2013; Grimmettt & D'Amico, 2008; Ek & Macintyre Latta, 2013; Macintyre Latta & Wunder, 2012).
- Intertwines content and pedagogical knowledge, drawing on the resources of the scholarly community. Accessing a learner's thinking so it is visible, in order to build on this knowledge intertwines content and pedagogical knowledge, drawing on and contributing to the resources of the scholarly community. Enabling prospective and practicing educators to create the conditions and supports for cultivating and guiding such learning experiences across multiple disciplines and interests is the scholar-practitioner's task (Kemmis & Smith, 2008; Shulman, 2004).
- Places professional knowledge as primary to strengthening the field of education locally and globally. Scholar-practitioners cultivate a philosophical and pragmatic language for what they are orienting their practices toward and why. Such a language of practice articulates and strengthens teaching for educators, their students, parents, and the wider community (Macintyre Latta, Schnellert, Ondrik, & Sasges,2016; Richardson, et al., 2015).
- Seeks links across the research with teaching. So, scholar-practitioners do not only read or reference what the research says, but intentionally pursue opportunities to draw upon it, adapt it, and act on it, in varied educative situations, growing capacities for discernment and practical wisdom (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015; Farr Darling, et al., 2007; Macintyre Latta & Crichton, 2015; Phelan, 2015).

In-situ scholar-practitioner inquiry to re-imagine education

To support the formative nature of professional knowledge undergirding the scholar-practitioner identity, the professional community we envision invests in the ongoing intellectual well-being of all involved, continually invigorating and sustaining educators' practices. And, collectively, we all need to take responsibility for creating and sustaining such community. This is something that will never be completely achieved. We need to always be working towards it. Our design efforts envision how features of this ongoing effort might look in practice, including:

- Greater focus on connecting coursework to the complexities of classrooms for which educators are being prepared. Such attention to the complexities of classrooms as productive considers the dire consequences of curriculum enactment when translated as monolithic, orienting teaching and learning toward oneness or sameness, consequently turning away from multiplicities of all kinds (Berg, 2016; Case & Balcaen, 2008: Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014; Cochran-Smith, et al., 2016; Douglas, 2016; Groundwater-Smith, 2012; Martin, 2016).

- Greater emphasis on curricular enactment, with room to really practice many ways to teach. Such concrete practice with a multiplicity of teaching approaches and practices invests in educator confidence in learning processes. Our investment considers the dire consequences of curricular enactment when translated as primarily technique and strategy that orients teaching and learning toward preconceived representations of learning. If teaching and learning always follows set orders, sequences, and hierarchies, the results tend to be generic learning products, consequently turning away from fluid, purposeful learning encounters across students and educators that manifest more divergent learning processes and related products (Egan, 2010; Macintyre Latta, 2013; Phelan, 2015).

- Increased efforts to prepare educators to work in respectful and responsive ways with students' families and local communities, building in productive ways on the resources that all students and contexts offer. Such efforts assume students need to see themselves in aspects of the curriculum, and find themselves contributing to the collective sense-making and in relation to community. Rather than being disturbances, differences ought to be experienced as catalytic resources in coming to know self and others (Binfet, 2016; Broom, 2015; Phelan, 2011; Pinar, 2011;).

- Development of new ways to work with the field to strengthen the profession as a whole. These ways purposefully support practice-based research and reorient associated policies, helping to approach educative practices more wisely, more creatively, and more flexibly. Thus, seeking to understand the nature and importance of professional identity and continually attempting to develop a justified and well-articulated professional identity (Bosetti & Gereluk, 2016; Broom, 2016; Butler, Schnellert, & MacNeil, 2015; Campbell & Groundwater-Smith, 2010; Cochran-Smith, 2015; Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2012; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2009; Martin, 2015; Zeichner & Bier, 2015).

These features shape what we come to identify as the *INSPIRE¹* Teacher Education Program at UBC Okanagan, invested in the primacy of educators in the lives of their students. The tagline "Be inspired to inspire" is at the heart of our *INSPIRE* education programs, investing in professional learning over the continuum of an educator's career through:

1. In-situ: Multiple learning opportunities deliberately negotiating theory/practice intersections
2. Scholar-Practitioner: Prospective and practicing educators participating as continuous students of learners/learning.
3. Inquiry: Understood as the heart of all learning.
4. Re-Imagining Education: Orienting learners/learning towards individual/collective growth and well-being.

Learning to teach in the UBC Okanagan program is designed to be interdependent with extended field and practicum experiences, sharing a common vision of teaching in both school and community sites. Relationships across the teacher education program and these sites will offer sustained supervision and feedback, mentorship expertise, co-planning and decision-making, and ongoing inquiry opportunities and research connections. The envisioned professional learning culture invites teacher candidates to join and participate within communities of scholar-practitioners across all phases of careers and across diverse learning settings, with all sharing a commitment to growing professional knowledge. Building on existing working relationships in the field with the Faculty of Education at UBC Okanagan, communities of scholar-practitioners (CSP) will represent varied educational settings, forming geographically located forums. These geographically located communities will bring prospective and practicing educators into a conjoint relationship, engaging them in explorations that challenge and extend the reach of their current understandings regarding their pedagogical and content knowledge.

Creating the needed conditions and supports, CSP participants must share commitments to *INSPIRE* career-long professional knowledge. An advisory group comprised of 24 educators generated through interested educators attending prior forums organized to discuss the renewed program, spent three consecutive sessions developing needed CSP commitments. The educative role that these forums served alongside the commitments generated, mobilized understandings of the renewed program that heightened all of our attention to the potential powers and significances that the CSPs might elicit for reframing education away from competition and imposed control, toward a growth mindset.

Faculty Advisors hired by the Faculty of Education at UBC Okanagan will coordinate and facilitate these CSPs. Practitioner inquiries and research opportunities within and across participating sites are expected to be the norm. An annual Scholar-Practitioner Conference is intended to serve as a powerful vehicle for prompting connections and insights among participants and across sites. Investing accordingly will build and sustain the needed learning culture of the CSPs. Such involvement needs to be regarded by participants as something fitting for specific needs and goals. So, it will not be for all. Initial involvement necessarily invites participants to help work out the fundamental elements of the CSPs during the planning stages and over the first years of operation. We envision engaging multiple school and community sites, connecting purposefully with our Post Baccalaureate, Summer Institute, and Graduate Program, and eventually linking with an Education Doctorate program to intentionally inform, engage, and contribute to the field.

---

¹ The thoughtfulness undergirding the program name of INSPIRE was introduced by Anne MacLean, School Experience Coordinator at UBC Okanagan.

Collectively, we envision these programmatic considerations as holding much potential to reframe public education as a public good—a fundamental human right, versus education as a marketable commodity (Westheimer, 2015). And, while acknowledging that these are very timely ideas in contemporary scholarship, we are reminded that these are also not new ideas. History demonstrates over and over again that similar efforts tend to get shortchanged through lack of time and care to connections cohering the parts-to-whole relationships. Additionally, research documenting, disseminating, and mobilizing the long-term significances for all involved, are undermined as outside pressures for evidencing increased student knowledge is assessed through measures and tests that betray curricular enactment as concretely experienced in these settings. These are matters we need to grapple with on a continual basis. To see and act with the potential envisioned, asks our faculty to contribute to our teacher education program finding needed conditions and structures to do so. The parts-to-whole programmatic connections need to be cultivated in relation to the scholar practitioner identity. A relational accountability needs to be practiced, with working groups regularly sharing their thinking in progress with all others, remaining open to enlarging, deepening, and adapting thinking en-route. It is key that groups are not simply reporting back, but listening to each other, partaking in complicated conversations, and grappling with ideas. This is the difficult and complex learning terrain of the scholar-practitioner. It is also where the sustenance for learners and learning is derived. We all change in the process, and collectively we gain language, imagery, and practice articulating the significances for ourselves, our students, and the profession. But, re-tracing this terrain suggests a reminder that is worthy of holding on to: the importance of conscious embodiment of the scholar-practitioner community as we set out to teach for it. Conscious embodiment shapes our design task from the beginning of our renewed programmatic efforts, currently, and for the future we are investing in.

Re-membering: Design thinking at work

The renewal of our Teacher Education program was a significant opportunity for our faculty and one that required balancing what the literature suggests, with the requirements of external regulatory bodies (i.e., Teacher Regulation Branch - [http://www.bcteacherregulation.ca/),](http://www.bcteacherregulation.ca/)) and the existing practices, beliefs and culture of the faculty itself. In 2014 our Faculty of Education, in response to budgetary and structural constraints, adopted a design thinking approach to programmatic renewal, including considerations of changes to governance.

Design Thinking is typically defined as a human centered process that fosters empathy and various points of view through structured dialogue, narrative, and the development of iterative models and prototypes (Crichton & Carter, 2017). Design Thinking privileges problem finding over problem solving, recognizing that if groups focus primarily on finding solutions they risk attending only to the symptoms of challenges rather than the actual source of the challenges. While Design Thinking risks becoming a catch phrase for any activities that support brainstorming, visualization, and focus group discussions, we adapted the process developed at Stanford's d.School ([https://dschool.stanford.edu/resources/).](https://dschool.stanford.edu/resources/)) Drawing on d.School's five step process of gaining empathy, defining the challenges we were facing, ideating possible solutions, prototyping those solutions into tangible programmatic elements, and testing those prototypes with colleagues and educators in regional school districts,-- we formed a series of faculty design groups to work through the designing process and address the constraints given to us by campus senior administration.

Design constraints focused the challenges being faced, and our constraints included the need to balance our budget, restructure an aging teacher education program, and revisit potential governance structures for our increasingly smaller faculty. Thus, design thinking fittingly became a medium to unpack challenges and improve educational practices through iterative analysis and implementation derived through collaborations fostering contextually sensitive ways to proceed

(Wang & Hannafin, 2005). So, design thinking very much served as a guide as we confronted our efforts to create and implement our program and continues to prompt CSP participants as they identify, investigate, and respond to practices.

The origins of Design Thinking can be found in the Participatory Design process developed during the early 1960s. It is a process often used within grass roots organizations to support community planning by addressing social concerns. Since then, the Participatory Design approach has been adapted to address system design and support the incubation of innovations within the technology sector. Since the 1980s, the Design Thinking process has become synonymous with interaction design and has been used widely to support problem finding for the public good - Collective Impact (Dam & Siang, 2017).

Consistent within the Design Thinking process, participants learn to develop and continuously support one another to foster:

- Empathy for the various points of view invested in the outcome of the process (for example, faculty members, senior administration, educators in the field, teacher candidates, regulatory members, etc.)
- Optimism that the process will lead to a positive outcome
- Belief that the iteration of ideas and ideation (definition of those ideas) is valuable
- Creative confidence in the process and the participants
- Ability to embrace ambiguity and make models
- Capacity to learn from trial and error and to wrestle with and adapt to change.

The list above is easy to write and tricky to live. Design Thinking requires design teams to balance the seemingly competing, yet complimentary, elements of need and desirability with feasibility and viability (IDEO, 2015).

Renewing a Teacher Education program requires relentless optimism and continuous, challenging and critical conversations. Design Thinking is not an easy process or one to be undertaken lightly. Its strength is in the encouragement of empathy, voice, dialogue, engagement and the potential for iterative, continuous change and adaption. It produces artefacts and traces that allow for reflection and growth, and it helps participants to remember (1) why they engaged in the change process in the first place, and (2) the importance of the challenges they have chosen to address.

As the Faculty of Education at UBC Okanagan prepares to welcome its first cohort of Bachelor of Education students, we acknowledge that we are continuously iterating our model within a myriad of challenges and tensions. Changing our program has come at a cost. We have stretched collegial friendships, utilized valuable research time for program development, and struggled to maintain our career trajectories while wresting with the ambiguity of change and programmatic uncertainty. It has been a long and labour intensive process and by embracing the potential and promise of the process of design thinking, we know that in many ways, our work is only just beginning.

Programmatic challenges and tensions

Inherent in designing, planning, and implementing a new program are challenges and tensions. When a faculty is given the opportunity to re-imagine teacher education, they must attend to and balance not only the exciting potential for change (the theory) but also the lived reality of change (the practice). In this case, the reality consists of the logistics and constraints of working within a complex system of the university, the field, regulatory bodies, and the provincial Ministry of Education and related organizational bodies.

The theory/practice conundrum in teacher education has always been with us (Darling-Hammond, 1999, Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996, Hughes, 2006; Loughran, 2006) and typically it has been viewed as existing primarily between the university and the field. In our recent re-design, we have come to realize that the theory/practice conundrum plays out in a multiplicity of settings. These settings include those within the Faculty of Education itself, the larger university, school districts, schools and teachers, external regulatory bodies, and the provincial Ministry of Education.

The challenges and tensions have been and will continue to be numerous, but three are addressed here. Colleagues, both academic and administrative, view issues from different perspectives. This is a good thing, as long as these different perspectives are viewed with respect. One such example is in the faculty's understanding of one of the key features of the new program, that of the scholar-practitioner. As we fostered and negotiated the multiple relationships involved, the importance of re-membering the educator as scholar-practitioner is continually foregrounded.

When the term scholar-practitioner was first introduced at a design committee meeting, it was for some, a new term, but not a new concept. The committee quickly endorsed the notion to be a key underlying concept of the new program. However, the challenges included a) sharing this decision in a collegial, inclusive fashion with the faculty who were not on this committee; 2) encouraging collaboration and buy-in to the concept of scholar-practitioner; and 3) recognizing the tensions within the faculty among those who saw themselves closer to one end of the spectrum (scholars) than those who saw themselves closer to the other end (practitioners). The goal is for all faculty to live somewhere within the hyphen of scholar-practitioner. An aligning challenge is to acknowledge and encourage our partners in the field to do the same – see themselves as living in the hyphen of the scholar-practitioner, assuming an inquiry stance and encouraging such a stance with their students. One way we are doing this is through the development of communities of scholar-practitioners, described earlier in this paper.

There are theory/practice challenges with regard to sharing, communicating, and buying-in to the notion of scholar-practitioner. Some faculty take a more theoretical stance and look closely at the conceptual ideas and framework of the new teacher education program and ask, "How can we do this successfully?" Others may tend to take a more "Where do I fit in?" practical look. Substantial workload in a Faculty of Education is situated within the teacher education program. Therefore, a new teacher education program impacts significantly the identity of the entire faculty. While some faculty appeared to be more invested in the new program design than others, this challenge will only be fully recognized and addressed as we live through the implementation and consequent revisions of the program.

Another challenge and potential issue is in the actual planning and delivery of the program within the theory/practice framework. Supporting faculty in their individual pedagogical approaches is theoretically sound; however, the new program was designed to be offered in "blocks," where teams of three to four instructors are expected to plan, teach and assess collaboratively. This is a challenge that has been heartily taken up by faculty, but one that has and will continue to take much planning time and commitment.

Finally, the logistics in relation to planning and implementing the new program has been incredibly challenging both theoretically and practically. Approval of the new program was required from various university level committees as well as from our external regulatory body. Oftentimes, addressing pieces of these different approval processes was a chicken and egg scenario, as the timing often overlapped or proposals were needed at the same time but often were conditional upon other approvals presented simultaneously. It was important to include our partners in the field at all stages of the new program from design input to implementation, but oftentimes we were somewhat limited in what could be shared based on where we were at with these approval proposals. Included in the logistics challenge and related to the theory/practice tension are the many, many, many questions and issues related to admissions numbers, budget, scheduling, room bookings, field placements etc.

At this point, re-tracing and re-membering the programmatic terrain and recognizing that there will be challenges and tensions ahead, is realistic and important. Being able to build upon the varying strengths of the faculty and to work to address issues collegially and collaboratively will stand us in good stead as we embark on this adventure of continuing to plan and then support our new teacher education program.

Re-storying: Critical friendships and mentoring—supporting programmatic intents

In keeping with the focus on developing educator identity characterized by the notion of a scholar-practitioner, faculty adopted collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches to co-planning and co-constructing the new Teacher Education courses. Focusing on continuous, life-long learning, referring to multiple perspectives, traditions, and disciplines, we began our journey as critical friends establishing just and inclusive paradigms for teaching and learning. We became aware of the interdependency and interconnections emerging from contexts, situations, and learning environments. As critical friends, our objective was to revise, inform and support our own renewed practices and curricular orientations and provocations. Costa and Kallick (1993) position critical friends within a paradigm where learning occurs via regular dialogue and regular feedback. Ragoonaden and Bullock (2016) situate critical friendships in a climate of trust, compassion and empathy, encouraging analysis, integrity and culminating with an advocacy for success. There exists the recognition that since it is difficult to assess and reframe one's practice, a critical friend nurtures the emergence of alternate frames of reference upon which to introduce change. The design of an inquiry with a critical friendship might change over time to be responsive to the unique factors of the research/learning situation, especially as members discover and challenge previously held assumptions (Mackaiau et al., 2016). Swaffield (2007) refers to critical friend as a supportive yet challenging relationship between professionals, encouraging and cultivating constructive critique and requiring knowledge of the context of the teaching environment. Several studies demonstrate that the utilization of the critical friend method in various educational contexts yielded beneficial professional development outcomes for the educators involved in this process: increased confidence, confirmation of good practice, a sense of belonging to a collegial community, and breaking the sense of isolation in teaching assignments. As transformative scholar-practitioners offering a vast array of varied cross-cultural experiences, we were attempting to guide pre-service teachers to modify and to adapt the content of instruction and teaching styles to the historical and socio-cultural realities of their students. Individually and collectively we found ourselves re-storying the nature of knowledge, curriculum, methodology, and instructional materials, to do so. An ancillary aim was to analyze ways in which contemporary methods of teaching and learning could be transformed into a diverse, sustainable and global curriculum, inclusive of multiple perspectives which inform Canadian realities (Ragoonaden, Sivia, & Baxan, 2015). In particular, discussions surrounding culturally responsive teaching and transformative praxis were undertaken followed by a foray into concepts of social justice, culture, and identity in a pluralistic society. Furthermore, focus was on understanding the multiple identities of Canadian students by promoting the development of culturally relevant materials which examine the impact of marginalization, alienation and isolation on cultural minorities, including First Nation, Inuit, and Métis Peoples of Canada.

Sustaining Communities of Scholar-Practitioners

As a unique part of the program, and as a bridge for storying and re-storying all aspects of our renewed program, the Community of Scholar-Practitioners (CSP) which is envisioned as the umbrella community, links the particular co-created and emergent learning communities in each of the four geographic regions that we serve. These communities are intended to provide a space and place for teacher candidates, their mentor teachers, the Faculty Mentors (FMs) and Faculty Advisors (FAs), as

well as other interested educators and invested community stakeholders to gather together to engage in professional learning conversations that will extend and enrich members' theoretical, pedagogical, and content knowledge. The CSP was designed, in part, to reflect the claims in research literature that learning happens through the interactions and relations between and among us (Stengel, 2004), and that attending to relationships in community is central to the work of re-claiming our wholeness, sense of passion and vitality as educators (Cherkowski & Walker, 2016; Palmer, 2007). Certainly, building learning communities in schools has been an important focus in research and practice for decades, with the idea that creating opportunities for teachers to engage in professional conversations focused on their practice and student learning can provide improvement for student learning. The characteristics of effective learning communities provide guidance for some of the structural components of a learning community for improving teaching. For example, effective learning communities are built on a shared vision and a desire for shared leadership of the community and the initiatives that will emerge from the meetings. Additional characteristics include learning-focused conversations with the use of important information about students learning to be able to know whether student learning is improving and how to help those students who are not learning. Creating a culture of collaboration to ensure teachers are working together to improve the learning for all students is an important aspect of building an effective professional learning community (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Stoll & Louis, 2007).

While we know from this research that these communities have the potential for improving practice, we also know that building community in ways that harnesses the power of relational learning for teachers to experience meaningful, relevant and learning-focused conversations that will have an impact on their own practice remains a challenge when these communities are contrived, mandated, or structured in ways that denies the importance of relationships at the heart of learning and teaching (Cherkowski, Hanson & Walker, in press). Accordingly, we envision these CSPs as an opportunity for educators across all parts of the system with the community stakeholders to collaboratively co-develop the structures, routines and themes of inquiry that are relevant and meaningful for their contexts and their professional learning needs with the added enrichment of research and scholarship from the FMs and FAs. Additionally, we aim to promote the benefits of collegiality, connection, relationship and caring that can often be missing from the working lives of educators, and that are integral to feeling a sense of wholeness, passion and fulfillment in their work (Cherkowski & Walker, 2014); feelings that are important for promoting classroom learning environments where students may thrive from their own sense of passion for learning (Day, 2004).

Through attention to relationships, care and connection (Born, 2014) the CSPs have potential to become a community for re-enlivening the work of teaching and learning toward wellbeing, wholeness and a sense of vitality in and through the work of teaching and learning. The relationships between the FMs and FAs would seem the starting place for what can become authentic, productive, meaningful and life-enhancing learning in the CSPs. This partnership will be the foundation upon which the learning communities will form, and so it is essential that attention to assumptions about community, knowing and learning as relational, and the importance of engaging in professional learning with educators that honours a respectful and reciprocal intention for authentic inquiry be part of the initial work of building this educative partnership. Building community is about more than creating opportunities for learning conversations, it is about building the relationships within which this learning can happen, and growing and sustaining these relationships is the primary work of the FMs and FAs. The FM and FA teams will work within one of four local school districts, coordinating teacher candidate placements for field experiences and internships, while building communities of scholar practitioners that will meet monthly throughout the teaching year. These CSPs of teacher candidates, mentor teachers, and other interested teachers and administrators in the district will be facilitated by the FAs and FMs and designed around themes that will emerge out of the work

happening in the schools. The CSPs will be distinct, given the co-constructed nature and processes that we envision, and linked to the larger program through the FM and FA teams who work together to ensure coherence and consistency across and within the various program components. One of the aims of these communities is offering space, time, encouragement and academic resources for members to co-construct professional learning as an ongoing practice. Our hope is for these communities to foster and encourage robust, ongoing, collective professional learning, and that members will document and share their learning at our annual Scholar-Practitioner Conference, bringing all CSP participants into a networking and learning forum.

Significances and Possibilities

The prefix "re" emphasizes insistence on seeing anew, again and again. Re-tracing, re-membering, and re-storying the evolution of our community of scholar practitioners to date has been such a cyclical journey, carrying forward a temporal awareness of past within present, forming and informing the future. It is attention to this temporal movement that our program efforts to date find to be deeply educative. As LaBoskey (2004) and Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) among others have documented, self-study is an approach to studying professional practice settings. We found that this methodology builds on the self-initiated and design-thinking ground of our renewed program efforts, strengthening our collective interests in improvement through participatory engagement, and inciting generative pathways for ongoing programmatic planning. In keeping with the focus on developing criticality in a progressive scaffolding of ideas, concepts and epistemologies, self-study builds upon previous experience through reflection and revision, facilitating and promoting transformative pedagogy and practice. By reflecting on significant professional events and analyzing these circumstances, our community of scholar practitioners have focused on seeking pathways between knowledge and practice. These program pathways invested in re-tracing, re-membering and re-storying opportunities for faculty, practicing and prospective educators, community educators, and others, to engage in the workings of the program again and again. Both an active and receptive doing manifests in re-tracing, re-membering, and re-storying the conceptual workings of the renewed program, purposefully bringing practitioners and researchers together and, thus, theory and practice together. The separation of practitioners from researchers, theory from practice, is documented for over 100 years in the research literature as being unproductive. The program design understands that contexts in support of learning, discerning leadership, and good teaching, live at the intersections of theory with practice when educators understand their identity as inquirers--teacher researchers—continually questioning what they are doing and why, theorizing their practices and practicizing their theories. We experience much potential in following and furthering the development of such languages of practice. The capacity for educators (and in turn their students) to articulate what they are doing and why, what they are orienting away from and why, "inspirits purpose and emotion, informed by knowledge and understanding" (Dewey, 1928, p. 30). Negotiating confidence and ways of being that cultivate CSPs where teacher candidates and mentor teachers and leaders understand learning as necessarily experimental, grounded in questions, collaborative, connected to and derived from work with students, and sustained and interdependent with school and community contexts and needs, forms our current task. So, negotiating the needed relationships, seeking fitting conditions and supports, and investing in conjoint mentoring relationships with schools and other education sites, reframes professional growth for all involved.

Opportunities to really explore what being a scholar-practitioner entails for learners and learning at all stages of study and careers are what the teacher education program at UBC Okanagan is hoping to emphasize. In other words, an educator's professional knowledge is formative and requires ongoing mentorship. Our program is aiming to provide access to living in classrooms in these ways. The room for questioning, scrutinizing, analyzing, discerning, reflecting, speculating, adapting, changing, and building lived meanings awakens the inspirited discourse that must be enacted to gain the needed practice. Bottom line---it re-imagines education. The powers and possibilities inspiriting such inquiry, orient towards learner/learning growth, greater self-understandings, enhanced well-being, and opportunities to continually situate self in the world alongside learning to live in the world well with others. It is such inspirited meaning-making that educators, students, and greater communities need to productively engage now and for the future. It is such meaning-making that invests in the search within research that emphasizes the primacy of educators assuming a scholar-practitioner identity.

The investment CSPs cultivate and sustain, entrusts learning situations to teachers and their students. Thus far, our programmatic efforts reveal glimpses into how a teacher education program that invests accordingly and invites prospective educators to join and participate within a community of practicing educators from school and community sites across all phases of careers and across varied learning settings, generates a scholar-practitioner community inspiring ongoing investment in professional knowledge. We see how such investment recruits passionate prospective and practicing educators fostering a shared research-informed platform of beliefs about the formative nature of all learning, assuming an inquiry-oriented pedagogical stance towards curricular practices across all disciplines and interests that values the given complexities and diversities within all educative situations. We see how such investment incites the needed educative conditions and supports to form a community of educators acting as resources and catalysts for continual participatory learning connections throughout the Okanagan valley and beyond. We see how such investment holds much potential for raising the profile of education's empowering roles and significances in the lives of individuals and communities. The attentive gaze, thus far, indicates it is a most worthy investment to realize and re-realize. But, such an attentive gaze sees the long-term consequences of reframing education away from competition and imposed control, towards individual/collective growth and well-being. And, so, it is an attentive gaze that acts within the present to foster the needed time, habits, and resources that cultivating these practices takes. Though we agree this temporally- aware gaze is most worthy, it takes bold pedagogically-oriented leadership that extends both within and beyond specific teacher education programs, school districts, and government and related curricular initiatives. A concerted, coordinated, long-term collaboration invested in bringing teacher education programs, school districts, the Ministry of Education, and interested others, sharing a common vision committed to reorienting education accordingly, could foster the needed practices for prospective educators alongside practicing educators to access the possibilities for learning of all kinds. It is the term 'community' in the CSPs that supports our gaze and challenges our gaze. To strive to a sharing of this common vision amongst all stakeholders will be a lived-out, challenging, but worthwhile goal.It is the realizing of these possibilities through investing in communities of scholar-practitioners that we find much hope within as we re-trace, re-member, and re-story

education and, in doing so, we envision how this investment significantly re-orients the ways we might learn/live in the world together.

References

Berg, S., Willis-Stewart, S., & Kendall, S. (2016). Creating healthy schools and student engagement: The got health? Initiative. *Revue phen EPS/PHEnex Journal,* 8(1), 1-12.

Binfet, J. T., (2016). Kindness at school: What children's drawings reveal about themselves, their teachers, and their learning communities. *Journal of Childhood Studies*, 41, 29-42.

Born, P. (2014). *Deepening community: Finding joy together in chaotic times*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler

Bosetti, L. & Gereluk, D. (2016). *Understanding School Choice in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

British Columbia Ministry of Education (2017). Teacher Regulation Branch. Retrieved from http://www.bcteacherregulation.ca/AboutUs/AboutUs.aspx

Broom, C. (2016). Power, politics, philosophy and reform: A historical review of curriculum reform, academia, and government in British Columbia, 1920 to 2000. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 48 (5), 711-727.

Broom, C. (2015). Empowering students: Pedagogy that benefits educators and learners. *Citizenship Social and Economics Education.* 14.2.

Bullock, S. M. (2014). Self-study, improvisational theatre, and the reflective turn: Using video data to challenge my pedagogy of science teacher education. *Educational Research for Social Change, 3*(2), 37–50.

Butler, D., Schnellert, L., & MacNeil, K. (2015). Collaborative inquiry and distributed agency in educational change: A case study of a multi-level community of inquiry. *Journal of Educational Change, 16*(1), 1-26.

Campbell, A. & Groundwater-Smith (Eds). (2010). *Connecting inquiry and professional learning in education.* London: Routledge.

Case, R. & Balcean, P. (2008). Supporting a community of critical thinkers. In R. Case, Anthology of Social Studies (pp. 89-98). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Cherkowski, S. Hanson, K. & Walker, K. (in press). Flourishing in adaptive community: Balancing structures and flexibilities. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*.

Cherkowski, S. & Schnellert, L. (2017). Professional learning communities as emergent, responsive learning teams. *Teacher Development, 22*(1), 229-248.

Cherkowski, S. & Walker, K. (2016). Flourishing leadership: Engaging purpose, passion, and play in the work of leading schools. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 54 (4), 378 – 392.

Cherkowski, S. & Walker, K. (2014). Flourishing communities: Re-storying educational leadership using a positive research lens. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 17*(2), 200-217.

Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163-202.

Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A.M., Abrams, L., Chavez Moreno, L., Mills, T. & Stern, R. (2016). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In Gitomer, D. & Bell, C. (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 439-547). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Villegas, A.M. (2015) Studying teacher preparation: The questions that drive research. *European Education Research Journal, 14*(5), 379-394.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2015). Teacher communities for equity. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 51*, 109-113.

Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational Leadership (51)*2, 49-51.

Crichton, S. & Carter, D. (2017). *Taking making into classrooms: A toolkit to foster creativity and imagination*, Open School, Canada, Victoria http://www.mytrainingbc.ca/maker/downloads/Taking_Making_into_Classrooms.pdf

Dam, R. F. & Siang, T.Y. (2017). *Design thinking: Get a quick overview of the history.* Retrieved from https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/design-thinking-get-a-quick-overview-of-the-history.

Day, C. (2004). *A passion for teaching.* London, UK: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Educating teachers for the next century: Rethinking practice and policy. In G. Griffin (Ed.), *The Education of Teachers.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Lieberman, A. (2013). *High quality teaching and learning: Changing policies and practices.* New York: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Rothman, R. (2015). *Teaching in the flat world: Learning from high-performing systems.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1928). Body and mind. In*: Boydston J (ed.) John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953, Vol. 3. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, pp.25-40.*

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. A. McMurry (Ed.), *The third yearbook of the national society for the scientific study of education.* Part I. (pp. 9-30). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Douglas, S. (2016). Preparing for linguistic diversity: Teacher candidate reflections on an elementary education course in additional language teaching and learning. In M. Hirschkorn & J. Mueller (Eds.), *What should Canada's teachers know? Teacher capacities: Knowledge, beliefs and skills* (pp. 536-568). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-36OcipMmoPbTdia2hrN1F5RjQ/view

Egan, K. (2010). *Learning in depth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ek, A. & Macintyre Latta, M. (2013). Preparing to teach: Redeeming the potentialities of the present through conversations of practice, *Education & Culture, The Journal of the John Dewey Society*, 29 (1), 84-104.

Farr Darling, L., Erickson, G., & Clarke, A. (2007). C*ollective improvisation in a teacher education community.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Remillard, J. (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach." In F. Murray (ed.), *The Teacher Educator's Handbook* (pp.63-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grimmett, P., & D'Amico, L. (2008). Do British Columbia's recent education policy changes enhance professionalism among teachers? *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 78.* Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/grimmett.html

Groundwater-Smith, S., Ponte, P., Mitchell, J., Mockler, N. & Ronnerman, K. (2013). *Facilitating practitioner research: Developing transformational partnerships.* UK: Routledge.

Groundwater-Smith, S. & Mockler, N. (2012). Sustaining professional learning networks: The Australasian challenge. In C. Day (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Teacher and School Development* (pp. 506–515), London: Routledge.

Groundwater-Smith, S. (2012). Mentoring teacher inquiry: Lessons in lesson study. In S. Fletcher & C. Mullen (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Mentoring and Coaching in Education* (pp. 494–505), London: Sage Publications.

Hamilton, M.L. & Pinnegar, S. (1998). The value and promise of self-study. In Hamilton. M.L., et al (Eds.) (1998). *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235-246). London: Falmer Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012) *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2009). *The fourth way: The inspiring future for educational change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hughes, Jacqueline A. (2006). Bridging the theory-practice divide: A creative approach to effective teacher preparation, *Journal of Scholarship and Teaching, 6 (1), 110 –117.*

IDEO. (2015). *The field guide to human-centred design: Design kit.* San Francisco, CA: IDEO.

Jenlink, P. M. (2005). On bricolage and the intellectual work of the scholar-practitioner, Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly, 3(1).

Kemmis, S. & Smith, T. (2008). *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. L. Russell, (eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). The Netherlands: Springer.

Leiberman, A. (2009). Inquiring teachers: Making experience and knowledge public. *Teachers College Record ,*111(8), 1876-1881.

Loughran, J. (2010). *What expert teachers do: Enhancing professional knowledge for classroom practice. New York: Routledge.*

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a peadagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching.* New York: Routledge.

Loughran, J. (2002). Understanding self-study of teacher education practices. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 239-248). London: Routledge/Falmer.

Macintyre Latta, M. (2013). *Curricular conversations: Play is the (missing) thing.* In W. Pinar, Studies in Curriculum Theory Series, New York: Routledge.

Macintyre Latta, M., Schnellert, L., Ondrik, K., & Sasges, M. (2016). The inspirited nature of mindful curricular enactment's community (re)making. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 49(3), 255-272.*

Macintyre Latta M. & Crichton S. (2015). Innovation's renewing potential: Seeing and acting mindfully within the fecundity of educative experiences, *Education and Culture, The Journal of the John Dewey Society*, Volume 31, Issue 2, 27-38, Purdue University Press, United States.

Macintyre Latta, M. & Wunder, S. (Eds.) (2012). *Placing practitioner knowledge at the center of teacher education-- Rethinking the policies and practices of the education doctorate*. In E. Hamann & R. Hopson (Eds.), Education policy in practice: Critical cultural studies series. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Martin, C. (2016). Education, justice, and discursive agency: Toward an educationally responsive discourse ethics. *Educational Theory,* 66 (6), 679-786.

Martin, C. (2015). When the ideal of liberal egalitarianism meets the fact of austerity: reorienting philosophical perspectives on educational policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, *30*(2), 201-219.

Palmer, P. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Phelan, A. (2015). *Curriculum theorizing and teacher education: Complicating conjunctions*. New York: Routledge,

Phelan, A. (2011) Towards a complicated conversation: teacher education and the curriculum turn, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 19:2, 207-220, DOI:10.1080/14681366.2011.582257

Pinar, W. F. (2011) *The Character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurrent question of the subject.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ragoonaden, K., Sivia, A., & Baxan, V. (2015). Teaching for diversity in teacher education: Transformative frameworks. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 6(3*), 1-18. http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cjsotl_rcacea/vol6/iss3/6

Ragoonaden, K., & Bullock, S. (Eds.) (2016) *Mindfulness and critical friendship: A new perspective on professional development for educators*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. An Imprint of Rowman & Littlefield.

Ragoonaden, K., & Mueller, L. (2017). Culturally responsive pedagogy in higher education: Indigenizing curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education. 47*(2), 22-46. http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/187963

Richardson, P., Cherkowski, S., & Schnellert, L. *(2015).* Awakeness, complexity, and emergence: Learning through curriculum theory in teacher education. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 13(1), 139-167.*

Stoll, L., & Louis, K.S. (2007). (Eds). *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas.* Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Strong Mackaiau, A., Ching-Sze Wang, J., Ragoonaden, K., & Leng, L. (2016). Empowering global P4C research and practice through self-study: The philosophy for children in Hawaii international journaling and self-study project. In M. Gregory, J. Hayes, & K. Murris (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of philosophy for children, Section IX – Research directions and methods in philosophy for children.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Swaffield, S. (2007) Light touch critical friendship. *Improving Schools,* 10(3), 205–219.

Shulman, L. S. (2004). *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wang, F., & Hannafin, M. J. (2005). Design-based research and technology-enhanced learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53 (4), 5–23.

Westheimer, J. (2015). *What kind of citizen? Educating our children for the common good.* New York: teachers College Press.

Wideen, M.F. & Grimmett, P. (Eds.) (1995) *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* London: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Educação, Santa Maria,* 35(3), 479-501.