

**Niagara University**  
**College of Education**  
**Conceptual Framework - Annotated Bibliography**

- Adler, S. (1991). The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 17(2), 139-151.  
In this paper Adler reviews the literature on reflective practice and describes its role in teacher education. Cruickshank's (1987) and Schon's (1983 and 1987) perspectives of reflective practice are clearly outlined. The College of Ed Conceptual Framework aligns most closely with Schon.
- Airasian, P. & Walsh, P. (1997). Constructivist cautions, *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 1997, 444-449.  
This article provides clear and concise description of the philosophical orientation of constructivism and presents important insights into the challenges educators will face as they attempt to make reform based on this theory.
- Armstrong, T. (2006). *The best schools: How human development research should inform practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.  
Much of constructivism is rooted in educational beliefs about developing the best in people, NOT just raising test scores. This text describes the goal of developing people and why this approach should be the focus in education.
- Avery, P. (1999). Authentic assessment and instruction. *Special Education*, 65(6), 358-373.  
This study examines how student variables, such as engagement and demographics, as well as teacher instruction, impact student performance on authentic assessments. It employs process-product practice.
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,  
Chosen by Niagara's CCTL for a book study, this text provides direction and support for constructivist practices by University faculty. The best of college professors align teaching with how people, college and PK-12 students, actually learn.
- Bargh, J.A. & Schul, Y. (1980). On the cognitive benefits of teaching, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72,5, 593-604.  
One of two older studies (see Benware, C.A. and Deci, E. L., 1984) that suggests that humans develop conceptually when they are teaching others vs. studying for a test. These two studies provide a foundation for peer collaboration, cooperative learning and support for the Conceptual Framework and specifically process-product.

- Benware, C.. & Deci, E. (1984). Quality of learning with active versus passive motivational set. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 4, 755-765.  
 One of two older studies (see also Bargh, J.A. & Schul, Y.,1980)) that suggest that humans develop conceptually when they are teaching others vs. studying for a test. These two studies provide a foundation for peer collaboration, cooperative learning and support for the Conceptual Framework and process-product.
- Black, A. & Ammon, P. (1992). A developmental-constructivist approach to teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(5),323-335.  
 This article describes a teacher preparation program based on principles similar to those of the College of Education. It also offers a solid foundation in developmental constructivism with reference to Piaget's stages.
- Bos, C. (1995). Professional development and teacher change: Encouraging news from the trenches. *Remedial & Special Education*, 16(6), 379-383.  
 This paper reflects on teacher change as it relates to IDEA (1990). This work is evidence of using process-product examinations to promote teacher development.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.  
 This text is considered the single best resource of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It was developed with a Federal grant and included some of the best psychological minds in the US. It describes the research studies supporting active and conceptual learning for people of all ages. This is a readable compendium of evidence for constructivist practice.
- Brooks, J. & Brooks, M. (1999). *In Search of Understanding: The case for the constructivist classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.  
 This is the quintessential book on constructivist practice.
- Brophy, J. (1986).Teacher influences on student achievement. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1069-1077.  
 This article summarizes the research that links teacher behavior to student achievement which represents process-product from the conceptual framework.
- Carter, K. & Gonzalez, L. (1993). Beginning teachers' knowledge of classroom events. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(3), 223-233.  
 This study examines how student teachers develop their knowledge about classroom events. It is an important contribution to the implementation of process-product research.

Clements, D. (1997). Misconstructing constructivism. *Teaching Children Mathematics*. 4(4), 198-291.

This article takes a look at many of the misconceptions associated with constructivism and provides important ideas about how this philosophy can be integrated into the teaching of mathematics.

Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing group work: Strategies for heterogeneous classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

An excellent book on cooperative learning that emphasizes several strategies that are especially important for low-SES populations.

Condon, M., Clyde, J., Kyle, D. & Hovda, R. (1993). A constructivist basis for teaching and teacher education: A framework for program development and research on graduates. **SOURCE???**

This article recommends a shift in focus from teaching to learning in the preparation of teachers. It offers an interesting perspective for process-product and constructivist preparation with learning as the outcome.

Daniels, H. & Bizar, M. (1998). *Methods that Matter: Six Structures for Best Practice in Classrooms*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

A general methods text that promotes candidate learning of student-centered strategies.

Daniels, H., Bizar, M. & Zemelman, S. (2001). *Rethinking High School: Best practice in teaching, learning, and leadership*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

This text translates the process-product, student-centered, and reflective practice orientations into important considerations for educational leaders.

Danforth, S. & Smith, J. (2005). *Engaging troubling students: A constructivist approach*, Thousand Oaks: CA: Corwin Press

A readable and story-filled text written by passionate educators. This book offers strategies that work with the “hardest-to-teach” youngsters. The authors advocate that student-centered, caring, and differentiated approaches are necessary if teachers are going to reach every student.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). Teacher testing and the improvement of practice. *Teaching Education*, 12(1), 11-34.

In this article Darling-Hammond advocates for the new, performance-based teacher assessments which require that teachers implement a process-product orientation and reflective practice.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing teachers for changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*, San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Written by two leading Teacher Educators, this text describes programs, policies and practices that mark the best Teacher Education that we have

today. The Niagara program is aligned with and supported by the evidence they provide.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Ifill-Lynch, O. (2006). If they'd only do their work ! *Educational Leadership*, 8-13.

Homework is an issue that often pits college-based educators with their field-based associates. This article offers a reasoned approach that promises success, especially in inner-city situations and offers a resolution for those interested in connecting opposing positions.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*, New York: New Press.

This famous book takes teachers to task who have failed miserably with black children. This text is often discussed along with Ladson-Billings' *Dreamkeepers*. Delpit suggests that it is easy for white teachers to not take black children seriously and they often really don't care if they learn. Written some time ago, this book is a clear call for many of the interventions that the Niagara program has taken to assure that graduates are ready, willing and able to teach every student.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Education and democracy*, Boston: Heath.

One of two (Dewey, 1938) books that present the philosophy that underlies the research supporting constructivism. School is for producing democratic thinking citizens who wish to prosper in and improve a diverse society. Powerful experiences in thoughtful classrooms will achieve this.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*, New York: Collier Books.

The second of two (Dewey, 1916) books that present the philosophy that underlies the research supporting constructivism. School is for producing democratic thinking citizens who wish to prosper in and improve a diverse society. Powerful experiences in thoughtful classrooms will achieve this.

Draper, R. (2002). School mathematics reform, constructivism, and literacy: A case for literacy instruction in the reform-oriented math classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(6), 520-530.

This article brings student-centered, constructivist practice to the teaching of math. This is an important concept because math and science are often considered subjects that do not align well with these practices. The article promotes literacy as a constructivist practice to facilitate mathematics learning.

Duckworth, E. (1996). *The having of wonderful ideas and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Duckworth was a student of Piaget and gained a great deal of insight into his cognitive views of learning. This book provides a vision for school reform based on constructivist practice.

- Duffy, T. & Jonassen, D. (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of instruction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.  
This book is a conversation among intellectuals about constructivist theory and instructional practice. It is a resource for developing a strong background in learning theory.
- Eby, J., Herrell, A. & Hicks, J. (2002). *Reflective planning: Teaching and evaluation: K-12*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.  
This text promotes reflective practice among pre-service teachers. This is an excellent methods text that covers all of the aspects of the INTASC standards.
- Egan, M. (2007). Reflective thinking: The essence of professional development, *Excelsior: Leadership in Teaching and Learning*, 2, 1, 1-13.  
The author, a leader in NYACTE, provides a strategy for student teacher supervisors to develop the reflective practice in new professionals. Theoretically sound and practically based, this piece also gives clear direction for how a Teacher Education program can improve reflective process throughout the program.
- Elias, M.J. & Arnold, H. (eds) (2006). *The educators' guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement: Socio-emotional learning in the classroom*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.  
Students who do well academically usually exhibit emotional health and positive social skills. This text describes specific programs and ideas for young educators to implement effective socio-emotional approaches in their classroom learning experiences.
- Ferraro, J. (2000). Reflective practice and professional development. *ERIC Digest*, ED449120.  
Although the author of this article gives a great deal of attention to reflective practice in the domain of professional development for teachers, she also provides a history of the concept of reflective practice in the field of education. Schon (1987) and Dewey are given credit for the roots of this movement.
- Flynn, P., Mesibov, D., Vermette, P. and Smith, R.M. (2004). *Applying standards-based constructivism: A two-step guide for motivating middle and high school students*, Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.  
One of two texts (Flynn, et al., 2007) describing how constructivism can be implemented in classrooms through the use of the Two-Step model. The text offers tried, tested and real world examples. It integrates research into a framework to assist teachers in engaging every learner.
- Flynn, P., Mesibov, D., Vermette, P. and Smith, M. (2007). Self-published.  
One of two texts (Flynn, et al., 2004) describing how constructivism can be implemented in classrooms through the use of the Two-Step model. The

text offers tried, tested and real world examples. It integrates research into a framework to assist teachers in engaging every learner.

Foote, C., Vermette, P. & Battaglia C. (2001). *Constructivist strategies: Meeting standards and engaging adolescent minds*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

This book is designed to actively engage pre-service and in-service secondary teachers in reflective practice about student-centered teaching.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner promotes an approach to intelligence that is highly student-centered and suggests practices that encourage learning based on his theory of Multiple Intelligences.

Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*, New York: Harper & Row

Control theory is later re-conceptualized as Choice theory, Glasser suggests that humans are in control of their own lives, especially their thinking processes. He explains why allowing student choice in assignments and student responsibility for decisions produces the most powerful education.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Multiple Intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner explains his theory of eight ways to be intelligent. The author suggests that working to student strengths should produce the deepest understanding in each student.

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons*. New York: Basic Books..

Gardner to elaborates on his theory of eight ways to be intelligent. The author concludes that working to student strengths will produce the deepest understanding.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

The author concurs with Gardner's theories that intra-personal and interpersonal capacities are indeed powerful and useful intelligences. Together with Gardner's books it describes why this approach is credible and offers suggestion for implementation.

Good, T.L. & Brophy, J. (2008). *Looking in classrooms (10<sup>th</sup> ed)*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

A comprehensive educational text that offers the definitive evidence and support for the approaches implemented at Niagara University. It offers balance between old style, teacher effects research and more current research methods. It also includes a discussion on classroom management and motivation.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

More than twenty years ago, this massive research study found that school is irrelevant and focuses on teaching useless information in passive ways. This negative vision of education is in contrast to a successful educational program. The author also critiques standardized testing, suggesting that it does not provide the answer to education's problems.

Harris, K. & Graham, S. (1994). *Constructivism: Principles, paradigms, and integration*. SOURCE??

This article is a primer for constructivist practice with students with disabilities. It also offers a great summary of the various forms of constructivism.

Henderson, J. (1996). *Reflective teaching : A study of your constructivist practices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

This is a text for the advanced graduate teacher education programs. It helps new teachers to reflect upon their own practices and become teacher leaders for student-centered approaches.

Hyerle, D. (1996). *Visual tools for constructing knowledge*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

This book provides effective tools for promoting learning in a constructivist fashion. It can be used as a methods or foundations supplemental text.

Johnson, B. (2003). *The student-centered classroom handbook*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

This book is the first in a series to promote constructivist practice in secondary content classrooms. This book is beneficial for pre-service and practicing social studies teachers.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

A valuable first book on cooperative learning including: how to do it, why it works, and what to avoid.

Jones, K., Jones, J., & Vermette, P. (2008). *Constructivist perspectives of learning: Applying the theories of Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky and Bruner to the middle School mathematics classroom*, Manuscript under review.

Former students, now practitioners, collaborated with a faculty member to interpret the major constructivist theorists that they now implement in the classroom. This is one of two "practice-into-theory-into practice" articles that summarize a major theory and applies it to teaching and learning.

Jones, K., Jones, J., Vermette, P. & Kline, C. (2008). Using the works of Glasser, Goleman and Gardner to improve student UNDERSTANDING: Why these theorists MATTER to middle level educators. Manuscript under review.

Former students, now practitioners, collaborated with a faculty member to interpret the major constructivist theorists that they now implement in the classroom. This is one of two “practice-into-theory-into practice” articles that summarize a major theory, applies it to teaching and learning.

Jones, J., Jones, K., and Vermette, P. (2008). Teachers thinking about student thinking: An application of key concepts in teacher education. Manuscript under review.

In traditional classrooms, teachers think about what they are saying to learners. In a constructivist classroom, they are thinking about what the learners are thinking. The same is true in a teacher education class and the authors contend that there are about three dozen critically important concepts for novices to internalize. Concepts are identified, presented in a graphic organizer and applicable for developing the knowledge base of a pre-service candidate.

Klein, M. (1998). Constructivist practice in pre-service teacher education in mathematics: Reproducing and affirming the status quo? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(1), 75-86.

This article explores the challenges of integrating constructivist practice with mathematics instruction. In particular the author proposes an alternative mathematics to challenge cultural, sexist, and racist assumptions common in this field.

Kohn, A. (2006). The tougher standards fad hits home: Invoking “accountability” and “competitiveness” to justify homework, *Rethinking Schools (Fall)*, 32-39.

School improvement does not mean more, harder and longer according to Kohn, the champion of thoughtful, differentiated and personalized instruction. Kohn says what we need in our classrooms is instruction that support children, allows for freedom of thought, and fosters collaboration and social interaction.

Knapp, M. (1995). *Teaching for meaning in high poverty classrooms*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Knapp’s research team concludes with extensive evidence that inner city students need constructivist and naturally differentiated practice instead of “drill and kill.”

Kuntz, K., McLaughlin, T., Howard, V. (2001). A comparison of cooperative learning and small group individualized instruction for math in a self-contained classroom for elementary students with disabilities. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 24(3), 41-56.

This paper illustrates how the student-centered practices of cooperative learning and individualized instruction facilitate mathematics learning

among students at-risk. The work employed in this study presents the process-product orientation.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American Children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billing studied eight teachers who were able to effectively teach low-income, black children and found that, while their teaching styles and personalities were very different, they all used constructivist practices. In addition these exemplary teachers had a distinct commitment to issues of social justice especially race consciousness.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching: The case for culturally relevant pedagogy, *Theory into Practice*, 34(3),159-165.

A shorter version of her book this article puts additional stress on the societal aspects of culturally relevant teaching (CRT) because it helps students see a clear purpose behind their school learning.

Lagemann, E. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

This book analyzes the process-product view of educational research by exploring the major issues in the field.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M., Gardner, M., Slack, P. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.

This book explores how educational leaders can implement constructivist philosophies within their practice.

Leinhart, G. (1992). What research on learning tells us about teaching. *Educational Leadership*, April, 20-25.

This article summarizes the research on multiple kinds of knowledge, the role of prior knowledge, and social and cultural roles in learning. It promotes a constructivist orientation.

Linn, M. (2001). An American educator reflects on the meaning of the Reggio experience. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(4), 332-335.

This paper presents information on the Reggio Emilia model for early childhood instruction. This model is aligned with our constructivist orientation.

Marlowe, B. & Page, M. (1998). *Creating and sustaining the constructivist classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

This book provides an historical perspective on the roots of constructivism and answers many questions teachers have about the practices associated with this orientation.

Mayer, R. (2004). Should there be a three-strike rule against pure discovery learning? The case for guided methods of instruction, *American Psychologist*, 59, 1, 14-20.

Constructivism is not a free for all or anything goes theory of learning. Mayer describes the role that scaffolding plays in student conceptualizations.

Mercer, C., Jordan, L. (1994). Implications of constructivism for teaching math to students with moderate to mild disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 28(3), 290-307.

This paper examines the relevance of constructivism in the teaching of math to students with disabilities. It has important insights for a population who too often is limited to more teacher-centered approaches.

Mikusa, M., Lewellen, H. (1999). Discuss with your colleagues: Now here is that authority on mathematics reform, Dr. Constructivist! *Mathematics Teacher*, 92(2), 158-164.

This article suggests ways to help mathematics teachers implement constructivist practices.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2002). *What the research shows: Breaking ranks in action*. Reston, VA: NASSP.

This book identifies the results of significant research studies that demonstrate that student-centered, process-product, and reflective practice orientations are key to successful teaching and learning.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass..

The best book by the leading "care" theorist. This text describes how emotion encourages learner development in cognitive and socio-emotional ways.

Novick, L. & Holyoak, K. (1991). Mathematical problem solving by analogy. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*. 17(3), 398-415.

This study provides empirical evidence for constructivist learning theory. It is an exploration of schema development and transfer.

Nuthall, G. (2000). The anatomy of memory in the classroom: Understanding how students acquire memory processes from classroom activities in science and social studies units. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 247-304.

This study explores the basis of memory for students as they learn in classroom settings. It provides research to support a schema-based model for memory.

Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text, *Reading Teacher*, 39, 564-570.

The author describes his popular K-W-L model.

Olsen, D. (1999). Constructivist principles of learning and teaching methods. *Education, 120(2)*, 247-356.

This is a quick read to provide background on constructivism and implications for teaching.

Osterman, K. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community, *Review of Educational Research, 70,3*,323-367.

How important is "belonging" to students trying to learn ? Just about everything, according to this researcher, who reviews all the available evidence through the end of the century.

Perkins, D. (1992). *Smart Schools: Better Thinking and Learning for Every Child*. New York: Free Press.

This book explores the ways that schools can change to better serve students. The recommended strategies are aligned with our philosophical orientations.

Perkins, D. (1999). The many faces of constructivism, *Educational Leadership, 57,3*, 6-11.

Perkins, a leading constructivist thinker, offers his ideas about how to develop standards-based student understanding (not recall) in learners. These pieces explore the various schools of thought about constructivism and understanding and offer suggestions about implementation.

Perkins, D. (1998). What is understanding ? in Wiske, M.S. (ed), *Teaching for Understanding: Linking research and practice*, San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Perkins, a leading constructivist thinker, offers his ideas about how to develop standards-based student understanding (not recall) in learners. These pieces explore the various schools of thought about constructivism and understanding and offer suggestions about implementation.

Phillips, D.C. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher, 24(7)*,5-12.

This article provides a comprehensive review of the literature on constructivism.

Prawat, R. (1992). Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning: A constructivist perspective. *American Journal of Education, May 1992*, 354-395.

This article was one of the first shared by colleagues in the department that spurred us to move to articulate constructivism in our conceptual framework. It is a comprehensive view of the theory and it offers insight into school climate factors that may interfere with adopting this approach to teaching.

Prevost, F. J. (1996). A new way of teaching. *Journal of Education*. 178(1), 49-60.

This article brings constructivist practice and the academic content area of mathematics together. It explores how teaching must change to engage students in mathematics learning.

Pugalee, D. (2001). Algebra for all: The role of technology and constructivism in an algebra course for at-risk students. *Preventing School Failure*, 45(4), 171-177.

This article discusses the importance of integrating technology and student-centered approaches to ensure that all students meet mathematics standards.

Rauff, J. (1994). Constructivism, factoring, and beliefs. *School Science & Mathematics*. 94(8). 421-427.

This article links constructivism to the beliefs students develop as they learn mathematics.

Richardson, V. ed. (1997). *Constructivist Teacher Education*. London: Falmer Press.

This is an excellent edited book on the theory, research, and practice of constructivist teacher education.

Rothstein, R. (2004). *Class and schooling: Using social, economic and educational reform to close the Black-White achievement gap*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute,

The problems referred to as the Achievement Gap are not just those of the classroom teacher” many of them are societal issues requiring great amounts of financial support. This text puts effective instruction in its correct context and the Reform Movement as part of the bigger picture. This has been read widely by top level officials responsible for policy making in the State.

Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. USA: Basic Books.

In this seminal look at reflective practice, Schon explores problem solving in the professions of engineering, architecture, management, psychotherapy and town planning. Schon provides insight into how reflection in action contributes to the quality of work of an outstanding professional.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

This book is a follow-up to Schon (1983). It focuses on the practices that should be used in schools preparing professionals.

Schwartz, D.L. & Bransford, J. (1998). A time for telling, *Cognition and Instruction*, 16, 4, 475-522.

When should one lecture? When should students read? According to this study, information is most beneficial after learners have raised significant and personalized questions. So they explore, play with ideas and then expose students to information they seek. Finally they apply their ideas and reflect on the process.

Sheeran, T. & Sheeran, M. (????) *Schools, Schooling and Teachers; A Curriculum for the Future. NASSP Bulletin. 80 (580). 47-56.*

This article provides the reader with insight into the constructivist nature of curriculum as envisioned for the future of schooling.

Smerdon, B., Burkam, D., & Lee, V. (1999). Access to constructivist and didactic teaching: Who gets it? Where is it practiced? *Teachers College Record*, 101(1), 5-34.

This study examines the implementation of constructivist practices and suggests that students of average social and academic status are most likely to get didactic instruction. Recommendations for policy change are offered.

Stodolosky, S.S. & Grossman, P.L. (2000). Changing students, changing teaching, *Teachers College Record*, 102, 1, 125-172.

In a well developed case study, the authors found that the English and Math teachers who created student-centered learning experiences found greater success with all adolescent students than did those using a traditional teaching model.

Tomlinson, C.A. & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction + understanding by design*, Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

This book aligns two powerful frameworks: differentiation and Understanding by Design. These paired theories are significant in the planning process.

Vermette, P. (1994). Four fatal flaws: Avoiding the common mistakes of novice users of cooperative learning, *The High School Journal*, 255-260.

Secondary teachers make four basic mistakes when implementing cooperative learning. The author discusses these mistakes and suggests alternatives for using cooperative learning effectively.

Vermette, P. (2008). Teaching teens as if they MATTER: ENGAGING adolescents in their own educations. Larchmont, NY: Eye-on-Education (expected publication May 2008).

The author has identified eight (8) factors using the mnemonic ENGAGING. The book helps teachers reach every student. The text is built on the constructivist framework and can be used as a basic text for secondary student teachers.

Vermette, P. (1998). *Making Cooperative Learning Work: Student Teams in K-12 Classrooms*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

This book is written using the constructivist framework and actively engages the reader throughout. Designed for pre-service and practicing teachers, the book helps educators to understand the theory, research, processes, and assessment strategies associated with cooperative learning.

Wandberg, R. & Rohwer, J. (2003). *Teaching to the Standards of Effective Practice: A Guide to Becoming a Successful Teacher*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

This book is a methods or seminar supplemental text. It is written in an interactive fashion to promote the learning of teacher candidates. It is aligned to the INTASC standards.

Wasserman, S. (2007). Let's have a famine ! Connecting means and ends in teaching big ideas, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89,4, 290-297.

An activity without reflection will not support student learning. The author provides information for teachers creating "hand-on, minds-on" learning experiences.

Willingham, D.T. (2006). The usefulness of BRIEF instruction in reading comprehension strategies, *American Educator*, AFT, 30-45, 50.

Written for practitioners, this article shares conceptual reading strategies and underscores the problem of students who know the strategies but do not remember them or choose to use them.

Windschitl (1999). The challenge of sustaining a constructivist classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1999, 751-755.

This article provides clear and concise information for teachers wishing to implement constructivist practices who are facing challenges within the current educational system.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 131-175.

This article is a favorite for those challenged with implementing constructivist practices. It offers a solid theoretical perspective and support for teachers struggling to become more student-centered.

Wong, L. (1995). Research on teaching: Process-product research findings and the feeling of obviousness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 504-511.

In this article Wong provides support for conducting process-product research. It illustrates the importance of educational research.

Zahorik, J. (1995). *Constructivist Teaching*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.  
This booklet was distributed in 1998 and provided the stimulus for initial discussion on constructivism. This provides a history of constructivist philosophy and presents important implications for teaching.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective Teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.  
This book encompasses all major aspects of reflective practice with teacher candidates. Credit is given to Donald Schon's (1983) views of the reflective practitioner and Dewey's theories as the foundation for reflection in learning.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H. & Hyde, A. (1998). *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.  
The authors of this book recommend content-specific practices that are aligned with the philosophical orientation of the College of Education.

DRAFT

## ADDENDUM

- DeVries, R., Zan, B., Hildebrandt, C., Edmiaston, R. & Sales, C. (2002). *Developing Constructivist Early Childhood Curriculum: Practical principles and activities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, John. (1964/1974). The Process and product of reflective activity: Psychological process and logical form (1933): In R. D. Archambault (Ed.) Rpt. in *John Dewey On Education: Selected Writings*.: University of Chicago Press. 242-259.
- Dewey, J. (1964/1974). "What Psychology Can Do For The Teacher" (1895): Rpt. In *John Dewey On Education: Selected Writings*. Ed. Reginald D. Archambault:Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 108-138.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *How we think*. Toronto: Dover Publications Inc.
- Diez, M. (2007) Looking back and moving forward: Three tensions in the teacher dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58:5, 388-396.
- Eisner, E. (1999). "The kinds of schools we need" *Interchange*. 15(2), 1-12.
- Eisner, Elliot. (1993). Why standards may not improve schools. *Educational Leadership*, 50(5), 22-23.
- Eisner, E. (1999). "The uses and limits of performance assessment, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(9), 658-660.
- Lederman, N. G., & Niess, M. L. (1999). Rubric's cube. *School Science and Mathematics*, 99(3), 113-115.
- Moskal, B. (2000). Scoring rubrics part II: What, when and how? *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 7(3). Retrieved November 7, 2003, from <http://pareonline.net/genpare.asp?wh=6&abt=Scoring%20rubrics>
- Pomplun, M., Capps, L., & Sundbye, N. (1998). Criteria teachers use to score performance items. *Educational Assessment*, 5(2), 95-110.
- VanTassel-Baska (1986) *Effective Curriculum and Instructional Models for Talented Students* (1986)
- VanTassel-Baska (1997) *A Problem-based Curriculum: Parallel Learning Opportunities for Students and Teachers*
- VanTassel-Baska (2002) *Curriculum Planning & Instructional Design for Gifted Learners* (2002)

Wenzlaff, T., Fager, J., & Coleman, M. (1999). What is a rubric? Do practitioners and the literature agree? *Contemporary Education*, 70(4), 41-47.

Zozakiewicz, C. & Rodriguez, A. (2007) Using Sociotransformative Constructivism to create Multicultural and Gender-Inclusive Classrooms. An intervention Project for Teacher professional development.  
Incorporates a constructivist framework into a multicultural setting.

DRAFT