

Framing a New Standard for Teaching in Alberta

John E. Hull

The King's University College

'A paper first presented to the Expert Panel mandated by Alberta Education to prepare a research-based framework for the development of a new Teaching Quality Standard'

A research panel asked to frame the discussion for a new Teaching Quality Standard in Alberta assumes this task requires a paradigm shift away from the status quo efficiency movement. As a member of the panel, the author provides an analysis of paradigm shifts in education and recounts important lessons to be learned. The author challenges the notion that the alternative paradigm posed by an emerging knowledge society provides the best framework to define quality teaching. To accentuate the centrality of relationships, the author offers culture-making as a preferred paradigm where who teachers are is valued as much as what teachers do.

Un groupe de recherche à qui on a demandé de délimiter une discussion sur une nouvelle norme pour la qualité de l'enseignement en Alberta part du principe que la tâche exige que l'on délaisse le mouvement actuel prônant l'efficacité. L'auteur, membre de ce groupe de recherche, analyse les changements de paradigme en éducation et rappelle les leçons importantes à tirer de cette évolution. L'auteur conteste la notion que le paradigme alternatif que pose la société de la connaissance émergente constitue la meilleure base sur laquelle axer l'enseignement de qualité. Il propose plutôt un paradigme reposant sur la création de la culture selon lequel les enseignants sont appréciés pour ce qu'ils sont autant que pour ce qu'ils font.

In December 2011, the Professional Standards Branch of Alberta Education commissioned the Association of Alberta Deans of Education (AADE) to provide the government with a research-based framework to develop a new Teaching Quality Standard (TQS) in the Province. The deans understood both the significance of this request and the relevance of its timing: the current TQS document was 15 years old and the government's desire for a new standard was part of a bigger push to rewrite the province's 25 year old School Act. AADE struck an expert panel from within its ranks to answer the government's prescribed research question: *What competencies do teachers need to support students to be engaged, ethical, and entrepreneurial citizens?* Although the government's phrasing of the question contained a strong bias, the panel hoped its work would generate an unfettered dialogue leading to an Alberta consensus on quality teaching. On March 20, 2012, AADE submitted its report entitled *A Framework of Effective Teaching for Learning*.

Early in its consultations, the expert panel adopted the position that good teaching is best characterized with a paradigm shift towards an emerging *knowledge society* and away from the traditional *efficiency model* of teaching. My contribution included the provision of a critical perspective on this paradigm shift and I provided this to the panel during the generation of the framework. The position paper I submitted to the panel is presented here in three parts: the first provides an analysis of paradigm shifts generally and of some specific implications this latest shift has for our understanding of good teaching; in the second, I appeal for balance as the panel navigates this paradigm shift; third, I explore the category of relationships as a necessary component of a TQS document, a strategy that leads to the conclusion that our efforts to define good teaching may take us beyond the parameters of the efficiency versus knowledge society paradigm war.

Reflections on a Paradigm Shift to the Knowledge Society

As our panel contemplates how best to frame the revision of Alberta's TQS, it is paramount that we critically evaluate a fundamental shift that many believe is taking place in our society. Our colleague, Sharon Friesen (2009), provided us with a succinct summary of the reigning efficiency movement paradigm and its origin. She echoed the many school reform voices of the past when she stated the "efficiency model of learning is fundamentally flawed" (pp. 2-3). The shortcomings of this brand of education have been well documented over the last 60 years, but to the chagrin of most school reformers, the efficiency movement has persisted as the status quo.

Quoting Gilbert (2005), Friesen summed up a contemporary perspective on the limitations of the efficiency model with the charge that its conceptions of knowledge, minds, and learning are out of step with the 21st Century situation. Friesen (2009) described that situation as "a world where what we know is less important than (*sic*) what we are able to do with knowledge in different contexts and where our capacity for learning far outweighs the importance of our ability to follow rules" (p. 3).

Writ large, the emerging paradigm is often referred to as the knowledge society. Following a well-established pattern in school reform initiatives, this latest challenge to efficiency-driven education is derived from new insights into learning theory. In agreement with the other members of the panel, I reject the traditional paradigm's mechanical conceptualization of the mind with its emphasis on memory and problem solving routines. *Knowledge* within the efficiency movement means the possession in memory of information, and *achieve understanding* means one must be able to recognize which problem solving type a particular problem exemplifies and be able to apply the appropriate problem-solving method. To overcome these limited meanings this new post-modern paradigm downplays knowledge and understanding in favour of *learning to learn*.

Although the prospect of knocking the reigning mechanistic view of knowledge off its throne is appealing, I also have reservations about the emerging paradigm's alternative solution. The new 21st Century paradigm wants to elevate the learning process while depressing the significance of knowledge acquisition. The need to draw teachers' attention to worthwhile and visible learning is undeniable; Hattie's (2009, 2012) work makes a compelling case for this long overdue emphasis. I am not convinced however, that knowledge must be placed on the back seat, or worse, considered irrelevant as a consequence. If there was a better understanding of knowledge to replace the machine-like model that dominates, I wonder if there would still be an

eagerness to subjugate the acquisition of knowledge to the learning process. For my part, I am still pondering this and other basic questions such as: Is *what* we know insignificant compared to *how* we know? Is knowing how they learn THE most important knowledge for students to possess? Should teachers be experts in learning only, or should they be experts in teaching as well? What underlying worldview wants an education where what we know and teaching are devalued in favour of how we know and learning?

I return to these essential questions later in the paper, but first I want to briefly explore the history of paradigm warfare in education because it provides us with useful insights as we develop a TQS framework. Years ago, Yvonna Lincoln (1988) observed that dominant paradigms have a way of usurping the power of alternative agendas. Writing about conflicting paradigms of inquiry, Lincoln (1988) coined the term *latent paradigm syndrome* to refer to an incumbent paradigm's capacity to supply the criteria by which the ideas and initiatives of a new paradigm are evaluated. This revelation helped Lincoln explain why efforts to establish an alternative paradigm are so often hijacked and pushed off course. Lincoln's insight has proven beneficial for my own research in the field of curriculum theory and in the next section, I will share some of the lessons I have learned.

Lessons in paradigm warfare

In the field of curriculum theory, the term *traditional education* no longer applies to the venerable liberal arts approach; rather, it designates the much younger efficiency movement in education, or to be precise, the *curriculum as technology* orientation. Curriculum theorists who have surveyed the main perspectives that make up this field of education typically juxtapose the status quo curriculum as a technology approach with non-traditional school reform movements such as progressivism, humanism, critical pedagogy, reconceptualism, post-structuralism, and post-modernism (Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Jackson, 1992; McNeil, 1977; Tanner & Tanner, 1980). The staying power of this traditional curriculum orientation is particularly evident in two realities that surprisingly have received little attention. I contend that both of these realities exemplify Lincoln's (1988) notion of the latent paradigm syndrome.

The first reality pertains to the usual way educators experience the curriculum as technology orientation. In a field made up of four or five orientations from which educators and government officials can choose to design and deliver curriculum content, there are two major orientations, the dominant curriculum as technology orientation and its chief antagonist, the *child-centered* orientation, plus two minor orientations, the *liberal arts* orientation and the *social reform* orientation. Over the decades, the child-centered orientation has gone by various names such as progressive education, humanist education, critical pedagogy, post-structuralism, and post-modernism.

All four orientations have made significant and enduring contributions to the field of curriculum theory and practice. For instance, the ubiquitous organization of curriculum into subject disciplines is rooted in the liberal arts orientation while the social reform orientation provided us with many of the loftiest goals in education. The child-centered orientation emphasized developmentally appropriate and personalized approaches to learning and supplied most of the pedagogical insights. The status quo, curriculum as technology orientation defined knowledge and learning in the form of quantifiable and measurable outcomes, and it provided an assessment system that defined educational success.

The interplay between these orientations is difficult to sort out at the classroom level. Their distinct agendas sometimes co-exist peacefully and occasionally, they even reinforce one another. At strategic times however, they present us with deeply conflicted visions of education. What typically happens when these orientations clash unfolds more or less as follows: teaching innovations become co-opted, defused, and marginalized by the dominant curriculum as technology orientation because of its heavy-handed emphasis on efficiency, standardization, and measurement of learning. The assessment industry has so frequently trumped pedagogical innovations it has been nicknamed *the tail that wags the curriculum dog*. This creates frustrated reformers who are left wondering why schools are so resistant to substantive changes to teaching and learning. The answer is both complex and elusive, as the huge body of literature on school reform can testify.

At the risk of oversimplifying an answer, I believe that substantive school reform regularly fails because the curriculum as technology orientation maintains a startling position relative to the others. It successfully masquerades as the one orientation that is neither a philosophy nor has a philosophy. Many would-be reformers in government and in schools are deceived by this orientation's image as the most effective vehicle available to deliver curricular/educational innovations regardless of their philosophical origins. Disguised as a tool lacking any biases of its own, curriculum as technology dominates its opponents by forcing their reforms to conform to its *embedded assumptions* about knowledge, minds, learning, and especially, assessment. To use McLuhan's (1964) vernacular, the curriculum as technology approach functions both as the medium and the message.

The second reality that illustrates Lincoln's (1988) latent paradigm syndrome shows up in the way teachers teach. All classroom teachers, most unwittingly, adopt an *additive approach* to teaching. Unable to consistently teach from a preferred orientation, teachers are compelled to teach from all of them simultaneously. Given the inherent conflicts that exist in these major orientations at critical junctures, teachers often find themselves in impossible circumstances. For example, they are required to acknowledge and teach to individual student needs and learning styles utilizing a variety of teaching methods, while at the same time they are accountable to teach a single prescribed curriculum to all students that is ultimately verified by high stakes, standardized exams. For decades, teachers have espoused support for innovative teaching methods, but most settle for much less in their classrooms because of the entrenched values and priorities established by the efficiency movement.

There are a few points for the expert panel to consider from the historic paradigm wars in the field of curriculum theory. As we develop a research-based framework for writing a new TQS, we should, first and foremost, be wary of using the efficiency orientation as the vehicle for implementing a vision of teaching that we hope will guide our province for the next two decades or more. Specifically, we should avoid using that orientation's priorities and universe of discourse to describe a new vision of teaching, and we definitely should refrain from evaluating the merits of any new paradigm for teaching with the established criteria popularized by the efficiency movement. If the language and the criteria that define successful teaching and learning in the old paradigm cannot be circumnavigated, the knowledge society paradigm will likely not become the new normal, despite the bluster and optimism exhibited by its proponents. Like Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (1995) and their post-structuralist colleagues, the proponents of the new knowledge society may end up reaching the sour conclusion that their alternative paradigm has arrived in theory, but not in the classroom. If history teaches us anything about navigating a complete paradigm shift away from the efficiency movement, we

should be concerned about defining good teaching in terms of competencies, which as we well know, is the key term in the research question provided to us by the government!

The history of paradigm wars in education also teaches us that paradigm shifts are not always as substantive as we assume them to be. Cremin's (1961) work is most helpful in this regard. He traced the efficiency movement, the child-centered education movement, and the social reconstruction movement to the same origin: all were rooted in that broad late 19th and early 20th centuries social movement known as progressivism. Proponents of these distinct strands of progressivism shared a common goal in their pursuit of human liberation from all kinds of traditional authority structures. One value-structure rationalized them all: the modern dream of a strong, unified, scientifically organized society filled with virtuous, educated, and free individuals all living up to their human potentialities. However, their chosen paths toward achieving this modern, secular goal proved to be divisive, especially in education. Within the vast social reform movement once known as progressivism, there has been something for everyone to attack. As a consequence, the shared fundamental ideals of progress and human freedom remained largely unnoticed.

When a replacement paradigm is not rooted in a fundamentally different worldview framework from the paradigm currently in place, any proclaimed paradigm shift will be less substantive than advertised. What we are likely to observe are surface changes of personality or methodology, not foundational differences. When this panel puts forward a framework for revising the TQS, we should be clear about the underlying assumptions the 21st Century paradigm presents to us. We should determine how fundamentally different the inherent assumptions of this paradigm really are. Equally important, we should evaluate the merits of these assumptions.

To conclude this first section, I want to reference a warning made several years ago concerning the emergence of a knowledge society. Hargreaves (2003) states:

Like other forms of capitalism, the knowledge economy is, in Joseph Schumpeter's terms, a force of creative destruction. It stimulates growth and prosperity, but its relentless pursuit of profit and self-interest also strains and fragments the social order. Along with other public institutions, our schools must therefore, also foster the compassion, community, and cosmopolitan identity that will offset the knowledge economy's most destructive effects. (p. 1)

These sobering words strongly suggest that any new vision for teaching that we put forward in Alberta should not only put distance between us and the old efficiency paradigm, but it should address the capacity of teachers to engage the emerging knowledge society. Knowledge is vital because as Hargreaves (2003) implies, it is the knowledge that teachers and students need in order to understand how this emerging knowledge society operates as a force of creative destruction. To offset the destructive consequences implicit in our society's 21st Century economic system, teachers and their students will have to know what it means to be human and what it looks like to become dehumanized. They will have to know what compassion looks like, what it means to live in a community, and what being a world citizen entails.

If we assume that the backdrop for our revision of the TQS is best understood in terms of a paradigm shift away from the efficiency movement, there are important lessons that we can learn from the recent history of paradigm warfare in education. I suggest all of the following lessons and their guiding questions are relevant to our work:

1. Education paradigms are always expressions of bigger social paradigms.
 - Are we happy with the direction that education is being pulled?
 - Should education be a mirror of society or a light for society?
2. Old paradigms are extremely difficult to remove, because they dictate the rules of reform for new initiatives.
 - Will the use of competencies and concerns about accountability prevent us from escaping the old paradigm's view of teaching?
 - What different criteria are appropriate for evaluating a new vision for teaching?
3. New paradigms typically present us with high stakes and absolute choices that may not actually be absolute or even necessary to make.
 - Must we choose between the polarities discussed in part two of this paper?
4. Although a new paradigm may appear to offer what reformers have long hoped for, the alternative may pose serious problems of its own.
 - What new vision of teaching will address warnings such as those made by Hargreaves (2003)?
 - As important as evidence based research is, is it the sole source of insight and wisdom upon which we should draw our conclusions about quality teaching?

A Call for Balance

It feels like the 21st Century desire to part-company with a technical, efficiency view of teaching requires us to make unnecessary choices. For example, I get the distinct impression that 21st Century teachers are supposed to become *experts in learning*, not *experts in teaching*. I understand why some contemporary educators find it necessary to say this, but I find it an unfortunate polarization. If we assume a balance between expertise in teaching and expertise in learning is critical to a healthy view of quality teaching, the headings in our current draft are weighted too heavily in favour of expertise in learning. Three of the current headings make reference to “worthwhile learning for all students,” and the word teaching appears only once in the whole outline. Of course, everything depends on how we eventually flesh out these sections, but we seem headed down a path that reinforces this unfortunate imbalance.

We have correctly placed Hattie's (2009, 2012) monumental works at the centre of our literature review. From reading Hattie's works, I feel it does not make sense for expertise in learning to overshadow expertise in teaching. His second signpost of excellence in education clearly stated that, “teachers need to be directive, influential, caring, and actively and passionately engaged in the process of teaching and learning” (Hattie, 2009, p. 238).

Hattie obviously demonstrated that an emphasis on learning has been severely lacking in the traditional, status quo approach to teaching. We make an equally critical mistake if we over balance our view of teaching in the opposite direction. Our vision for teaching should not neglect learning or teaching and our framework should presuppose that teachers should be experts in learning and in teaching.

The polarity between learning and teaching is directly connected to a second false polarity: the juxtaposition of what we learn (content knowledge) with how we learn (process knowledge). Today we often hear what Hattie (2012) said in his fifth signpost of excellence in education, “it is

not the knowledge or ideas, but the learner's construction of this knowledge and ideas that is critical" (p. 19).

An emphasis on students' construction of their own knowledge is greatly needed, because it has been missing in our schools for so long. However, knowledge and ideas are critical for Hattie. The central message of his book "is to enable each teacher to better understand his or her effect on his or her students, and to assist teachers to develop a mind frame of evaluation to help them to move into the group of highly effective teachers (that is, those who regularly have impacts $d < .40$) that we all should be inspired to join" (Hattie, 2012, p. 33).

Further to this, Hattie placed knowledge at the top of his list of bullets that define the *Expert Teacher*. The first bullet says expert teachers must "have high levels of knowledge and understanding of the subjects that they teach" (Hattie, 2012, p. 4). The list continues with three areas of expertise concerning student learning, then concludes with a reference to expertise that provides "defensible evidence of positive impacts of the teaching on student learning" (Hattie, 2012, p. 4).

The clincher for me is that Hattie does not sacrifice knowledge on the altar of learning. This can be seen in the unpacking of his term *critical evaluation*. Hattie (2012) contends:

Such critical evaluation is what is asked of teachers and school leaders. This development of critical evaluation skills requires educators to develop their students' capacity to see the world from the viewpoint of others, to understand human weaknesses and injustices, and to work towards developing cooperation and working with others. It requires educators to develop in their students a genuine concern for self and others, to teach the importance of evidence to counter stereotypes and closed thinking, to promote accountability of the person as responsible agent, and to vigorously promote critical thinking and the importance of dissenting voices. All of this depends on subject matter knowledge, because enquiry and critical evaluation is not divorced from knowing something. This notion of critical evaluation is a core notion throughout this book—and particularly in that teachers and school leaders need to be critical evaluators of the effect that they are having on their students. (p. 4)

For Hattie, critical evaluation represents a fundamental kind of knowledge. One expression of this kind of knowledge refers to teachers knowing the effect that they are having on their students. The fact that there are other expressions of this kind of knowledge could be easily missed since Hattie's (2012) book concentrates on this neglected expression almost exclusively. The constant refrain about the importance of teachers knowing their effect on students for visible learning is not the only reference point of critical evaluation. In the first chapter of his book, Hattie (2012) stated "[although this] book is concerned with achievement; we require much more, however, from our schools than mere achievement" (p. 3).

The more which Hattie referred to is students becoming people who can meaningfully engage in political, social, and cultural issues while maintaining the respect and well being for others—even those with different views. This kind of education is not typical of an instrumentalist approach to knowing and will not evolve from constructivism, which emphasizes the freedom of choice to students. Instead, this education requires the same kind of knowledge that Hargreaves (2003) called for that I cited earlier in the paper.

These first two unfortunate polarities dovetail into a third one, the separation of *what teachers do* (expressed as competencies) from *who teachers are* (expressed as visionaries and role models). Consequently, the shift to the knowledge society paradigm suggests that we:

<u>Promote</u>		<u>Neglect</u>
1. (Experts in) Learning	and	(Experts in) Teaching.
2. Learning (how to learn)	and	Knowledge (what we learn).
3. What teachers should do (competencies)	and	Who teachers are (visionaries and role models).

The government produced early drafts of the TQS and prompted the notion to define good teaching with a set of competencies. This early work promoted the view that quality teaching can be captured with a list of measurable actions. Hattie's work also promotes the idea that what teacher's do matters, but he warned against allowing this cliché to obscure from us the fact that the truth lies with this codicil, "what 'some' teachers do matters—especially those who teach in a most deliberate and visible manner" (Hattie, 2009, p. 22). The variance between ineffective and effective teaching goes well beyond observable actions. What good teachers *do* must be understood in the context of who good teachers *are*. Essentially, good teachers *are people of vision*, who possess deep understandings about the child, the relationship between teaching and learning, the purpose of education, and the role of assessment. We must stop cutting off practice from vision and hesitating to give vision a prominent place in our concept of good teaching.

Good teaching is as much about being as it is about doing. One without the other is equally problematic. For example, picture a competent teacher who lacks vision, or worse, has a misguided vision. Then imagine a visionary teacher who lacks competence. Our notion of a good teacher should include what shapes the vision, as well as the practice itself. Vision and practice do not make sense if they stand apart. Ultimately, it is vision, not practice that drives good teaching, and not all visions are equal. Thus, our effort to define the good teacher should put as much care into clarifying the appropriate vision as it does describing the relevant competencies.

I fear that Lincoln's (1988) latent paradigm syndrome is once again at work when we seek to define quality teaching in terms of competencies alone. Regardless of how carefully these competencies are spelled out, this approach reflects a technical, break-something-down-into-its-constituent-parts approach. This method usually does a good job of listing and describing parts of a whole, but it often loses sight of the whole and what it means in the process. What concerns me even more are the close ties between a vision of teaching comprised only of competencies, the efficiency movement, and a pragmatic approach to education in the service of economic growth.

Finally, insofar as we do not give account for who teachers should be in the new TQS, we do not adequately acknowledge the reason virtually all of us become teachers, which is to make a difference in the lives of students.

To reiterate, if the panel wants the new TQS to transcend the old mechanistic assumptions of the efficiency paradigm, then students are not simply minds and teachers are more than technicians. Knowledge must be more than information and education must become more than banking knowledge where teachers deposit information into passive students (Freire, 1983). Hattie's (2009, 2012) books, among others, alert us to a vast amount of evidence that calls us to finally leave the efficiency model behind. I trust we will follow his lead with our final project.

The knowledge society paradigm however, does not take us far enough. Students are more than simply learners and teachers are more than critical evaluators of learning. Knowledge pertains to more than the process of learning, and education goes beyond the acquisition of marketable attributes and character development. As a first response to this emerging context, we should at least seek balance when we imagine our new TQS. Let us balance the priorities of

teaching and learning, the significance of what we learn and how we learn, the characteristics of what good teachers do and who good teachers are.

Relationships are at the Core of Teaching

To this point in my paper I have made reference to some important lessons that we can learn from earlier iterations of paradigm warfare in education. I have also attempted to apply these lessons to the paradigm shift our panel accepts as context to our work of presenting a framework document to the government for the purpose of rewriting our TQS document. I have come to the conclusion that neither the efficiency movement nor the knowledge society paradigms provide a balanced framework for defining the quality teacher. The way forward, therefore, is not to be found in either one, or in some creative compromise, but should originate outside this paradigm war.

I propose a third way forward, one that understands teaching, learning, students, and teachers in the context of relationships. Humans are multi-functional beings: we worship, socialize, feel, buy and sell, appreciate, create, think, communicate and engage in politics, entertainment, and sports. We tend to associate particular human functions with certain differentiated social institutions that have arisen. For example, we associate our aesthetic functioning with art galleries and performance halls, our political functioning with government, our economic functioning with commerce, and our communication function with the media. We might call these the leading functions when we participate in these social institutions, but of course, we never function one way at a time and never stop being fully human when we paint, vote, or buy and sell.

Most people would agree that thinking is the prominent way teachers and students function when in school. We sometimes think about thinking, but mostly we think about the other domains of our functioning. We also do more than think about things like religion, politics, economics, sociology, biology, and language; we live them in school. Our socializing, communicating, believing, and aesthetic appreciating constantly contextualizes our thinking. All this functioning is wrapped up in our individual and collective narratives.

The connection between our individual narratives and a bigger story may not always be clear, but it seems to me that all teaching and learning is based on world and life view perspectives that are themselves rooted in basic beliefs about life's biggest questions. In school, these essential questions include: Who is a good student? Who is a good teacher? What is most worth knowing? How should students and teachers be evaluated?

If thinking is, or should be, a leading function in our educational experience, the reality is school life can be very political, as anyone knows who has administered or taken a standardized test. School life also exhibits economic exchanges, aesthetic expression, socializing, communicating, and ethical bonding. My reason for stating what may be obvious is to suggest both the old and new paradigms under discussion in this paper present us with a limited understanding of students, teachers, and what education entails.

If I were right in my belief that the image of students as either minds or as learners is inadequate, then what would serve as a more appropriate descriptor would be students and teachers as relational beings. We have long held to the notion that all humans function in four foundational relationships, regardless of their race, creed, ethnicity, gender, geography, or era. All humans have a relationship to self, with the divine, with other human beings, and the environment. These four foundational relationships provide the framework for all of our functioning no matter what the social institution or context.

Each of us has a self-concept and we know how important this relationship is for everything we do. Our time in school is undeniably critical for the formation of our self-image. In this school experience, our teachers play a huge role in the way we come to see ourselves. With the exception of the sixties and seventies when we momentarily thought self-identity was best determined in isolation from others, we have always known that our personal identity is draped in the cloth of our other foundational relationships.

Every person also has a relationship with the divine. This could be the god of one's religion or whatever it is that one ultimately serves. Bob Dylan clearly stated this in his song, "Everybody's got to Serve Somebody." One of life's biggest challenges for us as humans to navigate is to consistently and faithfully serve the divine we profess to serve. Each of us must also relate to our fellow humans. Like planets revolving around a star, we have concentric orbits that include ever greater numbers of our species in significant relationships that require responsible participation from each of us. We relate to family, friends, colleagues of all sorts, and fellow citizens. The fourth relationship is the one we have with our earthly environment with all of its biological and physical diversity. We know today, like never before in our history, how critical our relationship to the environment is.

These four relationships are foundational in our experience; they are givens. How we will live in them is not a given and must be learnt. We must learn what it means to be human and how to live well. The consequences of how we choose to live are staggering for all four relationships. Our health as individuals, as families, as neighbourhoods, as communities, as nations, and as a planet, hangs in the balance.

Whether or not we acknowledge the responsibility of teachers to teach their students how to live, this is what teachers always do and they do it through modelling how they live in the classroom. Teachers cannot avoid this, even if they believe the most they should teach is the program of studies. Whether teachers think teaching students a preferred way of life goes beyond their mandate or they make a conscientious effort to be a life-shaping influence, students learn how to live from their teachers' example. Every teacher and student teacher I have ever known entered teaching because they wanted to make a difference in the lives of their students. They cannot always clearly articulate what that difference should or will be, but they intuitively know they want to foster healthy relationships with students that not only make their experience of school meaningful, but have an impact on their future.

Ironically, teaching and learning the curriculum are not prominent in what most of us mean by making a difference. When I ask applicants to our program what they hope their legacy or reputation will be as teachers, the conversation always turns to the best teachers they ever had. What they remember of those teachers is almost always identical to how they want to be remembered by their future students. It comes down to matters of classroom atmosphere and the culture of learning; it is all about showing and demanding respect, and modelling things like passion, compassion, love of learning, and commitment. Without question, these applicants knew that the curriculum content they learned from their favourite teachers was just as significant as how they learned it. However, what they remember the most is the quality of the relationships the teacher fostered that provided the context for *the what* and *the how* of their learning. If there is a universal motive for entering the teaching profession it has to be to make a life changing difference. Surely, this central reality must have a prominent place in a revised TQS.

A second relevant source of information that speaks to the importance of relationships is the individual submissions to the government's Professional Practice Competencies for Teacher's

distributed last December. From these submissions it is very evident that all of our institutions have vision statements for teacher preparation and within those statements, we reveal our distinctive visions for good teaching. It is also apparent that we all expect our pre-service graduates will be people of vision. This is imperative because we want our students to learn how to engage worldviews, discern between perspectives, be creative, care for the environment, respect others and be responsible world citizens. To be able to fulfill aspirations such as these, our graduates must possess knowledge of all sorts. They need wisdom to understand the principles of sustainability and how to engage divergent views on sustainability. This example, like so many others we submitted, assumes good teachers must be able to discern between divergent points of view and actually hold one of their own. I cannot ever recall hearing someone cite a favourite teacher for her lack of holding a point of view or for never taking a position.

At the risk of promoting another one-dimensional vision of students, teachers, and education, I suggest we look to the work of Crouch (2008). Crouch begins with the premise that everyone is vulnerable to being misshaped by our culture because we are fully engaged in it as consumers. He contends that the development of a critical stance toward culture is not sufficient. Neither is it acceptable to merely pattern our lives after our culture. If we want to change culture for the better, we must create culture. This is something everyone can do regardless of how gifted or challenged they are. Changes may be significant or barely noticeable, but it is in the making of culture individually and communally that we fulfill our human calling and offer hope to others. Crouch (2008) clearly develops his position within a Christian faith frame of reference, but I think his perspective will appeal to people of other faiths and ideologies, whether religious or secular. His notion of culture making seems to resonate well with the language and hopes we attach to our own teacher preparation programs.

There remains one last topic for me to briefly present in this paper. If we are truly confronted by two paradigms, neither one of which adequately describes the meaning of quality teaching, then we need a richer understanding of knowledge. I know of schools that work with such a model and they refer to it as the Head, Heart, and Hand model of knowledge. Knowledge in this model is not known until it is acted out in experience. For example, in terms of recycling, head knowledge means we know that recycling is good for the environment, hand knowledge means you actually engage in activities like recycling, and heart knowledge, which is the critical hinge component, means we act out what we know because we are committed to it. To educate for this kind of knowledge, teachers must foster meaningful relationships in their classrooms. They must be people of vision and deeply understand how to teach and encourage their students' learning.

I anticipate that few people will take issue with the centrality of relationships for teaching and learning. Hattie's (2009) massive analysis of hundreds of studies found that teacher-student relationships rank near the top of all the indicators that bring about the desired effects we want in our students. The characteristics of these relationships that most impacted student achievement were providing more voice to students, empathy, warmth, encouragement of higher thinking, encouragement of learning, adapting to differences, and genuineness (Hattie, 2009).

Writing relationships into a TQS document will pose a challenge. The magnitude of the challenge will tell us much about our aspirations to be paradigm shifters. If the challenge involves defining precise, measurable outcomes, we will have hardly budged from the efficiency movement model. Hattie (2009) has already demonstrated how to quantify all the qualities

listed above. If the challenge asks us to articulate new and imaginative ways to demonstrate visionary teaching that educates students into ways of life built upon meaningful, foundational relationships, then we will know that we really are breaking free of the established paradigm patterns.

References

- Association of Alberta Deans of Education. (2012). *A framework of effective teaching for learning*. Commissioned research paper for The Professional Standards Branch, Alberta Education.
- Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Crouch, A. (2008). *Culture making: Recovering our creative calling*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP books.
- Eisner, E., & Vallance, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of the curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Friesen, S. (2009). *What did you do in school today? Teaching effectiveness: A framework and rubric*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Education Association.
- Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gilbert, J. (2005). *Catching the knowledge wave? The knowledge society and the future of education*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum: A project of the American educational research association*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Lincoln, Y. (1988). *The making of a constructivist: A remembrance of transformations past*. Paper presented at the Alternative Paradigms Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: Mentor.
- McNeil, J. (1977). *Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1980). *Curriculum development*. New York: Macmillan.

John E. Hull has spent the last 38 years serving faith based learning communities, first as a high school teacher in Ontario, then as a professor in education at The King's University College in Edmonton. He holds an Ed.D. in History and Philosophy of Education from The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (University of Toronto). Currently he serves as Education Faculty Dean at The King's and is chair of the Association of Alberta Deans of Education. His research focuses on school reform and curriculum design.