solve problems," with 90 percent feeling well or very well prepared to do so. Alverno College faculty, teacher candidates, and faculty at placement sites all sang the same refrain—that the program's operation itself as a collaborative community provided the necessary foundation for engaging deeply with their coursework and fieldwork, whether as instructors, students, or mentor teachers. Not only did 100 percent of the teacher candidates we surveyed say that they often experienced collaborative learning in their own coursework, but they also all reported they had been prepared to "collaborate with colleagues to address students' needs and to improve instruction." In our survey of current Alverno students, all the surveyed teacher candidates also responded that they felt well prepared to "set norms for building a productive classroom community."

Finally, at Montclair State, where we observed a teacher candidate working with student groups in a fourth-grade classroom to solve math problems, 99 percent of survey respondents said they were prepared to "engage students in cooperative group work as well as independent learning," with the same percentage saying they had experienced "collaborative learning and group work" in their own coursework and were prepared to "develop students' questioning and discussion skills." Candidates also had the opportunity to learn to lay the groundwork for collaborative activity, as 98 percent reported being prepared to "set norms for building a productive classroom community."

These kinds of results are reflected in those for the other programs as well, as we have described in other chapters. In what follows, we show how this work contributes to more equitable opportunities and outcomes for students, and more attention to social justice practices in their schools.

CHAPTER 9

TEACHING FOR EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

As a teacher for social justice, I envision a class where I am able to teach to all students' learning styles and levels, cultures and backgrounds. As discussed in . . .class, there is not an achievement gap, but instead an educational debt. We as educators and aspiring teachers owe students an equitable classroom and education.

—San Francisco Teaching Resident

Today's public schools are at the leading edge of a society that must strengthen its democracy and economy by building on its increasing racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity. Today's teachers are pioneers in the nation's ambition to educate all its young people to live, work, engage in, and contribute to an equitable twenty-first century. This ambition—captured in the federal Every Student Succeeds Act as preparing all students for college and career—is a strong driver of the content and practices of the seven programs we studied. If teachers are to achieve this goal, they must be prepared to teach for both deeper learning and equity. They have much to overcome.

Despite countless declarations that education is the civil rights issue of our time, past practices have made little progress in reducing education opportunity and achievement gaps that help perpetuate social inequality. In 2013, the federal Equity and Excellence Commission issued a scathing indictment of US education: "No other developed nation has inequities nearly as deep or systemic; no other developed nation has, despite some efforts to the contrary, so thoroughly stacked the odds against so many of its children. Sadly, what feels so very un-American turns out to be distinctly American."[1] Key reforms in the recent era of educational accountability thus far have only exacerbated existing problems by causing many educators to leave the profession and narrowing educational opportunities for students.[2]

Deeper learning practices, as we've described them in earlier chapters, can contribute to reversing this negative trend. Student-centered, inquiry-based experiences are better able than rote instruction to support the learning and understanding of diverse groups of students, especially those

bearing the burdens of increasing poverty and social inequality. There is considerable work to do in this regard. Deeper learning has traditionally been the purview of elite students and schools. Exploring this issue in a provocative essay a few years ago, Harvard education professor Jal Mehta noted that "deeper learning has a race problem," largely because of the ways in which curriculum opportunities are differentially allocated in the United States:[3]

> Deeper learning has historically been the province of the advantaged—those who could afford to send their children to the best private schools and to live in the most desirable school districts. Research on both inequality across schools and tracking within schools has suggested that students in more affluent schools and top tracks are given the kind of problem-solving education that befits the future managerial class, whereas students in lower tracks and higher-poverty schools are given the kind of rule-following tasks that mirror much of factory and other working-class work. To the degree that race mirrors class, these inequalities in access to deeper learning are shortchanging black and Latino students.[4]

Mehta acknowledges that skepticism among many stems, in part, from the widespread myth that students must acquire the "basics" before they can engage in deeper learning, that "inquiry-oriented instruction is fine for students who come with a significant background in 'basic' or 'core' knowledge and skills, but to pursue that approach with students who lack this background is likely to be ineffective and does little to build their basic knowledge and skills."[5]

Mehta suggests that solving this problem requires two actions on the part of educators. One is to argue convincingly that deeper learning is key to providing equitable schooling, in that "joining the culture of power means doing one's own experiments and not just reading about experiments that others have done; such deeper experiences give disadvantaged students the same opportunities to participate in the real world of the disciplines that the most advantaged students have long had."[6] The second is to "diversify their vision of deeper learning" and make deeper learning practices themselves inclusive. This requires recognizing that "in every religious or ethnic community there is some tradition through which people learn deeply" and incorporating those traditions into instruction.[7]

Consonant with Mehta's recommendations, each of the seven teacher preparation programs helps candidates understand the social, historical, and political context of race and inequality in America and how it is reflected in schools and classrooms. Several of the courses emphasize this foundational knowledge, as we've noted in earlier chapters. The programs also frame equity/social justice and deeper learning as mutually reinforcing, and they embed both concepts in the content and practices of coursework and field experiences. For many this includes a focus on having teacher candidates learn to teach for deeper learning in partnership schools serving students living in poverty, those in communities of color, and those with large populations of immigrants and families whose primary language is other than English. By working with educators to strengthen deeper learning in such schools, these programs are able to enact both their commitment to high-quality teaching and learning and their determination to contribute to equity and social justice.

However, the programs do not see this dual focus as appropriate only for teachers preparing to teach students in underserved communities. They also take this approach with teacher candidates who may end up teaching in suburban communities, where inequities are often found inside the school, as a function of tracking systems. Moreover, their concern about equity extends to gender, sexual orientation, religion, and other social identifiers that are subject to marginalization and inequality.

Previous chapters addressing the first four dimensions of deeper learning experiences have described how the programs focus explicitly on helping their teacher candidates create learning opportunities that reflect the growing, research-based understanding of how people learn. In this chapter, we address the final dimension, showing how these programs are also determined to help "right" the pervasive social and educational "wrongs" of inequality and injustice by focusing on learning that is equitable and oriented to social justice. Both the "what" (the content) and the "how" (the structures and practices) of these programs are aimed at giving the young people who are most burdened by inequality and injustice access to outstanding teachers who can afford them learning opportunities often reserved for those in the most advantaged neighborhoods with the most privileged status.

The programs reconcile their explicit attention to the two foci—teaching for deeper learning and teaching for equity and social justice—by recognizing their complementarity. High Tech High's academic dean, Ben Daley, articulated the connection: "We think that constructivist, progressive, project-based learning . . . is inherently an equity argument. . . . That's why we're trying to have high-quality projects that engage all learners. That's why we were doing it, the whole time."

Teaching that reflects a complete understanding of learning requires knowing and accommodating students' developmental needs with personalized, transferable, contextualized, and social opportunities that build on the knowledge students bring with them. As we described in earlier chapters, that prior knowledge is inextricably connected to students' language, culture, and life experiences. This is true for all students, regardless of their family background and social advantages. However, teaching students who are from low-income families and with marginalized identities requires constructing lessons with an awareness of race, class, and other characteristics that shape students' "place" in society and, as a result, their "place" in school. To ensure that such students have access to rich and deep learning they must treat and incorporate students' unique identities as strengths and resources for learning, rather than deficits. They must help students build new knowledge on the knowledge that students bring with them to school.

We begin this chapter by describing how the practices and understandings of teacher candidates and graduates of these programs reflect this intersection of teaching for deeper learning, equity, and social justice. We then turn to how the content and practices of the teacher education programs help prepare them to do this work.

TEACHING AT THE INTERSECTION OF DEEPER LEARNING, EQUITY, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

The vignette "An Equity-Focused, Equity-Enhancing Socratic Seminar" depicts a contextualized history lesson on South African apartheid taught by Martha, a Trinity teacher candidate, that reflects both teaching for deeper learning and social justice commitments. With equitable teaching uppermost in her mind, Martha uses a pedagogical approach that makes the high-status, intellectual content of AP World History accessible to a racially diverse group of students. This equitable pedagogy provides opportunities and support to all voices in the class.

The lesson focuses on a racial justice topic that is of great interest to the students—apartheid—and that connects with their real-world experiences in segregated and unequal San Antonio. On the previous day, Martha had contextualized the topic, bringing it closer to home by having the school's assistant principal share his experiences growing up in South Africa during apartheid. The main activity—an instructional conversation in a Socratic seminar—engages students in constructing knowledge as a social process.

An Equity-Focused, Equity-Enhancing Socratic Seminar

The Lee High School AP World History freshmen are sitting in two circles, an outer circle with nine students and an inner circle with eleven students. The class is racially diverse; most students are Latino and white, and a few are African American. Martha had asked them to come prepared with written questions about things that they were wondering about apartheid.

Martha begins by reviewing the directions for the Socratic seminar, emphasizing that it is self-directed: "As soon as someone is ready, you can ask a question."

One student says, "I don't think we get it."

Martha explains that only students in the outside circle can ask questions and only students in the inside can answer.

A student in the outer circle raises his hand to go first, and Martha projects the student's cell phone on the overhead. The phone has a picture of a political cartoon on it. The first frame depicts Nelson Mandela when Mandela was first arrested in 1962 and put in jail. The second frame shows Mandela when he is released in 1990, coming out of the jail, taller than in the first frame. The student asks the inner circle to explain the meaning behind the cartoon.

It takes students a few minutes to understand the process, and no one speaks right away. Finally, students in the inner circle begin weighing with responses, such as, "When he was arrested, it made him stronger." The discussion continues for a bit and then students are quiet again.

Martha asks if anyone on the outer circle has a question to ask of the inner circle. She then prompts a specific student to ask a question, and he responds by posing the following question: "Segregation continues to exist in different ways. What kinds of segregation still exist and why?"

Students in the inner circle have numerous responses to this question: "Social class."

"Segregation between rich and poor. The top 1 percent [is wealthy], but the majority of the world is super poor." "To give a real-world example of that, I met this guy. He lives in this huge gated community in a huge house. I have a little tiny house." "Different laws are based on racial groups (like in South Africa)."

"The guest speaker said yesterday that people in Africa were already divided up into tribes. That's still huge today—conflicting views, different languages, stereotypes, regardless of skin color."

A student then asks, "How would the world be if Mandela hadn't stood up and protested against the government?"

Students respond: "Other people have the same mind-set and would have stood up. Without the help of other people, Mandela wouldn't have made impact." "Social pressure." "Suppose that no one else took their place; there would not be as much social pressure, probably things wouldn't have gotten worse."

The student who first asked the question about segregation asks a follow-up question: "Do you think segregation can happen again in the future?"

(continues)

Students respond: "Definitely in other forms." "[People] segregate us to create controversy, to entertain. It kind of works; it separates us, we shouldn't be focusing on that. We're all Americans."

After a few more minutes of discussion, Martha says, "I'm resetting the clock. If you are on the outside, go inside. If inside, go on the outside."

The students switch circles quickly and quietly. Students on the outside continue to ask questions related to apartheid in South Africa and segregation more broadly, with students on the inside reflecting and responding. The students are respectful of each other's ideas, although a small group of students speak up consistently.

Martha does not engage with the students or direct them in their conversation, except to occasionally encourage quieter students to engage, saying, "Okay, you should ask that question you wondered about."

In the last five minutes of class, Martha asks for any final comments. When there are none, she says, "Take a couple of moments, three minutes or so, to finish up writing on the reflection page. Look back, reflect on the seminar process and how you did. . . . Take a moment and do some reflection."

Before they begin working on their reflections, she asks, "What did you think about Socratic seminar? Thumbs up if you liked it, thumbs down if you didn't." On the whole students were very positive and appeared to like the process, even though they found it challenging to come up with responses to the questions.

Students work on their reflections until the bell rings.

Martha also personalizes learning by organizing the seminar around the students' questions and experiences. She welcomes the students' engagement with a cultural artifact (a political cartoon) already familiar to high school students. She positions students in the room (mixing students who differ in skill and confidence), mindful of their differences without compromising access or treating differences as either assets or deficits. She scaffolds the conversation in ways that press all students to participate.

Following the lesson, Martha and her mentor teacher Denise reflect and debrief. Martha observes that the lesson went well overall, noting that some students asked clever questions and engaged in robust discussions about race, which they could relate to their own lives. Martha and Denise also note that the Socratic seminar allowed students who are typically not vocal to participate. Denise observes: "One of the kids that spoke today is a child that sometimes finds it difficult to order in a restaurant. One of the most vocal students you heard today, you would never guess that that person finds it difficult to talk to teachers, to express him or herself." When Ileana, the PDS coordinator at the school site, asks Martha how she had selected students for the inner and outer circles, Martha explains that she had originally planned to let students choose where to sit. But, taking students'

differences into account, she realized that choice might not yield a productive mix of participants (more and less confident talkers) in both circles. So, she intervened: "I pulled a couple of strong voices to the outside. I knew some students would sit in the inside, so I pulled them out." She didn't want the confident talkers to dominate the exchange or treat the less confident ones as if they weren't as capable of participating.

Martha is also pleased that her scaffolding encouraged students to engage. "I learned from the first group. I was waiting to see if they would panic because it was too quiet to say something. The second round, I went around and said, 'That's a good question, you should ask that.' That helped because it gave them confidence to know that I thought the question was good enough."

Denise also provides critical feedback, what she called "cool feedback," aimed at improving Martha's future practice:

> I feel that they need more background earlier on, on both [the topic and Socratic method], and maybe scaffolding. If you had mini-Socratic time throughout the year, such as "Okay, our warm-up today is three minutes in and three minutes out," and then move on, keeping track of that, so they have that experience, that would be a helpful tool. I think for the subject matter, maybe another day where they had more of a sense of the facts, the history: What was going on in the United States? At the same time that civil rights issues were being worked out in our country, understanding the dynamic when South Africa plunged itself into an apartheid regime. What was the rest of world doing? Then that spills into World War I, World War II. So [it would be good if] they had more of a bank of knowledge from which to pose their questions. But I am pleased by the level of some of the kids who had that outside thinking or asked big questions.

The conversation makes clear that Martha herself is engaged in deeper learning about how to teach simultaneously for deeper learning and for equity.

That Martha focused on social justice content by teaching about South African apartheid may seem like an obvious choice, given that her course was world history. However, we also saw many teachers infuse topics related to equity and justice in subjects where it would be less expected, such as science and math. The biology lesson described in chapter 6, where the teacher used the topic of skin color to contextualize the more abstract concept of natural selection, is one of many examples.

The focus on social justice topics was not limited to high school teachers. In chapter 5, we described a Bank Street teacher, Ted, teaching mathematics to fourth graders. Revisiting Ted's and teacher candidate Jarod's classroom here, we see that, in addition to engaging their students in developmentally appropriate deeper learning, Ted and Jarod also actively engage them in discussions about inequality, justice, and civic participation.

Ted's class environment reveals many opportunities for students to develop fundamental knowledge and skills as they grapple with social justice issues. The posted time line of American history—which includes dates such as 1929, when the nineteenth amendment was ratified, giving women the right to vote, and 1861, when the Civil War began—serves as a constant reminder to students of America's historical inequities, and the importance of continuing to make history by fighting such inequities. Also displayed are students' own accounts of slavery, written from a slave's perspective (a challenging, complex topic, especially for fourth graders). Such lessons require that both Ted and Jarod understand the scope of students' intellectual, social, and emotional development as they are giving them access to a complex historical topic. They also embed inclusionary messages in everyday classroom routines that help create a culture of belonging. Among the many books on shelves and in labeled tubs around the room are titles featuring characters of many cultural backgrounds, and there is a tub of African American autobiographies. This, too, is an equity move, since so many students of color report low levels of belongingness in their schools and classes. We return to Ted's classroom in the box "Developing Deeper Thinking Through Literature."

Ted's and Jarod's classroom advances social justice and provides for equitable opportunities for students to learn challenging fourth-grade academic content. Ted's singing an African song brings another culture and language into the classroom, which helps to create a culturally open-minded community to nurture students' development of an inclusive orientation. The focus of the book during story time involves issues of free speech, power, and politics. Jarod's thoughtful questions have students consider these issues with their peers, develop their ability to think critically about weighty issues like fairness, and learn to effectively communicate their ideas to others.

Trinity elementary teachers also infused social justice activities into their teaching. As we described in chapter 6, a kindergarten teacher at Lamar Elementary, a professional development school site, engaged her class in launching a schoolwide recycling program. A fourth-grade teacher who was concerned about low voter-participation rates in the state created a

Developing Deeper Thinking Through Literature

As the fourth graders clean up their work and put their folders away after forty-five minutes of mathematics work, Ted quietly sings an African song while he sets up a snack. Students come in groups to receive their crackers and go back to their seats. Ted's singing shifts to English: "In everything we do and everything we say, you and I are making history today." This signals to students that what they do matters and is important. It is also a reminder of the historical references Ted has placed all around the students, with a historical time line hanging literally from a line across the ceiling onto which they clip cards recording events.

After the snack, the students gather around the rug to engage in story time with Jarod, who will read chapter 6 from *The Landry News,* the chapter book they are working their way through. The chapter is about a teacher, Carl Larson, who has risked disciplinary action for distributing a student-written newspaper that includes content to which some board members object. He has been given the choice to resign and retire or to undergo a disciplinary proceeding. The reading raises issues of free speech, loyalty to students, and courage to allow the community to address a social issue his students have written about. To keep students thinking, Jarod stops and asks as the plot unfolds, "There's a lot happening here. What *is* happening?" Several students contribute to explaining what happened to the teacher. Jarod then asks: "What's the choice that Mr. Larson has?" Once that is clarified, Ted adds a more complex question: "As you listen, think about this: How is Carl Larson changing?"

After Jarod reaches the end of the chapter, Ted says: "Take a minute and turn and talk: How is Mr. Larson changing?" The students immediately engage with one another about this question. Clearly this is a familiar routine for them, and they are deeply ensconced in conversation. Ted brings their attention back by counting backward—"4, 3, 2, 1"—and saying, "I'm hearing some lovely thoughts. What do you think? How is Mr. Larson changing?" Hands fly up and students give long, detailed answers to the question. They begin to have a conversation with each other rather than offering discrete "right answers" for the teacher. Ted encourages them to build on each other's thoughts by asking questions like: "Do you want to add on to that?" "Can someone clarify further?" With this book being read aloud together, there is a level playing field for all students to engage in a deep conversation that calls on them to think analytically and inferentially about the reading.

project-based unit in which students developed public service announcements, encouraged voter registration, and created a "Rock the Vote" campaign. A Trinity alum and a colleague together crafted a unit on race relations, which they shared with current Trinity MAT candidates.

Meanwhile, Trinity alums working as teachers at other schools continue to make an impact: one started an antibullying club at his high school, and another, working with a current MAT candidate, established a coffeehouse poetry event focused on race. One teacher wrote an article for the *Texas*

Education Review, reflecting on his teaching at a racially and linguistically diverse campus in the Dallas Independent School District. Another, who is a principal in San Antonio, started a healthy food initiative in her school and in the district. Another has been involved in developing new visions of urban schooling. Working with the university, a Trinity alum and her mentor put together a Women in Science program that brings a hundred female students each year to the Trinity campus to spend a day visiting the labs and working with female science faculty. Activities like these were commonplace both in and out of classrooms across all seven programs.

HOW DO PROGRAMS PREPARE TEACHERS TO TEACH AT THIS INTERSECTION?

This very diverse set of seven teacher preparation programs—public, private, large, small, traditional and alternative, across geographies—shares several characteristics that provide the foundation that supports teacher candidates as they teach at the intersection of deeper learning and equity. Each program is explicit and transparent about its commitment to both social justice and deeper learning values and principles. These commitments underlie the programs' designs, coursework, and fieldwork, including their selection of partnering districts and schools. Each program actively engages candidates in deeper learning about equity and social justice, including self-reflection around their own identity and social location, as well as tools to understand students' identity and social location. These support candidates in developing culturally responsive instructional strategies and nondeficit accommodations for English learners and students with special needs, and taking an activist stance against education inequality and injustice. We provide examples of each in the following sections.

Explicit Commitment to Equity and Deeper Learning

Although the language differs somewhat from program to program, each is loud and clear about its commitment to equity and social justice—shown, for example, in pronouncements of program leaders, mission statements, program descriptions, and ongoing conversations about program improvement.

The San Francisco Teacher Residency program is transparent that its goals are to prepare teachers who seek to promote equitable education in the city of San Francisco and to achieve greater justice in schools through "transformative teaching"—closely aligned with teaching for deeper learning. The language on the program's website couldn't be clearer:

> The San Francisco Teacher Residency (SFTR) . . . offers aspiring educators the opportunity to help transform lives and communities in San Francisco through the teaching profession. Plain and simple: we are on a mission for social justice. SFTR aims to improve academic achievement and social-emotional development for historically underserved students in San Francisco's public schools by recruiting, preparing, and supporting highly effective and equity-centered teachers.

These words are far more than rhetoric. The first of four key pillars of "transformative teaching" that guide SFTR's coursework, clinical experiences, supervision and ongoing support, and definitions of success is *leading for equity and social justice*. SFTR seeks to prepare teachers who "position themselves as students of their students and school communities . . . to create sanctuaries of humanization," and who "understand experiences in classrooms, schools, and school community through a systems analysis, and take action as allies, advocates, and leaders to identify and interrupt oppressive forces." In the words of SFTR's executive director,

> As important as anything we do is to prepare people to be successful in culturally diverse communities and in schools that are serving historically marginalized students and high-needs populations. If we're not doing that, . . . or at least if we're not making significant progress in that direction and remaining committed to that front-and-center through all of the work that we're doing—then we don't have any business preparing teachers to teach in San Francisco.

Trinity's program is grounded in a set of "core beliefs" about principled practice that juxtapose deeper learning and equity. Among them, "ethical responsibility" includes fostering awareness of the equity issues that arise in teaching, along with an orientation that encourages candidates to address political and systemic sources of inequity. "Cultural responsiveness" positions candidates to consider the context of instruction, including students' prior knowledge and experiences as well as their community setting.

Similarly, the first of High Tech High's four program design principles is equity. The others—personalization, authentic work, and collaborative design—reflect the programs' vision of equity and deeper learning pedagogy as mutually reinforcing.

CU Denver's program, as we noted in chapters 2 and 3, is driven by four "essential questions" that frame teacher candidates' experiences as they move through the program, and that shape instructors' decisions as

they design courses and field experiences. The questions focus teacher candidates' inquiry into their own assumptions and beliefs, and how those intersect with their intentions, actions, and reflections about equitable teaching. Following curriculum scholars Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, whose curriculum development guide, *Understanding by Design*, urges planners to start with essential questions that guide student inquiry, CU Denver's questions are "essential" because they are open ended and thought provoking, call for higher-order thinking, point toward transferable ideas, raise additional questions, require support and justification, and recur over time.[8] We repeat these questions here, since they make explicit the program's commitment to integrating deeper learning and social justice.

- *Essential Question 1*: What do I *know and believe* about myself, my students, their families, and their communities within the larger social context?
- *Essential Question 2*: How do I *act* on these beliefs to create inclusive and responsive learning opportunities and transform inequities?
- *Essential Question 3*: How do I *enact* principles of social justice and equity, inclusiveness, cultural and linguistic responsiveness, learning theory, and discipline-specific pedagogy within my pedagogical practices to plan, revise, and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure success and growth for all my students, always acting as a critical urban educator to advocate for my students?
- *Essential Question 4*: How do I *reflect* upon principles of social justice and equity, inclusiveness, cultural and linguistic responsiveness, learning theory, and discipline-specific pedagogy within my pedagogical practices in order to further plan, revise, and adjust curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure success and growth for all of my students, always acting as a critical urban educator to advocate for my students?

CU Denver also added a social justice principle to the five CREDE pedagogical standards that guide their planning for teaching and learning. This standard, called Critical Stance, presses teacher candidates to engage their own students in interrogating conventional wisdom and practices, to reflect upon ramifications, and to seek to actively transform inequities through a lens of democracy and civic engagement.

Bank Street's public commitment to social justice can be traced to its century-old progressive underpinnings, as articulated by Barbara Biber,

the distinguished mid-twentieth-century Bank Street leader we cited in earlier chapters:

> When John Dewey turned to revolutionizing educational experience as a channel toward reconstructing society, he provided for many of us who were young in those early decades of the century a means of transforming general ideals for social change into the reality of revolutionizing a potent social instrument—the school system. . . . If education was ultimately to effect social change, we had to bring the reality of how the world functions into the classroom curriculum; if we expected children to become awakened to the advantages of a democratic society, we had to provide the experience of living democratically in the social setting of the schoolroom, of being part of a cooperative structure characterized by egalitarian interpersonal relations.[9]

Today that commitment is expressed in the program's intentionality about infusing social justice throughout the program's culture. Cecelia Traugh, Bank Street's dean, shared one example: "One of the things we, the faculty, did was a yearlong inquiry into the conference groups [weekly meetings of faculty with up to seven teacher candidates undergoing their fieldwork]. We focused that around three questions. One was how the conference group and the supervised fieldwork could become sites for social justice learning." Traugh noted that the yearlong process helped to reinforce the inquiry and equity stance of the faculty's work and make social justice a driving thread in her conversations with faculty.

Montclair and Alverno are equally transparent about their commitments. The clear articulation of values and commitments serves as the foundation of all the programs' work. However, as we describe in the following sections, it is the core features of the programs that bring them to life.

Intentional Candidate Recruitment

As part of their elaborate recruitment and selection practices (described in chapter 4), the programs are intentional about making their commitment to social justice and equity a critical criterion for selecting applicants. For example, the heart of High Tech High's candidate selection process—the Bonanza—engages prospective teachers in a variety of activities designed, in part, to assess how they view issues of equity in relation to education. As prospective participants' fitness as teachers is examined, their interest in