KIEL HARELL

13. THE FOXFIRE COURSE FOR TEACHERS

A Description of How It Works

Just in taking this class, I have been able to work with at least six different people on an extended basis, face-to-face in a way that never would have happened otherwise. I mean, there are just too many other things dragging our schedules in different ways. And, to be able to sit down with Renae for two hours yesterday and talk about her action plan and work on each other's projects; that would never be possible in another format… And the reading groups where we come up in the afternoon and just sit on the porch and just work through the text. Those are great things that can only happen in this kind of format…The other perspective is, as a teacher, we're going to spend 180 hours over the next ten months with a group of thirty kids. And so, anything we can do to practice consensus building skills, that community negotiation, all that stuff, any practice we can get with doing things like that is just good stuff.

The above quotation comes from an interview with Harvey, a middle school social studies teacher, who was participating in the Foxfire Course for Teachers with fourteen others from around the state of Georgia. He was sitting in a rocking chair on the porch of the Guest House at the Foxfire Museum and Heritage Center explaining the unique experience of spending a week with other teachers reflecting together on their classrooms, the work of John Dewey and the Foxfire Approach. Earlier in the evening, he had been joined on the porch by two other teachers. Together they took turns reading aloud a chapter in *Experience and Education* by John Dewey, stopping periodically to ask questions, clarify meaning, and most importantly, relate the text to their myriad experiences as classroom teachers. In other corners of the Foxfire Center, similar groups of teachers were engaging with the same ideas in different ways.

Harvey, like the majority of the other participants, was taking the course for credit toward his master's degree in education. He explained that he chose Foxfire as an elective because he was starting at a new school in the fall and was looking for ways to improve his approach to teaching history. As a white teacher preparing to teach at a school with a majority non-white student population, he believed that the Foxfire Approach would help him come up with ideas about how to create more interest and ownership over the state's history. By the end of the week, Harvey presented an action plan to his peers that outlined a unit in which his new students would research

individuals from different social classes and backgrounds during different historical periods as a way to supplement the history provided by the course's textbook. The other participants presented their own action plans that were similar in the sense that they were inspired by the Foxfire Approach but unique in that they were rooted in their classroom contexts and the goals they brought with them to the course. As Harvey indicated in the opening quotation, these action plans were the result of deep reflection among groups of teachers made possible by the unique format of the Foxfire Course for Teachers.

In this chapter, the experiences of Harvey and other teachers who have participated in the Foxfire Course for Teachers are viewed through the lens of reflective teaching. In the first section of this chapter, an overview of the literature on reflective teaching is provided. This section pays particular attention to John Dewey's early writing on this topic as well as the work of Donald Schon. Then, Ken Zeichner's writing on reflective teaching is used to provide criteria for authentic professional development. This section is followed by a brief overview of the structure of the Foxfire Course for Teachers and the spaces it provides for teachers to reflect on their practice. Finally, the chapter concludes with an analysis of teachers' reflective experiences[1] against the criteria outlined for authentic development of teachers.

REFLECTIVE TEACHING AS AUTHENTIC DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

Reflective teaching has been a prominent agenda item both in teacher education research and the goals of teacher education programs for decades. To an outsider, this may seem like a confusing phenomenon. Viewed one way, some level of reflection is required for any task. In fact, people cannot help but reflect upon their actions. On the other hand, reflection can mean something much more robust. It can refer to systematic interrogation of both the means and ends of action; the setting aside of time and effort for investigating routines, traditions and outcomes. Many researchers and teacher educators have employed the term "reflection" in ways that preserve this expansive continuum. For the past thirty-five years, however, teacher educators working in the progressive and critical traditions have spilled much ink in their efforts to clarify this more robust vision of reflective teaching, often linking the idea of reflective teaching to the concepts of democratic education and teacher professionalism. From this perspective, promoting reflection among teachers is crucial, particularly among in-service teachers, like the participants in the Foxfire Course for Teachers, as they are ultimately responsible for much of the direction in their professional development and growth.

John Dewey's Reflective Action

Reflective teaching has deep roots in educational research dating back at least to the time of John Dewey's early education writing in the beginning of the twentieth century. While he certainly wrote about reflection in his earliest work

on education (Dewey, 1904) and promoted a form of it at his laboratory school in Chicago (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936), his definitive account on reflection was *How We Think* (Dewey, 1933). In this work, Dewey provides his most commonly cited definition of reflection. He describes it as an "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends" (Dewey, 1933, p. 6). Dewey distinguished between routine action and reflective action. While the former is dictated by tradition, authority, and technical considerations, the latter involves active investigation through the process of both identifying problems and developing solutions to them. Dewey's five step model of reflective action started with the apprehension of a problem and then, through an iterative process of inquiry, terminated in a provisional solution that could then be tested in further action. Describing Dewey's concept of reflective thought, Hatton and Smith (1995) write:

> Reflection may be seen as an active and deliberative cognitive process, involving sequences of interconnected ideas which take account of underlying beliefs and knowledge. Reflective thinking generally addresses practical problems, allowing for doubt and perplexity before possible solutions are reached. (p. 34)

This quotation reiterates several important aspects of Dewey's reflective thinking. For Dewey, reflection is a process of interrogating prior beliefs in order to reach a provisional solution to a practical problem that can be tested out and fed back into the process of inquiry.

Reflective Teaching in the 1980s

Despite these early roots in education, reflective teaching did not receive a tremendous amount of attention until a revival in the 1980s (see, for example, Carr & Kemmis, 1983; Beyer, 1984; Tom, 1985; Zeichner, 1987; Tanner, 1988; Munby & Russell, 1989). Valli (1992) explains this reemergence as the result of a number of converging factors.[2] In addition to a shift toward cognitive psychology and away from behavioral psychology, there was a broader interest in teacher thinking and understanding "local meaning" that is associated with interpretive research genres (Borko, Whitcomb, & Byrnes, 2007). This research emphasis was also bolstered by the work of critical, feminist and multicultural researchers whose work helped legitimize ethnographic and other naturalistic research methodologies and helped renew attention to the moral basis of education (Valli, 1992). From these perspectives, education is a moral pursuit and not strictly a technical one. When taking the moral components of education seriously, it is worthwhile to investigate how teachers think about their actions in a classroom.

Second only to John Dewey in the literature about reflective action, Donald Schon helped reinvigorate the discussion of reflective teaching with the

publication of his influential text *The Reflective Practitioner* in 1983. Schon's view of reflection was both informed by Dewey's work and extended it by drawing a distinction between types of reflection employed by professionals in various fields. For Schon, it is relevant to consider when the reflection is happening in relation to professional practice. Reflection-on-action is the systematic thinking that occurs either *before or after* action. In the realm of teaching, reflection-on-action would include the thought processes that go into planning units and lessons as well as the reflective debriefing that should occur after implementing plans. Reflection-in-action, on the other hand, refers to thinking that occurs *during* action as the practitioner attempts to frame and solve problems in real time. This too is familiar to educators who practice reflection-in-action when they adjust their lesson plans to accommodate unforeseen difficulties with content or an unanticipated but relevant question posed by a student.

Importantly, Schon's contributions to the development of reflective teaching do not only discriminate along temporal lines, but also make meaningful distinctions between the types of knowledge practitioners are employing when they are reflecting-on-action and reflecting-in-action. As a critique of technical rationality which promotes hard and fast lines between theory and practice, Schon's view blurs these lines and places value on tacit understanding (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). For Schon, practitioners are not simply translating theory and "best practice" that originate with researchers in universities to their classroom context. Instead, teachers develop knowledge-in-action as they "think on their feet" and begin to answer many of the thorny practical problems that arise in their day-to-day work. This knowledge-in-action accumulates and mixes with traditional theories and forms into practical theories about teaching. The process of reflection (both *in* and *on* action) subjects the teacher's knowledge and practical theories to criticism. Through the iterative process of thinking and acting, teachers are able to develop in ways that help them better realize their educational values.

As should be evident from the above discussion of theory and practice, those using the language of reflective teaching in this era were largely in opposition to top-down reforms that were being pursued in education that promoted the view of teacher-as-technician. The idea of reflective teaching was seen as standing in opposition to conservative trends and promoted the development of teachers as professionals who create and use their own knowledge and act with relative autonomy to serve their students and communities. For these reasons, reflective teaching became attached to many teacher education programs around the country and the world. Despite the shared goals, even before the end of the 1980s reflective teaching had become an attenuated and disarticulated idea that masked a tremendous variety of conceptual commitments (Calderhead, 1989). While there was great variation within the meanings, reflective teaching became ubiquitous throughout teacher education research, programs, and materials (Feiman-Nemser, 1990).

Zeichner's Reflection for Authentic Development of Teachers

Following up on the prevalence of ambiguous work being done in the name of reflective teaching throughout the 1980s, Zeichner (1993) systematically investigated the work of teacher education programs that claimed to foreground reflective practice. During this study he found that many of the programs were employing a usage of the term that undercut the genuine development of teachers as professionals. He criticized the programs along two lines. The first category of criticism related to the oft-cited theory and practice divide in education. He found that, instead of being empowering and creating a dialogic exchange of both theory and practice between teachers and universities, the teachers in these programs were being asked to reflect on how to better implement the curriculum and instruction developed at the university. While the idea of reflective teaching was supposed to interrupt the idea of teacher-as-technician, by employing it in such a narrow sense, these programs were reinforcing it and thus undermining the nuanced view of knowledge generation promoted by Schon and others. Zeichner also found that these programs limited reflection to issues of practice. In essence, teachers were encouraged to reflect on the *means* of education, while leaving the *ends* to schools of education and professional researchers.

The other category of Zeichner's criticism involves what he called the "individualist bias" (1993, p. 8). He found that the programs that employed the language of reflective teaching routinely conceived of reflection as an individual practice. First of all, teachers were encouraged to reflect on their own classrooms at the neglect of the larger systems their classroom were situated within. Much like the aims of education, the social context of schooling was placed out-of-bounds for teacher reflection in these programs. Secondly, reflection was promoted as an individual activity instead of one to be pursued in a community of practice (Wenger, 1998).

Zeichner's critiques about the generation of knowledge in many programs claiming to promote reflective teaching were prefigured in Schon's criticism of technical rationality. Zeichner's "individualist bias" critiques, on the other hand, apply to Schon's view of reflection. Despite his progressive contributions to the generative work of teaching practice, Schon conceived of reflection as a largely solitary task. Further developing the critique over a decade later, Liston and Zeichner (1996) write, "Apart from the context of mentoring, reflection is portrayed by Schon as largely a solitary process involving a teacher and his or her situation, and not as a social process taking place within a learning community" (p. 18). Interestingly, while Schon furthered much of the work of Dewey in relation to reflective teaching, he did not adopt his emphasize on the social aspect of inquiry. According to Carol Rodgers (2002), "Dewey knew that merely to think without ever having to express what one thought is an incomplete act. He recognized that having to express oneself to others, so that others truly understand one's ideas, reveals both the strengths and the holes in one's thinking" (p. 856).

Schon's conception of reflection also fails to consider the social aspect of reflection as it pertains to the social context of schools. By failing to encourage practitioners to consider the larger institutional contexts that shape the teaching profession and instead focus inwardly on their individual practice, "Schon is encouraging a submissive response to the institutional conditions and roles in which teachers find themselves" (Zeichner & Liston, 1996, p. 19). Instead, Zeichner and Liston argue that "teachers should be encouraged to focus both internally on their own practices, and externally on the social conditions of their practice, and that their actions plans should involve efforts to improve both individual practice and their situations" (ibid). This view is much more consistent with teaching as a traditional profession in which teachers are not simply agents of the state, but rather have a responsibility to consider the context of schools as a whole. It also echoes the commitments of critical educators who are not only worried about the students in their classrooms, but also struggle to interrupt the reproduction of inequalities in schools and view education as having a role in the social reconstruction of society.

Zeichner's criticism of how reflective teaching has been implemented in some schools of education is useful because it provides evaluative criteria for reflective teaching that promotes authentic professional development of teachers. In many ways the Foxfire Course for Teachers is well designed for supporting teachers as they strive for the types of reflection described by Zeichner. In the remainder of this chapter, the structure of the Foxfire Course for Teachers is described and then followed by teachers' descriptions of their experiences participating in it. Their reflective experiences are analyzed against the criteria for authentic professional development, namely that reflection be a generative and social process and that the targets of their reflection go beyond their classrooms to include the aims of education as well as the social context of schooling.

The Foxfire Course for Teachers

The Foxfire Course for Teachers is designed to promote deep engagement with the Foxfire Approach to Teaching and Learning. According to the Foxfire Fund website,

> The Foxfire Course for Teachers is an in-depth examination of each of the [Foxfire] Core Practices and their applications. During the Course, teachers will identify their existing perceptions of the relationships between teachers, learners, and the curriculum. Those perceptions will be challenged, and the teachers will begin to redefine their own teaching philosophies to include the Core Practices and merge them back into their own teaching practices. (www.foxfire.org/teaching)

During the weeklong residential course at the Foxfire Museum and Heritage Center, approximately fifteen participants and two facilitators work together to critically engage with the Foxfire Core Practices. Most of the participants are

working teachers pursuing their master's degrees at Piedmont College who are taking the course as an elective during the summer. Each week of the course attracts participants from different schools, different grade levels and different subject areas.

The Foxfire Course for Teachers has three "givens" that the participants must complete during their week together at the Foxfire Center. The first two givens of the course require students to "critically engage" with the *Foxfire Course Book* and *Experience and Education* by John Dewey. The *Foxfire Course Book* is organized around the ten Foxfire Core Practices and includes many teacher narratives about their experiences using and contributing to the Foxfire Approach. Whereas this text grew directly out of teachers experimenting in their classrooms, *Experience and Education* predates Foxfire by fifty years. Dewey's work did not inspire the original program, but rather affirmed much of the work that was already being done by teachers in the Foxfire Teacher Networks. As such, the text became a central element of the Foxfire Course for Teachers. Finally, the last given requires each participant to present an action plan to their peers that explains how they will integrate aspects of the Foxfire Approach into their teaching. In this way, each participant is required to translate insights gained through their collective engagement to action plans specific to their classrooms.

The Foxfire Course for Teachers is structured to allow the participants to experience the Foxfire Approach and gain insights into what it feels like to be a student in this type of learning environment. As such, only a few unilateral decisions are set before participants arrive at the Foxfire Center, leaving the majority of the time for them to deliberate about and experiment with different instructional approaches. As a result of the open structure of the course, each iteration takes a shape of its own as a result of the unique mix of participants and their goals and interests. Beyond the course texts, many of the participants report gaining deep insights into the Foxfire Approach by experiencing the push and pull of a group trying to make decisions together about their education. In this way the participants are able to better understand how to teach using the Foxfire Approach because they have experienced it as a student.

REFLECTION IN THE FOXFIRE COURSE FOR TEACHERS

Generative Reflection

The Foxfire Approach is an exemplar of teacher-created knowledge. From the original project up through the Teacher Networks and the development of the Foxfire Core Practices, the theory and practice of Foxfire has been teacher generated. This attitude toward the Foxfire Approach is also present in the design of the Foxfire Course for Teachers. Facilitators explain that "critical engagement" with the texts require participants to interrogate the ideas as opposed to blindly accepting them. One facilitator explained this aspect of the course during the first day,

Don't look at the Core Practices as if they came down from some mountain and are to be accepted as absolute truth. As a matter of fact, the version of the Core Practices that you have now in front of you was developed in 2009. And the feedback element into the revision of them was comments from people in this course and from practitioners doing this stuff in classrooms. We're probably on the threshold of another revision, so your critical engagement could well assist with that. You're responsible for keeping this thing dynamic and responsive.

By emphasizing the participants' role in contributing to the Foxfire Approach through their critical engagement during the week and ultimately through their experimentation with it in their classroom later on, the facilitator highlighted the generative nature of reflection in the Foxfire Course for Teachers.

Another aspect of the Foxfire Course for Teachers that encourages generative reflection is the requirement to develop an action plan to bring the Foxfire Approach to their individual classrooms. During the week, there is often disagreement about what is possible in the classroom due in part to differing constraints and levels of comfort with experiential teaching approaches; however, participants come to realize that the Foxfire Approach can look different in different settings. A second year kindergarten teacher explained this back and forth like this,

Everybody has different opinions about how things are going to work especially when we teach in such different schools. Like Donna teaches at a school where, you know, almost all of her children are defiant. They come from bad situations and then you have a lot of these people from Forsythe, I mean, they're wealthier. They have a lot more resources available. It's totally different circumstances everywhere you go. People are going to butt heads and have different, you know, teaching methods. What works in one classroom is not going to work for another. And people have spoken out and said, 'Well, that's not going to work. That's not practical for me.' But that's what the facilitators have kept trying to point out to us. Just because it works for you doesn't mean it's going to work for somebody else. We're trying to find ways to make things work for everyone's situation.

Part of the process of developing the action plan requires participants to inventory their teaching contexts and look for opportunities to bring in elements of the Foxfire Approach. Participants are not mandated to incorporate all of the Core Practices into their action plans. Instead they are encouraged to start small and create an opening in their teaching with the goal of incorporating more over time. Because of this, participants generate action plans that vary widely in terms of scope and focus. For instance, one action plan might focus on classroom management and inviting students to participate in collectively setting norms in the elementary classroom, whereas another action plan might be the redesign of a unit in a physics course to include more group work and student choice. In this way, participants are generating new applications of the Foxfire Approach based on their situations.

Social Reflection

One of the most striking things about the participants' responses to the course is the way in which relationships develop over the week and contribute to the learning experiences. As Harvey indicated in the opening quotation, participants become close and have extended opportunities to reflect together on their experiences and work collectively on their action plans. Many of the participants in this study reported similar experiences to Harvey's. One participant explained it like this, "It feels like we've known people a lot longer than two days. I mean, has it really only been two days that we've all been together? That seems to happen a lot faster in this setting." Despite only knowing two colleagues from her middle school when she arrived, this participant felt strong social bonds after only a few days. By the end of the week, she expressed that the community building that occurred during the week contributed most to her reflecting on the Foxfire Approach.

Other participants described the quick development of relationships as being the result of the stress of the deliberative format of the course coupled with the relative isolation of being at the Foxfire Center for a week. In an interview conducted on the third day of the course, one participant described a stressful moment that contributed to group bonding,

> Last night I came out to do my reading and a few of the teachers were interacting. I walked in while there were tears flowing and sort of this crisis moment that was both teaching and personal. And it's one of those things. It's like true bonding. And I found that really meaningful. You know, just sharing personal experiences and talking about different things that we've gone through. And that's the sort of thing that I like about being in these places. Where things kind of bubble up to the surface when you are no longer distracted by everything in your regular life. Just a truly meaningful and important moment. Where people who are more-or-less strangers kind of break down in front of each other because of that freedom.

Other participants described similar experiences happening in the evening, away from the large group, as playing an important role in the course. During the second half of the week, the students become more comfortable with each other and their deliberation over instructional decisions improves. Many participants felt this group development was the result of the residential format where participants had opportunities to interact informally. One participant described it like this,

> I think the more people interact outside of the official large group space and the more they can talk openly and freely about what they're feeling, the easier it is to voice your issues and concerns and opinions.

Despite the opportunities for participants to socialize outside the formal large group discussion sessions, many of the participants were surprised to report that their engagement with the Foxfire Approach often permeated the entire week, including

evenings, early mornings and meal times. A veteran 3rd grade teacher explained this as a function of bringing teachers together in a residential setting,

> Teachers never leave teaching, we always talk about it. It's like we don't leave it at school and talk about other stuff. It always ties back into teaching. Like at dinner time, the discussion was still basically teaching.

Another participant who anticipated having free time during the week was shocked that discussions were continuing late into the evenings,

> Last night, it was eleven o'clock and it wasn't over. I've seen different small groups and I've talked with different people. And it's not just about life and different things; that's included because that is a part of learning. It's about what we're doing here and our projects. It's like class isn't ending. It's just continuing until bedtime and that's just amazing that I'm still just taking it all in.

She went on to explain that the conversations that were occurring throughout the week were characterized by sharing of experiences and ideas about teaching,

> Whatever we're doing, it's not just one person talking or one person sharing their ideas. It leaps from this to that and that's how it is in my head all the time. But it's *my* ideas and that's through *my* personal experience and this has allowed it to be through eighteen other people sharing their ideas and their experiences in life and their journeys. And it's shaping the way I think and I hope the way others are thinking.

She found this to be one of the primary virtues of the Foxfire Course for Teachers because it allowed everyone to share in the collective expertise of the group. By reflecting together on the course texts, the structure of the course itself and their own teaching experiences, the group was able to gain deeper insights into the Foxfire Approach and the ways in which it might impact their future teaching.

Reflection about the Aims of Education and Social Context of Schooling

Finally, aspects of the Foxfire Course for Teachers encourage participants to go beyond immediate classroom concerns and reflect upon larger issues in education, such as the aims of education and the social context of schooling. In particular, the heterogeneity of the group pushes discussions in ways that would otherwise not occur. Because participants come from around the state (and in some cases from other states and even other countries), they have the chance to hear and discuss other schools and their shared constraints. For example, during the course, it is common for participants to engage in critical discussions about larger reform agendas in education such as the rise of charter schools and the implementation of the Common Core State Standards. During one week of the course, for instance, the participants engaged in an extended discussion about the Common Core and how it was impacting the

ability of teachers to allow for student choice in the classroom. Teachers of English language arts argued that it was conducive to the Foxfire Approach because it does not mandate specific readings, whereas math teachers argued that it constrained them in their teaching by mandating specific methods for mathematics. Through these conversations, participants gained a deeper understanding of standards on the differential impacts on teaching practice.

Overall, the heterogeneity of the group in terms of subjects taught pushed conversations beyond the narrow concerns of a given discipline resulting in participants having conversations that reached bigger issues in education. Early on during her week at the Foxfire Center, a middle school math teacher lamented the fact that the group was not composed of only math teachers; however, she came to see a value in the mixture as the week unfolded. She explained her experience like this,

> Part of me wants it to be with more middle school math people because we have a shared experience and shared goals. And just expectations on us and what we do in our classrooms, but I don't think it would be as interesting. And I don't think I would get so many out-of-the-box ideas. And I say that because...in my math group, in my PLC, we're very objective-driven. What lesson are we going to teach today? What resources do we have? You know, there is an agenda for the day and we're going to map out our plans for this week. I get so used to that goal-orientedness, that we don't ever have that time to just explore possibilities and discuss or think of the more creative solution. When you get a group of people together that don't have the same goals and the same standards, you can't talk about those specifics so you have to think big picture.

She went on to explain that the mixed group of participants required her to either teach her classmates about her subject or translate her concerns to broader issues that would be relevant to all teachers. As a result, her group was able to talk about larger ethical issues in education that often get overlooked for more narrowly technical ones as well as generate more creative solutions to problems she was encountering in her math teaching.

The goal of discussing the aims of education and the social context of schooling is also aided by the presence of *Experience and Education* in the required texts for the course. Most participants described being familiar with Dewey's ideas from foundations courses in their undergraduate education programs; however, only a few of them had read any of his writing and none of them had read an entire book by him. Because the text deals with more abstract concepts, participants are tasked with finding the relationship between them and the Foxfire Approach. For instance, *Experience and Education* addresses issues such as freedom and social control. These complex issues at the heart of democratic education become translated into practical discussions about the degree of student choice you should allow when using the Foxfire Approach and the role of the teacher as a facilitator of learning.

111

These broader discussions about education prompted by *Experience and Education* also become more accessible because of the collective knowledge and understanding brought to them by the mixed group of participants. Many of the participants described struggling with the text when reading alone; however, they were able to access it during their extended group discussions. An experienced paraprofessional pursuing her initial certification master's degree described her struggles with the text and eventual understanding like this,

> Even if it's an easy book, I probably struggle more than most people would. But talking about our ideas and sharing the experiences about the certain topics, I have a clearer understanding than anything I could have ever read in that book. And it doesn't only just give me an understanding, then it brings it into me and points me back out into all these different directions that I can take it in. And I can see it in other aspects of my life. As far as my child. My job. The students that I might teach. I'm able to take it all in and then spray it back out. Most people might can do that from reading. I can't. I mean, I can take it in and highlight things and say, 'yes, that's amazing' but I'm not seeing it like how I'm seeing it here.

Many other participants described similar experiences with coming to understand the difficult concepts in *Experience and Education*. For instance, a small group charged with facilitating a discussion about social control led the group through an experiential simulation in which the large group was charged with creating a game and playing it. The point of the activity was to animate the concept of social control as it pertains to social activities. A child playing a game does not feel their freedom being impinged upon simply because the game has rules. On the contrary, the game is defined by its rules. After experiencing this activity, several participants remarked that this helped them better understand the role of social control in democratic teaching and the need for certain boundaries to be placed on freedom in the classroom. Without the presence of *Experience and Education* in the course, these deeper understandings about student choice would not have been reached.

CONCLUSION

The Foxfire Course for Teachers provides a unique space for in-service teachers to deeply reflect upon their teaching philosophy and practice. The types of reflective experiences available to participants in the course are best understood in relation to the history of reflective teaching. As has been argued in this brief chapter, the design of the Foxfire Course for Teachers promotes genuine professional development by supporting reflection that is generative, social and conscious of the aims of education and the social context of schooling. Teacher educators and facilitators of professional development who are interested in supporting deep reflection should look to the Foxfire Course for Teachers as a model of how to support teachers on this path.

NOTES

[1] This chapter employs data collected from my dissertation research which examines the role of reflective teaching and deliberative democracy in the Foxfire Course for Teachers. The observation and interview data comes from three separate iterations of the course that occurred in the summer of 2013.

[2] Elsewhere this convergence of factors is conceived of as a shift away from "teacher education as a training problem" to "teacher education as a learning problem" (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

REFERENCES

Beyer, L. E. (1984). Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *35*(3), 36–41.

Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. A. (2007). Genres of empirical research in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *58*(1), 3–11.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and teacher education*, *5*(1), 43–51.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1983). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Geelong, Vic: Deakin University.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69–109). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dewey, J. (1904). *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath & Co.

Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). *Conceptual orientations in teacher education*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(6), 33–49.

Mayhew, K. C., & Edwards, A. C. (1936). *The Dewey School: The laboratory school of the University of Chicago, 1896–1903*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1990). Metaphor in the study of teachers' professional knowledge. *Theory into Practice*, *29*(2), 116–121.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104*(4), 842–866.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Tanner, L. N. (1988). The path not taken: Dewey's model of inquiry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *18*(4), 471–479.

The Foxfire Approach. (n.d.). Retrieved December 20, 2015, from http://www.foxfire.org/teaching.html

Tom, A. R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. *Journal of teacher education*, *36*(5), 35–44.

Valli, L. (Ed.). (1992). *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques*. New York, NY: Suny Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker*, *9*(5), 2–3.

Zeichner, K. M. (1987). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *11*(5), 565–575.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *19*(1), 5–20.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.