

臺北市立大學
106 學年度博士班入學考試試題

所 別：教育行政與評鑑研究所博士班

科 目：教育英文

考試時間：90 分鐘【10：30－12：00】

不得使用計算機 或任何儀具。

總 分：100 分

※ 注意：不必抄題，作答時請將試題題號及答案依照順序寫在考試試卷上；限用藍色或黑色筆作答，使用其他顏色或鉛筆作答者，所考科目以零分計算。（於本試題紙上作答者，不予計分。）

申論題（每題 25 分，共 100 分）

一、請先摘述說明下文的要旨，並加以申述評析之。

According to Kachur, Stout, and Edwards(2010), the following recommendations and considerations for using walkthroughs can be effective starting places for teacher leaders and administrators:

1. Involve the teaching staff and begin with teacher volunteers.
2. Provide training and practice teacher walkthroughs in a safe setting while engaging potentially reluctant teachers.
3. Start slow and keep the process simple in the beginning.
4. Model nonjudgmental/non-evaluative conversations.
5. Develop walk-through norms and ground rules.

Teachers' workplace learning is viewed as an important component of the overall professional development of teachers (Retallick, 1999). Improving professional learning for educators is a crucial step in transforming schools and improving student achievement (Darling- Hammond et al., 2009). Designing principles for learning and walkthroughs, as part of a teacher-driven cycle of improvement, are an effective strategy development that provides a structure to achieve long-term improvements and sustainable learning (Curtis & City, 2009). (Excerpt from Feeney, E. (2014). Design principles for learning to guide teacher walkthroughs. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 87(1), 21-29.)

二、請摘述說明下文的要旨，並評析其中的觀點。

The norms about adult and organizational learning have proven very difficult to change. Our culture is very strongly oriented around a status mind-set that can best be summarized as the belief that, when it comes to a knowledge, skill, or individual or organizational attribute, "you either have it or you don't." This stands in sharp contrast to a more developmental approach, which acknowledges the gradual and sometimes incremental learning that characterizes individual and organizational growth in other settings. And, although our colleagues in schools and districts report some progress in "separating the person from practice" and getting educators to move out of the "land of nice" to actually name and address the real challenges and stuck points they face, the analyses often don't do below the surface and the norms for follow-up still need to be strengthened. Rather, while educators seem pleased to be able to see and learn from each other's practice (and consequently enjoy and are enthusiastic about participating in rounds), the next-level-of-work suggestions are often not as deep and context specific as they could be. (Excerpt from Teitel, L. (2013). *School-based instructional rounds: Improving teaching and learning across classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. p. 23.)

三、請以中文先摘述說明下文的要旨，並加以申述評析之。

School relocation typically occurs due to changes over time, such as changes in population demographics, for example, a declining birthrate (Lin, Huang, & Ho, 2014; Post & Stambach, 1999; Valencia, 1984), low enrollment (De Witte & Van Klaveren, 2014; Egelund & Laustsen, 2006; Engberg, Gill, Zamarro, & Zimmer, 2012), land ownership (including government land grants), urbanization and city growth, unsafe buildings, facility improvements or institution expansion (Ho, 2004), as well as school performance (Dean, 1982; Deeds & Pattillo, 2015). Urbanization and city growth appear to be crucial factors that drive, or push, the relocation of schools in high population density cities, including Singapore (Ho, 2004; Wong, Ho, & Toh, 2001), Hong Kong (Ho, 1995), and Taiwan. However, natural disasters are another factor that is often documented in the reports as causing schools to close or relocate (Barrett, Ausbrooks, & Martinez-Cosio, 2012) and have probably occurred far more often in many places around the world. For instance, Hurricane Sandy in New York City resulted in the loss of instructional school days, and some schools were relocated in 2012-2013 as a result (Chakrabarti & Livingston, 2012). (Excerpt from Sung, C.-I. (2015). Evaluating a Public School Relocation in Urban Taiwan. *Urban Education*. 1-23. doi: 10.1177/0042085915618711).

四、請以中文先摘述說明下文的要旨，並加以申述評析之。

Graduate and post-graduate programs were initially developed by universities to increase discipline-specific mastery. Doctoral programs in leadership prepare students for important roles in our society; highly educated leaders are in demand, and universities that provide leadership education are necessary (Bowden and Rudenstine 1992; Green et al. 2001; Smallwood 2004).

Faculty members are a central component of graduate and post-graduate programs as they are responsible for facilitating student learning and are often a pivotal determinant for student selection of a university (Bryant 2003) or for leaving a program (Lovitts 2001; Pauley et al. 1999; Smallwood 2004). The emphasis, type, and content of doctoral degree programs in leadership are evolving rapidly to the extent that discovering faculty competencies necessary for the future could help define a roadmap for the next decade (Crawford et al. 2002).

This study was exploratory and reports on the 21st century competencies for doctoral faculty who currently teach in leadership programs. Prior studies have focused on preparing graduates to become new faculty to teach in traditional undergraduate settings (e.g. Austin et al. 2008; Gardner 2005; Purcell 2007); however, there is little research specific to the new-century skills necessary for doctoral faculty who currently teach in leadership programs. The literature suggests that information technologies will continue to bring about global changes and that educating potential leaders is our best hope for the future (Bowden and Rudenstine 1992; Green et al. 2001; Hyatt et al. 2009). To address the challenges going forward, it is important, then, to discover requisite competencies for this group of doctoral faculty members.

(Excerpt from Hyatt, L. & Williams, P.E. (2011). 21st Century Competencies for Doctoral Leadership Faculty. *Innovation Higher Education*, 36(1): 53-66. doi:10.1007/s10755-010-9157-5)