

1993

School-Based Teacher Education in the United States : An Uneven Evolution

Mary K. Ducharme
Drake University

Edward R. Ducharme
Drake University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ducharme, M. K., & Ducharme, E. R. (1993). School-Based Teacher Education in the United States : An Uneven Evolution. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(2).
<https://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1993v18n2.3>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol18/iss2/3>

Parliamentary Answer (1991). (Cited in Anon, op. cit.).

Patrick, H., Bernbaum, G. and Reid, K. (1982). *The structure and process of initial teacher education within universities in England and Wales*. Leicester: University of Leicester School of Education.

Patten, J. (1992). *Letter to Sir William Taylor*. Chairman, CATE. Mimeo.

UCET (1991). *Report on the 1991 Annual Residential Conference 29th November - 1st December*. Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

UFC (1992) *Letter to Principals and Vice-Chancellors*. 3 February.

Note:

The *Times Educational Supplement* (TES) and the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* (THES) have been extensively used, so their abbreviations have replaced the normal referencing conventions in the body of the paper.

SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: AN UNEVEN EVOLUTION

Mary Kluender Ducharme and Edward R. Ducharme
Drake University

What does school-based teacher education mean in the United States? Certainly, it does not mean that funding, decision-making and management of programs are the province of individual school districts; in the United States, teacher education is firmly ensconced in higher education. The overwhelming majority of teachers are prepared in colleges and universities, licensed by individual states, and employed by local school districts. Law, tradition, and funding suggest that this general pattern will not change soon.

While teacher education is located primarily in higher education institutions, school-based teacher education exists. It exists in many forms, ranging from student teaching and other field experiences in which students apply concepts and skills learned on campus to comprehensive partnerships among higher education institutions and local school districts for comprehensive initial and continuing teacher development. In this article, we explore several configurations of school-based teacher education. We first present brief scenarios that illustrate common school-based patterns, then describe several configurations currently in operation in the United States. We then summarise some of the issues inherent in school-based teacher education.

USING SCHOOL SITES FOR TEACHER PREPARATION: FOUR SCENARIOS

More than 1,200 higher education institutions offer teacher education programs in the United States, varying in size from small private colleges to large public universities. The teacher education programs in those institutions may range from small departments with two or three faculty members to colleges of education within universities with faculties of 200 or more. Each program is affected by a variety of influences: state legislators and policy makers, university-wide committees, school district personnel, individual faculty members and cooperating teachers. At the same time, however, curriculum in teacher education follows a remarkably similar pattern: "a composite of general undergraduate education, specialised study in academic departments or schools of education, and clinical experiences in elementary or secondary

classrooms and schools" (Doyle, 1990, p.6). The extent to which the clinical experiences' component of teacher education programs is integrated with the other curricular elements or a shared responsibility of higher education and the schools varies widely. The following four scenarios demonstrate the range of configurations:

Scenario 1: Traditional Teacher Preparation

Amy is a twenty-one year old undergraduate majoring in elementary education in a state university in the mid-western United States. She is beginning her fourth year of study and plans to graduate next spring. During her first two years of college, most of Amy's coursework was in arts and sciences, but she also took an introductory course in education, during which she spent approximately 80 hours observing in elementary education classrooms, and an educational psychology course. During her third and fourth years, she took more coursework in education and developed an area of concentration in science, a subject she looks forward to teaching. Amy's education professors took classes to elementary classrooms a few times during her education courses, usually for one-hour visits so students could try out lessons they had planned in the college classes. One professor required her to videotape her teaching episode so she could later critique it. She was pleased with those opportunities, but she felt like a visitor to the classroom, not like a real teacher. She is looking forward to next semester's student teaching, when she will be in an elementary classroom full time. She wonders: will her cooperating teacher use the same methods and have a similar philosophy to that of her campus professors? Will she remember all the ideas and concepts she has recently learned?

Scenario 2: Campus School Teacher Preparation

Jane is also twenty-one years old, an undergraduate majoring in art and elementary education, but she attends a private college in the eastern part of the United States. Jane chose this college because it has a high quality liberal arts program and a campus school serving as a

learning laboratory for education students. Jane worked voluntarily in the lab school since she was a first year student, and almost all of her education classes include work with elementary students in the campus school. She appreciates the many opportunities to try out what she is learning in her art and education classes, and she feels very comfortable in the classroom since it is so easily accessible to her. She has watched her own professors demonstrate lessons and has been encouraged to try activities on her own. She thinks the campus school is an ideal setting, but wonders if her experience is realistic since many of the students in the campus school are children of faculty members. Most of the others come from upper middle class families with a great deal of emphasis on education. She would like to teach in an urban school next year. Jane is confident that she has developed strong teaching skills, but she wonders if she will be able to apply what she has learned to a very different public school setting.

Scenario 3: Professional Development School Teacher Preparation

Jim is a fourth year undergraduate in education at a large state university; he wants to teach in a middle school after graduation. Like Amy and Jane, Jim took a substantial number of liberal arts courses during his first two years of school, and he has almost completed all of the required coursework in his academic major of social studies. The faculty at Jim's university has developed a partnership with a nearby middle school with a diverse student population in a relatively poor neighbourhood. Almost all of Jim's education coursework has been in the middle school building for the past two years; he believes that he knows the teachers and students well and that it is "his" building, too. His professors and the middle school teachers work together; sometimes a professor teaches a middle school class, and sometimes a middle school teacher teaches one of his education classes. Everyone talks about curriculum, students, and school issues together and a team of teachers and university faculty and students have begun a research project on improving students' writing. Jim will student teach in the building next spring; he has begun observing in his cooperating teacher's classroom so he can get to know the students better and talking with the teacher about teaching strategies he wants to develop further. She, in turn, is talking with him about a new unit of study she would like to try, with his help. Jim wonders if he will be able to find a school as exciting as this one when he looks for a job. He also wonders how long the teachers and professors can keep up the intensity of their work.

Scenario 4: Alternative Certification Teacher Preparation

Ron is a black twenty-six year old father of three. He completed an undergraduate degree in business, but after a couple of years, found he just didn't like the work. He wanted more opportunities to work with people, especially young people. But at his age and with his family responsibilities, he couldn't afford to go back to school for several years. Last year, he took a job as an instructional aide in the public schools. The pay was poor, but the district also offered him the chance to obtain his teaching certificate through an intense teacher education program jointly planned by the district and a local university to recruit minority teachers into the classroom. Ron's daily work experience as an instructional aide has made the classes more meaningful, because he can apply what he has learned right away. The classes are also designed to fit his schedule; he attends classes in the evenings, on weekends, and in the summer. Many of the classes are offered in the building, and master teachers in the building provide supervision. Ron has agreed to teach in the district for three years in return for the district's investment in him, but he hopes to be there a lot longer than that.

FROM SCHOOL-BASED TO UNIVERSITY-BASED TEACHER PREPARATION: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Totally school-based teacher preparation occurred in the United States only during the earliest days of formal teacher preparation itself. During the nineteenth century, preparing to be a teacher was essentially an apprenticeship, if in fact, any preparation existed. Many teachers left one classroom as a student only to enter another classroom as a teacher, often with little more preparation than the students they would teach. Beginning in the mid-1880s, Horace Mann and other school leaders advocated the establishment of normal schools for formal teacher preparation, basing them on European models (Urban, 1990).

Normal schools initially had the sole purpose of training teachers, and typically offered a combination of academic, technically oriented pedagogic study, and practice in classrooms (Urban, 1990; Ducharme & Ducharme, in press). Most normal schools were independent institutions established by the states, but many large urban school districts established their own normal schools to provide for their rapidly increasing school enrolments. The first school system-based normal school was Boston's Girl's

High and Normal School, established in 1854. Altenbaugh and Underwood (1990, p.149) report that, "By 1914, every city with a population of at least 300,000 maintained normal schools or training classes in connection with their public school systems, often integrated with the academic program of the city high schools". Johnson (1992, p.251) notes that the city training schools "demonstrated an alternate, more practical model of teacher training, but they did not develop systematic pedagogical theories, operating more along apprenticeship lines".

However, neither normal schools nor school-based teacher preparation endured long as mechanisms for teacher preparation. Normal schools rapidly changed from single purpose institutions dedicated to the preparation of teachers to multipurpose institutions of higher education. Most normal schools eventually became teachers' colleges, and many are now multipurpose state colleges and universities; for example, the St. Cloud (Minnesota) State Normal School is now St. Cloud State University. City training schools virtually disappeared by the 1930s, due to economics and the growth of university-based teacher preparation (Johnson, 1989, p.252). Altenbaugh and Underwood (1990, p.150) report that "while the nation had 46 teachers' colleges and 137 state normal schools in 1920, these figures shifted profoundly in only thirteen years to 146 and 50, respectively. The number of city normal schools declined from 33 in 1920 to 16 in 1933. By 1940, the term normal school had become obsolete".

During that same period, universities and liberal arts colleges established departments of pedagogy and programs for teacher preparation. The University of Michigan is believed to have appointed the first professor of education in 1879; by the turn of the century many other institutions had also established education programs, and it was possible to pursue a doctorate in education in a few universities (Hazlett, 1989). Higher education-based teacher preparation grew because of a combination of external and internal factors: states developed specific teacher certification requirements, most based on college level coursework; school accreditation programs increasingly required high schools to hire college-trained teachers; and colleges and universities became more actively involved in teacher preparation. At first, these requirements influenced only the preparation of secondary teachers, but similar requirements for elementary teachers soon followed. A bachelor degree and completion of an approved program of study in

education became the standard route for teacher certification, and some states began requiring advanced degrees for certification.

Most colleges and universities provided for school-based experience in their programs in one of two ways. Some, like many of the normal schools that preceded them, established campus schools or laboratory schools, in which faculty conducted research and experimentation and teacher education students could study pedagogy and develop teaching skills. Others provided student teaching experiences in the local schools. During the first half of the twentieth century, campus schools were quite common; at their peak in 1964, 212 schools were members of the National Association of Laboratory Schools. Like the city training programs, however, campus schools were expensive to maintain, and some educators expressed concern that lab schools did not provide a realistic site for preparation, since their students were often the children of faculty members or selected among better students. By the 1988, the number of laboratory or campus schools had decreased to 95 (Stallings & Kowalski, p.252).

Instead, colleges and universities increasingly used local public and private schools as field experience sites. For many, the primary school-based experience was student teaching in the final semester. In recent years, however, teacher preparation programs have incorporated school-based experiences into all aspects of their programs, including initial field experiences to introduce students to the profession, clinical experiences associated with pedagogy classes, and more intensive student teaching experiences (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). The faculty in many college-based university programs believe increased use of school sites is necessary if students are to link theory to practice. In this paper, we consider four ways in which school-based teacher education takes place: through student teaching, early field experiences as part of pedagogy coursework, professional development schools, and alternative teacher certification.

SCHOOL SITES FOR STUDENT PRACTICE: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND STUDENT TEACHING

Asked to describe the most influential part of their teacher education program, most teachers would answer, "student teaching." Guyton and McIntyre report that "most student teaching takes place in public schools and is a full-time experience for 10-12 weeks. This basic

organisational framework is nearly universal in the United States" (Guyton & McIntyre, p.518). National accreditation and most state certification requirements reinforce this pattern of full-time experience prior to initial certification. Most student teachers spend a semester of all day participation in a single classroom under the direct supervision of a cooperating teacher accompanied by periodic observations by a university supervisor. They spend approximately 15% of their time observing the cooperating teacher and classroom activities; during the remaining 85% of their time, they become increasingly involved in direct teaching experiences (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Johnson & Yates, 1982).

The student teaching experience exerts a high degree of influence on the prospective teacher's beliefs, behaviours and teaching skills, but those influences are often inconsistent with the philosophy, goals and pedagogical practices of the teacher education program. When the two approaches conflict, the influence of the student teaching experience usually prevails. Richardson-Koehler (1988) reports that students quickly begin to discount the influence of their campus-based learning and to attribute their growth to the cooperating teacher. Other researchers (Copeland, 1977; Denmark & Nutter, 1984; Watts, 1987) have noted that most student teaching contexts are not under the control of the teacher education program, but are pivotal to student teacher outcomes and attitudes. Researchers have made several recommendations to improve the fit between the campus-based portion of the teacher education program and the student teaching experience, including: careful selection of settings and cooperating teachers (Copeland, 1977), preparation of cooperating teachers for their roles (Zeichner & Liston, 1987); decreasing the amount of actual time spent teaching and increasing the amount of time studying the culture of the school and reflecting on practice (Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). Others have called for a re-emphasis on teaching laboratories (Berliner, 1985) and greater formal collaboration between the higher education institution and the public school to develop a shared understanding about the purposes, processes and intended outcomes of the student teaching experience.

School experiences for prospective teachers now often precede the final student teaching semester. McIntyre (1983) reports that teacher education students spend as many as 300 hours in classrooms prior to student teaching. Most states require early field experiences for admission to a

teacher education program. Early field experiences serve a variety of purposes: they give potential teachers initial experiences in the classroom and often help them make more informed decisions about teaching as a career; they provide opportunities to work with a variety of students, apply theory, test teaching strategies and experiment with alternative approaches. Applegate (1987) reports that supporters of early field experiences believe they will make prospective teachers more effective, the transition from student to teacher less painful, and campus-based theoretical knowledge more meaningful; they will also help "weed out" persons not suited to teaching and help prospective teachers better understand the culture they will soon enter. Many of the same concerns raised about student teaching apply to early field experiences. Even with careful planning, attention to placement and logistics and lengthy discussions between the campus-based and school-based educators, students on field experiences receive conflicting messages about appropriate practice.

SCHOOL SITES FOR COLLABORATIVE GROWTH: SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Many universities and school districts in the United States are seeking more collaborative ways to participate jointly in teacher education and to develop partnerships that allow them to work together to achieve common goals of teacher development, improvement of curriculum and instruction and transformation of schools. The Clinical Schools Clearinghouse (1992) lists 80 individual professional development schools in 19 states. In some locations, the partnerships are informal; recently, however, many school districts and colleges and universities have formalised the process, creating professional development schools similar to those called for by the Holmes Group (1986) and other teacher education reform groups.

Professional development schools and similar school partnerships differ from the old patterns of collaboration. Ideally, decisions are made jointly, and traditional roles are re-examined and redefined. Zeichner (1992, p.296) describes the difficult task that such an undertaking requires: "University faculty, teachers, and administrators are struggling to work out the new dimensions of their roles (such as classroom teachers having more influence on the total teacher education curriculum and university faculty playing a greater role in supporting and helping to institutionalise school reforms)". An underlying

assumption of the professional development school is that teacher development is a continuum, and that teacher education students, teachers, university faculty and administrators should work together to increase their knowledge, expertise and understanding to improve teaching and learning. Professional development schools and other partnerships are a relatively new phenomenon in the United States, and most of the newly formed programs are only beginning to make the fundamental changes in attitude and behaviour that they desire. Some partnerships are formal agreements between universities and entire school districts; others are the work of individual faculty members, teachers and students. A few examples suggest the range of activities and alternative structures being tried and tested:

- The University of New Mexico and the Albuquerque Public Schools have had a partnership for over 25 years designed to meet the complementary needs of the university and the school district. A key feature of this partnership is exchange of personnel in which university fellows teach in the schools and veteran teachers are released to work in college and district partnership efforts. Auger and Odell (1992) report that "in effect, the college is a subcontractor to the district, providing teachers for over 100 elementary, secondary, and special education classrooms. The district, in return, uses the savings to assign a number of veteran teachers, with full pay and benefits continuing, to work in partnership programs. This exchange of services renders the partnership a no-cost item for both the college and the district." (p.262) Some features of the program have changed over time, but the essential elements of the partnership - exchange of personnel, collaboration, and focus on improving both the school and the college programs - have endured.
- Texas A & M University developed a collaborative program with the Jane Long Middle School in a nearby school district. Interdisciplinary teams of university and middle school faculty developed curriculum and participated in school improvement activities. As part of the collaborative program, teacher education students and middle school teachers work together in an integrated methods course for the prospective teachers. (Knight, Wiseman, & Smith, 1992).
- At Texas Christian University, university faculty, experienced primary teachers and teacher education students work together on

the teaching of mathematics to young children. The experienced teachers cooperate with the teacher education students to plan instruction and review videotapes of lessons. At the same time, the experienced teachers participated in a graduate level seminar, exploring their own conceptions of the teaching of mathematics and examining their own practices. (Martin & Reynolds, 1993).

- The University of Nebraska-Lincoln developed an experimental elementary teacher education program in which intensive field experiences accompanied each semester of professional education coursework. Participating students worked in pairs in classrooms; they observed, planned and taught lessons, videotaped each other and reflected on their teaching in relation to what they learned in class. The cooperating teachers helped students make decision about lessons, gave them feedback, and were active partners in overall program planning. (Kluender, 1986).

SCHOOL SITES AS SOURCES FOR NEW TEACHERS: ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION

Although most teachers become certified by completing a traditional college-based teacher education program, many states have developed alternative certification programs. Most alternative certification programs provide individuals with bachelor degree opportunities to fulfil certification requirements without completing a traditional teacher education degree program; they are often designed to attract minorities to the teaching profession or to fill critical shortages in subject areas. Many alternative certification programs are collaborative efforts between higher education institutions and public school systems; they typically provide selection and employment of candidates by the school district, condensed coursework, and supervised internships.

The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE 1986, p.2) defines alternative certification programs by the following conditions:

1. The state has passed legislation or a state education agency has promulgated policies and procedures to establish a legally sanctioned process for licensing teachers who have not had prior professional training.

2. School districts are empowered to select, to hire, and ultimately to recommend alternative candidates for certification.
3. Alternative programs are intended to recruit or select college graduates other than those prepared in regular teacher education programs.
4. The required professional preparation is essentially hands-on, on-the-job training with some supporting workshops or courses.
5. Programs are school-based and may or may not include the cooperation or the participation of universities. Individual faculty may contribute services to particular programs.

ATE recommends that alternative programs include "intensive clinical experiences, careful evaluation procedures, extensive use of master teachers who are given time to truly mentor alternative certification candidates, careful selection of candidates with cooperation with colleges of education in completion of the alternative certification process" (Dixon & Ishler, 1992, pp. 33-4).

Many alternative certification programs follow these principles and have provided a substantive alternative to the traditional route for teacher certification. For example, some urban schools including several in New York City and Philadelphia, concerned that few black males become teachers, have developed innovative programs in which minority group teacher candidates become teaching aides, participate in intensive, short-term teacher preparation programs, and earn teaching certificates. Districts then require them to work in the district as teachers for several years, after which the district forgives the teacher's educational loan.

Some states have developed alternative state certification plans that include professional development, supervision, and mentoring of new teachers during their initial years in the classroom. For example, California established an alternative program for prospective secondary teachers with a degree in the subject they plan to teach. School districts were required to develop a professional development plan for each teacher, assign a mentor, and evaluate the teacher annually. After two years of teaching with a mentor, the candidate could be certified. An evaluation study by the California Commission

on Teacher Credentialing (1987), however, found many professional plans not well developed or monitored closely enough and little communication between mentors and beginning teachers. New Jersey's alternative certification program, initiated in 1985, allowed individuals to become certified if they had a bachelor degree with at least a minor in the teaching field, passed a test for content mastery, completed a provisional year as a regular salaried teacher, and participated in a 20 hour practicum and 200 hours of instruction. An initial study of the New Jersey plan indicated that candidates to the program had higher scores on the National Teaching Examination (NTE) than traditional candidates, and had a lower attrition rate from teaching (Gray & Linn, 1988). Critics of the New Jersey plan have raised several concerns, including the quality of training sites, lack of supervision, the generic nature and uneven quality of the seminars, and lack of evaluation on the program itself.

FUTURE TRENDS

What do we see as the likely scenario for teacher education in the future? We certainly do not envision that teacher education will move entirely out of higher education; professional education in all fields is firmly embedded in colleges and universities. Neither do we foresee a retreat from the increased partnership between higher education and elementary and secondary schools. Instead, we believe - and hope - that the work of teacher education programs and the elementary and secondary schools will become more intertwined, that their work will be viewed as common work. As elementary and secondary schools continue to attempt major reforms, they increasingly become the logical sites for teachers, prospective teachers and faculty members to jointly examine basic assumptions about schooling, test alternative approaches to effective teaching and learning, and work toward school reform. Professional development schools and other collaborative arrangements seem to us to hold the greatest promise of meaningful school-based teacher education in which schools and universities can pursue their legitimate goals, purposes and needs for the common purpose of the improvement of schools.

Yet, we are aware that we cannot think about how to improve the school-based component of teacher education unless we first address the underlying assumptions and beliefs implicit in teacher education programs. Zeichner (1993) points out that teacher education programs rest on several historical traditions (academic, social

efficiency, developmentalist and social reconstruction), each of which may use similar strategies and program structures, but to quite different purposes. Individual programs do not reflect a single tradition; rather, they combine, in varying forms, the underlying assumptions, tensions and inherent contradictions of the several traditions. Zeichner argues for increased dialogue to better understand how the specific approaches to teacher education are operationalised in an individual program. Elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators are engaged in similar discussions about the multiple demands, expectations, and calls for reform they face in the 1990s. If higher education and the schools are to work together to provide coherent, meaningful university-based and school-based teacher education, they must engage in a dialogue about the essential purposes of their joint endeavours.

REFERENCES

- Altenbaugh, R.J. & Underwood, K. (1990). The evolution of normal schools. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik, (Eds.), *Places where teachers are taught* (pp. 136-186). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Applegate, J. H. (1987). Early field experiences: Three viewpoints. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 75-93). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Association of Teacher Educators (1989). *Alternatives, yes - lower standards, no! Minimum standards for alternative teacher certification programs*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Auger, F. K., & Odell, S. J. (1992). Three school-university partnerships for teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 262-268.
- Berliner, D. C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(6), 2-8.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1987). *The effectiveness of the teacher trainee program: An alternative route into teaching in California*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Clinical Schools Clearinghouse (1992). *Professional development schools: A directory of projects in the United States*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Copeland, W. (1977). *The nature of the relationship between cooperating teacher behaviour and student teacher performance*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Denemark, G., & Nutter, N. (1984). The case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation. In L. Katz & J. Raths, (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 1, pp. 203-246). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Dixon, P. N., & Ishler, R. E. (1992). Acceptable approaches to alternative certification. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 9(1), 29-35.

Doyle, W. (1990). Themes in teacher education research. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 3-24). New York: Macmillan.

Ducharme, E. R., & Ducharme, M. K. (in progress). Development of the teacher education professoriate. F. Murray (Ed.), *A knowledge base for teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Gray, D., & Lynn, D. H. (1988). *EW teachers, EHER teachers: A report on two initiatives in New Jersey*. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Hazlett, J. S. (1989). Education professors: The centennial of an identity crisis. In R. Wisniewski, & E. R. Ducharme, (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Johnson, W. R. (1989). Teachers and teacher training in the twentieth century. pp. 237-256. In D. Warren, (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work*. New York: Macmillan.

Johnson, J., & Yates, J. (1982). *A national survey of student teaching programs*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 963).

Kluender, M. M. (1986). The Nebraska consortium for the improvement of teacher education. In T. J. Lasley, (Ed.), *Issues in Teacher Education* (Vol. II: Background Papers from the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Knight, S. L., Wiseman, D., & Smith, C. W. (1992). The reflectivity-activity dilemma in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 269-277.

Martin, K. & Reynolds, S. (1993). Veteran and rookie teachers: A stereoptic vision of learning in mathematics. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 245-253.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to effective supervision of student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 28-34.

Stallings, J. A. & Kowalski, T. (1990). Research on professional development schools. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 251-266). New York: Macmillan.

Urban, W. J. (1990). Historical studies of teacher education. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 59-71). New York: Macmillan.

Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 151-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. M. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 296-307.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Traditions of practice in U.S. preservice teacher education programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 1-13.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 23-48.

Zeichner, K., & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8(2), 95-117.

PARTNERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION: A PROGRAMME IN ALBERTA

Glenda Campbell-Evans
Edith Cowan University

A persistent quest for improvement and change seems to be characteristic of Western education. New ways of thinking, doing and knowing occupy the time and energy of educators at all levels. Educators concerned with the pre service education of teachers plan and deliver programmes which vary from institution to institution. In Canada, some teacher education courses are school-based, some are traditional, some are developed from a school-university partnership model and some follow a discipline-based degree.

This article presents a descriptive account of the Teaching Partnership programme; a school based teacher education initiative implemented in September 1993 in Alberta, Canada.¹ The rationale, intentions and origin of the project are discussed. Details of the programme format and structure including changes to the traditional roles and organisation of faculty, teachers and schools involved in the preparation of student teachers are explicated. Attention is also drawn to the place of the Teaching Partnership programme within the overall offering of the Faculty. Issues related to planning and implementation are highlighted and expectations of the programme revealed. Information for the paper was collected through interviews with the faculty participants in July 1993 and from planning documents.

THE PROGRAMME

The Teaching Partnership programme is a joint initiative of the University of Alberta Faculty of Education and the Edmonton Public School Board (EPSB). The programme evolved as follows. While discussing issues akin to teacher education at the Dean's Advisory Council, the Superintendent of EPSB suggested that the faculty 'do a programme in schools'. The suggestion received further consideration during subsequent discussions of the Council which is comprised of a variety of stakeholders including the Dean of Education, Dean of Arts, school system superintendents, and Alberta Teacher Association (ATA) personnel. The support of the Dean and the Superintendent was the catalyst for action. The programme is the product of their

commitment. As one member of the planning team recounted, "It started with the Superintendent and the Dean and has been working its way down."

Interested individuals were sought and a Teaching Partnership Committee was formed consisting of three members of the Faculty of Education, representatives of the EPSB and the Edmonton local branch of the ATA. It was expected that programme development and design would be a collaborative effort among the major stakeholders. The committee was able to plan free of constraints regarding course content, assignment, structure and format.

The Teaching Partnership provides an "alternative teacher education model in which theory is provided in the context of direct experience with children" (Teaching Partnership Committee Planning Document, June, 1993). It aims to contextualise the process of learning to teach. One committee member expects,

...more points of connection and more efficiency in terms of the use of their (students) time spent in seminars or library because they won't be frightened off by ignorance about curriculum topics and child development.

The Teaching Partnership rests on assumptions different from those common to many traditional teacher education programmes. The programme name emphasises the importance of the relationships between players. Participants in this school-based programme aim to interact with one another in ways that are not widespread in many current patterns of teacher training. There is agreement that "all partners learn and teach. In the atmosphere of co-learning there will be growth on the part of all concerned" (Teaching Partnership Committee Planning Document, June, 1993). An active contribution to the Teaching Partnership is called for from all participants; junior teaching partners (student teachers), senior teaching partners, principals, Faculty of Education personnel, and the Teaching Partnership Committee. A highly interactive, reflective and holistic context for learning is expected.