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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 legislatures 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 tryout 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 lab school. She states that 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 where they have a 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 understands what it is like to teach in a building of this type. 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 spend the next spring in the building and next fall he has begun observing in his cooperating teacher’s classroom so he can get to know the student 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 school as well 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 and professional training. Normal schools were independent institutions established by the states, but many large urban schools had their own normal schools to provide for their rapidly increasing school enrolments. The first school system-based normal school was Boston’s Girls’ 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 schools to train teachers and associate 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 many, if not most, colleges and universities 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 1920s, and it was not until the growth of university-based teacher preparation (Johnson, 1989, p.252) that “the nation had 46 teachers’ colleges and 137 state normal schools in 1920, but 33 in 1950, and only 17 in 1970. By 1990, just 17 states had teacher training schools; most of the others had been absorbed by state universities” (Hazlett, 1990, p.252). Altenbaugh and Underwood (1990, p.150) report that “while the nation had 46 teachers’ colleges and 137 state normal schools in 1920, there were only 17 state normal schools in 1990. 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 been the first to offer such a program 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 (Hazelte, 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 the addition of student teaching for elementary teachers soon followed. A 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 gain pedagogical 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 the 1930s 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 1980s, 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 teacher education experience is 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 teaching 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 field experience 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

Asking 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 experiences and field-based 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 experience (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 outweighs those of the program (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; Denemark & 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 for balancing the two approaches to meet the complementary needs of the university and the school district. A key feature of this partnership is exchange of personnel in which school teachers are released to work in the college and district partnerships. The college, 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.

**SCHOOL SITES FOR COLLABORATIVE GROWTH: SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP**

Many universities and school districts in the United States are seeking more collaborative ways to participate 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 overall 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 relatively new phenomena 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 partnerships. The college, 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 middle school 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 the college-based 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 decisions 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 fulfill 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.

Vol. 18, No. 2, 1993
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 professional year as a regular 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 National Teacher 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 teacher candidates, lack of supervision, the generic nature and uneven quality of the seminars, and 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 founded in higher education and universities. Neither do we foresee a retreat from teacher education unless we first address the underlying assumptions and beliefs implicit in teacher education programs. Zeichner argues for increased dialogue to better understand how the specific approaches to teacher education are operationalized 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.
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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. 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.