

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: CANADIAN RESEARCH IN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

Thomas Falkenberg
University of Manitoba

In this introduction I try to frame a place for this handbook in the discourse of initial teacher education (ITE) in Canada and, through it, identify its intended purpose. I will do so by first addressing four themes that have played a central role in the conceptualization of the handbook:

- giving voice to Canadian ITE research;
- understanding research in ITE;
- conceptualizing Canadian ITE research; and
- identifying a role for Canadian ITE research for Canadian ITE programming.

I discuss each of the four themes in separate sections below. The second part of this introduction makes some suggestions on the question of where ITE (research) in Canada could go from here and how this handbook can support this path.

Giving Voice to Canadian ITE Research

Over the last few years I have seen the emerging and strengthening of an *inter-active* pan-Canadian community of ITE scholars under the leadership of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE; website: <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>). Since the revival of CATE about ten years ago under the presidency of Tim Hopper (University of Victoria), further built upon by his successors in the presidency, CATE provides now two major means for the continuous development of such an inter-active community: its Polygraph Series, in which a number of collections of Canadian teacher education research have been published, including this handbook; and its now bi-annual Working Conference Series, which itself has been leading to publications of Canadian teacher education research (all published on the CATE website). I think that it is now very difficult for research in and about Canadian ITE not to give serious consideration to the Canadian voices brought together through those publications on a range of areas, like foundational studies in ITE (Christou & Bullock, 2013), field experiences in ITE (Falkenberg & Smits, 2010), and self-study of teacher education practices (Kitchen & Russell, 2012b).

When I talk about “voice” here, I envision it as a *process*, namely the process of interaction of a community. That means a call for a “stronger voice” of Canadian ITE research in the Canadian discourse on ITE is primarily a call for a stronger *inter-active community of Canadian ITE*, which includes Canadian ITE researchers and the Canadian ITE community more generally. The interaction manifests itself in different communal practices, like the intentional reception of Canadian ITE research within the community, understanding and creating of research programs driven by larger interests of the community of Canadian ITE, and so on. A strong voice manifests itself in these kinds of communal connections. This handbook is intended to strengthen the Canadian voice on ITE (research) that has been developing over the last decade. It was actually the emerging and strengthening of this inter-active community of Canadian ITE scholars that gave rise to the idea and the ultimate development of this handbook. A single, handbook-like source about *Canadian ITE* (research) was missing. With CATE’s Polygraph Series and Working Conference Series—both very successful and alive—the timing seemed right for such a handbook-like source. The published handbook strengthens the Canadian voice on Canadian ITE; on the other hand, it also reflects Canadian *voices* (plural) across the different chapters, as well as within chapters—different voices that make up the inter-active community of Canadian ITE research.

When I started conceptualizing the idea of a handbook on Canadian research in ITE, the driving force was the notion that it was time for a forum for an all-Canadian and handbook-like perspective on (research on) ITE in Canada. To adequately reflect Canadian voices beyond the circle of voices I was aware of, I invited a number of Canadian ITE scholars involved with the Canadian Association for Teacher Education to be part of an advisory board for the handbook project; to quote from the invitation to participate in the advisory board: “The role of the Advisory Board is to advise the editor on the structure of the handbook, relevant topics to be included, on potential contributors to chapters, and on the solicitation process for chapter contributions.” The advisory board consisted of the following people: Tony Clark (UBC), Julie Desjardins (Sherbrooke), Karen Goodnough (Memorial), Clare Kosnik (OISE/UT), Tom Russell (Queen’s), and Jon Young (Manitoba). Initially, we met at CSSE’s annual conference and then communicated through a conference call and e-mails, leading to an outline of the handbook in terms of themes to be addressed and potential contributors to be approached. While I needed to make some changes along the way, the structure, themes, and contributors for the most part reflect this original outline. From the beginning it was important to the project to have Indigenous and francophone voices represented in the handbook.

Usually when one is concerned with someone or a group “having a voice,” it takes its starting point in the perception that the person or group does not have (enough of) a voice and the view that the person or group should have a voice in the respective context. The idea of this handbook arose from my and others’ perception that *Canadian* voices in ITE are not heard loudly enough and need to be heard more loudly in the Canadian discourse on ITE and in Canadian school education more generally.

One indicator for neglected Canadian voices in the Canadian discourse on ITE is the prominence given to the teacher education research literature from the USA. The concern is not the drawing on and engaging with that literature, rather it is a matter of neglecting Canadian ITE research in the Canadian discourse where it seems inappropriate to do so. One symptomatic example can be drawn from the now often referenced and relatively recent report on teacher education programs in Canada by Crocker and Dibbon (2008). In their literature review focusing on “recent teacher education reform initiatives” (pp. 41–42), the authors draw exclusively on literature on teacher education reform from the USA, neglecting the existing recent literature on teacher education reform in Canada by Canadian scholars for the Canadian context (see, for instance,

Chapters 9 and 10 of this handbook, and CATE's Polygraph Series and Working Conference publications, both referenced above).

Why is an adequate representation of Canadian voices in Canadian ITE discourse important? Because education is at its core a moral endeavour (see, for instance, Chapter 13 of this handbook; Coulter & Wiens, 2008; Falkenberg, 2009) shaped by cultural and communal values that establish capabilities that Canadian children are to develop during their school-age years. Interestingly, while there is collaboration across different levels of school education in Canada—for example, the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol (<https://www.wncp.ca/english/wncphome.aspx>) and the collaboration through Council of Ministers of Education Canada (<http://www.cmec.ca>)—formal education at any level is under provincial and not federal jurisdiction, with the exception of reserve-based schooling, which is under federal jurisdiction. There has been and still exists the view that school education has to be guided locally rather than centrally. The continued existence of even more localized control of school education through school boards within Canadian provinces is a continued testament to this sentiment about school education in Canada (for a defense of local control of school education against a tendency toward stronger centralization of control by provincial governments, see Young, 2009-10).

It is now this understanding of the importance of a local perspective on educational matters that provides the strongest argument for strong(er) Canadian voices in matters of Canadian teacher education. This local perspective is not just about control over educational goals, but it is also about the need for understanding the local context, for consideration of and concern for the local context, and for research undertaken within that local context, shaped by the specific Canadian system of social imaginaries (Taylor, 2004) dominant in Canadian society. This is in no way dismissing the important ITE research undertaken in the USA and elsewhere. The point here is a different one. Even if we draw on ITE research undertaken, for instance, in the USA, it will need to be *interpreted* for the Canadian context. For this, at least, Canadian voices are needed; no one else will do that for us. What shapes the Canadian ITE discourse influences Canadian ITE, which in turn influences school education. Thus, we should want to hear the voice(s) of Canadian ITE research for the benefit of Canadian school education. Canadian teacher education (research) should not be defined by its opposition to teacher education (research) in other countries. However, the dominance does shape Canadian teacher education (research) discourse, which is problematic in light of the argument I just made.

The main purpose of this handbook is to provide a single, handbook-like source of Canadian ITE research for Canadian ITE. The first part of the handbook provides a description of ITE in the different regions of Canada; it provides ITE researchers, practitioners, and policy makers with an overview of primarily the programmatic aspects of Canadian ITE. In the second part of the handbook, core aspects of ITE programs are discussed by leading Canadian ITE researchers in the respective areas with reference to other Canadian ITE research, thus providing a unique Canadian perspective on the respective areas. The third part of the handbook brings together chapters focused on selected issues in ITE from a Canadian perspective. While many issues could have been selected, the focus was on those that are broadly relevant to *programmatic* consideration of ITE: philosophical-foundational issues in ITE; rural ITE; gender issues in ITE; social justice issues in ITE; and the issue of internationally educated teachers.

Understanding “Research in ITE”

One core question that the advisory board faced when conceptualizing what should be included in a handbook on Canadian research in ITE was the question of whether subject-specific education in initial teacher education programs should be included in the handbook. In other words, should drama teacher education, mathematics teacher education, and so on be themes addressed in the handbook? The advisory board ultimately decided against the inclusion of subject-specific initial teacher education themes. For me there were two main reasons to argue against such inclusion, both were of pragmatic nature. First, including subject-specific perspectives on teacher education would have meant increasing the volume of the handbook—and thus the work involved—by probably 50%. This would have made the project untenable. Second, with the advisory board and myself being grounded in CATE as our organizational affiliation, identifying the right scholars as lead authors for subject-focused ITE would have been somewhat challenging. In their thematic analysis of the research foci of the presentations at CATE’s annual conference from 2007–2011, Hirschhorn, Kristmanson, and Sears (2013) have found that only 12% of all presentations had a subject-specific research focus (p. 69), and, as they noted, the research foci of the presentations were not evenly distributed across different subject areas, with 56.5% of the subject-specific presentations being focused on mathematics teacher education (p. 69). Subject-specific ITE research does not have a strong representation in CATE.

While the decision not to include subject-specific ITE themes in this handbook was based on pragmatics, it raises the more substantial question of how the domain of research in ITE should be understood. A number of more recent handbooks and handbook-like publications on ITE in the USA (e.g., Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, McIntyre & Demers, 2008; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) do not have separate chapters on subject-specific ITE. Almost thirty years ago, Shulman (1986) suggested that for teacher education subject-matter related questions are important and should not be forgotten. He suggested that the pendulum has swung from teacher education being concerned with only subject matter learning, to only non-subject related competencies. More recently, Kosnik and Beck (2009) have identified as one of their “seven key elements of pre-service preparation” (the title of their book) subject content and pedagogy. They argue that for a teacher “much of the school day is spent teaching specific subjects and accordingly teachers must be prepared for this work” (p. 105). While that is undeniable, one can also argue that ITE that is primarily structured as subject-specific ITE is too re-active and not enough pro-active in promoting and preparing for what some might see as the need for a stronger holistic or integrative school curriculum (see, for instance, Clark, 1997; Drake, 2007; Miller, 2007, 2010).

There is no doubt that *conceptually* research in subject-specific ITE does belong to the domain of ITE research, but there is also no doubt that *practically* and in terms of scholars’ self-understanding there are interesting tensions between subject-specific ITE (research) and subject-transcending and more “programmatically” ITE research. In terms of these tensions, it is noteworthy that in Canada there are almost no tenure-track positions focused on teacher education more generally—most seem to be linked to a specific subject-area—and that many scholars involved with CATE, including those who have taken on leadership positions in the organization, identify themselves (also) as subject-specific teacher educators: professors in science (teacher) education, language arts (teacher) education, PE (teacher) education, and so on.

Research in ITE has a specific domain of study that is distinct from the domains of study of other educational research. Research in ITE is concerned with the theory and practice of the education of teachers. This domain of study is clearly distinct from, for instance, research in the area of language arts education. However, the question of what the domain of study of research in ITE *is*, is quite different from the question what domains of studies *need to be considered* in order to address

appropriately the theory and practice of the education of teachers. Whether it is Shulman's (1987) classical "categories of the knowledge base [for teachers]" (p. 8), Darling-Hammond and colleagues' "vision of professional practice" (Bransford, Darling-Hammond, & LePage, 2005, p. 11), or Kosnik and Beck's (2009) "seven priorities for teacher education" (p. 8), the domains of study that have been identified as being relevant to the education of teachers seem to include almost all domains of study of educational research. What matters to teaching and to being a teacher is relevant to the education of teachers and, thus, is relevant the domain of study of research in ITE. David Berliner (2002) declared educational research "the hardest science of all" (p. 18), arguing that

doing science and implementing scientific findings are so difficult in education because humans in schools are embedded in complex and changing networks of social interaction. The participants in those networks have variable power to affect each other from day to day, and the ordinary events of life . . . all affect doing science in school settings by limiting the generalizability of educational research findings. Compared to designing bridges and circuits or splitting either atoms or genes, the science to help change schools and classrooms is harder to do because context cannot be controlled. (p. 19)

Teacher education research seems to me to be the most complex section of this "hardest science of all", because in addition to what Berliner says about educational research more generally, teacher education research requires understanding of (almost) all other educational domains of study.

However, teacher education has its own domain of study. This handbook's Chapter 11, "The Pedagogy of Canadian Teacher Education," makes this distinction clear. While in ITE programs teacher candidates learn about pedagogical approaches that they can use in their practicum teaching and later in their own classrooms, those are conceptually—although, of course not always practically—distinct from what Chapter 11 is about, namely the pedagogical approaches used *in* ITE to help teacher candidates with their own learning to teach and to become a teacher.

This handbook shares in the "academic division of labour" and focus on subject-transcending aspects of the theory and practice of ITE—without assuming that *conceptually* or *substantially* subject-specific aspects of the theory and practice of ITE should be excluded. In 1986, Wideen and Holborn published a paper that "describes and assesses research in teacher education conducted in Canada over the last 15 years and identifies substantive and methodological priorities for improving its quality" (p. 558). They state that "the review was limited to reports in which data had been collected, analyzed, and interpreted. This excluded papers of a prescriptive and philosophical nature" (p. 559). This handbook does intentionally include chapters of such nature (see the chapters in Part 1 and Chapter 18), suggesting that papers of such nature are within the domain of *research* in ITE.

Conceptualizing Canadian ITE Research

With this handbook being about Canadian research in ITE, another question the advisory board faced with respect to the content to be included was what should be meant by *Canadian* research. Is it referring to research in ITE undertaken by Canadian teacher education scholars, regardless of what the focus of the research was? Is it referring to research about Canadian teacher education, regardless of whether the scholar is Canadian or not? The handbook was to do both; it was to be *about* Canadian ITE and it was to be *by* Canadian scholars. The first section of the handbook provides an overview of teacher education programming in Canada, structured by region—with the exception of the first chapter in the first part, which discusses Indigenous teacher

education programming across Canada. For the other two parts of the handbook, the invitation to potential lead authors for a chapter expressed the focus on Canadian ITE research as follows:

The primary intention of these chapters is to provide the reader with insights into a selected aspect/issue of initial teacher education programs as it plays out in the *Canadian context* and as it is discussed by *Canadian scholars*. The chapters can frame those insights within international scholarship relevant to the respective aspect/issue.

In addition, each chapter was to give consideration to the anglophone as well as the francophone literature relevant to the respective chapter.

While this answers in a *formal* way what Canadian means in the context of this handbook, it does not answer the question in a *substantial* way. Because the chapters in Parts 2 and 3 have pretty much implemented the intention expressed in the quote above, and because the chapters in Part 1 of this handbook are describing in some detail ITE programming in the different regions of Canada, I can say with some confidence that the chapters collected in this handbook answer the question of what currently constitutes Canadian ITE (research) in a substantial way. As a matter of fact, this is one of the primary purposes of this handbook, a purpose inseparably linked to the purpose of giving Canadian ITE research a stronger voice (see above).

The handbook is not the first publication to provide a substantial understanding of what *Canadian* ITE (research) is. In terms of ITE programming, there are characterizations of ITE programs in Canada (e.g., Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Gambhir, Broad, Evans, & Gaskell, 2008; Van Nuland, 2011) and characterizations of certain aspects of the “landscape” of ITE programming in Canada (e.g., Connelly & Clandinin, 2001; Grimmatt, 2008; Grimmatt & Young, 2012). Recently, Lemisko (2013) has taken on the question “What is Canadian about Canadian teacher education?”, which is a different question than the previously referenced scholarship has been inquiring into, namely, “What is *Canadian* ITE?” Lemisko (2013), on the other hand, inquires into the question whether Canadian ITE programming reflects what other disciplines have characterized as “Canadian-ness.” Keeping in mind the methodological limitations of her study (Lemisko, 2013, p. 230), Lemisko does find evidence that Canadian ITE, as characterized by the selected sources, does indeed reflect the kind of Canadian-ness characterized in relevant contemporary (Canadian) citizenship scholarship.

In terms of ITE *research*, there are characterizations of Canadian ITE research more generally (e.g., Wideen & Holborn, 1986), and characterizations of specific aspects of Canadian ITE research (e.g., Kitchen & Russell, 2012a). A very original approach to inquiring into *Canadian* ITE research was undertaken by Hirschhorn, Kristmanson, and Sears (2013). They examined the themes of 375 presentations given at CATE’s annual conference in the years from 2007 to 2011 in order to approach the question of what characterizes Canadian teacher education research. They had two concluding observations. First, “the most striking feature of the scholarship of Canadian teacher educators as reflected in the data presented is its balanced (in terms of numbers of papers) diversity” (p. 74). Second, “the considerable focus on difference and diversity seems to us to be more distinctively Canadian. Kymlicka (2007) points out that, ‘issues of accommodating diversity have been central to Canada’s history’” (Hirschhorn et al., 2013, p. 76).

The past and current scholarship that gives us both a perspective on Canadian ITE (research) and a Canadian perspective on ITE (research) leaves a number of important issues untouched. Two of the most important ones go to heart of the idea of Canadian-ness more generally: the status of Indigenous ITE (research) within or next to Canadian ITE (research); and the “two solitudes” of an anglophone-oriented and a francophone-oriented ITE scholarship, each drawing often on quite different scholarly traditions, each being generally presented at different conferences organized by different scholarly associations. While this handbook responds in some small, formal way to these

important issues, it does not address them directly. These are clearly *Canadian* issues, and they need to be addressed in a constructive and co-constructed way as part of and for the benefit of Canadian ITE (research).

A Role for Canadian ITE Research for Canadian ITE Programming

Above I said that this handbook has been conceptualized and developed to give voice to Canadian research in ITE in Canada, because it has partially been neglected in Canadian ITE (research) discourse, and because it provides for a localized understanding of ITE. Here I want to briefly argue the benefits of such localized understanding, namely that it can be given due consideration by those responsible for ITE programs in Canada: faculties of education, the teaching profession, and provincial governments. ITE programming practice and policy should be value-focused and research-informed, as I will suggest and elaborate on in the next section, and Canadian ITE research will have to and should play an important role in informing this practice and policy. In my assessment, ITE research, whether Canadian or not, has not always been given such a role in program review and reform. (I elaborate on this point further in the next section.)

My wish for this handbook is that it does indeed play such a role for Canadian ITE practice and policy. For that reason I am very pleased that the handbook is published in the CATE Polygraph Series, which makes the book available as an open-access e-book. The open-access approach, which I wholeheartedly support, is a counter balance to the increasing commodification and privatization of primarily publically funded university research (see Elliott & Hepting, 2015).¹ Aside from the ethical issue of the public not having to pay for research it already payed for through the salary and often grants for researchers, this handbook can much better play the role of informing Canadian ITE practice and policy and the stakeholders involved by being published as an open-access e-book.

Where Could We Go from Here?

Forty years ago, Clarke and Coutts (1975) published the findings of a Delphi study that they had undertaken with “the chief administrative officers of the English-language teacher education institutions in Canada”—nowadays these would be the deans or associate deans for undergraduate programs—to solicit “their views about features or aspects of teacher education in the year 2000” (p. 221). Following the Delphi method, participants were initially asked for their views and then, in a second survey round, asked for their level of agreement with the views expressed by their peers. Following are some of the findings by Clarke and Coutts (1975), selected to suggest that (some of) the desirable features of ITE programs in Canada are a long way coming:

- 91% of respondents found it desirable or very desirable that “teacher education in the future will be much more individualized, with candidates having much more say in the design of their own programs” (p. 228). In addition, 95% of the respondents thought that this would probably be a feature of Canadian ITE programs by the year 2000 (p. 228).

¹ I am, of course, not promoting so-called “predatory” open access journals and book publishers, who have been attracted by the opportunities that a “publish or perish” culture in the academy provide for the commodification and commercialization of research at a time when advances in technology have made on-line publishing itself an easy and relatively cheap undertaking.

- 77% of respondents found it desirable or very desirable that “teacher education in the future will include a supervised internship with a total duration of approximately a year” (p. 228). 85% of respondents thought that this would probably be a feature of Canadian ITE programs by the year 2000; 2% thought that would “never” be the case (p. 228).
- 87% of respondents found it desirable or very desirable that “teacher education in the future will involve much more concern and commitment by the total university” (p. 230). 61% of respondents thought that this would probably be the case by the year 2000; 11% thought that that would “never” be the case (p. 230).
- 91% of respondents found it desirable or very desirable that “teacher education in the future will feature much greater concern for, and devote much more time to, the personal development of candidates” (p. 230). 81% of respondents thought that this would probably be a feature of Canadian ITE programs by the year 2000 (p. 230).

I venture to claim that none of these four features classified by administrative leaders in Canadian faculties of education as (very) desirable is in any substantial form in place in Canadian ITE in 2015.

Almost thirty years ago, Wideen and Holborn (1986) reviewed research in Canadian ITE from about 1970 to 1985. Here is a characterization of Canadian ITE that they drew from the review:

Teacher education in Canada is characterized by diversity. Programs differ widely from one institution to the next, in some cases, within institutions. Moreover, the landscape is constantly shifting as new programs are planned or introduced. . . .

Broadly speaking, two types of programs in Canada were being examined in the research reviewed. On the one hand, most provinces have some form of one-year (or one-year equivalent) program in which education courses are interspersed with one or more short practice teaching periods. Course work and the practicum are more or less separate, with little attempt to relate compass activity to the school experience. . . . On the other hand, in almost every province examples exist of alternative thrusts which provide a more extensive field experience and innovative approaches to course work In addition, in many institutions, smaller innovations have occurred which typically are directed toward a closer relationship between and an integration of campus input and school experience. (Wideen & Holborn, 1986, pp. 599–560)

Does this not more or less describe the ITE program landscape in Canada in 2015 (maybe except for the length of the program)?

In 1995, Sheehan and Fullan suggested that “teacher education has failed to achieve the place it deserves in the improvement of education,” because “there are several myths which continue to present major barriers to achieving needed breakthroughs” (p. 89). Ten years later in his 2005 keynote address at the annual conference of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education, Tom Russell concluded with some resignation that “teacher education reform is certainly possible; yet, it seems highly unlikely, not only because the challenges are many and considerable but also because many of the biggest challenges are invisible—taken for granted and lost in forgotten history” (Russell, 2009, p. 25).

There is clearly enough evidence available to justify Russell’s (2009) pessimistic view on actual enactment of ITE reform in Canada. On the other hand, if we look at some of the more substantial and recent programmatic changes in Canadian ITE, like the doubling of the length of many

programs in Ontario (see Chapter 4 of this handbook) and the slow demise of the role of foundational studies in ITE in Canada (Christou & Bullock, 2013), those seem to have happened without open and scholarship-based debate, which is exactly how re-visioning and re-forming should *not* happen. And even if larger reform steps have thoughtfully been taken in Canada, one cannot always be sure that those are indeed true steps of reform or steps in the right direction. Let's look at two examples.

First, there is the big institutional shift of ITE in Canada from normal schools to university-based ITE (see Chapters 7 and 8 of this handbook). Patterson observed that the one-year, university-based concurrent programs prominent in the 1970s and 1980s in Canada were very similar to the teacher's college or normal school concept (as referenced in Wideen & Holborn, 1986, pp. 559–560).

Second, there is the ever expanding number of consecutive programs, where teacher candidates enter their education degree program with a completed first, non-education bachelor degree. Currently 65% of all ITE program in Canada are of the consecutive type (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 60). Consecutive ITE programs conceptualize the first non-education degree as a component of the formal education of teachers in Canada, generally considered the part of formal teacher education in which future teachers develop their “content” expertise in one or two teachable subject areas, with a specific number of credit hours in teachable subject areas being an admission requirement for many ITE programs in Canada (see the chapters in Part 1 of this handbook). For a number of reasons, this approach to ITE seems very questionable. If we take this approach to “content preparation” of school teachers seriously, consecutive programs leave at least half of all teachers, namely those who will teach as elementary classroom teachers, unprepared for most of the subject areas they will be teaching, since they will be teaching more than two subjects. Also, and a far more fundamental concern, the notion that taking university-level subject-specific courses as preparation for subject-specific school teaching—even at the high-school level—has been damagingly criticized (see, for instance, Proulx & Simmt, 2011). Grimmitt (1998) has made the case for *concurrent* ITE programming on the ground of these two concerns, although at the surface, his line of argumentation runs somewhat differently.

There are many challenges to ITE reform in Canada, many systemic and many invisible, as Russell suggests, unless one knows where to look for them. But we can learn to look for them; we have the capacity and the scholarly support to identify desired programmatic features and practices; and we have the capacity and the scholarly support to plan and implement the changes needed and to advocate for the changes needed where forces external to a faculty of education are involved. The recent federal election in Canada and the presidential election of 2008 in the USA illustrate the power that hope can have for bringing change; but hope needs to be brought alive through strategic and thoughtful action. In the remainder of this introduction I outline a few general but important strategies to convert hope into a *process* toward a more systematic and intentional approach to assessing, revisiting, revising, reforming, and reconceptualizing existing ITE programming in Canada.

Value-Focused and Research-Informed Approach to Programming

I have been involved at the practical and scholarship level in ITE in Canada for 10 years. Again and again I have had reason to wonder about the irony that in the discussion, decision, and implementation of ITE programs so little attention and consideration is generally given to the huge scholarship in ITE that is available and to which many of the colleagues in one's own faculty and other Canadian faculties have been contributing. This statement, of course, needs many qualifications to be defensible, but, as a statement about a general tendency of how ITE program reviews and revisions happen, I think I have good reasons to make this claim (for some illustrative but also qualifying case reports, see Chapter 9 of this handbook).

On the other hand, I have been observing that the *Accord on Initial Teacher Education* (Association of Canadian Deans of Education [ACDE], 2005), developed and ratified by ACDE, is being referenced again and again in not just the Canadian ITE scholarship literature (including in chapters in this handbook), but also in discussions about program reform and design in faculties of education. This observation is a concern to me as well as a hopeful sign. It is concerning to me because the *Accord* consists of a set of statements about ITE programming that are not grounded in ITE scholarship within the *Accord* itself, and as such they contribute to the irony I identified above. They are value statements in which ITE programs in Canada should be grounded. They are, as ACDE said in response to a corresponding question, statements that are to reflect the views of ACDE members only, not of faculties of education or the Canadian teacher education (research) community at large. No one outside of ACDE was involved in the development of the *Accord*. Also, now ten years after the ratification of the *Accord*, it is very unlikely that any of the deans of education who developed and ratified it is still in his or her position. However, I take the attention given to the *Accord* in the ITE discourse in Canada also as a hopeful sign. I take it as an indication for the desire of the Canadian ITE community to have something in hand that can be considered a pan-Canadian framework for ITE programming. I take this as a hopeful sign, because it suggests a pan-Canadian outlook on ITE among ITE scholars and practitioners, and it suggests a good basis for enacting the strategy I will be talking about in the next section: a pan-Canadian research agenda for ITE.

With this last point in mind, I suggest as the first process strategy (Strategy #1) toward a more systematic and intentional approach to assessing, revisiting, revising, reforming, and reconceptualizing existing ITE programming in Canada that such programming be approached as value-focused and research-informed. This would mean three things. First, ITE practice needs to be understood as being grounded in and inextricably entangled in values. It is here, were ACDE's *Accord* with its normative principles can play the role of initiating and potentially framing the needed value discussions within a faculty of education.² Resulting value judgments about ITE establish the purpose of the respective ITE program, and they also establish the value base for appropriate processes to achieve those purposes, since means need to be in line with established ends, as Biesta (2010) has suggested. More philosophically oriented ITE research scholarship should be valued in this step for its potential for value discourses. Second, the programmatic means, which are framed by the value-based purpose(s), are then to be *informed*—not determined—by more empirically oriented ITE research. Third, a research-informed approach to ITE programming will also mean the need for *on-going* program evaluation, to establish what means might need to be adjusted to achieve the purpose(s) and to establish when those purposes might need to change.

Developing a Pan-Canadian Research Agenda for ITE

In order to provide the means needed for a value-focused and research-informed approach to ITE programming, the following strategy (Strategy #2) seems to me very promising: Under the leadership of CATE, a pan-Canadian research agenda for ITE should be developed and implemented.³ This strategy has two components. First, it suggests research by Canadian teacher

² Because of the exclusive way in which the normative principles of the *Accord* were developed, I would not want to go so far as Peter Grimmett (2008, pp. 41–42), who seems to suggest that the *Accord's* normative principles should be “translate[d] . . . into desirable outcomes that can be debated and assessed” (p. 41), but not questioned themselves.

³ I know of two attempts to initiate such a pan-Canadian ITE research agenda: Tardif, Lenoir, Lessard, Martin, Mujawamarilya, & Mukamurera, 2000; and Falkenberg, 2008. Neither seems to have had the desired effect.

education scholars for Canadian ITE programs. This is justified as follows. While a lot can be understood for Canadian ITE from research undertaken in other countries, social science research oriented toward action—under which a good portion of ITE research falls—needs to be conceptualized and practiced as *phronetic* social science research (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Flyvbjerg, Landman, & Schram, 2012).

Phronesis is that intellectual activity most relevant to praxis. It focuses on what is variable, on that which cannot be encapsulated by universal rules, on specific cases. *Phronesis* requires an interaction between the general and the concrete; it requires consideration, judgment, and choice. More than anything else, *phronesis* requires *experience*. (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 57).

Teacher education research oriented toward action in the particular and local context requires experience with the particular and the local context.

Second, this strategy also suggests *coordinated* research by Canadian teacher education scholars for Canadian ITE programs. In the natural sciences, research teams seem to be more the rule than the exception—because it is recognized that larger research problems are so complex and complicated that larger teams are needed to address them. In educational research—at least as far as I can tell for the Canadian context—the rule seems to be more the research team of one or two. How are we to address adequately larger research problems in the field of education without larger teams engaging in more coordinated research? Especially in the pursuit of phronetic social science research, coordinated research would be of great benefit, considering that phronetic social inquiry is grounded in a case study approach (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Such a coordinated research approach seems to me best organized by CATE, which has already demonstrated that it is able to bring Canadian teacher education scholars together on a regular basis. To support a value-focused and research-informed approach to ITE programming in Canada, such a coordinated research agenda would include (a) research and scholarship around value questions in teacher education to help ITE programs with their purpose development, (b) research and scholarship around programmatic means to achieve purposes in ITE programs, and (c) research and scholarship around on-going program evaluation.

Addressing Questions of Personnel

Based on informal observations, it seems to be the case that Canadian faculties of education employ more and more sessional instructors for the teaching of their BEd programs, moving professorial faculty members in further expanding graduate programs. Thus, faculties of education seem to move into a direction that other university faculties have already moved into a long time ago. This has two problematic implications for the quality of ITE programming. First, a greater use in number of sessional instructors in ITE programs endangers any attempt for coherent programs, which is a programmatic feature generally recognized as important to “powerful” ITE programs (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 41). Second, the use of more sessional instructors in ITE programs separates teaching from research even more than is currently the case for ITE programming. Considering what I suggested above about the important role of on-going program evaluation, this separation of those involved in the teaching and those doing the research in ITE is problematic. If the move of professorial staff into more and more graduate programming is difficult to avoid, ITE programs in Canada need to review the way in which teaching personnel for their undergraduate programs are hired, organized, and supported in order to address the issue of coherent programming

(Strategy #3). For instance, hiring course instructors on a term-by-term basis is clearly less desirable and so is their non-involvement in program planning and teaching team meetings more generally.

Another strategy toward a more systematic and intentional approach to assessing, revisiting, revising, reforming, and reconceptualizing existing ITE programming in Canada concerns the personnel needed for the type of value-focused and research-informed approach to programming. Although CATE is the second largest association within the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, to my knowledge the tenure-track or tenured positions in Canadian faculties of education that are *specifically* announced as positions in teacher education can be counted on one hand. It seems to me that this situation needs to be reviewed (Strategy #4) if Canadian faculties of education buy into a value-focused and research-informed approach to programming and support the development of a pan-Canadian research agenda for ITE in Canada.

Acknowledging and Responding to the Continuum of Teacher Education

Another strategy that would support a process toward a more systematic and intentional approach to assessing, revisiting, revising, reforming, and reconceptualizing existing ITE programs in Canada is to acknowledge and respond to the *continuum of teacher education*. ITE programming should be seen and understood “on life’s continuum”: “We see teacher education as being on a continuum of a lifelong process of learning to teach” (Connelly & Clandinin, 2001, p. 6). The education of a (future) teacher starts—in a most general sense—in the (future) teacher’s childhood. Childhood experiences shape his or her personal qualities that come to bear in his or her decision to become a teacher and in his or her work as a teacher. In a more specific but still general sense, a (future) teacher’s education moves then into the phase of informally learning about teaching and what it might mean to be a teacher when the (future) teacher attends formal schooling. This “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) shapes the (future) teacher’s view of teaching and his or her view of the process of learning to teach—for better or worse (Bullock & Russell, 2010). The formal ITE of the (future) teacher has in Canada two components: the university-based course work and the school-based practicum. Generally, there is very little connection between the two, except in the expectation of the teacher candidates and the collaborating teachers that the university-based course work prepares the teacher candidates for the practicum work. In Canada the education of teachers is expected to be complete in general terms after graduation from an ITE program. New teachers are hired and employed like more experienced teachers, with the same expectations and under the same conditions. Teachers, whether new or experienced, are expected to spend almost all their paid working time in the classroom. Any additional formal teacher education (in-service teacher education) is, thus, relatively rare, unsystematic, generally unstructured, and generally dependent on self-initiated activities, often on the teachers’ own time. More formal and systematic in-service teacher education in the form of formal degree studies at the university level—post-baccalaureate programs, MEd programs, or PhD programs—is generally unconnected with the actual teaching context of the respective teacher and is generally expected to be undertaken *in addition to* one’s full-time teaching work.

The notion that ITE is an integral component of the continuous process of teacher education needs to be recognized and supported (Strategy #5). Having received some insights into the working of a number of ITE programs across Canada through my involvement with CATE and some of my research projects, I can say with some confidence that the teaching profession at large is not as integrated into Canadian ITE programs as it needs to be. Such integration has two components. First, the university-based course work and the school-based field experiences need to be much more integrated than they currently are. This requires (a) a greater acknowledged and enacted responsibility for ITE by the teaching profession and school divisions and (b) a move toward ITE programming

that is co-constructed by faculties of education and the provincial and local teaching profession. Second, ITE programs need to be more strongly integrated into the continuum of teacher education from the time teachers are hired in school divisions. This requires (a) a greater acknowledgement and enacted responsibility by school divisions and the provincial government for on-going and systematic teacher education programming for all teachers, but in particular for beginning teachers, and (b) a move toward a greater integration and coordination of such programming with the ITE programming from which beginning teachers have just graduated.

A Role for This Handbook

This handbook can play a central role in enacting each of these five strategies. As a single-source publication that brings together information about ITE programming across Canada and scholarly discussions of core elements of ITE programs and research thereof, the open-access handbook can easily serve as a reference document for value-focused and research-informed approaches to undergraduate programming in Canadian faculties of education (Strategy #1). As a publication that brings together leading scholars in a range of areas of ITE research, writing about the current discourse in the respective fields, the handbook can also serve as a guide for developing a pan-Canadian research agenda for ITE in Canada (Strategy #2). Because of its nature as a handbook, it can also serve as a starting point for orienting new teacher educators in current and relevant ITE research for Canadian ITE programs (Strategy #3). The very existence of the handbook also makes a very strong argument for the need to acknowledge (initial) teacher education as an important field of study that needs to be recognized and considered as a stand-alone research area when Canadian faculties of education consider the creation of new tenure-track positions (Strategy #4), especially where faculties of education want to take a value-focused and research-informed approach to their undergraduate programming. Finally, the breadth and depth of the areas covered and the open-access availability of the handbook make it an ideal resource that can support a greater involvement of the teaching profession, school divisions, and provincial governments in approaches toward a closer collaboration of the different educational groups in ITE (Strategy #5).

My hope is that at least some of the discussed strategies toward a more systematic and intentional approach to assessing, revisiting, revising, reforming, and reconceptualizing existing ITE programming in Canada will be picked up or strengthened and that this handbook can play its role in supporting it.

References

- Association of Canadian Deans of Education. (2005). *Accord on initial teacher education*. Toronto, ON: Author. Retrieved from http://www.csse-scee.ca/docs/acde/acde_teachereducationaccord_en.pdf
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 18–20.
- Biesta, G. J. (2010). Why “what works” still won’t work: From evidence-based education to value-based education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29(5), 491–503.
- Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 1–39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Bullock, S. M., & Russell, T. (2010). Does teacher education expect too much from field experience? In T. Falkenberg & H. Smits (Eds.), *Field experiences in the context of reform of Canadian teacher education programs* (2 vols., pp. 91–100). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba. Retrieved from <http://umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch/Conference%202009.html>
- Christou, T. M., & Bullock, S. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Foundations in teacher education: A Canadian perspective*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Clark, E. T., Jr. (1997). *Designing and implementing an integrated curriculum: A student-centered approach*. Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.
- Clarke, S. C. T., & Coutts, H. T. (1975). Toward teacher education in the year 2000. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 21(4), 221–240.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, D. J., & Demers, K. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2001). Exploring the landscape of Canadian teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 4(1), 1–11.
- Coulter, D., & Wiens, J. R. (2008). Prologue: Renewing the conversation. In D. L. Colter & J. R. Wiens (Eds.), *Why do we educate? Renewing the conversation* (pp. 6–20). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crocker, R., & Dibbon, D. (2008). *Teacher education in Canada: A baseline study*. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Drake, S. M. (2007). *Creating standards-based integrated curriculum: Aligning curriculum, content, assessment, and instruction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Elliott, P. W., & Hepting, D. H. (Eds.). (2015). *Free knowledge: Confronting the commodification of human discovery*. Regina, SK: University of Regina Press.
- Falkenberg, T. (2008). Mapping research in teacher education in Canada: A pan-Canadian approach. In T. Falkenberg & H. Smits (Eds.), *Mapping research in teacher education in Canada: Proceedings of the Working Conference on Research in Teacher Education in Canada, Winnipeg, 1–3 November 2007* (pp. 1–19). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba. Retrieved from <http://umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch/Conference%202007.html>
- Falkenberg, T. (2009). Starting with the end in mind: Ethics-of-care-based teacher education. In F. J. Benson & C. Riches (Eds.), *Engaging in conversation about ideas in teacher education* (pp. 50–59). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Falkenberg, T., & Smits, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Field experiences in the context of reform of Canadian teacher education programs* (2 vols.). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba. Retrieved from <http://umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch/Conference%202009.html>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B., Landman, T., & Schram, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Real social science: Applied phronesis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gambhir, M., Broad, K., Evans, M., & Gaskell, J. (2008). *Characterizing initial teacher education in Canada: Themes and issues*. Toronto, ON: OISE/University of Toronto. Retrieved from <http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ite/UserFiles/File/CharacterizingITE.pdf>

- Grimmett, P. P. (1998). Reconceptualizing the practice of teacher preparation: On not throwing out the concurrent model with the reform bathwater. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 44(3), 251–267.
- Grimmett, P. P. (2008). Canada. In T. O'Donoghue & C. Whitehead (Eds.), *Teacher education in the English-speaking world: Past, present, and future* (pp. 23–44). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Grimmett, P. P., & Young, J. C. (2012). *Teacher certification and the professional status of teaching in North America: The new battleground for public education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Hirschhorn, M., Kristmanson, P., & Sears, A. (2013). Toward a national conversation about teacher education in Canada: An examination of CATE conference presentations. In L. Thomas (Ed.), *What is Canadian about teacher education in Canada? Multiple perspectives on Canadian teacher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 61–86). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Kitchen, J., & Russell, T. (2012a). Introduction: Improving Canadian teacher education through self-study. In J. Kitchen & T. Russell (Eds.), *Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 1–8). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Kitchen, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.) (2012b). *Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of pre-service preparation*. London, England: Routledge.
- Lemisko, L. (2013). Teacher education and new conceptions of “Canadian-ness”: What is Canadian about Canadian teacher education? In L. Thomas (Ed.), *What is Canadian about teacher education in Canada? Multiple perspectives on Canadian teacher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 212–233). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, J. P. (2007). *The holistic curriculum* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Miller, J. P. (2010). *Whole child education*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Proulx, J., & Simmt, E. (2011). Reflecting on hegemonic structures in teacher education programs through the use of empirical and historical research studies. In T. Falkenberg & H. Smits (Eds.), *The question of evidence in research in teacher education in the context of teacher education program review in Canada* (2 vols., pp. 215–229). Winnipeg, MB: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba. Retrieved from <http://umanitoba.ca/education/TERResearch/Conference%202010.html>
- Russell, T. (2009). Is teacher education reform possible? In A. Pitt (Ed.), *Key notes in teacher education: CATE invited addresses 2004–2008* (pp. 25–35). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/>
- Sheehan, N., & Fullan, M. (1995). Teacher education in Canada: A case study of British Columbia and Ontario. In M. F. Wideen & P. P. Grimmett (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualization?* (pp. 89–101). London, England: Falmer.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Tardif, C., Lenoir, Y., Lessard, C., Martin, D., Mujawamarilya, D., & Mukamurera, J. (2000). Savoirs professionnels et formation à l'enseignement. In Y. Lenoir, W. Hunter, P. de Broucker, & A. Dolbec (Eds.), *A pan Canadian education research agenda* (pp. 91–119). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Van Nuland, S. (2011). Teacher education in Canada. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(4), 409–421.
- Wideen, M. F., & Holborn, P. (1986). Research in Canadian teacher education: Promises and problems. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 11(4), 557–583.
- Young, J. (2009-10). *School board for the 21st century: Keeping the public in public education*. Retrieved from the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents website: <http://mass.mb.ca/publications/>