

Chapter 1

Introduction: Central Issues of Field Experiences in Canadian Teacher Education Programs

THOMAS FALKENBERG

This first of two introductory chapters to the book provides a systematic overview with some in-depth discussion of central issues of field experiences raised to various degrees in different chapters of the book. The last section provides background information on the genesis of the book and its chapters in general. A table that allows the reader to identify the chapters in the book that speak to features of a particular Canadian teacher education program rounds out this chapter.

This book is the result of a systematic and structured attempt by Hans Smits and myself to bring together Canadian teacher education scholars to write about the topic of field experiences in the context of Canadian teacher education programs. With this book we want to provide Canadian teacher education practitioners, scholars, and those interested in revising and improving teacher education in the Canadian context with a compendium of scholarly material written on the topic by Canadian scholars working and interested in issues around the topic. The second part (the last section) of this chapter describes the process involved in creating this book.

The chapters provide a substantive contribution by Canadian teacher education scholars to the current discussion of field experiences in teacher education programs within the Canadian context. To my knowledge this is the first time that such a comprehensive collection of current teacher education scholarship on this topic has been published. In such an extensive collection the issues raised on the topic are numerous and addressed from different perspectives. In the first part of this introductory chapter I provide a systematic overview with some in-depth discussion of the main issues raised in the different chapters of this book. What I present as the main issues is, of course, grounded in the conscious and not so conscious biases with which I have read the chapters, but I do hope that I have done justice to the collection in this book. The discussion in this chapter will be structured by issues rather than by chapters.

In addressing the focus of this book, most of the chapters discuss in one way or another program features of particular Canadian teacher education programs. To my knowledge there exist no at least somewhat comprehensive overview of the different programs that currently exist in Canada, aside from Crocker and Dibbon's (2008) recent study that provides an overview of some general features of teacher education programs in Canada using aggregated

data. However, there are a number of articles, book chapters, and even whole books on Canadian teacher education programs, but those are on *individual* teacher education programs.¹ Since most of the chapters in this book address the topic of field experiences with reference to particular teacher education programs in Canada, the collection in this book provides a good source for understanding specific program features of a number of programs that exist across the country, including specific program initiatives that are not (yet) program-wide. To provide some support to the reader who is interested in understanding some features of the teacher education programs discussed in this book, I have at the end of this chapter linked those particular teacher education programs with the chapter(s) in which they are discussed and listed what information about the program the respective chapter provides.

The collection of chapters in this book provides a rich discussion of many diverse issues around field experiences in Canadian preservice teacher education programs. This chapter is to provide the reader with a kind of birds-eye-view of central issues around the topic of field experiences in preservice teacher education as they are discussed in this book. The references to the different chapters will allow the reader to engage in more depth with the different issues as they are discussed in the respective chapter. The following is an overview over the issues discussed in the subsequent sections:

1. Field Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education: More than the Practicum
2. Different Approaches to Field Experiences in Canadian Teacher Education Programs
 - a. Placement and Timing of the Practicum
 - b. The type of Field Experiences
3. The Role of Field Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education
 - a. The Theory-Practice Divide
 - b. Working with Teacher Candidates' Pre-Conceptions: The Apprenticeship of Observation
 - c. Limits of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Candidates' Learning
 - d. The Urban-Rural Divide
4. School-University Partnerships
 - a. The Idea and Practice of School-University Partnerships
 - b. Challenges for School-University Partnerships
5. The Education of Teacher Educators
6. The Purpose of Teacher Education

¹ For example: the teacher education program at Simon Fraser University is described in Dagenais and Wideen (1999); the Midtown cohort teacher education program at OISE / University of Toronto is described in Beck and Kosnik (2002); the former teacher education program at Queen's University is described in Russell (2005) and in the articles in the 1999 special edition "Field-Based Teacher Preparation - Experience and Reflection" of *Teacher Education Quarterly* (volume 26, number 2); the former Master of Teaching teacher education program at the University of Calgary is described in Phelan (2005); the Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program at York University is described in Solomon, Manoukian, and Clarke (2007); and one cohort teacher education program at the University of British Columbia is described in Far Darling, Erickson, and Clarke (2007).

Field Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education: More than the Practicum

Based on anecdotal evidence, I claim that *typically* preservice teacher education in Canada provides program-based field experiences for teacher candidates only in the form of formal school practica, in which teacher candidates are placed in schools under the guidance of a practicing classroom teacher. However, as a number of the chapters in this book outline, there are teacher education programs in Canada in which various other forms of field experiences are provided to teacher candidates as part of the program but outside of their formal practicum.

At the University of Prince Edward Island, Ronald MacDonald conducted his science education course in a local high school (MacDonald, chapter 14). He met the teacher candidates shortly after the last daily high school class to allow interested teachers to be part of the course. At the core of the linking of the university-based course with school-based experiences was an assignment for which the teacher candidates were to develop a learning activity “to fit the needs of the in-service teacher and school students” (MacDonald, chapter 14, p. 263) and then to implement the activity in the classroom of the respective in-service teacher.

Over the last number of years Tim Hopper and others at the University of Victoria have been conducting part of their courses in classrooms as part of their School Integrated Teacher Education (SITE) project (Sanford, Hopper & McGregor, chapter 20). Course instructors and classroom teachers model teaching to the observing teacher candidates, who then gradually are provided with teaching opportunities in those classrooms. For Sanford, Hopper & McGregor this setting provides for a “systematic incorporation of school experiences into the teaching and learning of core concepts within university courses” (chapter 20, p. 349).

Similarly, over the last number of years a number of faculty members at the University of Manitoba have been conducting part of their courses in school settings as well (for a description of the structure of this design for two of those years see Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9). The experiences varied from observations of classroom teachers while teaching to teaching of small groups of students by teacher candidates. In all cases, classroom teachers have been an integral part of the conversations that were linked to the classroom experiences.

An integration of university-based course work and school-based experiences outside of the practicum are also part of the new teacher education program at the University of Saskatchewan, as Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) write: “Some of the classes are taught in the schools, and there is an expectation that assignments for the course will be carried out in classrooms” (p. 257).

At McGill University David Dillon goes even further with the integration of coursework and school-based experiences (Dillon & O’Connor, chapter 7). He offers an elective course of 3 to 6 credits in the third of the four year elementary teacher education program “that is essentially a tailored practicum” (chapter 7, p. 136) in which teacher candidates

may try teaching an age/grade level or subject area that they have not had the chance to teach before, they may explore related roles in a school such as resource teachers . . . or they may work with pupils in extra-curricular ways such as setting up and running a girls' club, a homework program, or a special interest program. (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7, p. 136)

This “practicum course” is accompanied by a weekly seminar and a portfolio requirement.

The practicum-external field experiences reported on in the respective chapters all seem to be characterized by three features. First, the field experiences are provided to teacher candidates as part of their university-based course work. Second, the arrangements for those field experiences are all based on initiatives by individual faculty members or small groups of individuals who see a great value for their teacher candidates' learning to teach in linking their coursework with field experiences outside of the official practicum. Third, all those arrangements – with probably the exception of the new program at the University of Saskatchewan – are not an integral part of the established structure of the teacher education program they each are embedded in, meaning that these links between university-based course work and classroom-based field experiences are idiosyncratic features of the university course or courses within which the field experiences are offered, as distinct from the practicum, which is an integral part of the program structure.

These features of these types of field experiences suggest that the arrangements upon which they rest are very vulnerable to dissolution. Because those arrangements are not an integrated part of the structure and design of the program – which would come with appropriate resources to support those arrangements – they do not only depend on the good will of faculty members but also on the availability of resources (generally in form of time) that those faculty members have to provide for. Changes in teaching assignments, research study leaves, and changes in time commitment of faculty members are all factors that contribute to the vulnerability of these kinds of field experience arrangements.

Other issues directly linked to these forms of field experiences will be discussed in other sections below. Three such issues are of particular relevance. First, alternative field experiences that link university-based course work with school-based field experiences are generally motivated by an attempt to overcome what some have called “the theory-practice divide” in teacher education programs, the divide between learning experiences in university-based coursework and those in school-based field experiences. Second, alternative field experiences, because they are generally not part of the formal structure of the program, require a different relationship to the field, a far more deliberate and collaborative relationship. School-university partnerships – the topic of a subsequent section – characterize the relationship that some of the programs discussed in this book strive for. Third, because alternative field experiences require a different relationship to the field, the different stakeholders around field experiences need to be considerate of the governance structure of field experiences, which is the topic of another section.

Different Approaches to Field Experiences in Canadian Teacher Education Programs

What the collection in this book demonstrates is the great variety in the design of field experiences in Canadian teacher education programs. Following I will highlight examples of that design variety by considering two aspects relevant in the design of field experiences.

Placement and Timing of the Practicum

In terms of the placement and timing of the practicum within the program, Canadian teacher education programs discussed in this book offer three different structures. The first structure spreads a number of practicum blocks over the length of the program, alternating coursework and practicum blocks, beginning with coursework. The current program at the University of Manitoba has this structural feature (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9), where a practicum block follows a block of course work in each of the four terms of the program. A number of current Canadian teacher education programs alternate field experiences and course work as well, but they provide field experiences right from the start of the program. This is the case at the University of Regina (Mulholland, Nolan & Salm, chapter 18) and the newly developed teacher education program at Mount Royal University (Naested, Nickel, Sikora, & Vaughan, chapter 19). Quite a different structure for the practicum-based field experiences is provided at the University of New Brunswick, where the practicum is on-going during the whole length of the one-year B.Ed. program (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11).

The placement and timing of the practicum is an important structural feature of a teacher education program. Particularly the question whether a teacher education program should provide for practicum field experiences right from the start is important, and the variation of the placement and the timing of the practicum in the four teacher education programs just mentioned shows that those programs have a different answer to this question. Russell (2005) has discussed different assumptions underlying two different approaches to the placement and timing question, one he calls the “theory first, practice later” approach, the other one the “practice first, understand later” approach. The latter case is not exemplified in any of the four programs, since in such a case the program would start with field experiences *before* any coursework is undertaken. At the core of Russell’s argument in favour of the “practice first, understanding later” approach lie two epistemological stances he takes: that experience precedes understanding in learning to teach, and that it is the “authority of experience” rather than the “authority of position” of the teacher educator that has the greater power in addressing teacher candidates’ prior conception of teaching, developed through the “Apprenticeship of Observation”.²

The stance that experience precedes understanding is in opposition to the epistemological position that a learner needs the theoretical understanding of (certain aspects of) teaching practices first (course work) in order to then *apply* those in concrete teaching situations (practicum teaching). A number of authors in this book argue against this

² On the idea of experience preceding understanding in learning to teach, see Loughran and Russell (1997), and on the idea of “the authority of experience” and “authority of position” see Munby and Russell (1994). On the notion of the Apprenticeship of Observation see this chapter below and the extensive discussion in Bullock & Russell (chapter 5).

epistemological stance. For instance, Sanford, Hopper and McGregor (chapter 20) argue for situated learning in learning to teach, which is incompatible with viewing practice teaching as applying propositional knowledge to concrete contexts. The second epistemological stance taken by Russell (“authority of experience”) takes its starting point in the recognition that all teacher candidates enter their teacher education program with preconceptions of teaching and learning, shaped through an Apprenticeship of Observation during the time of their K-12 schooling. However, such “preconceptions show a remarkable resistance to traditional attempts to change them” (Korthagen & Russell, 1999, p. 4). As Korthagen and Russell argue, for many teacher candidates it requires the “authority of experience” (experience they made for themselves) to have them question their preconceptions and to prepare them for what Piaget calls the accommodation process.

If teacher candidates are to theorize about teaching and learning, they can do so only with reference to some form of experience with teaching. Taking the concerns raised against the Apprenticeship of Observation seriously (see the section on this topic below), it is problematic if teacher candidates use their experiences as K-12 students as their reference for theorizing about teaching and learning, particularly, since they have not experienced teaching from a teacher’s perspective but rather from a student’s perspective. Thus, providing teacher candidates with experiences with teaching from a teacher’s point of view before engaging them into theorizing about teaching and learning seems to make a lot of sense. Russell (2005, pp. 144-145) provides quotes from three teacher candidates who started their teacher education program with a four-month practicum before having taken any course work. Those quotes express clearly those students’ readiness to engage in (what I would call) theorizing about teaching and learning, because their experiences with teaching and learning from a teacher’s perspective had them recognize specific and more general needs for such theorizing.

However, the two epistemological stances taken by Russell as well as the notion of teacher candidates’ readiness for theorizing based on the experience-first approach have to be seen in light of the arguments presented by Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985). The authors discuss three “basic pitfalls of experience”, arguing that caution has to be taken with the belief that “experience [is] as good a teacher of teachers as most people are inclined to think” (p. 53). The three pitfalls the authors discuss – the familiarity pitfall, the two-worlds pitfall, and the cross-purpose pitfall – are characterized as follows (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985):

Classroom experience in itself cannot be trusted to deliver lessons that shape dispositions to inquire and to be serious about pupil learning. On the contrary, it may block the flow of speculation and reflection by which we form new habits of thought and action. (p. 56)

In teaching, observation is a means, not an end. Tom [a fictitious teacher candidate with observational experience of teaching] may succeed in becoming a skilled observer, but this will not guarantee that he will know how to act wisely on what he notices. Nor will further classroom experience in itself activate the acquired skills in situation that call for observation. (p. 59)

Just because experiences seem plausible does not mean they are trustworthy. Sue’s belief that she knows how classrooms work will be difficult to dispel since it grows

out of things she has seen and participated in; these experiences are vivid and cathected. (p. 61)

The authors describe what they think give rise to the three pitfalls:

The familiarity pitfall arises from the fact that prospective teachers are no strangers to classrooms. The two-worlds pitfall arises from the fact that teacher education goes on in two distinct settings [school and university] and from the fallacious assumption that making connections between these two worlds is straightforward and can be left to the novice. The third pitfall arises from the fact that classrooms are not set up for teaching teachers: It is a case of being at cross-purposes. (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 63)

Interestingly, all three points mentioned here are discussed in chapters in this book and will also be addressed in this introductory chapter. What gives rise to the familiarity pitfall is linked to the already mentioned Apprenticeship of Observation, which is extensively discussed in Bullock and Russell (chapter 5). It is the theory-practice divide in many teacher education programs, the divide between university-based coursework and school-based field experiences that Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann say gives rise to the two-worlds pitfall. This theory-practice divide is discussed in a number of chapters, often in connection with attempts to overcome this divide (so, for instance, in Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7). The issue that according to Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann gives rise to the third pitfall is linked to the question of the preparation (education) of associate teachers for their role as teacher educators, a question that is addressed by a number of chapters, particularly so in the chapters by Broad and Tessaro (chapter 4), Hirschhorn and Kristmanson (chapter 11), and Lacourse and Correa Molina (chapter 12).

Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann's arguments are not arguments against the two epistemological stances taken by Russell per se, but they qualify those stances. Their arguments suggest that while "practice first, understanding later" might be an appropriate epistemological stance, *what* we understand based on practice (experience of practice) and whether that "what" is desirable is a different question from the question whether practice precedes understanding. Their arguments also suggest that "the authority of experience" can backfire relative to teacher candidates' *desired* learning and understanding about teaching and learning: just because we look does not mean that we see, and what we see is not all what is there but rather what we are prepared to see! In their chapter Bullock and Russell (chapter 5) adopt this kind of qualifying stance toward the two epistemological stances when they warn against expecting too much from learning in the practicum, and when they suggest – in my words – that the practicum is not "the teacher" for learning to teach but rather provides a meaningful experiential basis upon which university-based coursework can help teacher candidates to theorize about teaching and learning.

If one subscribes to the two epistemological stances promoted by Russell, however, one still does not need to subscribe to the idea of starting a teacher education program with a practicum component before or even when starting coursework. The argument put forward by Russell and others depends on the focus on learning to teach in the classroom. The three quotes from teacher candidates that Russell (2005, pp. 144-145) presents and that I reference above demonstrate quite clearly how the focus of the teacher candidates' readiness for

university-based coursework is on aspects of their still to be developed proficiency in classroom teaching. If that is also the focus of the coursework from the beginning, then providing classroom teaching experiences to teacher candidates with a focus on developing teaching proficiency makes a lot of sense if one subscribes to the two epistemological assumptions outlined by Russell. However, if the educational focus at the outset of a teacher education program is going beyond the focus on classroom teaching proficiency, assuming Russell's two epistemological stances will have different implications for designing experiences for teacher candidates around teaching and learning. Sanford, Hopper and McGregor (chapter 20), for instance, draw on Dewey's well-known notion of teacher candidates as "students of education" to make the case that teacher education has to be more than preparing proficient practitioners:

This means that practical work [by teacher candidates] should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction upon the professional pupil [i.e. the teacher candidate] in making him [or her] a thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than to help him [or her] get immediate proficiency.
(Dewey, 1964, p. 320)

Issues like the larger purpose of school education, poverty and schooling, resource distribution and its impact on learning, constraints faced by teachers, school divisional policies and their impact on teaching and learning, and so on are issues that are not directly linked to developing a proficient practitioner but are rather issue for "students of education". Initial classroom teaching experience in a teacher education program runs the danger of concentrating teacher candidates' learning focus on their becoming a proficient practitioner to the detriment of becoming a "student of education". If the latter is considered important, subscribing to the two epistemological principles mentioned by Russell would imply the design of experiences for teacher candidates that allow them to experience how different schools or teachers work for a larger purpose of school education, how different resource distribution impacts learning of students in different school settings, or how particular school divisional policies impact teaching and learning in that school division. Such experiences can then provide the basis upon which university-based coursework can help teacher candidates grapple with their preconceived notions around those different issues and the role these issues will play for them as teachers. School and classroom experiences addressing those issues will look quite differently than those helping teacher candidates to grapple with their notions of classroom teaching practice. Taking Russell's two epistemological stances seriously requires to ask the question: What type of field experience is appropriate as an experiential base for theorizing about *what* aspect of being a teacher? That aspect does not have to be classroom teaching practice. It might even be, as I argued, that starting with such a focus might weaken attempts to get at the other issues at a later time in the teacher education program. Indeed, some of the programs discussed in this book offer types of field experiences different from the "standard" type of practicum experience – and for the reason outlined here: to consider a wider purpose of the preparation of teachers than to just prepare them for good classroom practice. Next I turn to the more general issue of the design of different types of field experiences offered in teacher education programs discussed in this book.

The Type of Field Experiences

The chapters in this book show a number of different types of field experiences that are provided to teacher candidates as part of their respective teacher education programs. Next to the “regular” practicum, in which teacher candidates are placed in “regular” schools under the guidance of a classroom teacher, there are three more types of field experiences that programs discussed in this book provide for. First, in some programs field experiences are provided that are outside of the formal practicum, offered as part of a university-based course. Those types of experiences were discussed in the previous section. Second, in one program a practicum was offered in the context of an inter-professional team of learners of the respective profession. Two years ago a pilot program was offered at the University of Regina

that placed students in interprofessional teams in a number of community schools In these cases, a pre-service teacher collaborated with a nursing student, a social work student and a human justice student, all of whom were focused on a common health and learning issue that affected the students in the intern’s classroom.

(Mulholland, Nolan, & Salm, chapter 18, p. 321)

In some programs a third type of practicum experiences is offered through alternative field placements where teacher candidates are placed not in regular schools but rather in some type of community setting. I will introduce some of those alternative placements as they are discussed in chapters of this book. At the University of Regina, which is in the process of reviewing its teacher education program, “the plan is for students to successfully complete an alternate field placement in a community setting” (Mulholland, Nolan & Salm, chapter 18, p. 321). Similarly, the University of Victoria had recently begun offering a short-term, optional practicum at a site alternative to the sites of regular school-based practica (McGregor, Sanford & Hopper, chapter 17). Possible placement options included

community-based service and arts organizations, youth engagement or service oriented settings, alternative and private school sites, nature and outdoor recreational sites, hospitals, teacher education programmes, aboriginal organizations, international education placements and student day care camps.

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 304)

The authors describe the challenges that accompany such a type of practicum placement, from organizational issues, to matters of appreciation of the experience by teacher candidates, as well as matters of adjustment to a partnership with new collaborators in the community. Nonetheless, the preliminary data that they provide on the transformative impact of the experience on teacher candidates’ views about teaching, learning, and students are very promising.

Under the title “What kind of experience?” Boyle-Baise and McIntyre (2008) discuss two contexts for field experiences for teacher candidates, one of which is professional development schools and the other one community schools. What is of interest here is that they frame their discussion as the *normative* question of what kind of field experiences teacher candidates *should* get. This question invokes the logically preceding question of what the field experiences can /

should contribute to the overall purpose or goal of the education of teacher candidates in the first place. This is the very stance that McGregor, Sanford and Hopper (chapter 17) take in their rationalization for the alternate site of a short-term practicum in the program at the University of Victoria. For them the question of the purpose of their teacher education program (the “should”, as they call it) was central to their decision to develop and implement a community-based field experience:

For teacher educators, enhancing the development of such critically reflective practices therefore becomes central to programme design; at the University of Victoria we have approached this goal by conceiving of preparing teachers for their dual role as *citizenship educators* and *civic leaders*.

While there are a variety of ways in which such learning and approaches to leadership can be advanced, we see one primary means by which this learning can be enabled: community based field experiences.

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 300)

The notion of linking teacher education program design to the purpose of teacher education is one that can be found explicitly in several of the chapters in this book. I come back to this notion more extensively in this chapter below.

The Role of Field Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education

All Canadian teacher education programs have two central features in common: first, they are all university-based; second, they all have a practicum component that is distinct from the university-based course work. In this section I address the question of the role of field experiences within a teacher education program by (a) focusing on two roles that field experiences can play particularly well in preservice teacher education programs: addressing the theory-practice divide and addressing teacher candidates’ pre-conceived notions of teaching and learning, (b) focusing on the limits of the role that field experiences can play in a teacher education program, and (c) focusing on the larger issue of the urban-rural divide, which directly affects the role that field experiences can play for the preparation of teachers in and for rural school divisions.

The Theory-Practice Divide

What is the Problem?

The issue of the theory-practice divide seems to be the most prominent single issue addressed throughout this book. It is, for instance, a central issue in Bullock and Russell (chapter 6), Dillon and O’Connor (chapter 7), MacDonald (chapter 14), Martin and Russell (chapter 15), and Naested, Nickel, Sikora, and Vaughan (chapter 19). The prominence of this issue should not surprise, since the authors of all chapters are involved in the university-based course work of their respective teacher education program and are writing on the topic of school-based field experiences, which has been generally offered in separation from the former in terms of

timing, personnel, and curriculum. As, for instance, Mulholland, Nolan, and Salm (chapter 18, p. 322) write:

According to Van Zoest and Bohl's (2005) model for the current (traditional) constellation of learning communities in mathematics teacher development, there is a very weak connection with little to no overlap between the university teacher education community and the internship (field experience) classroom community.

So, if members of the university community write about the work done in the “other” community, noticing a divide between the work done in the two communities should not surprise, particularly since the work in both communities is addressing the learning needs of the same group of people (teacher candidates), and generally a view is held that those learning needs are better served in a *coherent* program, a point that I address more explicitly below.

In the chapters of this book “the theory-practice divide” refers generally to the disconnectedness between the university-based course learning in a teacher education program (“theory”) and the school-based learning in the program (“practice”). This disconnectedness and efforts to overcome it is not new to teacher education, as Bullock and Russell (chapter 5, pp. 91-92) point out with reference to Vick (2006), who traces this very issue back to the first half of the 20th century in teacher education in England and Australia.

I find the conceptualization of this disconnectedness as a “theory-practice” divide unfortunate for two reasons. First, it perpetuates the inadequate perception of what the university-based course experiences and what the school-based field experiences are about – *regardless* what experiences are provided in either sphere. University-based course work involves the practice of teaching, even if the course instructor does not make that explicit: teaching about teaching is teaching and the course instructor engages in a practice of teaching; teacher candidates experience teaching practice first hand in university courses. Tom Russell has been making this point forcefully when he emphasizes for teacher educators that how I teach (as a teacher educator) *is* the message (Russell, 1997). On the other side, field experiences in school settings are replete with theorizing. Theorizing about experience is the practice of linking the experience to ideas, conceptual frameworks, and principles. So, whenever a teacher candidate or an associate teacher makes sense of an experience, they theorize.³

The second reason why I think the conceptualization of the disconnectedness as a theory-practice divide is unfortunate is that it does not capture what I think the divide is actually about. In my view the divide is about the *disconnectedness of different domains of teaching competencies*. For instance, the planning of lessons that is discussed and practiced in university-based classes is not linked to a concrete context of a specific class of specific students in a specific school or to the implementation of the lesson. The theories about how students learn – discussed in university-based classes – are not linked to teacher candidates’ experiences with students in their school-based practicum. University-based course work can focus on developing competencies relevant to “practice” (like lesson planning and understanding how primary school students meaningfully develop number sense), but the disconnect between the two spheres in a teacher education program lead to a divide of domains of teaching

³ This point is separate from the questions of what kind of theorizing is happening and whether university-based faculty members can contribute to developing teacher candidates’ capacity to theorize about their teaching and professional experiences.

competencies that does not give sufficient consideration to the *interaction* between those different competencies in teaching. While there are aspects of teaching that do not require a concrete classroom context and university-level theorizing, respectively, in the actual enactment of those aspects of teaching those aspects need to be connected to other aspects of teaching. The problem that is captured by the notion of the theory-practice divide is the problem that *the preparation* of teacher candidates for theoretical and practical aspects of teaching at both the university and the school *is disconnected*, and that, thus, teacher candidates are not helped with the *interconnectedness* of different teaching competencies.

Although they use language of the “theory-practice gap” and separate university-based “learning *about* teaching” from school-based “learning *to* teach”, Dillon and O’Connor (chapter 7) seem to share the fundamental view about the theory-practice divide being the problem of not linking competencies focused on in university courses with those focused on in field experiences:

What the term “theory-practice gap” seems to refer to in teacher education is that guidelines for teaching offered in teacher education courses seem *abstract* to students, even if couched in applied ways, and thus difficult to integrate well in students’ learning since students have limited teaching experience upon which to interpret and integrate the guidelines. In addition, when students are immersed in the “practice” of student teaching, they often feel that the guidelines offered in their program (those few that they may be able to remember!) are insufficient in the face of the enormous complexity of the classroom. The real issue at play here seems to be the relationship between learning about teaching on the one hand and learning to teach on the other. (Dillon & O’Connor, chapter 7, p. 118)

Also, Bullock and Russell’s (chapter 5) suggestion to university-based course instructors to link their courses to teacher candidates’ field experiences can be understood as a call for an interconnection between competencies university courses and field experiences, respectively, focus on:

We contend that preservice programs must directly and actively assume responsibility for helping teacher candidates learn how to learn from field experience and to judge the quality of that learning. It is unacceptable for a course that has been interrupted by weeks of field experience to resume as though nothing had happened; doing so suggests that field experience is relatively unimportant and sends the message that education courses do not value field experience. Field experiences will always change those whom we are teaching, and we cannot resume teaching preservice teachers without knowing something about how they have changed; necessarily, they have new issues, new questions and new understandings of what it means to teach and learn.
(Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, p. 99)

How Can and Should the Theory-Practice Divide Be Overcome?

The question of how the theory-practice divide⁴ can and should be overcome to address their interconnectedness needs to be put in context. Answers to the question depend on one's vision of what to educate teacher candidates for (the purpose of teacher education). Below I discuss the purpose issue for teacher education, but even if one limits one's focus of the purpose for teacher education to "learning to teach", the issue of different visions of what it means to teach and, thus, what it means to prepare teacher candidates for this particular understanding of "teaching" is still relevant. In other words, one can only meaningfully approach the question "How can and should this divide be overcome?" relative to a vision of what teacher candidates are to be educated for. To illustrate the need to contextualize the question of how the theory-practice divide can and should be overcome, I draw on a section in Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7).

Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7, pp. 118-122) discuss Schön's (1987) and Korthagen's (2001) approaches to what "learning about professional practice" aims for and what they suggest that implies for the relationship of "theory" and "practice". Schön's (1983) well-known distinction between the technical-rationality approach and the reflective practice approach to learning about professional practice is grounded in different views of the purpose of professional education. In the case of the technical-rationality approach, professionals are to be prepared to identify the type of professional situation and then to effectively enact in that situation those practices that were externally developed as "best practices" to be engaged in in those situations. In this "theory-into-practice" approach a perceived theory-practice gap in professional education would be conceptualized as a gap between the kind of practice "the theory" says is the best practice in a given educational situation and "the practice" the professional learner is actually enacting in an instantiation of that education situation. On the other hand, in the case of the reflective practice approach a professional is to be prepared for being a "reflective practitioner" (Schön, 1987), who is someone who has developed "professional artistry" that shows in the practitioner's ability to reflect *while* engaged in her practice (reflection-in-action) in order to find the best way to deal with the concrete situation at hand, drawing on explicit and implicit theories held by the practitioner while engaged in the action. In this, as it could be called, "theory-supported practice" approach a perceived theory-practice gap in professional education would be conceptualized as a gap between a learner's engagement with theories about different aspects of the professional practice and the practice in which professional learners develop their competency to reflect-in-action drawing on those theories.

In order to overcome the theory-practice divide in the second sense, Schön (1987), as Dillon and O'Connor remind us, "proposes placing the practicum at the very centre of a professional program, thus basically reversing the traditional figure-ground of courses and practica within a program" (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7, p. 120). The imperative "Placing the practicum at the very centre of a professional program!" can imply a range of different things for teacher education and following I discuss a few of them.⁵

⁴ Henceforth, I will use the shorter and more commonly used term "the theory-practice divide", although with the conceptualization I explicated above.

⁵ The discussion above in the subsection on the placing and timing of the practicum is relevant here as well.

Teacher education programs in Canada are university-based, meaning that it is generally the completion of a university-based Bachelor of Education program that leads to teacher certification in Canadian provinces. All components of the program, including the practicum component, are formally university-based courses, and, thus, controlled by the university – although all such programs are shaped by program accreditation requirements (so for instance in Quebec) and certification requirements by the certification authorities (colleges of teachers in British Columbia and Ontario and provincial governments in all other provinces). Considering this current structure of university-based teacher education in Canada, the imperative “Placing the practicum at the very centre of a professional program!” raises the question of the role of the university in teacher education. While in the Canadian context the central role of the university in teacher education is not in question, the situation is quite different in the USA. There, so-called “alternative routes to certification” have been in existence since the 1980s and their numbers have steadily increased (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). The term “alternative teacher education program” is used with a range of meanings (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005, p. 656), but one common understanding is that it refers to all programs that are non-university-based programs. Such non-university-based teacher education programs range from apprenticeship-type, purely school-based programs supervised by teachers that do not involve any university coursework except maybe in form of degree requirements for program admission to programs that are district-based but involve the completion of a university-based degree program, like the Boston Teacher Residency program (Solomon, 2009). Do alternative teacher education programs of the more apprenticeship type overcome the theory-practice divide by design by having eliminated the “theory component”?

With the prominence of alternative teacher education programs in the USA it should not surprise that the question of the role of universities in teacher education is an on-going issue in the US literature (see, for instance, the chapters in Roth, 1999; and those in part 3 of Cochran-Smith, Fieman-Nemser, McIntyre, & Demers, 2008); but the issue has also been taken up by writers from the UK (see, for instance, the chapters in Furlong & Smith, 1996). Simplified, the literature discussing the role of the university in teacher education emphasizes specifically the importance of the “theoretical” aspect in teaching that the university can contribute. It is the expertise *about* teaching and learning, the scholarship and research in teaching and learning, and the critical distance to the teaching profession that Bridges (1996) discusses as the contributions of the university to teacher education; and Darling-Hammond (1999) suggests that university-based programs can better provide the meta-level competencies required to support learning to teach than alternative teacher education programs. However, both scholars emphasize as well, that those contributions by university-based teacher education programs cannot be taken for granted. Bridges (1996), for instance, suggests that with the current state of affairs in faculties of education, the quality of the contributions in the three mentioned areas leaves much to be desired. Darling-Hammond (1999), considering what research suggests about learning to teach, warns that

lest schools of education become sanguine, however, there are grounds for concern about traditional preparation programs as well. One major aspect of the critique of teacher education is that . . . many teacher education programs seemed to separate theory and application to a large extent. (p. 22)

This concern raised by Darling-Hammond leads back to, as Dillon and O'Connor phrased it (chapter 7, p. 118) "the relationship between learning about teaching ['theory'] on the one hand and learning to teach ['practice'] on the other", and, indeed, one way in which the range of responses to the imperative "Placing the practicum at the very centre of a professional program!" can be conceptualized is as a continuum that is based on the degree to which the practicum, or more generally field experiences are integrated with university-based theorizing: from no integration at all to complete integration. Following I want to characterize three places on this continuum, from least integrated to most integrated and with some references to different Canadian teacher education programs as they are discussed in chapters in this book and are illustrative of the respective case.

One form of integration is characterized by the attempt to connect *the experiences* within the two program components – university-based courses and school-based practica – through various ways without, however, changing the two components per se. The one-year teacher education program at the University of New Brunswick seems to be a prototypical example for this case (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11). In this program the practicum runs concurrently to the courses in the program, thus, providing opportunities to link course experiences with field experiences and vice versa. The latter opportunity is fostered through the encouragement of teacher candidates to choose as topics for on-campus course assignments issues that arose in their practicum. In addition, the program includes three year-long courses for which the course topics were "negotiated with representatives from the educational community" (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11, p. 226). Also, university-based faculty members are encouraged to work as associate teachers, and there are regular meetings scheduled between "the field services office, the school liaisons and the faculty representatives" (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11, p. 226).

A second form of integration is characterized by a direct link between course and field experiences *within individual courses*, thus, creating a new type of field experience in addition to the practicum, which itself is not changed per se. There are a number of initiatives in Canadian teacher education programs that use this form of integration: at the University of Manitoba (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9), at the University of Prince Edward Island (MacDonald, chapter 14), and at the University of Victoria (Sanford, Hopper, & McGregor, chapter 20). As the respective chapters make clear, this form of integration is based on the initiative of individuals or a small groups of teacher educators who have redesigned their own courses in the described ways. The program-wide practicum component is left unchanged.

A variation of this second form of integrating university-based theorizing and school-based teaching experiences is illustrated by David Dillon's (McGill University) field-based courses with accompanying seminar (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7). In this integrative approach field experiences are put at the core and beginning of course-based theorizing. In the field-based courses teacher candidates work in schools and the content of a seminar course that accompanies these field experiences is determined by those very experiences. In this variation as well, the formal practicum component stays untouched.

A third type of integration is characterized by the professional development school (PDS) model, which integrates course work and the practicum components in a particular way. Simplified, PDSs are practicum schools in which university-based faculty members, teacher candidates as well as a group of school-based classroom teachers meet regularly to engage in joint professional learning. (I say more about PDSs in the section on school-university partnerships below.)

Before I move to the next subsection, I want to briefly discuss two more points raised in chapters in this book that are connected to the question of the integration of field experiences with university-based theorizing. The first point is raised by Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) and addresses the idea of a “knowledge base for teachers”, which is traditionally quite widespread in the US literature on teacher education (see, for instance, Murray, 1996; Reynolds, 1989).⁶ This notion is often combined with an epistemological stance that suggests that in teaching this kind of knowledge is “applied” (see for instance the quote by Darling-Hammond above). Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) point to a shift in the conceptualizing of “teacher knowledge”, which is now often conceptualized in terms of “knowledge of practice” (p. 249), which suggests a different epistemological stance. From this stance schools become sites of *new* learning, rather than a place where the knowledge from university courses is “applied”. To develop this knowledge of practice, Lemisko and Ward, as many others before them, suggest that reflection on one’s action is central. However, Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13, p. 251) report that “reflection-in-action” rather than reflection *long after* the action – which is what is often the case in teacher education – is what teacher candidates appreciate and are motivated to engage with.

The idea of an epistemological distinction between different kinds of knowing, including the notion of “practical knowledge”, is not new (see, for instance, Eisner & Rehg, 1985; Fenstermacher, 1994; and the overview in Mundy, Russell, & Martin, 2001). However, it seems to me, judging by discussions I have and presentations that I attend, that the language of “applying theory” is still very wide-spread among teacher educators and teacher education scholars.

The second and last point, raised by Maubant and Roger (chapter 16), is linked to the point I made at the beginning of this subsection, namely that the question of how the disconnectedness of different domains of teaching competencies in teacher education programs can and should be overcome would depend on one’s vision of what to educate teacher candidates for. Maubant and Roger suggest as a response to the question what to educate teacher candidates for that we look at the actual work that teachers do: “If we wish to facilitate the development of teacher education programs, it would be advisable, as suggested by Gauthier & Mellouki (2006), to establish a teaching knowledge base according to the analysis of the work of teachers (Lenoir, 2005)” (Maubant & Roger, chapter 16, p. 286). Deborah Loewenberg Ball, who plays a prominent role in teacher education scholarship in the USA, has recently made the case that if teacher education takes “the work of teachers” – by which she means “the core tasks that teachers must execute to help pupils learn” (Ball & Forzani, 2009, p. 497) – seriously as the objective of what to educate teacher candidates for, then “the intricacy of this work demands a disciplined approach to preparing teachers and a determined rejection of approaches that permit a good general education, reflective field experiences, or unstructured mentoring to suffice as professional training” (p. 498). She suggests “shifting from knowledge to practice” (p. 503) in teacher education, which then “would not settle for developing teachers’ beliefs and commitments; instead, it would emphasize repeated opportunities for novices to practice carrying out the interactive work of teaching and not just to talk about that work” (p. 503). From that perspective, she

⁶ Interestingly, the latest handbook for teacher educators (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), does not speak of a knowledge base; the sub-title rather reads: “What teachers should learn and be able to do”.

promotes the use of the term “teacher training” to emphasize the need of “practicing” the central tasks that teachers need to engage in to help their students learn, like

leading a discussion of solutions to a mathematics problem, probing students’ answers, reviewing material for a science test, listening to and assessing students’ oral reading, explaining an interpretation of a poem, talking with parents, evaluating students’ papers, planning, and creating and maintaining an orderly and supportive environment for learning.
(Ball & Forzani, 2009, p. 497)

While many of us might agree with the view that teacher education should prepare teacher candidates for the teaching practices teachers engage in, few are probably at this time willing to translate this objective for teacher education into a teacher education curriculum the way Ball and Forzani have done – but that should be the appeal of their proposal: to challenge the received view.

Ball and Forzani’s approach to teacher education addresses the “theory-practice gap” in an interesting way by bringing the “practice” aspect to campus, a point that Aitken and Kreuger (chapter 3) make in their discussion of the role that university-based courses can play in the development of the competencies required by the Ministry of Education in Quebec for teacher education programs in Quebec:

Each of the twelve competencies is further defined by up to eight features (Ministère de l’Éducation, 2001). For example, one feature of Competency 1 is, “Transforms the classroom into a cultural base open to a range of different viewpoints within a common space” (p. 58). It is acknowledged that the best place to assess the development of the competencies will be the professional placement, but it is understood that skills can be acquired and knowledge can be constructed in a full range of contexts, including the university classroom.
(Aitken & Kreuger, chapter 3, p. 70)

Working with Teacher Candidates’ Pre-Conceptions: The Apprenticeship of Observation

It is probably not an understatement to claim that constructivism (in at least one of its various forms) is the received view of human learning in school teaching and in teaching about school teaching in Canada.⁷ The central pillar of constructivism as a theory of learning is that humans construct their own meaning for what they experience *using their prior understanding and pre-conceptions as a frame of reference*. The notion of the Apprenticeship of Observation is the attempt to give this constructivist idea a role in the teaching of adults enrolled in a teacher education program:

⁷ For instance, this view can be found in prominent textbooks in mathematics teacher education, like Van de Walle and Folk (2008, chapter 3), as well as the Common Curriculum Framework for K-9 Mathematics published by the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol (see WNCP, 2006, p. 2), which is the basis for the mathematics curricula of all members of the WNCP: the four western provinces and the three territories of Canada (www.wncp.ca).

The Apprenticeship of Observation affects the subsequent phases of the education of teachers [pre-service and in-service teacher education] in the form of beliefs about and attitudes towards teaching and learning, which teacher candidates bring with them when they enter a preservice teacher education program. The literature on learning to teach suggests that, first, many teacher candidates come with beliefs about teaching and learning into their preservice teacher education program that are problematic with respect to teaching for understanding (Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Bransford, 2005; Lortie, 1975; Richardson, 1996; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998), and, second, that it is very difficult to change those beliefs in preservice teacher education programs (Britzman, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001; Wideen et al., 1998). An explanation for those difficulties is that those beliefs about teaching and learning that teacher candidates bring with them into their preservice teacher education programs function as their *frames of reference* (Kennedy, 1999) or their *filters* (Wideen et al., 1998, p. 145), which they use to make sense (or no sense) of what they experience in their course work and in their practicum teaching.

(Falkenberg, in press)

The preconceived notions about teaching and learning that teacher candidates bring with them when they enter a teacher education program, thus, need to be considered in the design and implementation of the program because (a) those notions serve as the “frames of reference” (Kennedy, 1999) for how they make sense of the experiences in the program relevant to teaching and learning, and (b) are difficult to change. But why should those preconceived notions about teaching and learning be changed in the first place? As Kennedy (1999, pp. 55-56) points out, it is because teacher education programs generally consider the notions about teaching and learning that teacher candidates bring with them into the program as *problematic*. As a matter of fact, the very notion of the Apprenticeship of Observation is about this problematic status of those preconceived notions that teacher candidates bring with them when they enter a teacher education program. The following questions arise then for this subsection: Why are the preconceived notions (generally) problematic? and What role can field experiences play in addressing the problematic aspects of those preconceived notions? In the following I briefly address each of these questions with reference to chapters in this book.

Why are the preconceived notions (generally) problematic? The notion of the Apprenticeship of Observation tries to capture this problematic aspect. The notion goes back to Lortie (1975), who pointed out that when teacher candidates enter a teacher education program (in the USA or Canada), they have about 15,000 hours of observation of and experience with teaching in schools, namely as students of the K-12 school system. (In the case of after-degree teacher education programs there are about 1,500 additional hours of experience with undergraduate university teaching and learning to be added on.)⁸ But, as Lortie points out, because of the

⁸ Following Lortie, many teacher education scholars have discussed the challenges that the Apprenticeship of Observation brings for teacher education (see, for instance, Darling-Hammond, 2006, chapter 2; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Bransford, 2005; Kennedy, 1999; Korthagen, 2001, chapter 3; Sarason, 1996). In this book, particularly Bullock and Russell (chapter 5), Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7), and Martin and Russell (chapter 15) address the preconceived notions that teacher candidates bring with them into a teacher education program and the challenges that come with them for teacher education programs.

particular nature of school teaching and learning, being a student functions for many students as an *apprenticeship for being a teacher*.

The interaction [in the classroom] is not passive observation – it is usually a relationship which has consequences for the student and thus is invested with affect. Teachers possess power over their charges. . . . For persons with higher aspirations (e.g., the hope to attend college), the stakes are higher; they learn the significance of good grades and the value of teacher favor. In the terminology of symbolic interaction theory, the student learns to ‘take the role’ of the classroom teacher, to engage in at least enough empathy to anticipate the teacher’s probable reaction to his behaviour. This requires that the student project himself into the teacher’s position and imagine how he feels about various student actions.
(Lortie, 1975, pp. 61-62)

This Apprenticeship of Observation, however, is “ultimately a false apprenticeship” because it “limits their understanding of teaching and learning” (Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, p. 94). Bullock and Russell then go on and articulate four limits that Lortie identifies:

1. Students do not link the teaching strategies used by teachers to the effects those strategies have on their learning
 2. Students can imitate teachers
 3. Students believe teaching decisions are whimsical and subjective
 4. Students do not understand the complex decision-making processes that teachers engage in every day. . . .
- (Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, p. 94)

From a student’s perspective, *good* teaching *looks* easy, because from a student’s perspective only the surface features of good teaching are visible, like *that* a teacher gives instructions to students, *that* a teacher asks questions, *that* a teacher directs activities for students, *that* a teacher marks assignments; what is invisible is, as Bullock and Russell write, the complexity of the decision-making process behind all those surface features of good teaching. This suggests that a preconceived notion of teaching derived from a student’s perspective develops expectations in teacher candidates for their teacher education program that their program helps them develop the “surface qualities” they observed, like being able to develop different types of activities that are fun for their students to engage in and being able to “manage” the students. Those surface qualities are framed by the question “How do I do . . . ?”, which might be in the way of framing teaching as a complex practice that requires interlinking value questions with the contextualization of learning outcomes with designing learning experiences relative to students’ readiness, etc. Kennedy expresses the “being in the way” as follows:

the kind of teaching that reformers envision requires teachers to shift their thinking so that they have different ideas about what they should be trying to accomplish, interpret classroom situations differently, and generate different ideas about how they might respond to these situations. Such a shift in thinking might be analogous to Kuhn’s (1970) famous description of paradigm shifts in scientific communities.
(Kennedy, 1999, p. 56)

What role can field experiences play in addressing the problematic aspects of those preconceived notions? Learning by practicing is a double-edge sword. One edge represents the danger of field experiences providing the opportunity to replicate practice without developing a sense of the complexity of teaching and the competencies that go with that complexity. As Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7) point out:

As important as experience is as a basis for professional learning, it is in itself no guarantee of new and more skilful learning in practice, as the title of Britzman's (2003) book about student teaching warns, *Practice Makes Practice*, rather than 'practice makes perfect'. (p. 124)

This warning should not surprise, considering what was said about the Apprenticeship of Observation:

Lortie (1975) suggested that many teacher candidates primarily view the practicum as an opportunity to prove they can replicate the teacher behaviours they have seen throughout their lives. Experienced associate teachers will likely judge their teacher candidates by the extent to which they can replicate good teacher behaviours. Cultural replication is almost inevitable because teacher candidates initially have little choice other than to teach as they were taught (Sarason, 1996). It is little wonder that the culture of schools has not changed significantly.” (Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, p. 95)

However, there is another side of the sword of learning by practicing, which represents the potential of field experiences for *addressing* teacher candidates' preconceived notions of teaching and learning. Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7, pp. 125-126) make the case that *reflective* practicum approaches provide an opportunity for teacher candidates' preconceived notions about teaching and learning to “be exposed for examination and discussion at early stages of a professional program” (p. 126), which the authors take as an argument for teacher candidates having reflective field experiences early on in their program (see the subsection on the placement and timing of the practicum above).⁹

In the next sub-section I discuss some limits of the role that field experiences can play in teacher candidates' learning to teach in general, but the discussion will also address some limitations that the idea of reflective practicum approaches as a way of addressing the Apprenticeship of Observation faces.

Martin and Russell (chapter 15) – and to some degree Bullock and Russell (chapter 5) – suggest an additional approach to addressing teacher candidates' preconceived notions of teaching and learning, namely through modeling of good teaching practices in university-based courses by the teacher educator and explicit reflection on those practices (Martin & Russell, chapter 15, pp. 280-281; Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, pp. 98-99). A role for field experiences in this approach can be established if course instructors draw explicitly on teacher candidates' prior field experiences when reflecting on the course instructor's teaching practice.

⁹ A similar argument is made in Russell (2005). A comprehensive approach to the type of “reflective field experience” that I think Dillon and O'Connor have in mind is Korthagen's “Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education” (see, in particular, Korthagen, 2001).

Limits of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Candidates' Learning

Bullock and Russell (chapter 5, pp. 96-98) provide case studies that illustrate some of the limitations of (the traditional forms of) field experiences for learning to teach: teacher candidates have to teach in someone else's classroom, plan for the learning of students for whom ultimately someone else is responsible, and are under the "tutelage" of someone else during the field experiences.

The teacher candidate will always be limited in some way by teaching in someone else's classroom. In David's case, the limitation manifested itself implicitly because David knew he could never truly teach however he wanted, because his associate was ultimately responsible for the class. In Paul's case, this limitation manifested itself in explicit ways because he was told how to teach and was judged on his ability to mimic the behaviours his associate teacher expected of him.

(Bullock & Russell, chapter 5, p. 98)

Indicated already in the previous sub-section, (the traditional form of) field experiences face limits when attempting to overcome the Apprenticeship of Observation. One might even argue that (the traditional form of) field experiences can easily reinforce the outcomes of the Apprenticeship of Observation. Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985), for instance, argue this point, although they do not make the link to the Apprenticeship of Observation. Their "familiarity pitfall" of learning through experience – exemplified by the teacher candidate in the semi-authentic vignette 1 (pp. 54-56) – illustrates how *the way in which one engages with one's teaching practice and field experiences* makes all the difference in terms of addressing appropriately one's preconceived notions of teaching and learning.

To what degree field experiences will work with and work on the teacher candidates' preconceived notions of teaching and learning in the form of reflective practice will also depend on the preparedness of the associate teacher, under whose supervision and guidance the teacher candidate is involved in the field experience. If the associate teacher is not well prepared to address teacher candidates' preconceived notions of teaching and learning, the practicum might rather serve to reinforce a teacher candidate's preconceived notion of teaching and learning and she might not make the required paradigm shift (Kennedy) needed for a more desired teaching practice. This points to the crucial issue of the education of teacher educators, which I discuss in a different section below.

Sanford, Hopper, and McGregor (chapter 20) point to a related but more fundamental limit of (the traditional type of) field experiences, which is linked to the very core feature of field experiences, namely the provision of engaging in the practice of teaching in authentic teaching contexts. Such an engagement has the potential of putting the concern for the "practical" (in the sense of "technical") aspect of teaching ("How do I do . . . ?") to the forefront of learning to teach / being a teacher. Creating a context that raises primarily this concern can interfere with other, non-technical learning objectives in a teacher education program. Sanford, Hopper, and McGregor (chapter 20, pp. 346-347) side with Dewey's (1904/1964) idea of teacher candidates becoming "students of education" and his warning against an apprenticeship-type approach to learning in field experiences:

However, this [the view of learning by persons-in-situations] does not mean an apprenticeship of learning, though learning from a more experienced colleague is needed. Teacher education is far more complex a process than copying what has been done before by experienced teachers. Pre-service teachers need to apply technical skills in the classroom but at the same time they need to adapt these skills as they reflect on their learning. Many years ago Dewey (1904) warned us against separating knower from known when it comes to educating teachers.

. . . So we need to prepare teachers to become students of teaching without simply giving them the tools of teaching, though these need to be learned, and without simply putting them in a practical setting to learn on the job, though they need such experiences to learn how to teach. What we need is a way of systematically and recursively-developing skills from contexts, refined and studied in classes, which are actively developed and adapted by the teachers through a continuous process of becoming a student of teaching.
(Sanford, Hopper, & McGregor, chapter 20, p. 346)

Elliott-Johns and Ridler (chapter 8) point to another, rather fundamental limit of field experiences for teacher candidates' learning relative to expectations that are too high for what can be accomplished through field experiences in particular and preservice teacher education in general:

As the Dean of Education, Sharon Rich, writes in her Dean's Message for 2009-2010, recognition of "growing into" the teaching profession is a key element of understanding teacher education as a continuum, which only *begins* with completion of a pre-service program.
(Elliott-Johns & Ridler, chapter 8, p. 148)

Preservice teacher education in general, and field experiences in particular – as the part of teacher education programs which brings teacher candidates the closest to the practice they are to be prepared for – do not prepare "ready-made" teachers but rather prepare, if successful, good beginning teachers. Feiman-Nemser (2001) calls for the view of preservice teacher education being part of a "professional learning continuum" for learning to teach. While in her article she considers the preservice and the induction phase of the continuum, the continuum should be considered starting earlier with the Apprenticeship of Observation and going right up to retirement from the teaching profession (Falkenberg, in press). One can even make the case that the continuum starts even before the Apprenticeship of Observation begins and runs parallel to it, recognizing the contributions that a teacher's personal life story outside of her schooling makes to who she is as a teacher and how she enacts her teaching practice.¹⁰ The continuum is then conceptualized as a "continuum of the education of teachers" (Falkenberg, in press) in recognition of the fact that teaching is grounded in and shaped by the fact that the teacher is a person and by the factors that contribute to a person's development. Those factors are to be given consideration in preservice teacher education, similar to the consideration given to the Apprenticeship of Observation as one such factor.

¹⁰ See, for instance, the review in Richardson (1996, p. 105). Clandinin (personal communication, 1 November 2007; see Falkenberg, 2008, p. 15) makes a similar point, suggesting that "the education of a teacher" begins far earlier than with the enrollment in a teacher education program.

If we speak of the limitations of a particular approach, we can do so only relative to what the approach is to accomplish and to the context within which the approach is embedded. Changing what the approach is to accomplish or changing the context in which the approach is embedded will change to what degree the approach is (still) limited. The last limit just characterized might serve as an illustrative example of this point. If we assume that preservice teacher education is to prepare teacher candidates for being “finished” teachers, preservice teacher education in general – and the field experiences in particular – faces the limit of not being able to generally accomplish that.¹¹ On the other hand, if we recognize this limit and change our expectations for what preservice teacher education can accomplish, what had to be seen before as a limit of field experiences can suddenly be perceived as an opportunity of field experiences, for instance, to overcome the Apprenticeship of Observation, as was argued in the previous subsection with reference to Dillon and O’Connor (chapter 7). Kennedy (1999), in fact, argues that

an important role for preservice teacher education (PTE) is to change these initial frames of reference. Preservice teacher education is ideally situated to foster such a shift in thinking. It is located squarely between teachers’ past experiences as students in classrooms and their future experiences as teachers in classrooms. From their experiences, teachers develop the ideas that will guide their future practices. If these ideas are not altered during preservice teacher education, teachers’ own continuing experiences will reinforce them, cementing them even more strongly into their understandings of teaching, and reducing the likelihood that these ideas might ever change.
(Kennedy, 1999, p. 57)

Considering the important role that field experiences can have in a teacher education program for teacher candidates’ learning to teach – as argued before – much of what Kennedy considers an important role for preservice teacher education to be falls onto the shoulders of the field experiences in a teacher education program.

In addition, above I have qualified some of the limits of field experiences by making reference to “the traditional type of experience”. If the context in which field experiences are provided to teacher candidates changes – for instance by placing them in the context of professional development schools or other structures that integrate the continuum of the education of teachers (for a concrete suggestion see Falkenberg, in press) – some of the described limitations of field experiences will disappear.

The Urban-Rural Divide

There are two chapters in this book in which the issue of field experiences in rural settings is explicitly addressed (Lacourse & Correa Molina, chapter 12; and Mulholland, Nolan, & Salm, chapter 18). These chapters suggest to me – together with what I know about the challenges

¹¹ Canadian school divisions and the teaching profession itself seem to make exactly that assumption (based on practice and policy) if one considers (a) that a beginning teacher is treated exactly the same way in terms of workload as a veteran teacher, and (b) the general inattentiveness that is given to the later phases of the continuum of the education of teachers, illustrated, for instance, in the general ineffective practice of professional development for teachers.

that rural practicum placements face in the teacher education program in the teacher education program I am teaching in at the University of Manitoba – that there is an “urban-rural divide” in terms of possibilities and opportunities provided in the field experience component of Canadian teacher education programs. This divide affects negatively (a) teacher candidates who do and want to have a rural practicum placement and (b) rural school divisions themselves in terms of the provision of new, qualified teachers needed. Following Schmidt (chapter 21), who frames the divide in opportunities between the “regular” group of teacher candidates and another special group of teacher candidates (internationally educated teachers) as an “equity issue”, the urban-rural divide in field placements should be seen as an equity issue (better: equitability issue) as well, this time for those two groups just mentioned: teacher candidates who do and want to have a rural practicum placement and the rural school divisions themselves. In the following I discuss, first, some aspects of what characterizes the situation as an equitability issue, and, then, discuss some suggestions that have been made for addressing the urban-rural divide.

The role that field experiences can play in the context of teacher education in and for rural school divisions is framed by the conditions under which field experiences in such contexts are happening or are possible. With teacher education programs in Canada being located at universities, almost all teacher education programs are placed in urban areas. The logistical issues resulting from this spatial distance between rural schools and urban-placed teacher education programs impact the context for field experiences in and for rural schools. First, there is the issue of the education of the teacher educators involved in rural practicum placements. Unless a rural placement is fairly close to an urban centre, such placements involve not just associate teachers from rural schools, but also rural-based faculty advisors from the respective local area. Any education of associate teachers and faculty advisors that goes beyond the sharing of information – which can be easily done electronically – runs into the logistical and financial problems of bringing people from different regions together for professional development. Once technologies like video conferencing are more readily available the logistical challenges might disappear. These obstacles to the education of rural-placed teacher educators are of particular concern if one considers that one central factor of effective teacher education programs that is mentioned again and again is their level of *coherence* (see, for instance, Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 41). How can such coherence be accomplished if joint meetings of the different groups of teacher educators are problematic because of logistical and financial constraints? How much easier – in comparison – is it to bring together associate teachers and faculty associates that live in an urban area? In addition, because almost all university-based sites of teacher education programs are located in urban areas, having faculty members as faculty advisors – which is, for instance, a central feature of the newly developed teacher education program at Mount Royal University (Naested, Nickel, Sikora, & Vaughan, chapter 19, pp. 335-336) – becomes almost impossible for rural practicum settings.

Another challenge for rural practicum placements, compared to urban placements, concerns the design of the practicum itself. At the University of Winnipeg, teacher candidates are in their practicum schools once a week while they do course work. (Something similar is under consideration for the new teacher education program at the University of Manitoba.) Such an arrangement is in many cases logistically impossible for rural placements because

many teacher candidates with an interest in teaching in a rural setting reside in the city during the time of their course work.¹²

Where the logistical issues resulting from this spatial distance between rural schools and urban-placed teacher education programs will impact the context for field experiences in and for rural schools the most will most likely be linked to attempts to improve teacher education programs. As discussed in previous sections, the integration of university-based course work and school-based field experiences is considered to be one of the crucial means by which to improve the education of teachers. Such integration implies a closer relationship between university faculty and schools, particularly in professional development schools. With universities and their faculty being placed in urban areas, such an integration will most likely involve exclusively urban schools. The impact of such forms of school-university partnerships on the professional development of the teachers of partner schools was seen as one crucial way of improving the education of teachers at the preservice and the in-service level simultaneously. If rural schools are not involved in school-university partnerships, the advantage of improving teaching practices in schools which are in such partnerships will affect urban schools rather than rural schools – which can contribute to an urban-rural divide in the quality of school education.

Although I do not have supporting numbers for the claim, anecdotal evidence about the situation in Manitoba suggests to me that rural school divisions, in particular those in the North have a hard time filling all their teaching positions – compared to an oversupply of teachers in the urban areas, although in the “very urban”, that is the inner city school divisions there does not seem to be an oversupply of qualified teachers to be available. There seems to be a class of “less-desired” teaching placements for the vast majority of teacher candidates, which seem to be rural and inner-city placements. Solomon, Manoukian, and Clarke (2007) argue that for many teacher candidates “border crossing” is required in the institutional, ethno-racial, sociocultural, and moral-political “borderlands” in order for those teacher candidates to “ready themselves” (my term) for working in an inner-city schooling context, and that inner-city service learning in a teacher education program provides for opportunities for the personal transformation that is required for such border crossing. Generalizing from this line of argumentation, good field experiences in rural contexts might be crucial in shifting teacher candidates’ sense of what a desired teaching placement is to then include the teaching in a rural setting, in addition to preparing them appropriately for the specifics of teaching in a rural school – a non-rural placement should generally not prepare teacher candidates as well for rural teaching positions than a rural placement can.

What are some ways in which teacher education programs have tried to address the urban-rural divide? There seem to be two primary approaches. One approach is to eliminate the geographical divide by bringing the teacher education courses and their instructors to the rural school divisions. The Brandon University Native Teacher Education Program (BUNTEP) is one such example, where courses are offered off-campus directly in the communities the program is to serve. Once university-based teacher educators are located in

¹² I was told that when the practicum structure at the University of Manitoba included a one-day-a-week practicum component in the past, teacher candidates with a rural practicum placement living in Winnipeg during the time of their coursework were visiting during the once-a-week component an urban classroom together with a fellow teacher candidate who was assigned to that classroom for her practicum. This is a good illustration of the inequity that characterizes the urban-rural divide.

rural school divisions, linking them and their work to field experiences is much easier to accomplish. The challenge with this approach is to find sufficient and qualified university-based teacher educators who are willing to teach off-campus, which is often linked to staying away from home for at least part of the course teaching.

The second approach consists of bridging the geographical divide through the use of technology. Mulholland, Nolan, and Salm (chapter 18) report on

a digital internship pilot project currently underway [through which] virtual visits with interns are being introduced in such a manner that the faculty-intern conferencing process can be ongoing, synchronous, and without geographical boundaries, expanding into the realm of individual office and classroom spaces.
(p. 6)

Lacourse and Correa Molina (chapter 12, pp. 245-246) report on discussing the idea of creating a website that offers a discussion forum for teacher educators in rural areas as part of their research study.

As the technological possibilities, like video conferencing, will become more developed, more affordable, and, thus, more widespread, the technological approach to the urban-rural divide seems to me the most promising on the horizon.

School-University Partnerships

The Idea and Practice of School University Partnerships

The issue of closer links between university-based courses and school-based field experiences was already discussed at some length in the context of the ways different Canadian teacher education programs try to integrate theorizing and practice in their program in the subsection on overcoming the theory-practice divide. What I want to discuss in this section are more the attempts to “institutionalize” such integration through a “school-university partnership”. The idea of school-university partnerships as a structural feature of a teacher education program comes up in several chapters in this book (Dillon & O’Connor, chapter 7; Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9; Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11; Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13; McDonald, chapter 14; Sanford, Hopper, & McGregor, chapter 20).

Chronologically as well as in terms of in- and extensiveness school-university partnerships have been far more developed in the USA than in Canada. In the USA this has been the case particularly through the concept of the professional development school (PDS)¹³, a concept that was developed in the late 1980s and promoted first by the Holmes Group (Holmes Group, 1990¹⁴), although a proposal to develop school-university partnerships through “partner schools” has already been made earlier by John Goodlad (1984).¹⁵ The Holmes Group identified four purposes for PDSs, the first three of which are linked to an

¹³ The following about PDSs draws on Falkenberg (in press).

¹⁴ Republished as part of *The Holmes Partnership Trilogy* (2007).

¹⁵ For a historical perspective on the development of and work in partner schools see Goodlad (1993, 1999).

attempt to support the development of the teaching profession: (1) developing novice professionals (preservice teachers and beginning teachers); (2) continuing development of experienced professionals; (3) research for and development of the teaching profession. These suggestions for developing the teaching profession are directly linked to the idea of school reform, and PDSs are the Holmes Group's approach to supporting school reform efforts by providing an institutional framework for ongoing and collaborative teacher professional development. For the Holmes Group School reform was concerned with better learning (with understanding) for all students, which was identified by the Holmes Group as the fourth, *overarching*, purpose of PDSs.¹⁶ PDSs are relatively widespread in the USA. One estimate by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education suggests that there are more than 1000 PDSs in 47 states in operation (Darling-Hammond, 2005, p. x), although Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson (1998) caution against a too optimistic interpretation of those numbers when they write with reference to their studying PDSs: "The extent to which a professional development school actually exemplifies the characteristics outlined in *Tomorrow's Schools* is difficult to determine, but many of our interviews suggested that the gap between rhetoric and reality is wide." (p. 31)

In Canada there are to my knowledge no PDSs in place that exemplify the characteristics outlined by the Holmes Group, although there are some programs that use the term "Professional Development School" for their school-university partnerships; so, for instance, Wilfrid Laurier University (in a news announcement on their website) and the University of New Brunswick (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11). However, what chapters in this book illustrate is that there are attempts to linking university-based course work and school-based field experiences in a more formal and institutionalized way. Those attempts are characterized by different levels of formality of structure and of interaction between university-based teacher educators and school-based associate teachers.

Some school-university partnerships are characterized by the involvement of core faculty members in teacher candidates' field experiences as their faculty advisors. This is, for instance, a central characteristic of the newly developed B. Ed. program at Mount Royal University (Naested, Nickel, Sikora, & Vaughan, chapter 19). Such a design connects university-based course work and teacher candidates' experiences in the school classrooms:

We have sought to make these recommended connections between the coursework and practicum, particularly through extensive faculty involvement in the practicum, to scaffold this interface between theory and practice.
(Naested, Nickel, Sikora, & Vaughan, chapter 19, p. 328)

As Hirschhorn and Kristmanson from the University of New Brunswick, where core faculty members are invited to function as faculty advisors, point out, having core faculty members involved as faculty advisors can contribute to their professional development:

¹⁶ Lee Teitel (1999, p. 12) suggests that the discussions about PDSs have now converged around the four goals. Those four goals for PDSs can also be found on the website of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (www.aacte.org). Different purpose versions, however, can still be found; see, for instance, Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Clark, 1999).

In what follows, we will present the argument that the practicum can contribute significantly to a Faculty member's professional development by forging connections with the field, keeping current with curriculum and instruction (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11, p. 227)

Despite the hope that is expressed here for faculty members adjusting *their* approach to their teaching of university-based courses, it seems to me that the involvement of core faculty members as associate teachers gives primarily preference to the impact of coursework on field experiences: faculty members as associate teachers can help their students make sense of their coursework in the context of their practicum teaching. Some school-university partnerships, however, go further than that and have created a formal structure that provides room for the field impacting university-based coursework. One example illustrating this case comes from the University of New Brunswick, where three year-long courses are offered as part of the new teacher education program that are co-designed with members from the field:

The on-campus component of their programs consists of three year-long core courses whose focus and topics were negotiated with representatives from the educational community. The intention was to increase relevance of these courses and to align the various topics with moments in the school year. (Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11, p. 226)

Another example of the case where the field impacts what happens on campus comes from the new teacher education program at the University of Saskatchewan (Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13), where it is in some cases seconded teachers who are teaching university-based courses, partially in school settings:

At the current time, all incoming teacher candidates are assigned a partner school, and in most cases their introductory education course (focused on the philosophy of curriculum and the craft of teaching) is taught by a seconded teacher, faculty member, or a field experience coordinator. Some of the classes are taught in the schools, and there is an expectation that assignments for the course will be carried out in classrooms. (Lemisko & Ward, chapter 11, p. 233)

But it is the school-university partnership built and fostered by David Dillon at McGill University (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7) that goes probably the furthest in terms of linking field experiences to university-based courses. The university-based courses that he offers are field-based courses in which teacher candidates work in partner schools, and the content of a seminar course that accompanies these field experiences is shaped by those very experiences.

Some school-university partnerships are formalized at the divisional level, as is the case at the University of Saskatchewan (Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13), but in most cases of school-university partnerships reported on the chapters of this book the partnership is more informal in the sense that it grew out of and is based on personal connections that faculty members have with particular schools. This is the case for the reported partnerships at McGill University (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7), the University of Manitoba (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9), the University of Prince Edward Island (MacDonald, chapter 14), and the University of Victoria (Sanford, Hopper, & McGregor, chapter 20). The informal status of those school-university partnerships contributes to the challenges that they face, as will be discussed next.

Challenges for School-University Partnerships

While school-university partnerships provide a promising approach not just to improving the context for teacher candidates' learning to teach but also as an institutional framework for improving school teaching in general (following the Holmes Group), forming and sustaining such partnerships in the Canadian context face a number of challenges.

The first cluster of challenges are linked to the circumstance that in Canada teacher education is located at universities – in terms of the location of the responsibility. As such, teacher education programs are subject to the culture and institutional practices and policies of the university. I discuss the challenges that arise for school-university partnerships from the academic freedom principle, the notion of course teaching at universities, and the tenure and promotion policies.

As mentioned several times in this chapter already, the literature on effective teacher education programs emphasizes program coherence as a central feature of such programs. Such program coherence, however, requires that the content of and the pedagogy in those courses are coordinated in some meaningful way. Teacher education programs need to be more than a collection of individual courses. However, as McGregor, Sanford, and Hopper (chapter 17) suggest, the academic freedom that faculty members have in teaching courses can be in the way of creating such coherence:

Challenges remain: the issues of programme coherence and integration as well as faculty autonomy in course design have sometimes come into conflict. This is particularly true when there is an interest in trying to make change in a programme characterized by a course-driven, department sponsored model in which each instructor and faculty member has always been free to design and deliver the course content in ways they preferred. (p. 307)

The concern for program coherence in professional university-based programs should not be sufficient to challenge the principle of academic freedom in teaching one's courses; ultimately, it is this freedom that allows innovative teacher educators to create powerful learning experiences for their teacher candidates in their respective program setting. However, the concern for program coherence should give deans of education pause when they, as the final authority in assigning courses, decide who teaches what course in the teacher education program. The Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE) has not too long ago ratified an Accord on Initial Teacher Education (ACDE, 2006); and it is quite clear from reading the "Principles of Initial Teacher Education" outlined in the Accord that program coherence is to be a central component of any program that claims to be guided by these principles.

The professorial work at Canadian teacher education faculties is divided into three areas: research, teaching, and service. The performance expectations in those three areas are defined in and enforced through collective agreements, tenure and promotion policies, and pay-increment criteria. These expectations bring unwritten but practical time allocations to each of the three areas. Teaching a university course is seen as generally involving time for the classroom teaching itself, time for preparing the course, and time for marking assignments. However, being involved in a school-university partnership as part of one's course teaching involves far more than the time assigned (and indirectly enforced) in universities in general.

Dillon and O'Connor (chapter 7) identify one reason why the involvement in school-university partnerships is so challenging to university-based faculty members, given the university context just described:

To summarize this absolutely vital point about a new relationship with schools for developing and implementing enhanced field experiences, the challenge for teacher education programs seems to be to learn to develop a *dialogue* with schools, rather than to continue the all-too-common and unidirectional *monologue*. We feel that this challenge would be a very substantial one for most programs, yet the very success of a reformed – and more school-based – teacher education program rests on it. (Dillon & O'Connor, chapter 7, p. 25)

Engaging with schools in a dialogue takes time; time that the university system generally does not provide for relative to its expectations of faculty members. Can this challenge be addressed in some way? One way to at least mitigate the time factor in faculty members' involvement in school-university partnerships is to link the research and service component of one's faculty position to one's involvement with the school-university partnership – to the degree possible (a suggestion also made by Lemisko and Ward, chapter 13, p. 258).

The tenure and promotion policies at universities generally represent another, though directly connected challenge to building and maintaining school-university partnerships. Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) express this challenge as follows and put it in the context of their own program:

With real or perceived assumptions about what “counts” toward achievement of tenure and promotion, some instructors are reluctant to engage in the team/relationship-building processes required for meaningful collaborative instruction. Concerns such as these have been and are voiced in a variety of settings in the College – including “brown-bag lunch” program renewal discussions, new faculty mentoring meetings and in Faculty Council. These concerns are real and we need to continue to build the evidence (first emerging our pilot projects) to support the idea that collaborative teaching and learning is ultimately beneficial for both learners and instructors. (We are also finding it helpful that the collective culture at the University of Saskatchewan is beginning to shift toward an acknowledgement of the importance of a focus on learning and exemplary teaching – see new teaching awards and draft versions of a “learning charter”, as examples). (p. 257)

The Lemisko and Ward quote suggests also how the challenges of the tenure and promotion policies in faculties of education for faculty members' involvement in school-university partnerships might be mitigated: by working towards a cultural shift at the faculty and, ultimately university level to give the “scholarship of teaching” a greater consideration when it comes to conceptualizing what characterizes professorial work.

The second cluster of challenges has to do with the differences that often exist in the views about teacher education by university and school faculty. In some of the literature it is suggested that this is due to the different cultures in both institutions, particularly the different reward and accountability structures into which members of the respective institution are

enculturated.¹⁷ In addition to those social-contextual conditions, university-based teacher educators and classroom-based teacher educators generally have a different orientation from which they focus on teaching. While the latter group tends to focus more on teaching as a practice that helps their students learn, the former group tends to focus more on the learning to teach aspect of teaching. Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell (2006, p. 1034) talk about three different perspectives that members of both groups need to hold simultaneously in the context of teacher candidates' field experiences: "the perspective of the individual learning to teach, the perspective of the teacher in a school, and the perspective of the teacher educator in the university setting". And they add: "Not everyone is willing and able to do this".

Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) emphasize how important the subscription to a joint "educational philosophy" is for their school-university partnerships:

The three school divisions with whom we have formal partnerships all espouse educational philosophies that include constructivist theoretical understandings. This stance provides a point of agreement within our partnerships. (Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, p. 253)

The third cluster of challenges to faculty members' involvement with school-university partnerships has to do with what a colleague and I (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9) describe as "the governance of field experiences". We write about the governance aspect of teacher education:

There exists a *governance* aspect to teacher education located in the *power structures* and *interests* that connect the different parties involved in pre-service teacher education programs - whether we give attention to this governance aspect or not. (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9, pp. 165-166, italics in original)

These power structures and interests show at different levels and impact field experiences in general and school-university partnerships in particular. The argument we make in the chapter, discussing the case of a school-university partnership at the University of Manitoba, is that central aspects of field experiences like its funding, its duration, its staffing, its site, the curriculum and the evaluation involved in those experiences are all *governed*, meaning, someone or some group has power over those aspects, expressing particular interests, even if those powers and interests are not always visible. In the case of school-university partnerships in particular, we argue, it can threaten the sustainability of such partnerships if the governance structure is not part of the consideration and negotiation in those partnerships.

The governance structure of teacher education includes the provincial government as one of what we have identified as being the six "domains of jurisdiction" of the governance structure of field experiences in Canadian teacher education programs (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9, pp. 169-170). Other chapters in this book illustrate the impact of the current governance structure of teacher education in the different provinces and even across provinces. The impact of this governance aspect through teacher certification and in some

¹⁷ This point has been made by several authors (see, for instance, Sarason, 1982). Petrie (1995) and Stoddart (1993) emphasize in particular how these different cultures are a challenge to school-university partnerships, particularly when those take the form of PDSs, the probably most intense form of school-university partnerships. For a case study account of such challenges, see Baldwin (1999).

cases program accreditation requirements set by provincial governments and colleges of teachers, respectively, is illustrated in the chapter by Aitken and Kreuger (chapter 3) from Bishop's University in Quebec. Through its certification and accreditation power, the Quebec government has taken quite a prescriptive and, as some of my Quebec colleagues describe it, micro-managerial stance toward teacher education programs in Quebec. Aitken and Kreuger describe in their chapter the tensions that exist between the government's responsibility for the education of students and the relative autonomy of university programs. Aitken and Kreuger (chapter 3) describe how, in their view, they work in their program "within and against the new structures" (p. 69).

Two programs described in two separate chapters in this book illustrate the impact of the current governance structure at work at the even more general interprovincial level, namely through the recently ratified pan-Canadian Agreement on Internal Trade, in which its Labour Mobility Chapter requires the respective provincial certification authorities to certify any teacher with a valid teaching certificate from *any other* Canadian province.¹⁸ The new one-year teacher education program at the University of New Brunswick described by Hirschhorn and Kristmanson (chapter 11) has been developed partially in response to the actual and anticipated impact of the Agreement on Internal Trade on its previously two-year program (Hirschhorn, Sears, & Rich, 2009). McGregor, Sanford, and Hopper (chapter 17) describe how the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement between British-Columbia and Alberta (TILMA) – a predecessor to the Agreement on Internal Trade – has impacted the teacher education program design at the University of Victoria:

These policy decisions [like TILMA] have significant implications for universities and teacher education programming, as is evidenced by the University of Victoria's decision to downscale its elementary teacher education programme from a five to a four year programme so as to "compete" with teacher preparation programmes in Alberta.

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 300)

In acknowledging the importance of the governance perspective for school-university partnerships, Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) suggest a closer collaboration between the different "domains of jurisdiction" (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9). They suggest starting to develop collaboration based on "mutual commitments" that they suggest exist in the Saskatchewan context:

Although identification of a set of mutually agreed upon foundational principles will not resolve all the tensions and issues related to funding, regulation and delivery of field experiences, it seems that understanding and acknowledgement of our mutual commitments would be a good place to begin discussions about opening up organizational structures that seem to impede innovative decision-making processes in the governance of teacher education.

(Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, p. 255)

¹⁸ For more details see Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9, p. 169; and McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 300).

However, they recognize the challenges that such an approach to collaboration faces: “Unfortunately, at present, it remains the case that each organization appears to be working toward transformative education in isolation despite the mutually held goals and aspirations.” (Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, p. 255)

The Education of Teacher Educators

Several times in the previous sections I refer to the importance of the education of teacher educators for the quality of field experiences as part of a teacher education program. In this section I discuss issues that arise in connection with the idea of the education of teacher educators. In Canadian teacher education programs there are generally three kinds of teacher educators involved, depending on the role they play in the program: university-based course instructors, associate teachers, and faculty advisors. There is no formal education of teacher educators in Canada. Learning as a teacher educator seems to happen more through a form of legitimate peripheral participation in the sense Lave and Wenger (1991) define it, namely through participating as a teacher educator in the community of teacher educators within a teacher education program with the support (more or less) from more experienced members of the respective community. New faculty members teaching courses in a B.Ed. program might receive course outlines from previous course instructors or might receive advice in regard to textbooks that can be used, etc.; new faculty advisors might receive advice from more experienced faculty advisors in preparation sessions. In any case, the learning through legitimate peripheral participation for teacher educators is in Canada generally not systematically structured and seems to rely very much on trial and error.

Since, generally, those who work as teacher educators went themselves at some time through a teacher education program, the question arises to what degree an Apprenticeship of Observation *for teacher educators* is at play in their teaching practice. As teacher candidates they have observed course instructors in education courses, and they have observed associate teachers supervising them during their practica. If there is no formal preparation for teacher educators as there is one for K-12 teachers, what are teacher educators drawing upon when they plan and teach their education courses or supervise teacher candidates as associate teachers? As discussed above, Kennedy (1999) identified addressing teacher candidates’ preconceived notions about teaching and learning (resulting from the Apprenticeship of Observation) as one of the central roles for preservice teacher education. With no formal education for teacher educators, who is addressing teacher educators’ preconceived notions about teaching and learning in a teacher education program?¹⁹

In my view it is quite telling of the currently “autodidactic nature” of learning as a teacher educator that for the education (professional development) of faculty-based teacher education the probably most prominent form of professional development that has emerged is

¹⁹ I would see some indication for an Apprenticeship of Observation at play for (some) associate teachers and faculty advisors if I consider their perception of their role and their self-declared learning needs as teacher educators as identified in the study by Lacourse and Correa Molina (chapter 12, pp. 244-245). In my view, neither the role perception nor the self-declared needs as teacher educators indicate a deeper sense of the complexity of preparing teacher candidates that was discussed in previous sections of this chapter.

the self-study of teacher education practices (Laughran, Hamilton, LaBoskey, & Russell, 2004). Although the self-study literature emphasizes the importance of collaborative self-studying, the articles in the journal *Studying Teacher Education: A Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, for instance, are primarily reports by one teacher educator reporting on the self-study of her own teaching practice for the purpose of improving it.

A number of chapters in this book raise several important issues around the question of the education of teacher educators. I discuss each in turn.

As already mentioned above, Hirschhorn and Kristmanson (chapter 11) suggest that faculty-based teacher educators' involvement in school-based practica as faculty advisors provides them with an opportunity for professional development (as teacher educators). When they make this suggestion, they point to two factors that play an important role for the autodidactic nature of the professional development of teacher educators, namely *opportunity* and *willingness*:

With respect to linkages with schools and teachers, the new education program at UNB facilitates interaction between the university and the field by creating a partnership between a liaison teacher at the school and the Faculty representative [opportunity]. If appropriately valued and nurtured [willingness], this seemingly logistical collaboration can be a source of rich professional discussions [opportunity].
(Hirschhorn & Kristmanson, chapter 11, p. 228)

While opportunities can be provided within the university context, some of the challenges that I discuss above for school-university partnerships are directly linked to challenges for faculty-based teacher educators' willingness to engage in professional development: the award and recognition system in a university.

As most field experiences for teacher candidates are placed in schools, the more prominent role of teacher educators in the context of field experiences goes to associate teachers. What does their education and preparation for their work as teacher educators look like? It is probably fair to say – based on my experience with the teacher education program at the University of Manitoba and program descriptions in different chapters in this book – that generally their preparation for their work as teacher educators consists primarily of having relevant information about the practicum shared with them and having someone to talk to if problems arise. What Elliott-Johns and Ridler (chapter 8) write about their program at Nipissing University might be considered prototypical if not more on the more supportive side:

All Associate Teachers are provided with a detailed practicum information package for each placement, and Principals are also provided with all necessary information to facilitate hosting a teacher candidate (or candidates) at their school. Furthermore, an Advance Information Form is included in the practicum package and Associate Teachers are invited to submit relevant information in advance to support their teacher candidates and prepare them for a successful practicum (e.g., a brief outline of Fields of Study, Teacher Candidate's Responsibilities, Units, Topics, Books, Learning Materials etc. and teacher's School/Home Contact Information). . . . In addition to in-person support from Faculty advisors, Associate Teachers are provided with on-line support materials (e.g., the Practice

Teaching Handbook and samples of completed practice teaching evaluation forms are available on-line and these are also distributed as part of the information package). Furthermore, in order to build rapport with associates and principals in a particular area, many Faculty advisors are assigned to the same geographical route for several years.

(Elliott-Johns & Ridler, chapter 8, pp. 151-152)

The situation for associate teachers in regard to their professional development seems to look somewhat different in Quebec, considering that “it is a ministerial directive to offer continuing education to teacher educators [a term the authors use for associate teachers and faculty advisors]” (Lacourse & Correa Molina, chapter 12, p. 236). In some other provinces, some universities have been offering classes addressing the mentoring of teacher candidates or beginning teachers. At the University of Manitoba a Post-Baccalaureate course on mentoring has been offered sporadically over the last number of years, and Foster, Wimmer, Winter, and Snart (chapter 10) report on a course offering with a similar focus at their university:

Over the past several years, our Faculty of Education has been challenged regarding the assumption that a classroom teacher with five years of successful teaching experience has the necessary skills to mentor and supervise a Student Teacher. In 2006-2007, for example, at the request of the field and the profession, the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta introduced a graduate course that takes up academic themes and issues in teacher preparation and induction. Entitled *Educational Policy Studies 532 – Topics in Supervision: Preparation, Mentorship, and Induction of Student and Beginning Teachers*, the course has been offered five times to more than 85 practitioners enrolled in a master’s program or in open studies at the University of Alberta. (p. 200)

There are a number of challenges that associate teachers face in their work as teacher educators that need to be considered when designing any form of education for associate teachers. The first challenge comes with the dual role for the associate teacher: (a) being the teacher in charge for the learning of the students in the practicum class of their teacher candidate; and (b) being a teacher educator for the teacher candidate. Lacourse and Correa Molina suggest, associate teachers need to be able to take and switch proficiently between the different perspectives that come with their different roles:

The associate teacher must be sufficiently aware of the fact that she or he must not act in front of the preservice teacher as the teacher that she or he is, but as a teacher educator, capable of assuming two complementary, but very different identities. The associate teacher must, in this way, mobilize the resources specific to the roles and functions attributed to her or him in order to scaffold the preservice professional development and to manifest competency as co-educator and co-evaluator of teachers.

(Lacourse & Correa Molina, chapter 12, p. 241)

Linked to the issue of the dual role is the challenge of what Broad and Tessaro (chapter 4) call “the poorly defined role of the associate teacher” (see also Lacourse & Correa Molina, chapter 12, p. 239):

There is general agreement, in the literature and the field, that the role of associate teacher is poorly defined and that often expectations are ambiguous and overlapping. Sanders, Dowson and Sinclair (2005) suggest that associate teachers play roles as varied as friend, counselor, model, planner, professional peer, conferencer and evaluator and do not necessarily feel equipped to carry out these varied functions effectively.

(Broad & Tessaro, chapter 4, p. 80)

How challenging will the education of associate teachers be if the role for which they are to be educated is so “poorly defined”?

Another challenge to the education of associate teachers arises for rural-based associate teachers due to logistical reasons, an issue that I have already discussed in a previous section.

As is the case for faculty-based teacher educators, classroom teachers’ *willingness* to engage as teacher educators is a crucial factor for the quality of the field experiences as part of a teacher education program. Elliott-Johns and Ridler (chapter 8), for instance, describe for their program at Nipissing University the difficulty of having classroom teachers coming forward in sufficient numbers to function as associate teachers: “As a faculty of education we continue to grapple with some complex questions and issues such as . . . the increasingly limited availability of sufficient (and ‘top-quality’) associate teachers” (Elliott-Johns, chapter 8, p. 161). This leads to the question why classroom teachers would want to engage as associate teachers in the first place.

While I emphasize above that for teachers the role as a teacher educator requires a different orientation and focus than the one as a classroom teacher to K-12 schools, the qualities that are linked to the former role can greatly benefit one’s qualities in the latter role, which can serve as a good reason for classroom teachers to get involved as associate teachers – and which serves as a good reason for a systematic education of associate teachers to develop those qualities. Broad and Tessaro (chapter 3) provide an illustrative example for this case. In their study they have inquired into different practices of improving associate teachers’ strategies of providing feedback to their teacher candidates. As a consequence of their involvement with the project, associate teachers suggest that the value of their learning reaches beyond their role as an associate teacher:

The associate teachers indicated that the opportunity they had to dialogue and think critically and metacognitively about their practice was extremely valuable and altered their practice not only as associate teachers but also as classroom teachers. They indicated that paraphrasing and asking scaling questions are helpful instructional strategies for encouraging problem solving and goal setting for students as well. They mentioned that they wanted to revisit some earlier debriefing conversations to change them based upon their learning. They also suggested that the process of being filmed both heightened self-awareness and also provided rich opportunities to consider language and interaction and the power of questions, words, and listening.

(Broad & Tessaro, chapter 4, p. 85)

This illustrates the role of the education of associate teachers as effective *professional development* of classroom teachers. The professional work of supporting someone else’s learning around teaching that associate teachers engage in is similar to the practice of mentoring beginning

teachers. The work by and the education of associate teachers can greatly benefit by drawing on the literature on mentoring beginning teachers and the professional development for mentors for their work. This is exactly the stance that Broad and Tessaro take when they label the associate teacher as “educative mentors” (chapter 4, p. 87) and draw on the literature on mentoring conversations.

In their chapter, Broad and Tessaro also suggest the value of the filmed lessons and debriefing sessions in their education of the associate teachers as resources for professional development of classroom teachers:

One of the valuable outcomes of this study for the teacher education program, therefore, is the digital resource created from the filmed lessons and debriefing sessions. The elements of this project were utilized to structure the digital resource: (a) role of the associate teacher, (b) example literacy lessons, (c) example debriefing conversations, (d) reflections of associate teachers and teacher candidates. All of these elements are proving useful as artifacts that spur professional dialogue based in authentic experiences. This record of the lessons and the post-lesson debriefing sessions provides greater opportunity for educators working in a variety of capacities and locations to work with an “example of practice” that can support them as they inquire into effective feedback sessions and teaching practice. (Broad & Tessaro, chapter 4, p. 87)

Working as an associate teacher can also serve as a path within teaching as a career. Teaching as a profession has a “flat” career path, meaning that the kind of work one does as a teacher at the beginning of one’s career is the same kind of work one does at the time of retirement – aside from some formal teacher leadership work in school divisions that one might be able to move into, like working as a consultant within a school division, but those positions are few and far between. The move from the classroom into an administrative position is the only career move that is generally available to teachers, although many teachers see a move into administration as not desirable. Johnson (2004), for instance, has suggested the systematic and institutionalized mentoring of beginning teachers and other forms of teacher leadership in order to not just address the retention problem of teachers in the USA, but to also provide a career path for experienced teachers. Working as an associate teacher and mentoring a teacher candidate should have the similar potential for addressing career path issues for the teaching profession in Canada.

The Purpose of Teacher Education

Educational practices – including the practice of educating teachers – are guided by value judgments, whether those are made explicit or not. This might sound trivial, but there is a twist to it: even if we wanted to be explicit about all the values that guide our own educational practice, we would not be able to. There will always be a part of our value system that impacts our educational practice that stays at the subconscious level. For instance, somewhere else (Falkenberg, 2007) I have argued that teaching as a value-laden (moral) endeavour requires assumptions about a theory of morality, which itself requires assumptions about the human condition. Who of us teacher educators is able to articulate in some explicit ways what she

thinks are the conditions for our being humans? Our value system shows in our educational practice, the decisions we make, and in how we respond emotionally to particular educational situations. Psycho-therapeutic approaches suggest to us, that there are ways in which we are able to bring into our consciousness at least part of what guides our value judgments, and that should not be different for the value system that guides our educational practices. To make it even more complex, our value system does not stay static, so revealing our value system is, thus, not just a matter of revealing more and more of it over time. It changes over time as we interact with and in the world, particularly with people whose practices are guided by different value systems.

What guides the judgments we make in teacher education can best be conceptualized as a *network* of assumptions that is interlinked in different ways (Falkenberg, 2010). McGregor, Sanford, and Hopper's (chapter 17) discussion of the assumptions that guide the alternative practicum placements offered at the University of Victoria illustrates the idea of such a network. In their discussion they articulate how assumptions about education and learning are linked to orientations toward and practices of teacher education pedagogy:

Davis, Sumatra and Luce-Kapler (2008) argue that a genealogical analysis of western conceptions of education and theories of learning allow us to trace how these beliefs have produced particular conceptions of teaching. They present two general categories of learning theory: correspondence and coherence theory. Correspondence theories share a belief in knowledge as an external reality/truth that can be either discovered, traced, acquired or re-produced. From a teacher education perspective, correspondence theories of learning have produced at least two dominant ways of conceptualizing learning about teaching: the rationalist and empirical approaches. The rationalist model is of particular interest to this paper's discussion of field experience given its emphasis on logical constructions of knowledge and how it favours developmentally focused and incrementally organized *experiences* that move on a linear continuum from simple to complex. This understanding of experience emphasizes the study of an external reality that is then reinforced and practiced, usually characterized by conditioning or training regimes that are "practitioner-proof" (Dunne & Pendllbury, 2002, p. 197 as cited in Phelan & Sumsion, 2008, p. 26).

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 298)

A participatory approach also views knowledge as complex and diverse, and thinks about how knowledges are emergent through social and cultural practices. Teaching in this theoretical frame now moves from directing pre-service teachers to see/understand teaching practices in anticipated or normalized ways to triggering or nudging learning in unanticipated ways.

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 299)

McGregor, Sanford, and Hopper's chapter illustrates also how their taking a particular normative stance on the purpose question in teacher education (What do we educate teachers for?) is linked to the design and implementation of a particular form of an alternative practicum placement at the University of Victoria:

For teacher educators, enhancing the development of such critically reflective practices therefore becomes central to programme design; at the University of

Victoria we have approached this goal by conceiving of preparing teachers for their dual role as *citizenship educators* and *civic leaders*.

While there are a variety of ways in which such learning and approaches to leadership can be advanced, we see one primary means by which this learning can be enabled: community based field experiences. Called The Alternative Practicum, we offer our third year elementary teacher education students a three-week field experience in non-school sites.”

(McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17, p. 300)

The network of assumptions that guides our conceptualization of teacher education and its pedagogy includes assumptions that are more normative and others that are more empirical, the latter meaning that those assumptions are more likely to be given up by those holding the network of assumptions in the face of certain kind of empirical evidence (Falkenberg, 2010). I want to illustrate this idea by drawing on two different sets of “principles for preservice teacher education”, each of which emphasizes more one of these types of assumptions than the respective other. Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell (2006) have proposed “fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices”. About the “empirical” genesis of their principles, they write:

From our ongoing analyses of the three cases of pre-service teacher education and our three-way conversations about the interpretation of these cases, we have constructed seven principles of student teacher learning and program change in teacher education that we see as fundamental.

(Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006, p. 1025)

Accordingly, the nature of all their seven principles is such that there is some kind of empirical evidence imaginable that could have Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell opt to give up or at least modify the respective principle. The first principle, for instance, is as follows: “Learning about teaching involves continuously conflicting and competing demands” (Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006, p. 1025). As their explication of how this principle derives from their interpretation of teacher candidates’ learning to teach in the respective programs of the three authors make clear, the principles are based on interpretations of what “effectively supports” learning to teach, illustrated in the following quotation taken from the explication section of the first principle:

This vignette highlights the value of students struggling with the need to simultaneously be both learners of learning and learners of teaching so that they come to better understanding not only how a particular teaching approach influences their learning, but also how that teaching was constructed and performed. Clearly, what they experience as learners of teaching dramatically shapes their views of practice. Therefore, modeling approaches that create opportunities for student teachers to be cognizant of their learning about learning and their learning about teaching need continually to be made explicit.

(Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006, p. 1026)

What if such struggling turns out not to be the most effective way for teacher candidates to come to understand how a particular teaching approach influences their learning? What if a

modeling approach turns out not to be a very effective way of making teacher candidates cognizant of their learning about learning and their learning about teaching? The point here is not to question the principles outlined in their article or the empirical evidence those are build upon. The point is rather to identify the more *empirical* nature of the assumptions upon which those principles are based.

Of a more *normative* nature are many of the principles set out for preservice teacher education in the Accord on Initial Teacher Education by the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE, 2006). Although all their principles begin with “An effective teacher education program . . .”, many of the principles are not empirical assumptions about effective teacher education programs but rather normative assumptions representing value judgments about what is important in the education of teachers.²⁰ A principle like “An effective initial teacher education program encourages teachers to assume a social and political leadership role” (ACDE, 2006, p. 4) is clearly such a normative assumption about what teacher education programs *should* do, based on a normative stance about education in general that the Accord is quite explicit about in its introduction section:

We envision a democratic society that is inclusive, equitable, and sustainable and an education system that nurtures informed citizens who contribute creatively to human development and social change.
(ACDE, 2006, p. 1)

Such a normative stance on the type of society valued and the type of education system that goes with that type of society is clearly less susceptible to being given up by any kind of empirical evidence for those subscribing to those principles. The questions of the *purpose of teacher education*, i.e., the question what we educate teachers for, is clearly a normative question, but the network of assumptions upon which we base our ideas of teacher education does also include assumptions of a more empirical nature like the principles about learning about teaching by Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell.

There are some chapters in this book that embed their conceptualization of field experiences into a larger purpose of teacher education, based on normative assumptions similar to those just discussed. The embedding of the alternative practicum placement in a larger purpose of teacher education at the University of Victoria (McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper, chapter 17) that I refer to above provides one such example. Teacher education, so the authors argue, should “[prepare] teachers for their dual role as *citizenship educators* and *civic leaders*” (p. 300), and the design of an alternative practicum placement, they argue, is one meaningful way that can contribute to that purpose – which is itself a more empirical assumption.

²⁰ There are some principles that can be understood as being more empirical in nature, like the principle “An effective teacher education program ensures that beginning teachers understand the development of children and youth . . . and the nature of learning” and “An effective teacher education program involves partnerships between the university and school, interweaving theory, research, and practice and providing opportunities for teacher candidates to collaborate with teachers to develop effective teaching practices” (ACDE, 2006, p. 4). However, compared to the empirical assumptions set out in the principles by Korthagen, Loughran, and Russell (2006), none of those principles in the Accord are substantiated.

There are at least three other chapters that embed their conceptualization of field experiences in a larger purpose of teacher education or of education in general. Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) from the University of Saskatchewan write that

[they] are also driven by the desire to prepare teachers who strive toward social justice and who engage in education as transformative praxis. This requires a coherent program, with course work and field experiences that challenge the beliefs, attitudes and presuppositions of teacher candidates and supports them in developing understandings about the histories and experiences of diverse social groups and how to work with multi-identified students. (McDonald, 2007) We are striving to develop a renewed program that includes course work which engages teacher candidates in an exploration of anti-racist and anti-oppressive education and in the examination of how to include Aboriginal and multicultural knowledges and perspectives in teaching and learning. We have also built into the PGG requirements for teacher candidates to gather evidence from field experiences to demonstrate that they are reflecting upon and analyzing their growth in understanding the roles of teachers and schools in decolonizing education, building inclusive communities, incorporating Aboriginal and multicultural content and perspectives and in taking a leadership role in seeking to improve social and environmental conditions.

(Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, pp. 256-257)

Mulholland, Nolan, and Salm (chapter 18) from the University of Regina link their normative stance of an “anti-oppressive teaching theory” to guide the design of a pilot seminar for associate teachers, teacher candidates (= interns), and faculty advisors prior to the practicum (= internship). They write:

As the developers of the pilot seminar, we chose to focus on teaching to diversity as the first module to develop for the renewed seminar. Inspired by anti-oppressive teaching theory, we created a three-hour module that engaged cooperating teachers and interns in collaborative learning and structured dialogue about race, white privilege and equity in contemporary Saskatchewan classrooms (Earick, 2009; Marx, 2006; Pollock, 2008; Trepagnier, 2006). The content of the activities that we designed was familiar to the interns in the seminar, particularly since they have been immersed in similar discussions throughout the course work leading up to internship. Some of the cooperating teachers revealed to us in conversation and in written evaluations that most of the content was new to them. In that way, directly addressing the gaps in understanding related to anti-oppressive education helped level the power differential that is so common between cooperating teachers and interns (Anderson, 2007).

(Mulholland, Nolan, & Salm, chapter 18, p. 324)

Finally, Schmidt’s “critical, equity-oriented approach to field experiences for IETs [internationally educated teachers]” (Schmidt, chapter 21, p. 365) at the University of Manitoba provides another example of a network of assumptions involving a larger purpose of teacher education and an interlinking of normative and empirical assumption within that network. Teacher education, Schmidt argues, needs to be dealt with within the larger purpose of education, namely to contribute to a greater equity (equitability) in our society, which is a

normative stance. However, when Schmidt argues with the assumptions around the valuable contributions that internationally educated teachers can make for K-12 school education, then those assumptions are clearly more empirical-based assumptions that might be in conflict with empirical findings:

IETs have important contributions to make as role models for learners from diverse backgrounds and can also serve as important cultural and linguistic resources for these students, their families, and the wider school community (Ryan, Pollock, & Antonelli, 2009). IETs' resources and contributions are most fruitfully employed in school environments where they are recognized and valued as part of a wider affirmation of diversity and difference.
(Schmidt, chapter 21, p. 361)

As with normative questions in other domains, the network of normative assumptions about teacher education that educators subscribe to vary from person to person, whereby the degree of variation varies as well. In different chapters of this book authors make the point that for the sake of program coherence a good match in – as I would phrase it – fundamental normative assumptions about teaching and education between university-based faculty members and associate teachers should be in place.²¹ Aiken and Kreuger (chapter 3), for instance, point to different concepts of “competencies” (p. 70) in the literature, which is directly relevant to teacher education programs in Quebec, where program accreditation is directly linked to a program’s ability to address convincingly the set of 12 competencies for teacher candidates laid out by the provincial government (Ministère de l’Éducation, 2001). Aitken and Kreuger have also found in their study (Aitken & Kreuger, chapter 3, p. 74) differences in the concept of “success” for teacher candidates in their practicum between associate teachers and faculty advisors. How should teacher education programs respond to the issue of mismatching conceptualizations and fundamental normative assumptions?

Lemisko and Ward (chapter 13) provide a multi-prong answer to this question. At the first level they seem to suggest that a match in at least some fundamental assumptions are necessary or at least advantages for the school-university partnerships that they want to enter into:

The three school divisions with whom we have formal partnerships all espouse educational philosophies that include constructivist theoretical understandings. This stance provides a point of agreement within our partnerships.
(Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, p. 253)

However, they also recognize that responses to some aspects of the purpose question for teacher education might not quite match between the different parties involved in a school-university partnership. Rather than viewing this as a problem, they recognize it as a phenomenon inherent in school-university partnerships and see the situation as calling for on-going engagement:

²¹ A response to the purpose question for teacher education is directly linked to the purpose question of teaching. Associate teachers’ view about learning and teaching, thus, has a direct relevance to their view about the purpose of teacher education.

Building a shared mission and vision is complex and takes time and each partnership must be treated as a unique relationship shaped by particular cultures, goals and commitments of the member organizations. This means that authentic partnerships are more like a verb - an ongoing, unfolding process - rather than a noun - a fixed “business” contract. While living with this kind of complexity can be somewhat unnerving, we believe this kind of “authentic partnership” is necessary to achieve our goal of developing field experiences that are mutually transformative.

(Lemisko & Ward, chapter 13, p. 252)

This is exactly the stance that Hansen (2008) takes concerning the question whether inquiry into the purpose of teacher education is a process that will or should end with a final agreement. He suggests that this would not be a desirable process or outcome in the first place:

Should such inquiry [into the purpose of teacher education] strive to produce a final agreement about values? To examine purpose in teacher education implies something other than a process that would terminate dialogue through a final agreement. Rather, inquiry into purpose is crucial to maintain dialogue Dialogue about purpose embodies its own values, among them sustaining a sense of value (again, as contrasted with becoming passive), a sense of community (which often translates into critical energy), a sense of individuality (as each person articulates her or his outlook), and a sense of hope (that values matter in the world precisely because human life is not predetermined or predestined).

(Hansen, 2008, p. 23)

This dialogue about the central purpose question of teacher education needs to be part of our ongoing dialogue about teacher education.

This ends the part of this introductory chapter that discusses central issues of field experiences as they are raised in different chapters of this book. The next and last section of this chapter provides some background information on the genesis of the book and its chapters in general.

Introduction to the Chapters

In May 2009 Hans Smits and I sent out a note to the members of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE; www.csse.ca/cate) inviting them to engage in a writing-discussing-publishing project on the topic of “Field Experiences in the Context of Reform of Canadian Teacher Education Programs”. In the announcement we identified three focus areas for the writing and the conversations:

- (1) *What do we know with any certainty about the nature of field experiences in teacher education, currently and historically?*
(A review of research on the topic of preservice teacher education field experiences)

- (2) *What is the current state of field experiences in Canadian teacher education programs?*
(A description and analysis of features of field experiences in Canadian teacher education programs: formal features, but also assumptions made and stances taken within programs)
- (3) *What should be the role of field experiences in teacher education programs?*
What is possible within current structures of educational practice, both in universities and in schools? How might field experiences best reflect both what we know about teacher education pedagogy and what we might imagine can be different, and for what purposes and ends?

The invitation was sent out with the overall project goal to develop a set of documents around the topic of field experiences in teacher education programs that could be made available to the teacher education (research) community to support the scholarship and practice of teacher education in Canada. We employed a three-step approach to achieving this goal. Those interested in participating in the project had to commit to each of the three steps. First, by September 2009 they had to submit a draft paper that addressed at least one of the three focus areas. Second, they had to attend the Third Working Conference on Research in Teacher Education in Canada (www.umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch) that was held 5-7 November 2009 at the University of Winnipeg. The Third Working Conference was completely dedicated to this project. Depending on the focus area of their paper, participants were grouped into working groups for the Conference and were expected to have read all papers of all working group members in advance of the Working Conference. At the Conference, participants were to discuss the issues raised by and provide feedback on the papers of the other working group members. Third, participants were to revise their draft papers in response to the discussions and the specific feedback at the Working Conference and to submit a final draft by the end of December 2009. Those draft papers were then undergoing a **blind peer review** process, including the paper by one of the editors (Falkenberg & Young, chapter 9). All chapters in this book, with the exception of the two introductory chapters 1 and 2, are the result of this three-step working process as well as the blind peer review.

Hans and I are very pleased to provide in this book a collection of 19 papers (chapters 3-21) written on the topic of “Field Experiences in the Context of Reform of Canadian Teacher Education Programs” by teacher education scholars from 15 different universities from across Canada, including two chapters from Francophone scholars from Québec (see the list of contributors and their institutional affiliations in the section “Contributors” at the end of this book). We added to this collection of 19 papers two introductory chapters (chapters 1 and 2).

Each chapter in this book begins with an abstract, which should give the reader a sufficient overview over what the respective chapter is about. Although some papers have been written with one of the three above mentioned focus areas in mind, many address more than one. This made it difficult to cluster the 19 papers for ordering them in this book. For that reason Hans and I have decided to arrange those 19 papers in alphabetical order by the last name of the (first) author.

To my knowledge there is no comprehensive overview over teacher education programming in Canada available with the exception of the recent base line study by Crocker and Dibbon (2008), which provides aggregated, mainly quantitative data about structural

features of teacher education programs in Canada drawn from website information from the respective institutions. Most chapters in this book provide as part of their discussion of the issues they focus on information on the field experience component of a particular Canadian teacher education program; some chapters even centre their focus on features of the field experience component of a particular teacher education program. Although this information does not provide a comprehensive nor complete overview over the field experience component of Canadian teacher education programs, it does contribute to a better understanding of the qualities of the landscape of teacher education programming in Canada. To assist with this understanding, the table below provides an overview over the program information that can be found in particular chapters on the teacher education program at a particular university.

<i>University</i>	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Program Information (The chapter describes . . .)</i>
University of Alberta	Foster, Wimmer, Winter, & Snart (chapter 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • very extensively the practicum component of the teacher education program
Bishop's University (Québec)	Aitken & Kreuger (chapter 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the faculty's response to the government of Quebec's introduction of 12 standards for teacher education; how those competencies are assessed in the practicum component of the program, and some challenges with the assessment scheme
University of Manitoba	Falkenberg & Young (chapter 9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the governance structure of the regular practicum and the governance structure of field experiences offered as part of university-based course work
	Schmidt (chapter 21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the central features of the special teacher education program designed to qualify internationally educated teachers for provincial certification
McGill University	Dillon & O'Connor (chapter 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a cluster of university-based courses that provide teacher candidates with field-based experiences
Mount Royal University	Naested, Nickel, Sikora, & Vaughan (chapter 19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the different components of the newly developed and approved B.Ed. program
University of New Brunswick	Hirschhorn & Kristmanson (chapter 11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the central features that characterize the link between university and school faculty and university program and practicum experiences in the new, one-year B.Ed. program

Nipissing University	Elliott-Johns & Ridler (chapter 8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the practicum component of the different teacher education programs • critical discussion of four central assumptions underlying the design and implementation of the programs
OISE / University of Toronto	Chudleigh & Gibson-Gates (chapter 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change to the OISE field placement process • statistics about the teacher education program • support structure within the field experience component of the program for teacher candidates, associate teachers, and faculty advisors
University of Prince Edward Island	MacDonald (chapter 14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a curriculum and instruction course that is taught in a school setting and links the university-based course with classroom experiences of the students enrolled in the course
University of Regina	Mulholland, Nolan, & Salm (chapter 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • field experiences in the current program • history of and current reform efforts for the Internship Seminar in the program • on-going program review process (brief)
Université de Sherbrooke	Lacourse & Correa Molina (chapter 12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Quebec context for the practicum component of the program with particular consideration given to the role, the needs, and the education of faculty advisors and associate teachers, particularly those located in rural school settings
University of Saskatchewan	Lemisko & Ward (chapter 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current program structure with focus on field experiences; the six goals of the undergraduate program; underlying principles that underlie the program • first year of formal partnerships with school divisions to provide field experiences as part of a pilot cohort project • review process and changes to the program based on feedback from a review process

University of Victoria	McGregor, Sanford, & Hopper (chapter 17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how certain program components are embedded in a particular view of the larger purpose of the program • a detailed description of the design of a community-based, short-term, and voluntary community based alternative practicum • discussion of challenges and successes of the alternative practicum
	Sanford, Hopper, & McGregor (chapter 20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • underlying assumptions of the program; • three specific changes to the program: (1) course-based field experiences in some courses of the program; (2) use of e-portfolios; (3) professional seminars offered across the four-year program

References

- Association of Canadian Deans of Education (2006). *Accord on initial teacher education*. Retrieved from www.csse.ca/ACDE
- Baldwin, R. S. (1999). When public school and university cultures meet. In M. Wideen & P. Lemma (Eds.), *Ground level reform in teacher education: Changing schools of education* (pp. 77-94). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). The importance of the university-campus program in preservice teacher education: A Canadian case study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(5), 420-432.
- Boyle-Baise, M., & McIntyre, D. J. (2008). What kind of experience? Preparing teachers in PDS or community settings. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.; pp. 307-329). New York: Taylor & Francis / Association of Teacher Educators.
- Bridges, D. (1996). Initial teacher education and the reconstruction of the university. In John Furlong & R. Smith (Eds.), *The role of higher education in initial teacher training* (pp. 50-64). London: Kogan Page.
- Clark, R. W. (1999). *Effective professional development schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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: Routledge.
- Crocker, R., & Dibbon, D. (2008). *Teacher education in Canada: A baseline study*. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education.
- Dagenais D., & Wideen, M. (1999). Teacher education at Simon Fraser University: Collaboration between professional cultures. In M. Wideen & P. Lemma (Eds.). *Ground*

- level reform in teacher education: Changing schools of education* (pp. 169-183). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). The case for university-based teacher education. In Robert A. Roth (Ed.), *The role of the university in the preparation of teachers* (pp. 13-30). London: Falmer Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession* (reissued with a new introduction; pp. vii-xiii). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lesson from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: 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: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1964). The relation of theory and practice in education. In R. D. Archambault (Ed.), *J. Dewey on education: Selected writings* (313-338). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original published 1904)
- Eisner, E., & Rehage, K. R. (Eds.). (1985). *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing: Eighty-fourth yearbook of the NSSE, Part II*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Falkenberg, T. (2007). On the grounding of teacher education in the human condition. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 41(3), 245-262.
- Falkenberg, T. (2008). Mapping research in teacher education in Canada: A pan-Canadian approach. In T. Falkenberg & H. Smits (Eds.), *Mapping out 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.
- Falkenberg, T. (2010). *Philosophical foundations of teacher education*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Falkenberg, T. (in press). Framing an integrative approach to the education and development of teachers in Canada. *McGill Journal of Education*, 45(1).
- Far Darling, L., Erickson, G., Clarke, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Collective improvisation in a teacher education community*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Feinam-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record*, 87(1), 53-65.
- Fenstermacher G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 3-56.
- Fullan, M., Galluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise and stall of teacher education reform*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Furlong, J., & Smith, R. (Eds.). (1996) *The role of higher education in initial teacher training*. London: Kogan Page.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1993). School-university partnerships and partner schools. *Educational Policy*, 7(1), 24-39.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1999). Simultaneously renewing schools and teacher education: Perils and promises. In Richard W. Clark, *Effective professional development schools* (pp. 70-89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (with D. Berliner, M. Cochran-Smith, M. McDonald, and K. Zeichner) (2005). How teacher learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teacher for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hansen, D. T. (2008). Values and purpose in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.; 10-26). New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group and the Association of Teacher Educators.
- Hirschhorn, M., Sears, A., & Rich, S. (2009). The reform of teacher education at the University of New Brunswick: Why and how? *Brock Education*, 18(2), 81-95.
- The Holmes partnership trilogy: Tomorrow's teachers, tomorrow's schools, tomorrow's Schools of education.* (2007). New York: Peter Lang.
- Johnson, S. M. (2004). *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kennedy, M. M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 54-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (with J. Kessels, B. Koster, B. Lagerwerf, T. Wubbels) (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 1020-1041.
- Korthagen, F., & Russell, T. (1999). *Building teacher education on what we know about teacher development.* Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, April 1999, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC document: ED431717)
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices.* (2 vols.). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (1997). Meeting student teachers on their own terms: Experience precedes understanding. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* (pp. 164-177). London: The Falmer Press.
- Ministère de l'Éducation (2001). *Teacher training: Orientations, professional competencies.* Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(2), 86-95.
- Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin, A. K. (2001). Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. In Virginia Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., pp. 877-904). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Murray, F. B. (Ed.). (1996). *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Petrie, H. G. (Ed.). (1995). *Professionalization, partnership, and power: Building professional development schools.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Phelan, A. M. (2005). On discernment: The wisdom of practice and the practice of wisdom in teacher education. In G. Hoban (Ed.), *The missing links in teacher education design: Developing a multi-linked conceptual framework* (pp. 57-73). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). (1989). *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Roth, R. A. (Ed.). (1999). *The role of the university in the preparation of teachers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Russell, T. (1997). Teaching teachers: How I teach IS the message. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 32-47). London: Falmer Press.
- Russell, T. (2005). Using the practicum in preservice teacher education programs: Strengths and weaknesses of alternative assumptions about the experiences of learning to teach. In G. F. Hoban (Ed.), *The missing link in teacher education design: Developing a multi-linked conceptual framework* (pp. 135-152). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Sarason, S. B. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. (Originally published 1971)
- Sarason, S. B. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change."* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston Teacher Residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 478-488.
- Solomon, R. P., Manoukian, R. K., & Clarke, J. (2007). Pre-service teachers as border crossers : Linking urban schools and communities through service learning. In R. P. Solomon & D. N. R. Sekayi (Eds.), *Urban teacher education and teaching: Innovative practices for diversity and social justice* (pp. 67-87). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. *Educational Policy*, 7(1), 5-23.
- Teitel, L. (1999). Looking toward the future by understanding the past: The historical context of professional development schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(3&4), 6-20.
- Van de Walle, J. A., & Folk, S. (2008). *Elementary and middle school mathematics: Teaching developmentally* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Pearson.
- Vick, M. (2006). "It's a difficult matter": Historical perspectives on the enduring problem of the practicum in teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 181-198.
- Western and Northern Canadian Protocol (2006). *Common curriculum framework for K-9 mathematics*. Retrieved from www.wncp.ca/english/subjectarea/mathematics/ccf.aspx
- Zeichner, K. M., & Conklin, J. G. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Schulte, A. K. (2001). What we know and don't know from peer-reviewed research about alternative teacher certification programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), 266-282.