

Chapter 9

Rethinking “Field Experiences” in an Era of Teacher Education Reform: A Governance Perspective

THOMAS FALKENBERG and JON YOUNG

This paper examines the governance of field experiences in Canadian pre-service teacher education programs. For that purpose an analytical tool to describe the governance structure of field experiences is proposed. The tool is then used to analyze the governance structure of two different models of field experiences in the teacher education program at the University of Manitoba as case-studies. Based on these case studies, the paper argues for the importance of an inclusion of a governance perspective for rethinking field experiences in a shifting context for teacher education in Canada and outlines some of the challenges that such shifting faces.

Introduction

In Canada pre-service teacher education is a provincial jurisdiction and it is university-based. The former reflects the fact that the political decision making power for educational matters lies with provincial governments rather than the federal government. The latter means that generally the requirements for teacher certification are met through the successful completion of a university degree, a Bachelor of Education degree. Certification of teachers – the condition for being allowed to teach in publically-funded schools – is the jurisdiction of the provincial government in most provinces and the jurisdiction of the profession in those provinces where there is a College of Teachers (British Columbia and Ontario). While formally Faculties of Education – as entities of universities – have the autonomy to design the program for their Bachelor of Education degree (within limitations that we will discuss below), practically it is the certification requirements that shape the programs, since the goal of almost all of those enrolling into a Bachelor of Education program is to work as a certified teacher. Part of the certification requirement in all provinces is the successful completion of a classroom practicum situated in a school. Provincial School Acts – and often professional standards – require practicing teachers to be available as cooperating teachers for teacher candidates’ practica. Situated in schools, the legal jurisdiction over the practicum experiences of teacher candidates lies with the school principal and the school board in which the school is located.

This simplified outline of the “landscape” of overlapping jurisdictional responsibilities demonstrates two things. First, 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. Second, the governance of teacher education in the Canadian context is complex, interlinking the powers and interests of the participants in pre-service teacher education in a variety of different ways. In this paper we want to argue – with the help of two case studies – that pre-service teacher education program reform efforts, especially those concerning field experiences¹, need to take this governance aspect of teacher education (its power structures) seriously if those efforts are to be successful in the long-run. The governance structure of a teacher education program provides the framework within which different interests play out. If a program is well established, jurisdictions assigned and accepted, and matters run in accordance with jurisdictional responsibilities, the governance structure generally stays in the background. However, if arrangements in the program are to change in such a way that responsibilities impact on each other – which generally is the case for reform proposals – then the governance structure can no longer be taken-for-granted. If, for instance, a reform proposal calls for classroom teachers to be involved in teacher candidates’ field experiences outside of the formal practicum, then power relationship and jurisdictional questions such as: “who decides on the curriculum of those experiences”, “who evaluates teacher candidates learning in those experiences”, “who pays for the costs that incur through this new arrangement”, as well as the fundamental question of “who is proposing this reform” become prominent.

Our interest in the field experiences component of pre-service teacher preparation programs stems from two inter-related observations: First, in the eyes of many teacher candidates (as well as members of the profession and the general public) it is here that ‘the rubber hits the road’ – that regardless of the significance one attaches to the intellectual base of teaching, it is here that one comes face-to-face with the practical reality of public school teachers’ work and either does or does not demonstrate the ability to meet its initial challenges; and second, it is here where the three key players in the governance of initial teacher education – government, universities, and the profession – meet in the most concrete of ways. Underlying this interest is a belief that in Canada the educational literature and the educational discourse related to reforming field experience is grounded primarily in a curriculum or pedagogic orientation related to the integration of theory and practice and upon theories of adult learning, with insufficient consideration given to underlying matters of governance.

Put simply, our interest in this paper is, “what are the key dimensions of governance in the field experience, who controls them, and what are the implications of this for attempts to re-structure them”? In order to approach these questions we analyze the governance structure of two different cases of field experiences from the University of Manitoba using a particular analytical framework for this analysis.

¹ The term ‘field experiences’ in this paper includes the practicum experiences by teacher candidates enrolled in teacher education programs, but it also captures other forms of school and classroom experiences that are offered as part of the program. For instance, in some programs in Canada some instructors offer as part of their courses field experiences outside of the practicum. Whenever we talk about ‘field experiences’ in this paper we refer to experiences by teacher candidates in school settings as part of their program experience. For the purpose of this paper we consider only *school-based* field experiences and not community practica and other alternative field placements.

Before we explicate this analytical framework, though, we like to outline our view of the role that governance of field experiences plays in a changing context of teacher education in Canada. This explication will provide the background for the case studies.

The Governance of Field Experiences in the Larger Context of Teacher Education Revision and Reform

In this section we want to argue that understanding the governance structure of teacher education in general and the governance structure of field experiences in particular is relevant and timely considering the changing context for teacher education in Canada.

In the literature on teacher education in the USA the questions of where teacher education should take place (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Labaree, 2008) and who will and should control pre-service teacher education (Ballou & Podgursky, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Levine, 2006) have been extensively discussed, often in response to a political climate that is very critical of, some might say threatening to, university-based teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, Hess, Rotherham, & Walsh, 2004). In the Canadian context university-based pre-service teacher education appears currently not to be under such an immediate threat, at least not in the same way it is in the USA. However, there are clear indicators that the locus of teacher preparation for adequate teaching is shifting in Canada from the universities to school divisions and schools – in response to a changing context. We can identify two such changing contexts, which we discuss in turn.

Shortening of Pre-Service Programs

When we say that the locus of teacher education is shifting from the university to the school division and the school, we do not, in Canada, mean that the latter take on a formalized program of pre-service teacher education as the universities are offering it. Rather we mean that if formal pre-service teacher education programs at universities get shorter, then the time that teachers begin to have the sole responsibility for teaching and even mentoring teacher candidates themselves starts earlier. If we can assume that teacher candidates are not as ready to teach after one year than they are after two years of formal teacher education, the continued education of teachers takes place ‘on the job’. Where there is no formalized and supportive induction program in place, beginning teachers are left on their own to learn and develop while carrying the same full teaching responsibilities of veteran teachers. One example of a recent shortening of a pre-service teacher education program in Canada in response to changed contexts in teacher education is the pre-service teacher education program at the University of New Brunswick. The program has recently changed its teacher education program from a two-year program to a one-year program in response to contextual changes outside of the actual program (Hirschhorn, Sears, & Rich, 2009).

For two reasons, we think that *the governance* of teacher education does play an important role for understanding the quality of a shift of locus of the preparation of teachers and the impact of that shift on teacher preparation. First, when we talk about the university being the locus of teacher preparation (in form of pre-service teacher education programs) we are talking here more about the formal governance structure than the actual locus, since a good part of

any pre-service teacher education program is the practicum for which the locus is the school rather than the university. What stays the same for pre-service teacher education programs in Canada is not the locus but who has formal control (the jurisdiction) over the program experiences of teacher candidates. Second, one important impact that a shift of teacher preparation from the university to school divisions and schools has is that it implies a shift of the formal governance of teacher preparation for adequate teaching from the university to the school division and school. Analyzing this shift in locus of teacher preparation through the lens of the underlying governance structures, we claim, will help develop a deeper understanding of the qualities of this shift of locus as well as the impact of this shift.

Analyzing the governance structure of the *field experience* within university-based pre-service teacher education programs has become particularly fruitful for the analysis of this shift for two reasons; both were already mentioned in the introduction section. First, it is here that teacher candidates come face-to-face with the reality of teachers' work and either do or do not demonstrate the ability to meet its challenges. Second, it is in the practicum where most obviously the three key players on the governance of pre-service teacher education meet in the most concrete of ways.

Integrating Coursework with Field Experiences

The second changing context in the preparation of teachers in Canada is a shift from what could be called the "division of labour" in pre-service teacher education programs to more "integrated" approaches to the education of teachers (Falkenberg, in press). A greater number of instructors in Canadian pre-service teacher education programs appear to be moving toward an integration of field experiences into their university-based teacher education courses (see, for instance the second case study discussed below, and the long-standing SITE project described in Hopper & Sanford, 2007). An important question that such attempts to a greater integration of university-based course work and school-based field experiences raise is the question what governs these new and changed forms of relationships between the university and the field, and are those governance structures adequate. In the two case studies introduced below we will address this question, and we will argue, drawing on those case studies, that when matters of governance are left as an afterthought – "something for administrators to take care of" – rather than as a central element in the exploration of what is desirable and possible, the likelihood of viable and sustainable change is undermined.

Governance of Field Experiences: An Analytical Framework

The analytical framework developed in this paper uses Dale's (1997) discussion of governance that links *matters of focus* – what it is that is involved in the governance of initial teacher preparation/field experience – with *matters of jurisdiction* – on whose authority these activities are carried out. Dale (1997) suggests three broad categories of educational governance: funding, regulation and delivery. With regard to matters of jurisdiction the governance of initial teacher education in Canada (and elsewhere) is generally cast within an analysis of the interplay between three primary participants – the government, universities, and the teaching profession (Grimmett, 2008; Young, Hall, & Clarke, 2007). In particular with respect to the governance of

field experience we will suggest that each of those three primary participants will provide two domains for a total of six *domains of jurisdiction*.

Matters of Jurisdiction

The argument made here, and elaborated in more detail elsewhere (Young & Boyd, in press), can be summarized as follows: (i) that government, universities, and the teaching profession currently represent the three main parties involved in the design and delivery of pre-service teacher preparation in general and, for the purposes of this paper, specifically the field experiences component of the program; (ii) that each of these participants brings to questions of governance different core interests, structures (mechanisms through which involvement is regulated), and images of teachers' work; (iii) that each participant plays a different role in different elements of governance; and, critically for this paper, (iv) efforts to restructure the field experience by Faculties of Education which do not pay sufficient attention to the roles and interests of the other participants are likely to flounder.

The argument that the governance of teacher education in Canada is best understood as being co-constructed through the interplay of government, universities and the teaching profession requires at least some brief discussion of each of these parties. In Canada, government in this context would normally mean the provincial government that has traditionally played a governance role through such mechanisms as the funding of post-secondary education and through teacher certification.² Also not insignificant as part of government are school boards who actually hire the graduates of teacher education programs. Within the theoretical framework adopted in this paper there are two governmental domains of jurisdiction: the provincial government and the school boards. The recent implementation of the Labour Mobility Chapter of the *Agreement on Internal Trade* has the potential to substantially alter how provincial governments become involved in the governance of teacher education (Grimmett, 2008; Henley and Young, 2009), but a detailed consideration of this lies outside of the scope of this paper. Identifying universities as the second key partner rather than simply referring to Faculties of Education acknowledges that Faculties of Education exist within an institutional home, culture, and structure of the wider university – with core interests associated with academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and critical inquiry – and that decision making authority may be situated differently in relation to differing governance matters. The Faculty of Education and the university beyond the Faculty of Education form the two university domains of jurisdiction. Identifying “the profession” as the third partner creates some further complexities, particularly in those provincial jurisdictions without Colleges of Teachers. Individual members of “the profession” – teachers and administrators – clearly play a major role in all field experiences in Canadian Faculties of Education, but in terms of playing any *formal* or collective role in the governance of those experiences the picture is often far less clear. In the context of field experiences in teacher education a distinction in

² Section 3.2 of the Manitoba *Public Schools Act* further states that “programs taken in teacher education institutions in the province for the purposes of teacher education shall be subject to the approval of the minister” – a power that was implicitly drawn upon recently to require all Bachelor of Education programs to include at least three credit hours of *approved* Aboriginal Education coursework and six credit hours of Special Education/Diversity coursework. In implementing these requirements the University of Manitoba did have one proposed course not approved by the Minister.

the professional domain of jurisdiction should be made between the individual teacher as the collaborative teachers of a teacher candidate and the profession as a whole. This distinction leads to the corresponding two professional domains of jurisdiction.

Overall, then, there are six domains of jurisdiction: the province, the school boards, the faculty of education, the university beyond the faculty of education, the professional individual teacher (faculty advisor), and the professional collective.

Matters of Focus

Dale's (1997) three broad categories of educational governance: funding, regulation, and delivery are 'customized' for our examination of field experiences in pre-service teacher education to provide six areas of focus across the three categories as follows: funding; regulation (duration, curriculum, and evaluation); and delivery (staffing and site). These six areas of focus provide – as the name suggests – the *focus* with which each of the six domains of jurisdiction will be analyzed in the context of field experiences. This results in the following 6×6 matrix (Figure 1). Each of the 36 (non-shaded) cells in the matrix represents one particular focus under which one particular domain of jurisdiction for field experiences is analyzed. For instance, one area of focus is “Curriculum” (as part of the more general focus on the regulations of field experiences). Using this focus on “Curriculum” one can analyze, for instance, in what way the Faculty of Education (“Faculty”), as one domain of jurisdiction, governs the curriculum of the field experiences for teacher candidates in a particular teacher education program. (The corresponding cell suggesting this analysis is marked with “X”.) For instance, through this analysis one might find out that while it is the Faculty of Education that sets out the focus of the curricular experiences in teacher candidates’ field experiences, it is the collaborating teacher through the experiences that she provides to the teacher candidate in her classroom that governs what and in what order the teacher candidates experiences in her field experience.

<i>Focus</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>					
	Government		University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective
Funding						
Regulation						
* Duration						
* Curriculum						
* Evaluation						
Delivery						
* Staffing						
* Site						

Figure 1: A Governance Matrix for Examining Field Experiences in Canadian Pre-Service Teacher Education Programs.

We suggest the matrix in Figure 1 as a framework for an analysis of the governance structure of field experiences in general, and we will use this framework for an analysis of the governance structure of field experiences in two case studies in this paper. In applying this matrix an important distinction that emerges is between the formal/legal definitions of jurisdiction and the informal, ‘on the ground’ sets of arrangements that are negotiated both within and away from the formal provisions. This distinction will become clear in the following two case studies.

Governance of Field Experiences: Two Case Studies from the University of Manitoba

Pre-service teacher education programs/Bachelor of Education programs are offered in six post-secondary institutions in Manitoba (The University of Manitoba, The University of Winnipeg, Brandon University, Collège universitaire de St. Boniface, The University College of the North, and Red River College), each leading to teacher certification by Manitoba Education. Teacher certification requirements are laid out in *Regulation 515/88 Teacher Certificates and Qualifications*.³ While there are certification requirements specific to the Early, Middle and Senior Years Program Streams, common to all is the possession of a first Bachelors degree, and a Bachelor of Education degree that contains “at least 60 credit hours at least 30 of which – or 24 weeks – consist of student teaching” (Manitoba Regulation 515/88, Section 5[2][b]). Put simply, the Manitoba requirement is for a two-year Bachelor of Education degree with approximately half of the program devoted to student teaching/the practicum.

At the University of Manitoba, the Faculty of Education offers a pre-service teacher education program that leads to a B.Ed. Within the program three different program streams currently exist: the Early Years Stream with a focus on teaching at the K-4 grade level, the Middle Years Stream with a focus on teaching at the 5-8 grade level, and the Seniors Stream with a focus on teaching at the 9-12 grade level. Teacher candidates take stream-specific courses with the exception of a small number of elective courses that are open to students from all streams. The program components are essentially the same for all three streams: four terms, with each term being divided into about 9 weeks of university-based course work and 6 weeks of school-based practicum; students are generally in the same practicum school for two consecutive terms. In total, 48 credit hours of university-based course work and 24 weeks of practicum experience are required for the B.Ed. program.

In this section we analyze the governance structure of two types of field experiences within the pre-service teacher education program in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba: the practicum-based field experiences in the Early Years Stream and the course-based field experiences that have been provided in some courses in the Early Years Stream over the last two years. The consideration of two different types of field experiences designed *for the same students within the same program stream* will allow us more clearly to contrast the

³ This regulation is currently under revision to bring it into compliance with the Manitoba *Labour Mobility Act* and the Labour Mobility provisions of the *Agreement on Internal Trade*. The current revisions are not expected to change significantly the requirements for teacher candidates in Manitoba teacher education institutions.

governance structures of two field experience models that have a different status in the reform of teacher education in Canada, as will be discussed in the last section of this paper.

Case 1: Practicum-Based Field Experiences

The central general features of the field experiences *through the practicum* for students in the Early Years Stream are as follows:

- Practicum-based field experiences are offered as part of a formally organized 24 week practicum in schools.
- Teacher candidates have a 5 or 6-week practicum in each of the four terms of their program, in addition to a one week in school experience at the beginning of the school year in their second year. Each practicum is planned developmentally to shift from a focus on observation to one of mentored practice.
- The supervision of the practicum experience is divided between two parties: as an experience *within a school*, the practicum is supervised by professional personnel from the practicum school, generally a designated collaborative teacher in the practicum school under the supervision of the school principal. Formally, however, the practicum has the status of a university-based course, and as such it has to be university-based personnel that are responsible for supervising the experience as it concerns the practicum as a university-based course. The university-based supervision is done by faculty advisors, who are usually term-based instructors (as opposed to full-time professors) – generally retired teachers and administrators hired specifically for the practicum supervision.

Drawing on the conceptual framework described in the previous section, Figures 2a, 2b, and 2c outline the governance structure of the *practicum-based* field experiences in the Early Years Stream. In these as well as subsequent figures we use different levels of shading to signal the relative levels of authority that the different jurisdictions have over the respective focus, with the darker the shading the greater the level of authority.

Case 2: Course-Embedded Field Experiences

In the academic years 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 a number of faculty members teaching in the Early Years Stream of the B.Ed. program in the Faculty of Education have made arrangements with one school division to teach part of their university-based courses in the setting of several of its schools. These school-based parts of the courses were characterized by the following features: (1) a number of opportunities for teacher candidates to teach in pairs a small group of students from the school; (2) the observation of this teaching by the course instructors as well as the respective classroom teachers; (3) opportunities for these classroom teachers to engage with teacher candidates in professional conversations; (4) course meetings of teacher candidates and course instructors at the respective school.

The relevant context of these experiences included:

- teachers of the selected schools volunteered to participate in the project;
- central administration in this school division promoted this possibility as an opportunity for professional development for the teachers in the division;
- the teacher candidates' timetables were scheduled in such a way that they could attend back-to back courses at the school sites (involving instructors who participated in the project) as well as later scheduled classes at the university.

Drawing on the theoretical framework described in the previous section, Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c outline the governance structure of the *course-based* field experiences in the Early Years Stream.

Focus	Jurisdiction					
	Government		University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective
FUNDING Key elements/resources: - co-operating teachers - faculty advisors - administrative costs/ school experience office (e.g. travel costs etc.) - in-school support costs (materials etc) - release time for cooperating teachers	* The provincial government is the major funder of the University of Manitoba. The funding is mainly 'block' as opposed to 'envelope' or 'per student' funding.	* School boards resource the practicum/field experiences through the provision of in-school materials and supports (i.e. secretarial).	* The University determines Faculty budgets annually through a central budget review process. * The University sets tuition fees.	* The Faculty of Education controls the funding for Faculty, Advisors and the School Experience Office.	* Individual teachers contribute their time as cooperating teachers as a part of their professional responsibility	* Manitoba Teachers Society has the most representatives on the government's advisory Teacher Education & Certification Committee (TECC)

Figure 2a: The Governance of practicum-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Funding Focus.

Commentary (Figure 2a):

Funding: Cooperating teachers' and faculty advisors' time and expertise constitute the two key resources for the practicum. Co-operating teachers in Manitoba do not get paid for their mentoring work and this we see as an 'in kind' professional contribution. Since the *Public Schools Act* requires teachers to allow student teachers into their classroom but does not require teachers to mentor student teachers when they are in their classrooms control over decisions related to the provision of this resource we see as residing with the profession – but individually rather than collectively. The size of the provincial grant to the University of Manitoba and the university's allocation of funds to the Faculty of Education frames funding for the practicum.

Focus	Jurisdiction					
	Government		University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective
REGULATION						
Duration	* <i>Regulation 515/88</i> requires 24 weeks of school experience for certification.			* The Faculty of Education determines (in consultation with school principals) how the 24 weeks will be spread over two years.		
Curriculum	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.			* <i>Formal authority</i> to define the practicum experience resides with the Faculty of Education and is mediated by the Faculty Advisor.	* <i>In practice</i> the individual cooperating teacher plays a major role in defining the practicum experience.	
Evaluation				* A pass/fail system controlled by the Faculty of Education.	* <i>In practice</i> the cooperating teacher will usually play a key role.	

Figure 2b: The Governance of practicum-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Regulation Focus.

Commentary (Figure 2b):

Duration: In Manitoba Section 4.1 of the *Educational Administration Act* assigns to the Minister of Education the responsibility for prescribing “minimum standards of academic and professional education acceptable for the certification of teachers in the province”. While this provision of the Act has not been changed, the passage of the *Labour Mobility Act* this year does complicate this as its purpose is stated as being, “to ensure that the measures used by regulatory bodies to certify individuals to work in occupations comply with the obligations of Chapter 7 (Labour Mobility) of the Agreement on Internal Trade” (Manitoba Standing Committee on

Legislative Affairs, 2009). Certification regulations in Manitoba stipulate a minimum of 24 weeks of a supervised in school practicum and it is the Faculty of Education that decides on how those 24 weeks will be spread across the program.

Curriculum: In addition to the certification powers of the Minister, Section 3.2 of the *Educational Administration Act* states, “programs taken in teacher education institutions in the province for the purposes of teacher education shall be subject to the approval of the minister”. This power was exercised by the Minister of Education recently when all Bachelor of Education programs in the province were required to include a minimum of three credits of approved Aboriginal Education coursework and six credit hours of Special Education/Diversity coursework in their programs. Actual course descriptions and course outlines were reviewed, and not all of the courses proposed by the University were approved by the Minister. While such events signal the overarching powers of the Minister, for the most part the authority and the practice in the design of the practicum curriculum resides with the Faculty of Education and is developed in collaboration with members of the profession.

Focus	Jurisdiction					
	Government		University			
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty		
DELIVERY				Individual	Collective	
Staffing	* Regulation 515/88 requires that the practicum is supervised by university approved staff for certification.	* The School Boards provide support to the practicum in form of regulations for personnel to support the practicum.		* The Faculty Advisor is hired by the Faculty of Education. * The Faculty of Education places students, but this is dependent upon the cooperation of individual principals and teachers.	* Individual teachers volunteer/ agree to act as cooperating teachers	
Site	* Regulation 515/88 mandates school placement for certification.			* Faculties of Education decide which schools to use – but are dependent upon professional cooperation.		

Figure 2c: The Governance of practicum-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Delivery Focus.

Focus	Jurisdiction					
	Government		University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective
FUNDING Key elements/resources: - collaborating teachers - course instructor - administrative costs (i.e. travel costs, etc) - release time for collaborating teachers		* School board provided funding for release-time for collaborating teachers	* The University determines Faculty budgets annually through a central budget review process. * The University sets tuition fees.	* The Faculty of Education controls all the funding for the course connected to this field experience	* Individual teachers contribute their time as collaborating teachers as part of their own professional development	

Figure 3a: The Governance of the course-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Funding Focus.

Commentary (Figure 3a): “Collaborating teacher” means here those teachers who were willing to participate in and open up their classes for the course-based field experience project. Students and faculty members bore their own travel costs to and from the school sites. Faculty members contributed additional time above the regular time required for the course through meetings with school staff to discuss, coordinate and debrief the project.

Focus	Jurisdiction					
	Government		University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective
REGULATION						
Duration	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.	* School Board provided permission for the project to happen, which was done with consideration of the duration of the project.		* The duration was co-constructed between Faculty members and collaborating teachers at the partner schools.	* The duration was co-constructed between Faculty members and collaborating teachers.	
Curriculum	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.			* <i>Formal authority</i> to define the course experience resides with the course instructor. Course instructors have also <i>practically</i> co-defined the experience with the collaborating teachers and the school principal.	* <i>In practice</i> the individual collaborating teacher played a crucial role in defining the field experience through her discussions with teacher candidates (more so in some schools than in others)	
Evaluation	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.			* Authority for any evaluation connected with the field experience lies with the course instructor.		

Figure 3b: The Governance of the course-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Regulation Focus.

<i>Focus</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>						
	Government			University		Profession	
	Province	School Board	University	Faculty	Individual	Collective	
DELIVERY							
Staffing	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.			* Faculty members decided on their participation in this project. * The Dean of Education has the formal authority over the assignment of course instructors.	* Individual teachers volunteer/ agree to act as collaborating teachers		
Site	* The <i>Educational Administration Act</i> gives the Minister authority to approve all teacher education programs.	* The sites were negotiated between university course instructors, principals and individual teachers.		* The sites were negotiated between university course instructors, principals and individual teachers.	* The sites were negotiated between university course instructors, principals and individual teachers.		

Figure 3c: The Governance of the course-based field experiences in the Early Years Bachelor of Education Program: Delivery Focus.

Discussion of the Case Studies

In this paper we have presented a model for the analysis of the governance structure of field experiences in teacher education programs in the form of a thirty-six-cell matrix designed to help describe the range of governance issues (matters of focus) and the ways in which decision-making authority is exercised in relation to each of these issues (matters of jurisdiction). In the previous section we have used this matrix to analyze the governance structure of two models of field experiences in a particular pre-service teacher education program in Canada. In this section we discuss some insights we think the analysis of the complexity of the governance of field experience can provide, first, with reference to the challenges associated with, and differences between, the two different field experience models we have analyzed, and, second, with reference to teacher education in Canada in general.

The first insight the case studies provide is an understanding how different the governance structures of the ‘standard’ practicum-based field experiences model is from the course-based field experience model.

(a) Both field experiences are framed by the provincial government’s *Regulation 515/88*. However, in the case of the practicum-based field experiences, the provincial government has actively exercised its jurisdictional authority over its regulatory and delivery aspects (with the exception of evaluation) – for example, specifying minimum duration, defining what constitutes acceptable school placements, and requiring university-based supervision.⁴ In the case of the course-based field experience, on the other hand, this jurisdiction is far more difficult to exert for the government, since in this case the experience is offered as part of a university-based course, and – while the Minister of Education possesses the ultimate authority to approve teacher education programs (which might extend to aspects like curriculum and site of courses within that program) – it will be much more difficult to intervene with such specific teaching aspects of a university-based course. This difference points to a far greater design autonomy of the field experiences offered as part of a university-based course.⁵

(b) Connected with this first observation is the difference that the profession has a much greater jurisdiction in the regulatory and delivery aspects of the governance of the course-based field experiences, since it is the individual teacher’s willingness to participate in this field experience project that makes it possible in the first place. The project would not have happened if it were not for the professions’ (teacher’s) willingness and interest, which gives those teachers negotiation power that they do not have to the same degree in the practicum-based model. This negotiation power brings with it a greater sense of a need for collaboration or perhaps even co-construction among the now dominant jurisdictions in this model of field experiences: the faculty and the profession (the individual teachers). This means, that the distinction between ‘formal authority’ and ‘practical authority’, that is so important a

⁴ The most recent illustration of the Manitoba government exercising its authority in this area involves the regulating Faculties of Educations’ aspirations to use schools outside of Canada as placement sites for the practicum.

⁵ In some circumstances this autonomy needs to be qualified. Although not enacted in Manitoba, governments can control university-based teacher education programs through different means like the definition of specific ‘standards’ or ‘competencies’ that students have to demonstrate or inspection regimes for both schools *and* faculties of education, as the case of government control of teacher education programs in England demonstrates (Whitty, Furlong, Barton, Miles & Whiting, 2007)

distinction in practical terms for the practicum-based model, does not have the same practical importance in the course-based field experience model.

(c) While the control over evaluation is in practical terms split and sometimes controversial in the practicum-based model, it is not an issue at all in the course-based model. The profession has neither a formal jurisdiction over teacher candidates' evaluations in the case of the practicum-based field experiences, nor does it play any evaluative role in the course embedded field experiences. The former is the case because practicum-based field experiences are recorded as courses and it is the university-based faculty advisor who is formally in charge of teacher candidates' evaluation in the course and all experiences connected to the course; the latter is the case because the way in which the course-based field experiences were designed and enacted, school teachers involvement with teacher candidates' work in the schools did not include any evaluative aspect of teacher candidates.

(d) Taking the 'standard model' of the practicum-based field experiences as the reference point, in the course-based field experience model faculty members contribute 'in kind' to the funding of the project in form of additional time (for planning and debriefing meetings) as well as additional travel cost (to and from the schools).

Aside from insights into the two different models of field experiences discussed in the case studies, the analysis of the governance structure of two different field experiences of pre-service teacher education programs in Manitoba provide also insights into teacher education in general in the Canadian context.

(a) The analysis in the two case studies makes clear that one needs to distinguish between 'formal jurisdiction' and 'practical jurisdiction' ('lent' jurisdiction). The law or regulations define whose jurisdiction a particular focus of the field experience is. But as the focus 'curriculum' makes clear, while the university has the *formal* jurisdiction over the curriculum of the practicum as part of a university-based program, the actual practice of enacting the practicum component of the program sees a *practical* jurisdiction in the hands of the collaborating teacher. In some respect the two field experience models inquired into in the two case studies are at opposite ends of a spectrum that sees a clear distinction between formal and practical jurisdiction as in the practicum-based model on the one side and the course-based model on the other; in the course-based model there is very little relevance of the distinction between formal and practical jurisdiction, since the existence of the very field experience depends on *both* the faculty and the profession (individual teachers).

(b) Funding is the life-blood of programming. New initiatives are often linked directly to the need for additional funding. The analysis of the funding focus in the two case studies brings to the surface the complexities of funding of field experiences and that the funding structure might be quite different for different models of field experiences, requiring different approaches to secure funding – or to realize the vulnerability of an initiative because of the funding structure.

(c) In the two Manitoba field experience models professional involvement and jurisdiction finds expression primarily through the contributions of individual teachers rather than the profession as a collective. While the Manitoba *Teachers Society Act* defines a broad mandate for the Manitoba Teachers Society in promoting and enhancing the causes of education in Manitoba, it does not specify any formal role in the governance of teacher preparation in the ways that the Ontario *College of Teachers Act* or the British Columbia *Teaching Profession Act* does. This reality points to the complexities in talking about 'the profession' as an entity of jurisdiction in teacher education in provinces without a College of Teachers.

(d) The analysis of the governance structure moves deservedly to the forefront the issue of the relationship between university, government, and the profession. Our focus on field experiences in teacher education opens up a much wider discussion of the management of the relationship between the university and the profession. It is not our intent in this paper to argue in favour of any particular set of jurisdictional relationships. We have discussed elsewhere (Young and Boyd, in press) the different core interests, purposes and contributions that each organization brings to teacher preparation. What we hope is that the paper provokes and informs the discussions around where jurisdiction might best lie and what different forms of collaboration and co-construction might properly and realistically be envisioned.

Conclusion

While it is teacher educators (at the university and in the field) who design and provide learning opportunities for teacher candidates for their learning to teach, all those opportunities are provided within a program structure. It is this program structure that regulates how often teacher candidates work with students, who supervises them during this time, how many credit hours of course work teacher candidates have to take, to what degree course work and field experiences are integrated, and so on. Understanding this structure from a *governance* perspective means understanding the power structure (the jurisdictions) that formally regulates decision making within the different elements of the program; any program leaves a lot of room for “on-the-ground” decisions that need to be made as part of the program’s implementation. A program structure provides the context for learning and teaching, and it is within this context that decisions are made and interests are played out and their enactment negotiated. It is the *governance* perspective that focuses on the formal/legal and the informal/“on-the-ground” power structure within which those decisions are made the interests are played out and negotiated.

The analytical framework provided in the first part of this paper is designed to help with the understanding of the governance structure of field experiences in teacher education programs. We hope that the use of this analytical framework to understand the governance of field experiences in two cases illustrated the usefulness of this framework for that purpose. Through the points raised in the second part of the previous section we argue for the importance of considering the governance perspective on teacher education in general and on field experiences in particular, especially in the context of teacher education reform. In any effort for program renewal, one cannot plan to develop “the best model for teacher education” without considering the governance structures involved *and* without considering how the development of “the best model” has happened in the first place.

The governance structure of teacher education in Canada provides all three jurisdictional parties in the context of field experiences with some form of *power*. In our view that is important, because each of the three parties brings some form of *wisdom* to the context of teacher education. Simplified, faculties of education (should) bring *academic* wisdom to teacher education in form of theorized understanding of teaching and a critical understanding of the larger context of schooling, the profession (should) bring *practical* wisdom to teacher education in form of contextual and practical understanding of teaching, and, finally, the government (should) bring *political* wisdom to teacher education in form of the responsibility for the public

interest in education. In our view, the governance of teacher education should be structured in such a way that the power provided to each of the three parties can and must be enacted in such a way that it allows those three forms of wisdom to come to bear in teacher education. The analytical framework that we have provided in this paper and have illustrated in two case studies should provide the tool to understand and redesign power structures (in the context of field experiences) in such a way that these three forms of wisdom can come to bear in a reformed teacher education program.

References

- Ballou, Dale, & Podgursky, M. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: What is the evidence? *Teachers College Record*, 102 (1), 5-27.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). The AERA panel on research and teacher education: Context and goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 37-68). Washington, DC & Mahawa, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
- Dale, R. (1997). The state and the governance of education: An analysis of the restructuring of the state-education relationship. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. Wells (eds.), *Education, culture, economy and society*, pp. 273-282. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (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, Linda (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record*, 102 (1), 28-56.
- Falkenberg, T. (in press). Framing an integrative approach to the education and development of teachers in Canada. *McGill Journal of Education*, 45(1).
- Grimmett, P. (2008). Canada. In T. O'Donoghue & C. Whitehead (eds.), *Teacher education in the English-speaking world: Past, present and future* (pp. 23-44). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Henley, D. & Young, J. (2009). Trading in education: The Agreement on Internal Trade, labour mobility and teacher certification in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*. Retrieved July 22nd 2009 at <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/currentissues.html>
- Hess, F., Rotherham, A. & Walsh, K. (eds.). (2004). *A qualified teacher in every classroom? Appraising old answers and new ideas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 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.
- Hopper, T, & Sanford, K. (2008). Using poetic representation to support the development of teachers' knowledge. *Studying Teacher Education*, 4(1), 29-45.
- Labaree, D. F. (2008). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. 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. 290-206). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group and The Association of Teacher Educators.

- Levine, A. (2006). Will universities maintain control of teacher education? *Change*, 38(4), 36-43. *Manitoba Regulation 515/88, Teacher Certificates and Qualifications.*
- Manitoba Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs (2009). *Third Session – 39th Legislature*. Vol. LXI No. 3. June 2nd, 2009, pp. 30-33, and p. 70. Accessed July 2, 2009 at: www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/3rd-39th/hansardpdf/la3.pdf .
- Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA), An agreement between the governments of Alberta and British Columbia.* (2009). Accessed September 29, 2009 at: http://www.tilma.ca/the_agreement.asp
- Whitty, G., Furlong, J., Barton, L, Miles, S. & Whiting, C. (2007). Training in turmoil: Researching initial teacher education in England in the 1990s. In J. Freeman-Moir & A. Scott (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Critical essays on teacher education* (pp. 7-23). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Young, J., & Boyd, K. (in press). More than servants of the state? The governance of initial teacher preparation in Canada in an era of school reform. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*.
- Young, J., Hall, C., & Clarke, A. (2007). Challenges to university autonomy in initial teacher education programmes: The cases of England, Manitoba, and British Columbia. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23,81-93.