

Zeichner, Ken; Bier, Marisa

Die Wende zu mehr Praxis in der US-amerikanischen Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung

Beiträge zur Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung 30 (2012) 2, S. 153-170



Empfohlene Zitierung/ Suggested Citation:

Zeichner, Ken; Bier, Marisa: Die Wende zu mehr Praxis in der US-amerikanischen Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung - In: Beiträge zur Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung 30 (2012) 2, S. 153-170 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-138102

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:

Zeitschrift zu Theorie und Praxis der Aus- und Weiterbildung von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern

BEITRÄGE ZUR LEHRERINNEN- UND LEHRERBILDUNG

Organ der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung (SGL)

ISSN 2296-9632

<http://www.bzl-online.ch>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.

This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF)
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der


Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

The Turn Toward Practice and Clinical Experience in U.S. Teacher Education

Ken Zeichner and Marisa Bier

Abstract This paper discusses the current focus on the clinical aspect of teacher education in the U.S. Following an overview of the current context for teacher education in the U.S. and a discussion of the enduring problems associated with clinical teacher education, the paper analyzes current efforts in early entry, college recommending and hybrid programs to improve the clinical preparation of teachers. The paper concludes with an assessment for the future for teacher education in the U.S. by situating these efforts for improvement within the current political and economic context of teacher education that has encouraged the defunding of public universities where most U.S. teachers are prepared and the investment in non-university teacher education programs. Cautions are also raised about an uncritical glorification of practice in teacher education without attention to identifying the design features of clinical experiences that are associated with desired outcomes.

Keywords clinical experience – teacher education – educational policy

Die Wende zu mehr Praxis in der US-amerikanischen Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung

Zusammenfassung Dieser Beitrag diskutiert den derzeitigen Fokus auf die Praxis in der US-amerikanischen Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung. Nach einer Übersicht zum aktuellen Stand und einer Diskussion der fortdauernden Probleme in der berufspraktischen Ausbildung werden jüngste Anstrengungen von Früheinsteiger-, universitären und hybriden Programmen zur Verbesserung der berufspraktischen Ausbildung diskutiert. Der Beitrag schliesst mit einer Einschätzung zukünftiger Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung in den USA. Die drei Ansätze werden eingebettet in den gegenwärtigen politisch-ökonomischen Kontext der Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung, der Investitionen in nicht universitäre Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildungsprogramme begünstigt zu lasten der Budgets öffentlicher Hochschulen, die die meisten US-Lehrpersonen ausbilden. Es wird ausserdem vor einer unkritischen Verherrlichung von Praxis gewarnt, die nicht nach jenen Formen berufspraktischer Felderfahrung sucht, die am ehesten die erwünschten Wirkungen versprechen.

Schlagwörter Berufspraktische Studien – Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung – Bildungspolitik

A teaching force of around 3.6 million teachers teach in about 90'000 public schools in the U.S. Throughout the formal history of teacher education in the U.S. there have been a variety of pathways into teaching both inside and outside colleges and universities

(Fraser, 2007). Approximately 1'400 colleges and universities are authorized to offer teacher education programs and despite the tremendous growth in non-college and university programs since the 1980s, about two thirds of teachers in the U.S. continue to be prepared by colleges and universities. Increasingly, a variety of other non-profit and for-profit programs including school district programs currently prepare about one third of the new teachers in the nation each year (NRC, 2010; Zeichner, in press^a). In some parts of the country though, nearly as many teachers enter the field through non-college and university pathways as through college and university programs (Feistritzer & Haar, 2008), and in at least one state (Florida), school districts are required to have their own teacher education programs (Emihovich, Dana, Vernetson & Colon, 2011).

1 Teacher Education in the U.S.

Today, despite a growing variety of specific program structures for teacher education (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005), there are three basic ways to become a public school teacher in the U.S. First, between 1960 and 1990, colleges and universities had a virtual monopoly on the preparation of teachers. With the exception of emergency credentialed teachers in subject areas where enough qualified teachers could not be found (e.g. special education), almost all teachers entering U.S. public schools entered the teaching force through «*college recommending*» programs¹ sponsored by a college or university after completing an undergraduate or postgraduate teacher education program of at least a year in length (Grossman & Loeb, 2008). Beginning in the 1980s an increasing number of teachers began to enter the teaching force through «*early entry*» programs and completed most of their teacher education programs after becoming the teacher of record in a public school classroom fully responsible for students (Grossman & Loeb, 2008). Recently, a third and *hybrid* form of teacher education has emerged that is more school-based than the traditional university model, but where there is still a significant amount of preparation and mentoring support before candidates enter into the teaching force as teachers of record. The urban teacher residency that may or may not involve colleges and universities (Berry et al., 2008) is an example of a hybrid program model (also see Zeichner & Payne, in press).

All of the early entry, hybrid, and some of the college recommending programs occur at the postgraduate level and are one or two years in length. Most of the preparation of teachers in college recommending programs takes place at the undergraduate level in four or five-year programs. Education and teacher education in the U.S. are controlled at the state level and despite the existence of voluntary national program accreditation requirements, and some degree of cooperation among the states, there is signifi-

¹ «College recommending» programs are completed by teacher candidates before they become fully responsible for classrooms. In «early entry» programs, teacher candidates become fully responsible for classrooms before they complete their initial preparation program and earn a teaching license.

cant variation among the states in their requirements for teacher education programs (Zeichner, 2011). For example, eleven states do not require any clinical training before individuals become teachers of record legally responsible for classrooms while others have increased the amount of time that must be spent teaching in schools in a preparation program (AACTE, 2010).

In this paper we discuss examples of the various kinds of practice-centered models for pre-service teacher education that are in existence in the U.S. today in the three basic forms of teacher education (early entry, hybrid, and college recommending) and identify some of the central issues that teacher educators are working on in the U.S. in relation to clinical experiences for prospective teachers. Although it is clear that some of what teacher candidates need to learn to begin teaching can be acquired outside of the elementary and secondary classrooms for which they are being prepared, it is also clear from several decades of research on teacher learning that a number of critical elements of professional practice can only be learned in the context of real or simulated classrooms under the guidance of strong mentoring (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Feiman-Nemser, 2010).

In 2010, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships issued a widely discussed report calling for teacher education to be turned «upside-down» and for making clinical practice the central focus of preparation (NCATE, 2010). Since then, there have been a number of efforts involving programs throughout the country to improve the quality of clinical teacher education and its connections to the rest of preparation programs. Before examining some of these efforts, we will provide a brief overview of some of the major issues that teacher educators have tried to address in this work.

2 Issues and Problems in U.S. Clinical Teacher Education

The clinical education for teachers that exists today in the U.S. is highly varied in its characteristics and quality (Clift & Brady, 2005; NCATE, 2010; NRC, 2010). It consists of experiences for varying lengths of time in schools, in designed settings such as virtual classrooms, and in community settings (Grossman, 2010). The quality of school placements, the frequency and quality of mentoring, supervision and coaching, the degree of connection between the clinical experiences and the other parts of the preparation program, and the overall degree of monitoring of the quality of the experiences vary greatly within and across programs (Grossman, 2010; Zeichner, 2010a).

Historically, one of the major problems in teacher education within the dominant college recommending model has been the lack of connection between coursework and clinical experiences. Although most college recommending programs include multiple clinical experiences over the length of their programs and often situate these expe-

riences within some type of school and university (and sometimes community) partnership, the disconnect between what teacher candidates are taught in their courses and their opportunities to learn to enact these practices in their clinical placements is often very great even within professional development and partner schools (Bullough, Hobbs, Kauchak, Crow & Stokes, 1997; Zeichner, 2010b).

For example, it is very common for the cooperating/mentor teachers with whom teacher candidates are placed to know very little about the specifics of the courses that teacher candidates take in their program, and the instructors of the courses often know very little about the classrooms where teacher candidates are placed for their clinical work (Zeichner, 1996). As a result of his lack of connection, the ways in which placements are determined, and the structure of the cooperating/mentor teachers' roles, teacher candidates frequently do not have opportunities to observe, try out and receive detailed feedback on their teaching of the methods they learn about in their coursework. Even if the teaching practices that are taught in the courses exist in the classrooms where candidates are placed, candidates do not necessarily get access to the thinking and decision-making processes of their experienced mentors (Hammerness et al., 2005; Zeichner, 1996) who are usually greatly undercompensated, underprepared and undersupported for the complex and important work they are expected to do in mentoring prospective teachers (Zeichner, 2010b).

In addition, the quality of mentoring and assessment of the work of teacher candidates in school and community placements is highly variable and it is more common than not that very little preparation and continuing support is provided to cooperating/mentor teachers and to university supervisors (Grossman, 2010; Valencia, Martin, Place & Grossman, 2009). Even when this professional development is provided though, the underfunding of clinical teacher education often undermines the capacity of supervisors and mentors to support teacher candidates. This under-resourcing of clinical teacher education leads to higher numbers of candidates supervised by mentor/supervisors and has become a greater problem in recent years as the public universities where most teachers in the U.S. are still educated have lost significant amounts of financial support from their states (Newfield, 2008).

Although there have been some opportunities over the years for teacher educators to obtain external funding from the state, federal governments and private foundations to support innovation in clinical teacher education (e.g. Sykes & Dibner, 2009), the investment in carefully planned clinical teacher education prior to the assumption of responsibility for a classroom is disappearing with the exception of the teacher residency model as the federal government and foundations have increased support to «fast track» programs where there is often little or no *pre-service* clinical experience (Levine, 2012; Suggs & deMarrais, 2011).

The Turn Toward Practice and Clinical Experience in U.S. Teacher Education

Over time, and especially in recent times with the disinvestment of states in public universities² where most teachers in the U.S. are prepared, there is little evidence of programs being able to sustain the innovations that were initially supported by external funding. Now that the federal government has decided to phase out the «Teacher Quality Partnership» grant program that has supported many innovative efforts in clinical teacher education (AACTE, 2010; Rennie Center for Educational Research & Policy, 2009), it is not clear to what extent these efforts will be able to be sustained.

There are clearly links between efforts to shorten initial teacher education through early entry and urban teacher residency programs and efforts to reduce the role of colleges and universities in teacher preparation and open the preparation of teachers up to other providers. These efforts to create a market economy in teacher education in the U.S. are closely linked with efforts by the federal government and venture philanthropists to privatize U.S. K-12 education (Saltman, 2010; Zeichner, in press^a).

In the university programs, the educators who provide the mentoring and assessment of teacher candidates' work in the field are often adjunct faculty or doctoral students with low status and little decision-making authority in the institution. There is frequent turnover among these supervisors and they often feel that they are accorded second-class status in the program in comparison with research faculty (Bullough, Draper, Smith & Burrell, 2004). When permanent tenure-line faculty are involved in field supervision, this work often does not count in their teaching load and is not valued highly in the reward system that exists in most universities (Labaree, 2004).

A further issue involved in undermining the opportunities for teacher candidate learning during clinical experiences is the frequent lack of a curriculum (similar to the curriculum that exists for all courses) that lays out a well thought out plan for how opportunities to learn for teacher candidates will be created over the course of the clinical experience and how the needs of teacher candidates for learning to teach can be addressed over the course of a clinical experience and coordinated with the primary classroom mission of promoting pupil learning (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Turney, Eltis, Towler & Wright, 1985).

There is widespread consensus that the selection of classrooms as sites for clinical experiences has not been very effectively carried out in many programs (Greenberg, Pomerance & Walsh, 2011; NCATE, 2010), and that the increased accountability pressures on schools around pupil test scores together with the meager compensation provided for mentoring has complicated the task of locating high quality placements for many teacher candidates (Anderson & Stillman, 2011). Despite all of these problems, there is evidence of a great deal of activity across the country to focus attention on

² This disinvestment in public higher education is a part of a broader disinvestment in the public sphere that exists in some form or another in most countries (Zeichner, 2010c).

improving the quality of clinical teacher education in all three pathways into teaching. We now provide an overview of some of the major aspects of the current turn toward teaching practice and clinical experience and reflect upon the future for clinical teacher education in the U.S.

3 Examples of Efforts to Raise the Quality of Clinical Teacher Education in the U.S.

As the 2010 NCATE report asserts, the preparation of teachers must «move to programs that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses» (NCATE, 2010, p. ii). A variety of models for practice-based teacher education exist in which attempts are made to more closely link coursework with school-based experiences. They range from programs that create designed settings to provide «a sheltered opportunity for prospective teachers to engage in targeted practice of clinical skills» (Grossman, 2010, p. 2), to programs that provide early entry into the classroom in an effort to prepare teachers largely on the job, to hybrid university-based teacher education programs like urban teacher residencies that focus on preparation for specific contexts and that are largely situated in schools, to the shifting of college recommending programs into schools and communities.

One of the major aspects of the current turn toward clinical teacher education in the U.S. is a return to a focus in all of the various pathways into teaching on more strategically teaching prospective teachers how to enact particular teaching practices that are thought to enhance student learning (Zeichner, in press^b). One strand of current efforts in the U.S. to identify and teach «core» teaching practices as the central focus of a teacher education program is embedded in the teaching of specific school subjects (e.g. Ball & Forzani, 2009; Windschitl, Thompson & Braaten, 2011) and claims to draw on research that has identified certain teaching practices that enhance student learning. Other strands of this work focus on teaching particular instructional and classroom management strategies that are not tied to particular subject matter areas or grade levels (e.g. Danielson, 2007; Lemov, 2010). In reality, there is a great deal of variability in the empirical warrant for these various models of effective teaching (Pianta, 2011). Periodically, throughout the history of formal teacher education in the U.S., there has been a renewed focus on the enactment of particular teaching practices in American teacher education programs. Although the current incarnation of this trend differs in a number of significant ways from efforts of the past, it shares the intent to make teaching practice the center of teacher education (Zeichner, in press^b).

3.1 Clinical Experience in Designed and Virtual Settings

In addition to placing teacher candidates in school and community settings for clinical experiences, teacher educators have also been involved in creating simulations of

classroom practice within courses or connecting their courses to the practices of good teachers through technology. Grossman (2005, 2010, 2011) discusses various aspects of this work to create laboratories for clinical teacher education (Berliner, 1985) including the «micro teaching» movement in the 1970s (Grossman, 2005) and current efforts to make the thinking and practices of teachers who are using particular teaching practices more visible to teacher candidates through technology. The Carnegie Foundation funded «Quest Project» where teacher educators use the web pages created by K-12 teachers in their teacher education methods courses (cf. www.insideteaching.org) is an example of this work.

For example, in the Quest project, Pam Grossman, a teacher educator at Stanford University, created a website where she documented how she incorporated the website of an experienced Los Angeles high school English teacher (Yvonne Divans Hutchinson) in her English methods course. One aspect of this work focused on the task of engaging students in text-based discussions of literature. In addition to reading academic literature on this topic, teacher candidates utilized Hutchinson's website, which includes images of her leading discussions around texts in which students were very engaged, interviews with Hutchinson, and statements by her students, as well as examples of student work and methods and materials that Hutchinson used to prepare her students for discussions.

3.2 The Rise of Early Entry Programs

Over the last two decades there has been a tremendous growth in «early entry» programs that place novices in classrooms as teachers of record with very little preparation beforehand. Most teacher learning in these programs takes place while teachers are fully responsible for classrooms and relies heavily on the quality of mentoring that is provided by the program and the school district. Examples of early entry programs that have received substantial support from foundations and the federal government include «Teach for America» (TFA)³ and the «New Teacher Project» founded by a graduate of TFA and former superintendent of the Washington DC schools Michele Rhee, which sponsors «teaching fellows» programs in 25 major U.S. cities. Early entry teachers typically receive full beginning teacher salaries while they are completing their preparation program.

³ Teach for America which is the largest of U.S. early entry programs recently received a federal grant of \$50 million dollars to expand its capacity by 80% (Zeichner, in press^a), and over the last decade has received funding of over \$300 million dollars from private foundations and the federal government (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011). There is currently a great deal of controversy about this program because of its placement of underprepared teachers with only five weeks of training in schools to exclusively teach students living in poverty, the ambiguity of the research about the effectiveness of these teachers (Helig & Jez, 2010), the high turnover rate of these teachers after their 2-year commitment (Donaldson & Johnson, 2011), and the ties between the program and efforts to privatize public education in the U.S. (Sondel, Kretchmar & Ferrare, 2012).

These and other early entry programs typically include a brief summer institute of a few weeks prior to the beginning of the academic school year and then the assumption of full responsibility as a teacher for one or two years. During the one or two years in the program the novice teachers who usually do not have any background in Education continue to complete course work that will qualify them for a state teaching license and an experienced teacher mentor provides on-site support and guidance.⁴ Early entry teachers complete their certification requirements through college and university, school district or programs sponsored by non-profit or for-profit entities. In New York State and in Newark New Jersey for example, all TFA teachers complete their certification requirements through the «Relay Graduate School of Education», an independent normal school like program that only prepares teachers. Relay Graduate School of Education is a part of a growing trend throughout the nation for charter school networks to prepare their own teachers in new largely school-based programs that operate outside of the dominant university teacher education system.⁵

In early entry programs, individuals are usually required to make a commitment to teach in an urban or rural school in a high-poverty community for one or two years. Most of the teachers who enter the teaching force through one of the «fast track» or early entry programs where most of the preparation occurs while novice teachers are teachers of record fully responsible for a classroom teach in poor urban and rural communities (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Peske & Haycock, 2006), and are not found in public schools teaching students from the middle and upper middle classes, the children of many of the advocates of deregulation.

Although the research on the effects of different pathways to teaching is not conclusive and has shown greater variability within types of pathways than across pathways (e.g. Constantine et al., 2009; Decker, Mayer & Glazerman, 2006; Hellig & Jez, 2010; NRC, 2010; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005), there is some evidence of a «learning loss» by pupils as underprepared beginning teachers of record are catching up with teachers who completed all of their preparation for an initial teaching license prior to becoming responsible for classrooms (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). It is clear, given the high turnover of teachers in the most poverty impacted schools (e.g. AFT, 2007; Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2002), that the communities in which the schools staffed by many early entry teachers are located have become dependent on a constant supply of early entry teachers who stay for a few years and then leave.

The current teacher education system does not help these communities to develop the capacity to have access to a more experienced teaching staff in its schools and to lessen

⁴ Current federal legislation allows these teachers still in training to be considered «highly qualified» and therefore eligible to be responsible for classrooms.

⁵ The Aspire, Match and Academy for Educational Leadership teacher residencies are examples of these emerging networks to prepare teachers for particular charter school networks.

their dependence on inexperienced and underprepared teachers. Given the documented importance of teacher experience in teaching quality (e.g. Ronfeldt, Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2011), this is a serious problem of injustice for many poor communities. There is evidence that there are alternative approaches to preparing teachers for high-needs schools that are effective in bringing more fully-prepared teachers into these schools and keeping them there over time longer than is typical (e.g. Berry et al., 2008; Skinner, Garretton & Schultz, 2011).

3.3 Urban Teacher Residency Programs

In 2004, Tom Payzant, then superintendent of public schools in Boston, gave an invited plenary address at the national meeting of the major teacher education organization in the U.S., the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The title of his talk was «Should teacher education take place at colleges and universities?» In this talk, Payzant complained about the quality of the teachers his district was getting from the many colleges and universities in the Boston area and threatened that if college and university teacher education did not improve the quality of their programs, he would start his own program within the Boston schools. Soon after, the largely school-based Boston Teacher Residency Program was developed and has become one of the first urban teacher residency programs in the U.S. (Berry et al., 2008). Currently, the U.S. Education Department is promoting the urban teacher residency model and many teacher residencies are starting up across the country with federal and private financial support. In 2009–2010 the U.S. Education Department allocated \$143 million dollars to support the start-up of 40 new teacher residencies. A new organization has emerged with significant funding from private sources to support the development of residencies, «Urban Teacher Residencies United» (cf. www.utruncated.org).

Although the specific designs of urban teacher residency programs across the country differ, they all provide a structure that falls in between the fast track program that places novices in classrooms as teachers of record with little preparation, and traditional college and university programs where candidates complete all of their initial preparation before assuming responsibility for classrooms. Aspiring teachers – known as residents – are selected according to rigorous criteria aligned with the needs of particular school districts to participate in a one or two-year program. During the program, course work is integrated with an intensive, full-year classroom residency alongside an experienced mentor. According to an Aspen Institute report (Berry et al., 2008, p. 4), «UTRs are distinctive in that they seek to:

- Tightly weave together education theory and classroom practice
- Focus on residents learning alongside an experienced, trained mentor
- Group candidates in cohorts to cultivate professional learning communities and foster collaboration
- Build effective partnerships among school districts, higher education institutions and nonprofit organizations
- Serve school districts by recruiting and training teachers to meet specific district needs

- Support residents once they are hired as teachers of record
- Establish and support differentiated career goals for experienced teachers.»

The UTR model can potentially make a contribution to the teaching in high-needs urban areas where attrition is high and student learning and teacher experience are low by preparing teachers who are well-prepared to work in those communities and committed to staying in them for a longer duration than typically reported for graduates of early entry and university programs. Berry et al. (2008) propose that residencies are an important way that policymakers, practitioners, and the public should consider in their efforts to ensure that they have a teaching workforce that is ethnically and racially diverse and prepared to succeed. They suggest that districts need to consider the full array of options and make informed decisions about how they invest in teachers and teaching.

UTRs are currently based in many large cities across the nation (e.g. New York, Los Angeles, Chicago) and look different in different places in terms of how they are designed and implemented. Yet they are guided by a common set of principles that define the components of a high quality residency program, inform the design of new residencies, and distinguish teacher residencies from other kinds of preparation programs. These principles include tightly woven clinical experience as the central program element with a focus on wrapping classroom around this practice and on learning alongside an experienced mentor. In addition, support is provided to residents in the first few years following the completion of their residency. Guided by these principles, programs such as those in Boston, Denver and Chicago offer different applications of the UTR model, but both pair master's-level pedagogical training and education content with a rigorous full-year classroom practicum under the supervision of expert teachers who have been trained to mentor novices.

Thus far, there is some research that has demonstrated that urban teacher residences help create a more ethnically and racially diverse teaching force and increase teacher retention in high-needs schools. There is very limited evidence to date however, about the ability of UTR prepared teachers to raise student achievement (e.g. Papay, West, Fullerton & Kane, 2011).

3.4 Moving College Recommending Teacher Education More into Schools and Communities

Following about a decade of activity to develop school-university partnerships in teacher education through the development of «professional development schools» (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008),⁶ and in response to recent national calls to place more

⁶ Despite evidence that professional development schools in some cases addressed some of the enduring problems of clinical teacher education enumerated above (e.g. the disconnect between coursework and fieldwork), there is widespread agreement that the professional development school movement has not consistently addressed these problems, and that even when it did so, the improvements were not able to be sustained (Zeichner, 2009).

emphasis on school-based teacher learning (e.g. NCATE, 2010), there are currently a number of university-based programs that are adopting a hybrid approach to teacher education and moving instruction more into schools and communities where university instructors work side by side with practicing teachers in preparing teacher candidates (e.g. Noel, in press). With a focus on context, courses are situated in schools, are planned around existing school curriculum, and draw on the expertise that exists within the schools. This structure is not common in typical university-based courses, which are often disconnected from schools and from practices candidates may encounter in their individual field experiences.

At the University of Washington in Seattle (UW) where we both have worked for the past three years, some of the methods courses in the elementary and secondary teacher education programs (both post-baccalaureate certification programs) are taught in local public schools where instructors strategically attempt to connect academic and school-based practices. For example, in addition to the usual practice of professors providing teacher candidates with the theoretical basis for particular teaching strategies, teacher candidates also have opportunities in these courses to observe a classroom in which particular teaching strategies teacher candidates are learning are used with students. They may also have time to plan and rehearse lessons using these strategies that they then go and teach with students. In some cases there is an opportunity to debrief their teaching with their teaching peers, as well as with the professor and teachers in the school (Kazemi, Lampert & Franke, 2009).

For example, the elementary mathematics methods class at UW is taught by a faculty member and an experienced teacher in an elementary school classroom in a public school that is partnered with the university. In this course, teacher candidates regularly use small video cameras to record their attempts to try out the teaching strategies they are learning about with individual and small groups of pupils and they review these tapes as part of the debriefing process. They also submit the tapes to their university instructor who provides each candidate with feedback several times per quarter. This enables the instructor, who usually is not able to get around to see all of the candidates trying out the strategies each week, to gain an understanding of how each candidate is using the strategies and what they need to work on. When the instructor, her teaching assistants or the classroom teacher are in a small group directly observing candidates practicing specific teaching strategies, they also strategically intervene at times to model particular ways of asking pupils questions to accomplish such goals as eliciting students' reasoning in solving problems.

The elementary literacy class at UW is also taught by a faculty member and a teacher in the teacher's partner school classroom. Each session, teacher candidates work with individual children and groups of children, many of whom are English learners. To learn about children's literacy abilities and development, teacher candidates support classroom teachers by administering «high-leverage» literacy assessments and close-

ly observing students as they engage with reading and writing. In collaborative peer groups and with the support of the course instructor, students analyze children's literacy abilities and then plan and implement appropriate instruction. Debriefing with instructors and colleagues, teacher candidates continually analyze their own teaching and students' learning, using those insights to plan follow-up lessons. They provide feedback to the children's classroom teachers to support the instruction they are designing for children in their classrooms.

Thus far, there is limited evidence about the value of these school-based courses and collaborative teaching by university and K-12 educators. There is some evidence that the «take-up» and ability to enact the teaching practices by candidates are greater in this model than when coursework is offered in university classrooms. There is also some evidence of the power of situating instruction in the context of a classroom to disrupt teacher candidates' low expectations for the learning of students in high-need urban schools (e.g. Campbell, 2012).

3.5 Clinical Experiences in Communities

In addition to teacher candidate learning in school-based clinical experiences, for many years, some teacher educators in the U.S. have advocated for placing teacher candidates for periods of time in the broader communities in which schools are situated (e.g. Flowers, Patterson, Stratemeyer & Lindsey, 1948). These experiences have varied greatly in their purposes and in the activities in which teacher candidates are engaged. For example, some experiences have focused on service learning or on learning about how students learn in outside of school settings while others have emphasized learning about the resources and practices in the community and learning from adults in the community (e.g. Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Mahan, 1982; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996) so that candidates can learn to teach in more culturally responsive ways (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

These experiences can be short-term in a single course and/or community that may be characterized as visiting a community, or they can also be longer and more intensive, which may be thought of as immersing pre-service teachers in the community. Some programs are elective, such as Indiana University's Cultural Immersion programs, which provide opportunities for student teachers to work in local schools in other countries and within diverse communities in the U.S. (Longview Foundation, 2008). Other community experiences are required portions of teacher education programs in addition to or linked to school-based experiences (e.g. Zeichner, Payne & Brayko, 2011). Despite repeated calls over many years for clinical teacher education to be broadened into local communities, very few early entry, college recommending, and now hybrid programs like urban teacher residencies have done so. Some empirical evidence exists about the transformative power of community-based learning for prospective teachers in helping teacher candidates become more interculturally competent and teach in culturally responsive ways (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Sleeter, 2008)

4 Conclusion

There is widespread agreement in the U.S. that providing high quality clinical experiences to teacher candidates is the key element in providing effective teacher preparation and that many individuals entering the teaching force in the U.S. do not now have access to it (NCATE, 2010). While current efforts to build new, more clinically-based models for teacher preparation in the U.S. are needed, there are cautions that should be heeded as this widespread effort moves forward. First, one of us warned in 1980 that the then national effort to add additional field experiences to largely campus-based university programs needed to give careful attention to the nature and quality of this additional time in schools and its relation to the rest of the preparation program (Zeichner, 1980). What he saw at that time, uncritical glorification of school-based experience and a lack of attention to illuminating the particular design features of these experiences that make them educative, is also characteristic of the current movement. The current literature is filled with discussions of programs that involve more school-based experience in university programs, with the development of new school-based programs like urban teacher residencies, and hundreds of early entry programs, and with discussions of the movement of teacher education coursework to school and community settings that imply that merely moving teacher education to schools and communities is necessarily beneficial (Zeichner, 2010b). This literature often does not clearly illuminate the specific ways in which these school and community-based experiences operate (e.g. what co-teaching between university and school-based teacher educators looks like) and the ways in which particular features of these experiences are connected to various desired outcomes for teacher candidates and the schools. One hopeful sign in this regard is some recent research that seeks to identify the features of clinical placement sites and clinical experience design characteristics that support teacher candidate learning and pupil learning in schools (e.g. Anderson & Stillman, 2011; Ronefeldt, 2012).⁷

A second caution has to do with what is eliminated from teacher education programs as they move more to the field. There is some historical evidence that as programs have become more school-based, the focus of the preparation narrows to a more technical focus on the mastery of teaching skills, and that important elements of a teacher's education such as multicultural education, and the social foundations of education are reduced or eliminated (Greene, 1979; Zeichner, in press^a). While the mastery of teaching and classroom management skills and practices is important, teachers also need to have a clear sense of the social, political, community and cultural contexts in which they work, to be able to build and sustain strong relationships with their students, to be able to adapt their practice in response to the changing needs of their students, and a host of other things that go beyond the mastery of specific practices (Bransford & Darling-

⁷ Like most other things in teacher education, there is a long history of efforts to identify the features of good clinical sites in teacher education that should be studied by current researchers. One of the earliest and most interesting efforts in the past was made by McIntosh (1968).

Hammond, 2005). There is a danger that the current wave of emphasizing school-based experience in teacher education in the U.S. will contribute to further deprofessionalizing teaching rather than strengthening teachers' abilities to teach in culturally responsive ways and to acquire the adaptive expertise that is needed to successfully teach in today's U.S. public schools (Banks et al., 2005; Hammerness et al., 2005).

Finally, as briefly mentioned earlier, one of the major problems in U.S. teacher education in the last 50 years has been the inability to institutionalize and sustain innovations that have initially been funded by private foundations, states or the federal government. There is a whole litany of major efforts to transform teacher education throughout the country ranging from the National Teacher Corps of the 1960s and 1970s, the Professional Development School movement of the 1980s and 1990s to the over \$100 million dollar effort led by the Carnegie Corporation «Teachers for a New Era» that have failed to achieve this transformation to any significant degree (Fraser, 2007). As the public universities and public schools where the majority of teacher education in the U.S. still takes place have continued to lose their state and federal funding and private foundations have shifted toward funding alternatives to college and university teacher education and promoting charter schools (Levine, 2012; Suggs & deMarrais, 2011),⁸ and new resources are needed to implement new and intrusive accountability requirements for teacher education programs (Zeichner, 2011), it is becoming harder to imagine how college and university teacher education programs will be able to transform clinical teacher education in the ways imagined by the recent national panel (NCATE, 2010).

There is a clear and growing presence of private money in steering the course of teacher education policies away from colleges and universities playing a central role and toward the deregulation and privatization of teacher education in early entry programs (Saltman, 2010; Zeichner, 2010c). The success of this growing dominance of venture philanthropy, educational advocacy organizations, and education think tanks in making early entry and non-university programs the norm, and the disappearance of genuine public dialogue about the future of U.S. teacher education more than anything else will determine the ability of the nation to achieve the lofty vision to offer a high quality clinical education to all individuals entering the U.S. teaching force.

References

- AACTE [American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education]. (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- AFT [American Federation of Teachers]. (2007). *Meeting the challenge: Recruiting and retaining teachers in hard-to-staff schools*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aft.org/pubs/reforts/downloads/teachers/h2s.pdf>. (27.07.2012).

⁸ The U.S. Department of Education will also be phasing out one of the major recent sources of support for innovation in college and university programs, the «Teacher Quality Partnership» program.

The Turn Toward Practice and Clinical Experience in U.S. Teacher Education

- Anderson, L. & Stillman, J.** (2011). Student teaching for a specialized view of professional practice? Opportunities to learn in and for urban, high-needs schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62 (5), 446–464.
- Ball, D. & Cohen, D.** (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as a learning profession* (pp. 3–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ball, D. & Forzani, F.** (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60 (5) 497–510.
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Duffy, H. & McDonald, M.** (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In J. Bransford & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: Report of the National Academy of Education Committee on Teacher Education* (pp. 232–274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berliner, D.** (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (6), 2–8.
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, R., Hernandez, M., Wurtzel, J. & Snyder, J.** (2008). *Creating and sustaining urban teacher residencies*. Hillsborough, NC: Center for Teaching Quality and the Aspen Institute.
- 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 (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd ed., pp. 307–330). New York: Routledge.
- Bransford, J. & Darling-Hammond, L.** (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: Report of the National Academy of Education Committee on Teacher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bullough, R., Draper, M. J., Smith, L. & Burrell, J.** (2004). Moving beyond collusion: Clinical faculty and university public school partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20 (5), 505–521.
- Bullough, R., Hobbs, S., Kauchak, D., Crow, N. & Stokes, D.** (1997). Long-term PDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48 (2) 85–93.
- Campbell, S. S.** (2012). *Taking it to the field: Teacher candidate learning about equity-oriented mathematics teaching in a mediated field experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seattle: University of Washington, College of Education.
- Clift, R. & Brady, P.** (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The Report of the American Educational Research Association panel on research on research on teacher education* (pp. 309–424). New York: Routledge.
- Constantine, J., Player, D., Silva, T., Hallgren, K., Grider, M. & Drake, J.** (2009). *An evaluation of teachers trained through different routes to certification*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Danielson, C.** (2007). *Enhancing professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L.** (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106 (10), 1936–1966.
- Decker, P. T., Mayer, D. P. & Glazerman, S.** (2006). Alternative routes to teaching: The impact of Teach for America on student achievement and other outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25 (1), 75–96.
- Donaldson, M. L. & Johnson, S. M.** (2011). Teach for America teachers: How long do they teach? Why do they leave? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93 (2), 47–52.
- Emihovich, C., Dana, T., Vernetson, T. & Colon, E.** (2011). Changing standards, changing needs: The gauntlet of teacher education reform. In P. Earley, D. Imig & N. Michelli (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in the U.S.* (pp. 47–69). New York: Routledge.
- Feiman-Nemser, S.** (2010). *The case for strong clinical teacher education*. Remarks made at a press conference at the National Press Club: «Strong clinical teacher preparation: A must for long-term school improvement efforts.» Press Briefing sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (March 11).
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M.** (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 87 (1), 49–65.

- Feistritzer, C. E. & Haar, C. K.** (2008). *Numbers of alternative routes to teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Flowers, J. G., Patterson, A., Stratemeyer, F. & Lindsey, M.** (1948). *School and community laboratory experiences in teacher education*. Oneata, NY: American Association of Teachers Colleges.
- Fraser, J.** (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greenberg, J., Pomerance, L. & Walsh, K.** (2011). *Student teaching in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Greene, M.** (1979). The matter of mystification: Teacher education in unquiet times. In M. Greene (Ed.), *Landscapes of learning* (pp. 53–73). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grossman, P.** (2005). Pedagogical approaches to teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 425–476). New York: Routledge.
- Grossman, P.** (2010). *Learning to practice: The design of clinical experience in teacher preparation*. Policy Brief of the Partnership for Teacher Quality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Grossman, P.** (2011). A framework for teaching practice: A brief history of an idea. *Teachers College Record*, 113 (12). Retrieved from: <http://tc.record.org> (24.12.2011).
- Grossman, P. & Loeb, S.** (Eds.). (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M. & Zeichner, K.** (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 358–389). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Helig, J. V. & Jez, S. J.** (2010). *Teach for America: A review of the evidence*. Boulder: University of Colorado, Education and the Public Interest Center.
- Kazemi, E., Lampert, M. & Franke, M.** (2009). Developing pedagogies in teacher education to support novice teacher's ability to enact ambitious instruction. In MERGA (Ed.), *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia, Wellington, New Zealand*. Available at: <http://www.merga.net.au/documents/Kazemi.pdf> (26.08.2012).
- Labaree, D.** (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lankford, H., Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J.** (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20, 37–62.
- Lemov, D.** (2010). *Teaching like a champion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, A.** (2012). The new normal of teacher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 24). Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/The-New-Normal-of-Teacher/127430/> (27.07.2012).
- Longview Foundation.** (2008). *Teacher preparation for the global age: The imperative for change*. Silver Spring, MD: Longview Foundation.
- Lucas, T. & Villegas, A. M.** (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms* (pp. 55–72). New York: Routledge.
- Mahan, J.** (1982). Native Americans as teacher trainers: Anatomy and outcomes of a cultural immersion project. *Journal of Equity and Leadership*, 2, 100–109.
- McIntosh, R. G.** (1968). *An approach to the analysis of clinical settings for teacher education*. The Third Florence Stratemeyer Lecture. Chicago: Annual meeting of the Association for Student Teaching.
- NCATE [National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education].** (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NCR [National Research Council].** (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Newfield, C.** (2008). *Unmaking the public university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Noel, J.** (Ed.). (in press). *Moving teacher education into urban schools and communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Papay, J., West, M., Fullerton, J. & Kane, T.** (2011). *Can practice-based teacher preparation increase student achievement? Evidence from the Boston Teacher Residency* (Working Paper # 17646). New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

The Turn Toward Practice and Clinical Experience in U.S. Teacher Education

- Payzant, T.** (2004). *Should teacher education take place at colleges and universities?* Invited address presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.
- Peske, H. & Haycock, K.** (2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality.* Washington, D.C.: Education Trust.
- Pianta, R. C.** (2011). *Teaching children well: New evidence-based approaches to teacher professional development and training.* Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.
- Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy.** (2009). *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The role of practice-based teacher preparation programs in Massachusetts.* Cambridge MA: Author.
- Ronefeldt, R.** (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach: Effects of placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*, 3–26.
- Ronefeldt, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, J. & Wyckoff, J.** (2011). *How teacher turnover harms student achievement* (Working Paper # 17176). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Saltman, K.** (2010). *The gift of education and venture philanthropy.* New York: Macmillan Palgrave.
- Skinner, E., Garretton, M. T. & Schultz, B.** (Eds.). (2011). *Grow your own teachers: Grassroots change in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C.** (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd edition, pp. 559–582). New York: Routledge.
- Sondel, B., Kretchmar, K. & Ferrare, J.** (2012). *Mapping the terrain: Teach for America, charter school reform, and corporate sponsorship.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, B.C.
- Suggs, C. & deMarras, K.** (2011). *Critical contributions: Philanthropic investment in teachers and teaching.* Atlanta: Kronley & Associates.
- Sykes, G. & Dibner, K.** (2009). *Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal.* Washington, D.C.: Center on Education Policy.
- Turney, C., Eltis, K., Towler, J. & Wright, R.** (1985). *A new basis for teacher education: The practicum curriculum.* Sydney: University of Sydney Press.
- Valencia, S., Martin, S., Place, N. & Grossman, P.** (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60* (3), 304–322.
- Windschitl, M., Thompson, J. & Braaten, M.** (2011). Ambitious pedagogy by novice Teachers. *Teachers College Record, 113* (7), 1311–1360.
- Zeichner, K.** (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31* (6), 45–55.
- Zeichner, K.** (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences for prospective teachers. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M.L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215–234). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K.** (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice.* New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K.** (2010a). *The importance of strong clinical preparation for teachers.* Testimony presented at a U.S. Congressional Briefing organized by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senate Office Building. Available at: www.aacte.org.
- Zeichner, K.** (2010b). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 89* (11), 89–99.
- Zeichner, K.** (2010c) Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26* (8), 1544–1552.
- Zeichner, K.** (2011). Assessing state and federal policies to evaluate the quality of Teacher preparation programs. In P. Earley, D. Imig & N. Michelli (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in the United States: Issues and tensions in an era of evolving expectations* (pp. 75–105). New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K.** (in press^a). Two visions of teaching and teacher education for the 21st century. In X. Zhu & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for the 21st century.* Heidelberg: Springer.
- Zeichner, K.** (in press^b). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education.*

The Turn Toward Practice and Clinical Experience in U.S. Teacher Education

- Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H.** (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. & Melnick, S.** (1996). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176–198). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K. & Payne, K.** (in press). Democratizing knowledge in urban teacher education. In J. Noel (Ed.), *Moving teacher education into urban schools and communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K., Payne, K. & Brayko, K.** (2011). *Democratizing teacher education through practice-based methods teaching and mediated-field experiences in schools and communities*. Working paper, Center for the Study of Teacher Learning in Practice. Seattle: University of Washington.

Authors

Ken Zeichner, Boeing Professor of Teacher Education, Director of Teacher Education, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, USA, kenzeich@uw.edu

Marisa Bier, Ph.D., Director of the Seattle Urban Teacher Residency Program, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, USA, mlbier@u.washington.edu

