Two Visions of Teaching and Teacher Education for the Twenty-First Century

Ken Zeichner

University of Washington-Seattle[1]

> As a Teach For America corps member, you'll develop strengths that are critical to being a successful teacher in a low-income community. These skills are also essential to leadership across many other professions and sectors. We see our corps members' talent and resolve play out in the classroom and beyond, and so do the exceptional graduate schools and employers that actively recruit second-year corps members and alumni.[2]

Currently there is an intense debate that is taking place in many parts of the world about the kind of teaching and teacher education that should define education in the twenty-first century. In this paper, I outline the main ideas at issue in these debates and offer my analysis of how we should seek to resolve the current controversies and the jurisdictional challenge that colleges and universities are now facing to their right to offer teacher education programs (Grossman, 2008).[3] The

---

[1] Revised version of a Keynote address presented at the First Global Summit on Teacher Education, Beijing Normal University, October, 2011 and an American Education Week lecture presented at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in November, 2011.

[2] http://www.teachforamerica.org/why-teach-for-america/compensation-and-benefits/graduate-school-and-employer-partnerships

[3] Grossman (2008) has concluded "university-based teacher educators are dangerously close to losing their responsibility for overseeing the preparation of new teachers." (p. 11).

debates that I describe are concerned with the most basic questions about teaching and teacher education such as the nature of the role for which we are preparing teachers, who should prepare them, when should this preparation take place, and what should be the content of the preparation program.

Historically, the central issues underlying debates about the best approaches to teacher education stem from different assumptions and convictions about the purposes of public education, the teaching and learning process, and the teacher's role (Corey, 1958; Labaree, 1997). In the current debates, two different visions of the role of teachers and teacher preparation are being advocated. On the one hand, some have proposed building or maintaining a professional teaching force and a system of teacher education that prepares teachers for professional roles and teaching careers (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Sykes, 2004).[4] Others have believed that it is too costly to build and maintain a professional teaching force to teach everyone's children and have advocated for preparing teachers of "other people's children" [5] as technicians to implement the teaching scripts with which they are provided in the belief that the preparation these teachers receive and the subsequent scripting of instruction will lead to improvements in pupils' standardized test scores.

---

[4] The focus here is on the intent of teacher preparation and for teaching careers rather than on what has been accomplished to date. As Carroll et.al. (2010) have pointed out, teacher turnover keeps increasing and at the time of their report annual teacher attrition has risen to 16.8 percent and up to 46 percent of teachers leave the profession within 5 years.

[5] This term first used by Delpit (1995) refers to the fact that what policymakers and reformers advocate for students, they will often not accept for their own children.

Initial teacher education in this view (usually referred to as "teacher training") should be very brief and take place on the job. There is little expectation that these teachers will have teaching careers, and the system is designed to make it possible for these temporary teachers to replaced in a few years by other narrowly trained teachers who also will leave the classroom in a few years (Rosen, 2003).[6]

While these same debates are going on in many parts of the world (e.g., Moon, 2007), I will concentrate in this paper on how they are being enacted in the United States, which has a teaching force of approximately 3.6 million teachers who teach in about 90,000 schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Approximately 1,400 colleges and universities are authorized to offer teacher education programs in the U.S. and increasingly a variety of other non-profit and for-profit programs including the school districts themselves are running programs that currently prepare about one third of the new teachers in the nation each year (National Research Council, 2010).

The Landscape of Teacher Education in the United States

For most of the formal history of teacher education in the United States, a variety of pathways into teaching have existed both inside and outside colleges and universities. At one time or another since the mid-nineteenth century when formal

[6] "Teach for America" explicitly encourages recruits to teach for a few years on their way to entry into a prestigious law, business or medical school or directly to a high paying job in the corporate world. http://www.teachforamerica.org/why-teach-for-america/compensation-and-benefits/graduate-school-and-employer-partnerships. How long Teach for America recruits actually stay in teaching is disputed (Donaldson & Johnson, 2011; Helig, et.al. 2010). As can be seen in the opening quote in this paper, this encouragement of just a few years of teaching in high-poverty schools as a form of missionary work sends a message that participation in TFA will be seen in a favorable light by prestigious graduate schools and companies.

teacher education began, a variety of institutions (e.g.,) secondary schools, seminaries, academies, normal schools, teacher institutes, teacher colleges, community colleges and colleges and universities have all played important roles in educating the nation's teachers (Fraser, 2007). Throughout the nation's history, most teachers have entered teaching through what might now be referred to as "alternative routes" including a substantial number of teachers who were prepared in school district-based teacher education programs. Fraser has noted "by 1914 virtually every city in the United States with a population of 300,000 or more and over 80 percent of those over 10,000 maintained their own teacher preparation program as part of the public school system. (p.92)."

It was for only a relatively brief period of time in the United States (approximately 1960-1990) that colleges and universities held a virtual monopoly in teacher education. Since the 1990s, there has been a tremendous increase in non college and university sponsored teacher education programs including new for-profit programs (Baines, 2010, Holland, 2003) and more and more individuals are entering the teaching force in the United States through non-university sponsored routes into teaching sometimes with very little or no preparation at all before assuming full responsibility for a classroom of students (Grossman & Loeb, 2008).

Despite the growth in these non-university programs, most teachers in the United States still enter teaching through four-year, five-year undergraduate programs or one year or two year post-graduate programs. It is estimated that between 70 and 80 percent of teachers still enter the profession through college and university programs (National Research Council, 2010). 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), [7]and in at least one state (Florida), school districts are required to have their own teacher education programs (Emihovich, 2011).

There is widespread agreement in the U.S. and in many parts of the world that existing institutions of teacher education that emphasize what has been referred to as "bricks and mortar" campus-based initial teacher education are inadequate for meeting the demands to prepare new teachers for urban or remote rural areas and that new models of teacher education are needed as well that are more school-based that distribute or "drip-feed" teacher education over time rather than only before the commencement of fulltime teaching (Berry, et.al. 2008; Lewin, 2004; Moon, 2007).

Globally, there are around 54 million teachers (UNESCO, 2006) and just to meet the quantitative aspects of the international goal of achieving universal primary education by 2015 there was a need to add around 10.3 million more teachers between 2007 and 2015 (Zeichner, 2010c). This projection does not even begin to address the issue of teacher quality and the need to prepare teachers to teach students with special education needs and in schools in remote areas. In preparing teachers to meet the demands to achieve universal primary education, there is a clear tension between creating high quality teacher education for a small number of candidates and opening access to large numbers of teacher candidates

[7] For example, in Texas, in each year since 2007, two for-profit online teacher education programs "A+ Texas Teachers" and "iteach Texas" have produced far more teachers than any other teacher education program. (Smith & Pandolfo, 2011).

without being able to adequately prepare and support them (Gopinathan, 2008; UNESCO, 2006).

Gaps in Schooling and Criticism of University Teacher Education

Currently in the United States, as in many other countries in the world, there are serious gaps in opportunities to learn, school completion rates and academic achievement for different segments of the population. For example, in addition to the growing inequalities in access to the resources and environments that help individuals live their lives with dignity (Duncan & Murnane, 2011), there continues to be a crisis of inequality in U.S. public schools that denies many children living in poverty and "children of color" a high quality of education despite the good work of many dedicated and talented teachers. A number of gaps in educational opportunities and outcomes have persisted despite all of the reform efforts that have taken place in schools. These include inequalities in achievement as measured by standardized tests in reading and mathematics (Rothstein & Wilder, 2005), in secondary school graduation rates (Hall, 2007), in increased segregation of students according to their race, ethnicity and social class background (Orfield & Lee, 2005), in inequitable public funding for schools in different areas between and within districts (Carey, 2004**xxx**), in unequal access to advanced courses that provide the gateway to college (US Department of Education, 2000), in unequal access to a broad and rich curriculum that educates students to understand and to think critically (Kozol, 2005), and in the disproportionate assignment of students of color and English learners to special education classes with limited educational opportunities (Artiles, Harry, Reschly & Chinn. 2002; Hawkins, 2011). These

inequities have served to widen the gaps between which students learn to be thinkers and authentic problem solvers and those who are forced to learn out of context and to interact with knowledge in artificial ways (Rose, 2011).

There is also, as there is in much of the world (an inequitable distribution of fully qualified teachers. Currently we have a situation in the U.S. where there are serious inequities between the kinds of teacher education that is provided for teachers who work in different communities. 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 of color (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Langford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002; Peske & Haycock, 2006). These "early-entry" teachers who complete most of their preparation for teaching while serving as teachers of record fully responsible for classrooms are not found in public schools teaching students from the middle and upper middle classes, the children of many of the advocates of deregulation. [8]

Although the research on the effects of different pathways to teaching is not conclusive (e.g., Constantine, et.al., 2009; Decker, Mayer & Glazerman, 2006; Hellig & Jez, 2010; National Research Council, 2010 **add wp cite**), 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,

[8] Amarilo (2011) notes that by 2015, TFA recruits "could make up one-quarter of all new teachers in 60 of the nation's highest need school districts" This inequitable distribution of fully qualified teachers is also a problem internationally (OECD, 2005).

2005).[9] It is clear though, given the high turnover of teachers in the most poverty impacted schools (e.g., American Federation of Teachers, 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.[10] 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 their dependence on inexperienced and underprepared teachers. Given the documented importance of teacher experience in teaching quality (e.g., NCTAF, 2010), this is a serious problem of injustice for many poor communities.

Because of the existence of some econometric studies that have shown a low correlation between teacher experience and/or degrees and student test scores, some critics have made an absolute claim that neither experience nor schooling beyond the bachelor's degree makes any difference in teacher effectiveness. Rose (2011) criticizes these claims that experience and further study by teachers are not related to teaching effectiveness based on the limited nature of the studies on which they are based.

> On the face of it, this is a remarkable assertion. Can you think of any other profession from hair styling to firefighting to neurosurgery- where we

[9] Some like Gatlin (2009) have viewed this "catching up" process in a positive way- " initial differences in teacher quality are often negated after one to two years teaching experience." (p.471).

[10] Although a recent study that found that more Teach for America Teachers stay in teaching somewhat longer than is generally thought by critics, it concludes that the "revolving door transfer of teachers from the schools that most need skilled, experienced teachers remains a serious problem." (Donaldson & Moore Johnson, 2011, p.51).

> wouldn't value experience and training," (p. 36). The problem is that the studies for the most part deal in simple aggregates and define experience and training in crude ways. Experience is defined as years on the job, and it is no surprise that years alone don't mean much… What people do with their time on the job is crucial, becomes the foundation of expertise. As for the question of post-baccalaureate work, the same principle applies. What kind of training? Where? What was the curriculum? The quality of supervision? … To discount experience and training in blanket fashion is not only wrong-headed but also undercuts attempts to create better working conditions for teachers, more robust professional development, and opportunities for career advancement (p.36).

Government and Foundation Responses to the Problems of Teacher Education in the U.S.

There have been two major responses by the U.S. government and private foundations to the enduring problems of U.S. teacher education over the last 40 years. The first response has involved efforts to build an effective system of teacher education in the country within colleges and universities. Since the mid 1960s, the federal government invested in strengthening the college and university system of teacher education through competitive grants that were administered directly in Washington D.C. or through the states. Programs like the current "Teacher Quality Partnerships" program which funds partnerships in teacher education between schools and universities are examples of how the federal government has attempted

historically to improve the quality of the teacher education system in the U.S. by injecting targeted resources into college and university Education schools to engage in innovative practices (Sykes & Dibner 2009).

The federal government also for a time-between 1965 and 1995- sought to build research capacity in teacher education by funding national research and development centers focused on teacher education and teacher learning at the University of Texas-Austin and Michigan State University. Since then, apart from National Science Foundation funding that is available for teacher education research in STEM areas, there has been very little federal government funding available for teacher education research.

Additionally, several private foundations, notably the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, have historically invested substantial amounts of money to improve the quality of teacher education in the U.S. especially for schools highly impacted by poverty. [11] The over 60 million dollar "Teachers for a New Era" project led by the Carnegie Corporation from 2001- 2009 which sought to reform teacher education programs around a small set of core design principles (e.g., teaching is an academically taught clinical practice) is the most visible of recent foundation efforts to transform American teacher education (Carnegie Corporation, 2006).

The second and more recent response has involved efforts to greatly reduce the role of or to dismantle the college and university system of teacher education. In part because of a widespread perception of the unwillingness of college and university teacher educators to improve, there has been a shift away from investing

[11] See Suggs & deMarrais (2011) for a discussion of the role of foundations in investing in teachers and teaching.

in the improvement of the current system that is dominated by college and university-based teacher education toward efforts to break up the system and try to replace it with market competition. Arthur Levine a former Education school dean and now president of a large private foundation that supports education has argued that:

> The private sector sees teacher education and professional development as a low-cost, high-volume field with the potential for significant profits. Higher education is viewed as high in price, low in technology use, inefficient and weak in leadership. These perceived weaknesses make it a superb investment prospect (Levine, 2010, p.21).

This deregulation of teacher education and the belief that creating a competitive market for the preparation of teachers will lead to the greatest quality is also occurring in many other countries often promoted by governments or development agencies such as the World Bank and USAID (Klees, 2008; Furlong, Cochran-Smith & Brennan, 2009; Robertson, 2005; Tatto, 2006). The low regard for pre-service teacher education programs around the world today is illustrated by a comment made by a World Bank staffer Jacob Moreno when commenting on the state of teacher education internationally:

> Pre-service teacher education is, almost everywhere, one of the most obsolete pieces of educational systems… The overall lack of political and public confidence in teacher training systems cannot be denied (Moreno, 2007, p.1).

Consistent with the current fervor in the national media to criticize university Education schools in the U.S. as obstacles to "real reform" (e.g., Hartocollis, 2005; Kristof, 2006, Will, 2006), and teacher education programs as "barriers to entry to teaching" (Corcoran, 2009), both the Bush and Obama administrations and several influential private foundations have promoted the deregulation of teacher education and the growth of non- university providers of programs (Zeichner, 2010a). One clear example of this is an "Innovation in Education" competition sponsored in 2010 by the U.S. Department of Education in which $263 million dollars were awarded on a competitive basis to promote innovation in various sectors of education. The only teacher education projects that were funded in this competition were two of the major non-university providers of teachers, "Teach for America" ($50 million), the "New Teacher Project" ($20 million) and the non-profit situated "Boston Teacher Residency Program" ($4 .9 million). None of the projects that were submitted by college and university teacher education institutions were funded.

Another example is the "Race to the Top" competition recently sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (Crowe, 2011) that provided a record amount of funding for school reform to states. Significantly, one of the criteria in evaluating Race to the Top proposals was whether states had legislation in place that allowed non-university providers of teacher education to operate within their borders. These two examples demonstrate the ironic stance of the Obama administration in

promoting lower standards for teacher education while at the same time advocating for higher standards in K-12 education. [12]

Currently, college and university teacher education is not seen as worthy of significant investment either by the federal government or by many of the private foundations, and both are pouring money into supporting alternative pathways.

> As interest in TFA and other non-traditional programs has increased, funder interest in schools of education as a mechanism for bolstering the supply and quality of teachers has lagged (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011, p.35).

[13]Major conferences and the national media have been flooded with speeches and papers that wonder if a college and university system of teacher education is a good idea (e.g., Payzant, 2004, Vedder, 2011). Levine (2010) has claimed that "there is a growing sense among the critics that it would be more fruitful to replace university-based teacher education than to attempt to reform it." (pp. 21-22).

Confirmation of the low regard for university teacher education by many policymakers and mainstream media outlets can be found in the current situation where national rankings of university teacher education programs will be conducted beginning in 2012 by *U.S. News and World Report* working in partnership with The National Council on Teacher Quality, an advocacy group, biased against

---

[12] http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards

[13] Between 2000 and 2010 foundations gave $275 million dollars to Teach for America, which represents over 1/3 of all foundation support for teaching and teachers during this period. This, plus the $50 million dollar Innovation in Education award from the U.S. Department of Education, makes the investment in TFA over the last decade over $300 million dollars. The TFA teaching corps in 2010-2011 of 8,200 represented less than 1 percent of the teaching force in the U.S. (Suggs & deMarrais 2010).

university teacher education[14] whose president has gone on record favoring the elimination of state teacher licensing and allowing school districts the autonomy to hire whomever they believe to be fit for the job as in the private sector (Walsh, 2004). Interestingly, this exercise of rating teacher education programs according to a set of controversial "input criteria" developed by the NCTQ (Dillon & Silva, 2011) focuses only on teacher education programs provided by colleges and universities and ignores all of the others that prepare about a third of the nation's teachers despite a consensus among all participants in the current debates about teacher education on the wide range in quality among both college and university-sponsored and other teacher education programs. The lack of investment in college and university teacher education has had many serious consequences for university-based teacher education and, ironically, it has deepened the inability to innovate in many programs that are most in need of reform.

The local media all over the country have taken up in an uncritical way the narrative about the failure of university teacher education that is being promoted by groups like the New Schools Venture Fund[15], and Democrats for Education Reform[16]

---

[14] "The National Council on Teacher Quality was founded in 2000 to provide an alternative national voice to existing teacher organizations, and build the case for a comprehensive reform agenda that would challenge the current structure and regulation of the profession." http://www.nctq.org/p/about/index.jsp

[15] "New Schools aims to seed a market of autonomous, outcomes-oriented teacher preparation organizations, and set a new standard for teacher preparation with student learning at the center. The result will be performance-based teacher preparation organizations that consistently produce teachers whose students make, on average, at least one year of academic growth each school year." http://www.newschools.org/investment/people

[16] http://www.dfer.org/2011/01/dfer_for_teache_1.php

which are shaping teacher education policy in the Obama administration and in the current Congress.[17] For example on October 7th, the *Seattle Times* lead editorial "Refocusing the Teacher Quality Debate" praised the main element in Duncan's plan for teacher education accountability that requires the value-added evaluation of teacher education institutions and then reprinted the following comment made by a teacher educator in an online forum. This quote was probably taken by the Seattle Times from the Democrats for Education Reform white paper "Ticket to Teach."

> A growing chorus of critics including prominent education professors are amplifying concerns about weaknesses in teacher-prep programs. The director of teacher education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education was quoted on a New York Times online forum as saying that of the nation's 1300 graduate teacher training programs only about 100 were doing a competent job. The rest could be shut down tomorrow, said Harvard's Kay Merseth. (p. A.13).

This type of derogatory depiction of university teacher education programs has been repeated over and over again in local newspapers around the country. [18] It does not matter that there are not 1,300 graduate teacher education programs in the country or that Duncan's (2011) assertion in his blueprint that "only 50 percent of current teacher candidates received supervised clinical training." (p. 5). It seems that people can say whatever they want or call things whatever they want and their

---

[17] For example the Democrats for Education Reform white paper "Ticket to Teach" became the basis for the bill that is currently moving through Congress that would authorize charter principal and teacher education programs.

[18] The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education weekly News Stream bulletins regularly includes these kinds of articles and editorials (press@aacte.org).

assertions are taken at face value.[19] When the National Council on Teacher Quality issues a report on university-based teacher education, it is covered by the national media (e.g., Levin, 2011) as if it has been vetted through an independent peer review process. It does not seem to matter that these reports have not been reviewed independently.

Along with the lack of investment by the federal government and foundations and the increased regulation of teacher education programs by states which further undermines the ability to innovate in college and university programs, most states continue to substantially reduce their level of financial support to public universities where most of the nation's teachers continued to be prepared (Newfield, 2008). This lack of access to federal government and private foundation money and the continued deep cuts in state support for public universities have made it extremely difficult for university-based teacher education programs to operate let alone innovate.

Additionally, new punitive forms of accountability that have been brought into teacher education even though they have been questioned by many leading experts in assessment. The most controversial of these which is the major element in the Secretary of Education's new blueprint for teacher education (Duncan, 2011) is to evaluate and rank teacher education on programs in universities based on the standardized test scores of the pupils taught by their graduates (Zeichner, 2011). This is equivalent to the evaluation medical schools according to how many patients are cured by doctors who graduated from different medical schools or, at another

[19] See Libby & Sanchez's (2011) analysis of the corporate interests served by the group "Stand for Children."

level, holding business schools accountable for the terrible state of the economy in the country or holding medical schools accountable for the undisputed problems in our healthcare system. All of the cautions that have been raised by assessment experts about using student test scores to evaluate teacher quality (e.g., Economic Policy Institute, 2010) and the additional problems that are raised by trying to use this same method to link student test scores to teachers and then back to their teacher preparation programs have been ignored by policymakers (Zeichner, 2011). Suddenly, Louisiana and Tennessee, two of the states with the worst public school performance records in the nation have become the exemplars for reforming teacher education program accountability (Baker, 2011).[20]

There are a number of more reasonable and beneficial ways other than value added rankings of programs to strengthen the accountability system in teacher education including more rigorous and mandatory national accreditation of programs, higher quality classroom observation-based assessments during clinical experiences, the development of a high quality exit performance assessment that includes a student learning component, and higher standards on state teacher licensing exams (Darling-Hammond, 2010b; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Zeichner, 2011). For example, in response to the undisputed problem of high variability in the quality of classroom observation-based assessments during clinical experiences Pianta (2011) calls for :

---

[20] While Teach for America, the favorite program of funders in recent years, collects data on how its teachers are performing, it does not release any of this data to the public. TFA director Wendy Kopp is quoted as saying " We just don't feel it is responsible to show… There are so many flaws in our system." (Amarilo, 2011).

> Requirements by states and federal agencies that direct, valid assessments of teacher performance be included as part of teacher preparation and certification systems. Direct assessments actually sample real teaching behaviors as they are experienced by students (observations or student surveys) while valid assessments have demonstrable links to student achievement and other outcomes (p. 4).

In addition to identifying weak and strong teachers and teacher education programs, it is also important that an accountability system for teaching and teacher education support the improvement of weak teachers and programs. Even the strongest supporters of the use of value-added accountability such as Harris (2011) have stated that there is little evidence that the use of this approach has improved teaching and learning.

Our recent experience in Washington with a value-added ranking of teacher education institutions in the state with regard to the preparation of elementary teachers to teach reading and mathematics (Goldhaber & Liddle, 2011) confirms Harris's conclusions and offers nothing of use for understanding how program selection and specific features of the preparation programs rated contributed to the value-added ratings and "offer no direct guidance on how to improve teacher preparation programs." (p.32).

While it is true that both professional accountability through accreditation mechanisms and bureaucratic accountability through state program approval

policies have failed to close down or improve some weak programs,[21] the solution to this situation in my view and in the opinion of the recent National Research Council Panel on Teacher Education (NRC, 2010) is to study and redesign the system, not to destroy it.

Support for non-university providers of teacher education programs continues to increase and both non-profit and for-profit independent providers of teacher education (including the New York Times, and the American Museum of Natural History) are opening up new many new programs across the country. The dominant view currently among policymakers, and the public is that the U.S. needs to greatly reduce the role of universities in teacher education and move toward shorter more "practical" and more clinically-based programs. It is argued that bringing a "wider range of expertise and competition" into the preparation of teachers will promote innovation and raise the overall quality of teacher education programs (Democrats for Education Reform, 2011). Despite these noble proclamations of intent, there is a lot of money to be made by private investors if teacher education in the U.S. is transformed into primarily a competitive market economy. [22]

Some of the newer non university state approved programs like " A+ Texas Teachers" advertise themselves as providing "fast, affordable, and easy access" to

---

[21] See Darling-Hammond(1989) for a discussion of different forms of accountability in education.

[22] One fundamental question underlying this debate is whether education and teacher education are primarily public goods for the benefit of particular individuals or public goods that benefit the common good of the nation (Tyack, 2003).

the teaching profession[23] while other non-university sponsored programs provide a more substantive preparation for teaching (Grossman & Loeb, 2008). One of the more recent aspects of this movement to privatize what has largely been a public teacher education system in the U.S. is an effort to open charter teacher education programs like the "Relay Graduate School of Education" that began in New York State to prepare teachers for charter schools (Gonen, 2011). In return for what they claim are higher standards (e.g., program completion is dependent on demonstrating the ability to raise student test scores), these charter schools for preparing teachers want to be exempted from the many state regulations governing teacher education programs in colleges and universities. A bi-partisan sponsored bill was introduced in June, 2011 into the U.S. Congress to support the development of more charter teacher education programs across the country that would compete with college and university programs but would not be subject to many of the accountability requirements as college and university programs (Democrats for Education Reform, 2011; Riley, 2011). Not surprisingly, the "New Schools Venture Fund," a non-profit that invests money in education given by individual and institutional investors, has provided a strong lobbying effort on behalf of the bill. [24]

Hess (2009) of the American Enterprise Institute has articulated a view that is shared by many others (e.g., Fraser, 2002; Walsh, 2004) when he proposed decoupling the preparation of teachers from institutions of higher education rather than calling for investment in the improvement of programs sponsored by higher

---

[23] http://www.texasteachers.org/our-company/. This particular program refers to itself as a leader in the teacher education "industry."

[24] http://www.newschools.org/blog/why-we-need-great-colleges-of-education

education institutions. Hess and many others want to create a system where teacher preparation is controlled by local school districts. He has advocated for:

> A shift from the assumption that teacher preparation and training should necessarily be driven by institutions of higher education toward a more variegated model that relies on specialized providers, customized preparation for particular duties, and a just in time mindset regarding skill development and acquisition. Abandoning the default role for colleges and universities creates new opportunities. Rather than struggle to connect college-based education programs with site-based mentors or to boost the quality of practice teaching, new models might provide new providers or district-based operations to host training in more client-friendly locales and to import academic expertise, input and structure as they deem useful. (p. 456).

Two Forms of Teacher Education and Two Visions of the Teaching Role

Currently, there are two general approaches to teacher education in the U.S. despite all of the specific program variations that exist (e.g., selectivity in admissions, curriculum variations). First, there are college-recommending programs where all of the initial teacher preparation is completed before individuals assume full responsibility for a classroom as "teachers of record." On the other hand, there are "early-entry" or "direct entry" programs where much of

teachers' initial education is completed by individuals while they are fully responsible for a classroom of students.

The encouragement of alternatives to university hegemony over teacher education is not necessarily a bad thing. There is a wide range in quality in both early-entry programs and college and university recommending programs (Grossman & Loeb, 2008; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005) and the introduction of different models can potentially stimulate innovation and help improve all types of teacher education programs. Despite the improvements that have been made in recent years in many college and university-based teacher education programs, there is clearly a need for further and significant changes in many of these programs (e.g., NCATE, 2010).

It is also the case as pointed out by Wilson & Tamir (2008) that there are progressive elements in the critiques of university-based teacher education that address the failure of these programs overall in preparing enough teachers who choose to teach in, are successful in and stay over time in schools serving students living in poverty. There is greed and self-serving behavior as well as a genuine commitment to greater justice for those who are currently not served well by our public schools within both university and non-university teacher preparation. There is a big difference though between providing multiple pathways into teaching and seeking to dismantle the college and university system of teacher education that continues to prepare most of the nation's teachers.

It is important to note, that many of the early-entry alternatives that currently exist are often closely linked with a mostly technical view of the role of

teachers and with efforts to erode teachers' autonomy and collegial authority. Contrary to the many recommendations internationally to recognize teaching as complex and demanding intellectual work involving specialized knowledge and skills (Gopinathan et.al. 2008), the focus in some of the new programs is on preparing teachers to serve primarily as "educational clerks" who implement scripted teaching strategies and curriculum rather than preparing teachers as professionals who in addition to their technical expertise, also have acquired adaptive expertise so that they are able to exercise their discretion and judgment in the classroom to adjust their teaching to meet the varied needs of their students (Zeichner & Ndimande, 2009). [25]

This trend to prepare teachers primarily as technicians and to minimize the financial cost of their preparation can also be seen very clearly in other countries such as the widespread use of para teachers in India (Kumar, Priyam, & Saxena, 2001), "plasma" teachers in Ethiopia (Dahlstrom & Lemma, 2009), and in the growing emphasis on teachers as implementers of tightly structured teaching scripts in others (Compton & Weiner, 2008).[26]

It is important to point out that the difference between a view of teachers as professionals and teachers as technicians is not whether teachers are taught to use a

---

[25] Currently, the 49 teaching strategies in "Teaching Like a Champion" (Lemov, 2010) are a popular example in the U.S. of teaching skills-based approach that has been adopted in some teacher education programs. This particular set of strategies is a major aspect of the "training" given to teachers in the Relay Graduate School of education which was formed in New York as an alternative to university programs to prepare teachers for several charter school networks. Although this book is also used in the secondary teacher education program I direct at the University of Washington, it is only a small part rather than the major part of our teacher education curriculum.

[26] See http://www.teachersolidarity.com/blog/

particular set of teaching skills that are based on research, professional consensus, or in some cases (e.g., Lemov, 2010) on observations of the practices of good teachers. Both a teacher as technician orientation and teacher as professional orientation should provide teachers with the tools and skills that they need to be effective in supporting student learning.

The difference between these two views is that the teacher as a professional view goes beyond providing teachers with teaching and management skills and also seeks to ensure that teachers have extensive knowledge about the social and political contexts in which they work including the "funds of knowledge" (Gonzales, Moll, Amanti, 2005) in the communities in which their students live, and of the many elements connected to teaching such as assessment, learning and development theory and theories about how languages are acquired. A professional preparation for teachers also seeks to help teachers learn how to exercise their judgment in the classroom and adapt what they do to meet the continually changing needs of their students, and to learn how to learn in and from their practice so that they continue to become better teachers throughout their careers and are active participants in school renewal (Darling-Hammond, 1999).[27]

The Future for Teaching and Teacher Education

The role of alternative pathways into teaching has long been a part of teacher education in the U.S. and research on different models of teacher preparation supports the need for different pathways into teaching that provide access to teaching for individuals at different stages of their lives and in different life

[27] Both perspectives agree on the importance of teachers having deep knowledge of the content that they are responsible for teaching.

circumstances. However, it is clear from research as I pointed out before, that there is a great range in quality in both college and university programs and those offered by other providers (National Research Council, 2010) and that there are weak programs of all kinds that should be improved or closed.

Research has begun to provide a clearer understanding of the characteristics of effective teacher education programs that prepare teachers to promote student learning in the most economically challenged urban and rural areas of the country (Boyd, et.al. 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Grossman & Loeb, 2008). For example, the presence of a clear and common vision of good teaching and of learning that permeates all coursework and field experiences is an example of one of these characteristics (Darling-Hammond, 2006). The goal should be to support strong teacher education programs and to improve or close down weak programs whether they are sponsored by universities or others.

Problems with Disinvesting in University Teacher Education

There are several major problems with the current lack of significant investment in strengthening college and university-based teacher education while pouring substantial resources into promoting other models. The first issue is the question of capacity. Despite the exponential growth of various alternative pathways into teaching since the 1980s as noted above, colleges and universities continue to prepare between 70 and 80% of teachers in the U.S. (National research Council, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2009). It is doubtful given a teaching force in the U.S. of over 3.6 million teachers that an alternative system can be

developed by advocates of greater competition and markets in teacher education that would not include significant involvement of colleges and universities (Fallon, 2010).

In the current policy environment in the U.S. attracting and preparing academically talented individuals and preparing them for teaching is a central element in debates about how to improve schooling (e.g., Barber & Mourshed, 2007). However, as Paine (2011) has pointed out, this element of education reform has often been translated into an emphasis on attracting academically talented individuals with a de-emphasis on the content of teacher preparation. Paine comments on the 2010 McKinsey study that builds on its widely cited 2007 report referenced above.

> McKinsey's follow-on study (Auguste, Kihn, & Miller, 2010) is intriguing both by what it does in terms of addressing the question of teacher education and what it doesn't do. In "*Closing the Talent Gap,"* the authors ground the discussion of improving the teaching profession in the larger argument about achieving high performance (of schools and systems). Yet far more of the report aims around issues around entry to teaching (recruiting the right people) and far less on what preparation actually should entail. A key thrust of the 2010 McKinsey report is that the "top third +" strategy is worthy of emulation, as top performing countries (Singapore, Finland, and South Korea, as the cases highlighted in the report) use this approach. There is a relative lack of discussion of the content of initial teacher education, and no

> substantive interrogation of what rigorous teacher preparation entails (pp.6-7).

This almost exclusive focus on attracting the "best and the brightest" into teaching, even for a few years, through early entry programs like the New Teacher Project and Teach for America will not help solve the problem of providing all students in the U.S. with a fully prepared and effective teacher. As Grossman (2008) states: "We will never be able to recruit all of the teachers we need from the ranks of elite college students." (p.13).

Second, there is also a legitimate question that should be raised about the capacity of resource-strapped school districts to handle the increased responsibilities of a more school-based system of teacher education without the infusion of additional resources (Sykes, Bird, & Kennedy, 2010). Shifting teacher education to be more school-based without building the capacity in schools for handling their increased role in initial teacher preparation will result in a situation like that which occurred in the U.K. where a shift to school –based preparation merely served to reproduce the status quo.

> Experience in schools simply becomes an opportunity to receive or become acculturated to the existing practices of the setting with an emphasis on the reproduction of routinized behaviours and the development of bureaucratic virtues such as compliance … (Ellis, 2010, p.106).

Third, following the pattern in counties that lead the world today in student educational performance, preserving and strengthening the role of colleges and universities in the preparation of a professional teaching force of career teachers is

critical (Tucker, 2011). Colleges and universities can potentially make important and unique contributions to the education of professional teachers to help them learn how to use research-based teaching and assessment practices, to situate their teaching in relation to the historical, political and institutional contexts in which they work, to learn how to learn in and from their practice and to exercise their judgment in the classroom to adapt their teaching to the changing needs of their students, and to be active participants in ongoing school renewal (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Goodlad, 1990). The solution to the problems of college and university-based teacher education is to redesign and strengthen the system not to abandon it.

No county in the world today that has been successful in international comparisons of student achievement has achieved its success by relying heavily on a market-based economy in teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2010a). Despite the success of some charter schools, the overall poor track record of privatization and the spread of charter schools at the K-12 level (e.g., CREDO, 2009) does not bode well for the similar effort that is now underway to greatly deregulate teacher preparation in the U.S.

Finally, underlying much of the movement to privatize public schooling and teacher education is a belief that the major cause of the problems of inequities in schooling that I have alluded to today is bad teachers and bad teacher education programs.[28] If only we could fire the bad teachers and close the bad teacher

[28] The U.S. Secretary of Education has asserted that most college and university programs have done a mediocre job in preparing teachers based on his linking the inequities in public schooling for students largely with ineffective teachers (Duncan,

education programs and turn public schooling and teacher education over to market competition, all will be fine. This narrative ignores the overwhelming evidence that links inequities in schooling to inequities in the broader society such as the inequitable access to housing, nutritious food, jobs that pay a living wage, healthcare, early childhood care and so on (Berliner, 2006; Rothstein, 2004).

Despite a clear need to improve university teacher education, these programs are as responsible for the crisis of inequality in public education as business schools are for the collapse of the U.S. economy and the growing inequalities in the broader society such as access to jobs that pay a living wage, housing, nutritious food, and quality early childhood and health care.

Noguera (2011) challenges the wisdom of policies that assert that the opportunity and learning gaps for students living in poverty can be eliminated by school interventions alone.

> It has become fashionable for policymakers and reformers to criticize anyone who points to poverty as an obstacle to learning and higher achievement. Loudly proclaiming "no excuses," these reformers proclaim that large numbers of ineffective classroom teachers, not poverty, are the real obstacles to improving educational outcomes for poor children. While it is absolutely the case that poor children need dedicated, passionate, and effective teachers and principals to be successful, there is no evidence that even the best schools can overcome the effects of poverty on their own. (p.9).

University Teacher Education Responds

2009). The previous Secretary of Education had argued that participation in a teacher education program should be optional Paige, (2002)

Despite the indisputable problems that have existed in university teacher education in the U.S. that have been pointed out by both external critics and Ed school faculty themselves (e.g., Goodlad, 1990; Levine, 2005; Holmes Group, 1996), the improvements that have been made in many university programs over time (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), and the existence of a number of exemplary programs (Darling-Hammond, 2006), there is a growing movement in college and university-based teacher education in the U.S. today to respond to some of the enduring problems that have undermined its effectiveness: (a) to move the pre-service preparation of teachers closer to practice- to conduct some of the instruction of new teachers (e.g., methods courses) in the kinds of settings in which teacher candidates will later teach [29] and (b) to strengthen the clinical component in teacher preparation by investing in building the capacity of schools to serve as sites for clinical teacher education and experienced teachers to serve as effective mentors (NCATE, 2010). There are a growing number of examples of a new more connected and school-based form of college and university teacher education where responsibility for teacher preparation is shared across schools, universities and sometimes community agencies (Zeichner, 2010b).

There has also been a growth in hybrid programs (e.g., urban teacher residencies) that are centered in a rigorous clinically based education for teaching under the supervision of an experienced teacher which offer the potential to utilize the strengths of both university and school-based teacher educators (Berry, et al. 2008). Carefully structured and well- supervised clinical experience like those that

[29] This includes the creation of virtual settings (Pointer-Mace, 2009).

exist in the education of other professionals is absolutely essential for the education of teachers no matter what pathway into teaching is taken (Ball & Cohen, 1999).

We know a lot from existing research about the kinds of investments that should be made to provide this kind of experience for all novice teachers such as careful selection of clinical placements, the preparation and ongoing support for mentors and schools that serve as clinical training sites and the development of more rigorous evaluations of the success of these efforts in the practices of teacher candidates and in their ability to promote student learning upon completion of their pre-service preparation. (NCATE, 2010). We also know from research about the negative consequences of not providing a strong and well -supervised clinical experience for teachers before they enter the workforce (e.g., Valencia et al. 2009).

Conclusion

Currently we have a situation where there are serious inequities between the kinds of teacher education that is provided for teachers who work in different communities. As I mentioned earlier, 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 of color (Corcoran, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Peske & Haycock, 2006). These underprepared teachers who complete most of their preparation for teaching while serving as teachers of record are not found teaching students in public schools from the middle and upper middle class.

Addressing the serious inequities in educational opportunity and outcomes that continue to plague our public schools will require a significant investment in redesigning the college and university system of teacher education in the U.S. so that it becomes more clinically-based and focused more on the specific contexts for which teachers are being prepared. This new system must more effectively integrate college and university faculty and staff expertise with the expertise and knowledge that exists in successful schools and in communities to prepare the professional career teachers that everyone's children deserve (Zeichner, 2009; 2010b).

There is no reason to believe from the poor performance of deregulation and markets in any other sector of society or from the experience of other countries with strong records of student achievement in their public schools that the current trend to dismantle college and university-based teacher education and replace it with a market economy will result in anything positive for the nation. Continuing on this path, will only serve to widen the inequalities in public education that now exist between different segments of the population.

References

Armario, C. (2011). Big expansion, big questions for Teach for America. *Boston Globe,* November 27th. Retrieved from boston.com on November 29th.

Artiles, A.; Harry, B. Reschly, D.J.; Chinn, P.C.; (2002). Over identification of students

of color in special education: A critical overview. *Multicultural Perspectives, 4*(1), 3-10.

Asia Society (2011. *Improving teacher quality around the world: The international summit on the teaching profession.* Retrieved from http://asiasociety.org/education/learning-world/worlds-education-leaders-support-teachers on September, 17th.

American Federation of Teachers (2007). *Meeting the challenge: Recruiting and retaining teachers in hard-to-staff schools.* Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pubs/reports/downloads/teachers/h2s.pdf

Auguste, B.; Kihn, P. & Miller, M. (September, 2010). *Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching.* London: McKinsey & Co.

Baines, L. (2010). *The teachers we need vs. the teachers we have.* Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.

Baker, B. (October, 2011). Rating Ed schools by student out come data? Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/blog/rating-ed-schools-student-outcome-data on October 1.

Ball, D.L. & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.). *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barber, M. & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best performing school systems*

come out on top. London: McKinsey & Co.

Berliner, D. (2006). Our impoverished view of educational reform. *Teachers College Record, 108(6),* 949-995.

Berry, B.; Montgomery, D. et.al. (August, 2008). *Creating and Sustaining Urban Teacher Residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare and retain effective teachers in high needs districts.* Center for Teacher Quality. The Aspen Institute.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P.; Lankford, H.; Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J. (2008). Surveying the landscape of teacher education in New York City: Constrained variation and the challenge of innovation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 30*(4), 319-343.

Carey, K. (2004). *The funding gap: Many states shortchange low income and minority students.* Washington, D.C: The Education Trust.

Carnegie Corporation (2006). *Teachers for a New Era: Transforming teacher education.* New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Carroll, T. G.; Fulton, K.; & Doerr, H. (June 2010). *Twenty-first century teaching and learning: What research and practice reveal about professional learning.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Compton, M. & Weiner, L. (2008) (Eds.). *The global assault on teaching, teachers and their unions.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

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.

Corcoran, S.P. (2009). Human capital policy and the quality of the teacher workforce. In D. Goldhaber & J. Hannaway (Eds.). *Creating a new teaching profession.* (pp. 29-52). Washington, D.C: Urban Institute Press.

Corey, S. (1958). Controversy in teacher education: The central issue. *Teachers College Record, 59 (8),* 433-440.

CREDO (Center for Research on Education Outcomes). *Multiple choice: Charter school performance in sixteen states.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from **http://credo.stanford.edu** on December 21, 2010.

Crowe, E. (March, 2011). *Race to the Top and teacher preparation: Analyzing state strategies for ensuring real accountability and fostering program innovation.* Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.

Dahlstrom, L. & Lemma, B. (2009). Critical perspectives on teacher education in neo-liberal times: Experiences from Ethiopia and Namibia. *SARS 14*(*1-2),*29-42.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers College Record, 91*(1), 59-80.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). The case for university teacher education. In R. Roth (Ed.). *The role of the university in the preparation of teachers. (*pp.13-30). New York: Routledge.

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.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education.* San Francisco: Jossey

Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010a) *The flat world and education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (October, 2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005) (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

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.*

Delpit, . (1005). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in he classroom.* New York: Free Press.

Democrats for Education Reform (2011). *Ticket to Teach*. Retrieved from http://edreform.blogspot.com/2011/01/ticket-to-teach.html on October 1.

Dillon, E. & Silva, E. (2011). Grading teachers' teachers: Higher education comes under scrutiny. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(1), 54-58.

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.

Duncan, A, (October, 2009). *Teacher preparation: Reforming an uncertain profession.* Address given by the U.S. Secretary of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Duncan, A. (September 2011). *Our future, our teachers: The Obama administration*

plan for teacher education reform and improvement. Washington,D.C: U.S. Department of Education.

Duncan, G. & Murnane, R. (2011) (Eds). *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Economic Policy Institute (August, 2010). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers.* Washington, D.C: Author.

Ellis, V. (2010). Impoverishing experience: The problem of teacher education in the U.K. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*(1), 105-120

Emihovich, C., Dana, T., Vernetson, T. & Colon, E. (2011). Changing standards, changing needs: The gauntlet of teacher education reform. In P. Earley, D. Imig and N. Michelli (Eds). *Teacher education policy in the U.S.* (pp. 47-69). New York: Routledge.

Fallon, D. (2010). A golden age for teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(2), 33-35.

Fraser, J. (2002, Spring). A tenuous hold. *Education Next.* Retrieved from http://www.aei.org.

Fraser, J. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history.* New York : Teachers College Press.

Feistritzer, E. & Haar, C. *Alternative routes to teaching.* (2008). Upper Saddle River N.J: Pearson.

Furlong, J.; Cochran-Smith, M. & Brennan, M. (2008).(Eds). *Policy and perspectives in teacher education: International perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Gatlin, D. (2009). A pluralistic approach to the revitalization of teacher education.

Journal of Teacher Education, 60(5), 469-477.

Goldhaber, D. & Liddle, S. (2011). *The gateway to the profession: Assessing teacher preparation programs based on student achievement.* Bothell, WA: Center for Education Data and Research, University of Washington, Bothell.

Gonen, Y. (February 15, 2011). Charters get own education graduate school. *New York Post.* Retrieved from www.nypost.com on May 15, 2011.

Gonzales, N.; Moll, L. & Amanti, C. (2005) (Eds). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* New York: Routledge.

Gopinathan, S.; Tan, S.; Yanping, F.; Devi, L.; Ramos, C. & Chao, E. (2008). *Transforming teacher education: Redefined professionals for 21st century schools.* Singapore Institute of Education and the International Alliance of Leading Education Institutes.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Grossman, P. (2008). Responding to our critics: From crisis to opportunity in research on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 10-23.

Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (2008) (eds). *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Hall, D. (August, 2007). *Graduation matters: Increasing accountability for high school graduation.* Washington, D.C: Education Trust.

Harris, D. (2011). *Value-added measures in education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Hartocollis, A. (2005, July 31). Who needs education schools? *The New York Times,*

24-28.

Hawkins, M. (2011). (Ed). *Social justice language teacher education.* Bristol, U.K: Multilingual matters.

Helig, J. V. & Jez, S.J. (June, 2010). *Teach for America: A review of the evidence.* University of Colorado: Education and the Public Interest Center.

Hess, F. (2009). Revitalizing teacher education by revisiting our assumptions about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 450-457.

Holland, R.G. (2003) *To build a better teacher: The emergence of a competitive education industry.* Westport CT: Praeger.

Holmes Group (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI; Author.

Klees, S. (2008). A quarter century of neo-liberal thinking in education: Misleading analyses and failed policies. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education 6(4),* 311-348.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America.* New York: Crown.

Kristof, N. (2006 April 30). Opening classroom doors. Retrieved from the *New York Times* (http://select.nytimes.com/2006/04/30/opinion/30kristof.html?r=1. On May 15, 2008.

Kumar, K. ; Priyam, M. & Saxena, S. (2001). The trouble with para-teachers. *Frontline, 18*(22). Retrieved from www.frontlineonnet.com/fl1822/18220930.htm on February 14, 2010.

Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34* (1), 39-81.

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.

Levin, T. (2011). Training of teachers is flawed study says. *New York Times, July, 21st.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/ on July 21st, 2011.

Levine, A. (September, 2006). *Educating school teachers.* The Education Schools Project. http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf.

Levine, A. (2010). Teacher education must respond to change in America. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92,*(2), 19-24.

Lewin, K. (2004). *The pre-service training of teachers: Does it meet its objectives and how can it be improved.* Background paper for the UNESCO Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO Institute for Educational Planning.

Libby,K. & Sanchez, A. (2011). For or against children: The problematic history of *Stand for Children. Rethinking schools, 26*(1), 20-25.

Moon, B. July, 2007). *Research analysis: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers: A global view of current policies and practices:* Paris: UNESCO.

Moreno, J.M. (2007). Do the initial and the continuous teachers' professional development sufficiently prepare teachers to understand and cope with the complexities of today and tomorrow's education? *Journal of Educational Change, 8,* 169-173.

National Center for Education Statistics (March, 2000). *Mapping the road to college: First-generation students math track, planning strategies and context of support.* Washington, D.C: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2010). *Who will teach: Experience matters.* Retrieved from www.nctaf.org/NCTAFWhoWillTeach.pdf

National Research Council (April, 2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy.* Washington, D.C: National Academies Press.

National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (November, 2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* Washington, D.C: Author.

Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Noguera, P. (2011). A broader, bolder approach uses education to break the cycle of poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan, xx*, 8-14.

Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (January, 2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty and education inequality.* Los Angeles, The Civil Rights Project, UCLA. Retrieved June 20, 2008 from www.civilrightsproject, ucla.edu.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers.* Paris: Author.

Paige, R. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teacher challenge*: *The second annual report on teacher quality.* Washington, D.C: U. S. Department of Education.

Paine, L. (October, 2011). *Exploring the interaction of global and local in teacher education: Circulating notions of what preparing a good teacher entails.* Keynote address presented at the First Global Summit on Teacher Education. Beijing: Beijing Normal University.

Payzant, T. (February, 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.

Pianta, R.C. (November, 2011). *Teaching children well: New evidence-based approaches to teacher professional development and training.* Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.

Riley, B. (2011*). Innovation and entrepreneurship in education*. Retrieved from http://www.newschools.org/blog/why-we-need-great-colleges-of-education on September 10th. San Francisco: New Schools Venture Fund.

Pecheone, R., & Chung, R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 57(1), 22-36.

Peske, H. & Haycock, K. (June 2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality.* Washington DC: Education Trust.

Pointer-Mace, D. (2009). *Teacher practice online: Sharing wisdom, opening doors.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Robertson, S. (2005). Re-imagining and re-scripting the future of education: Global knowledge, economy discourse, and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education, 41(2),* 151-170.

Rose, M. (Spring, 2011). The mismeasure of teaching and learning: How contemporary educational reform fails the test. *Dissent,* 32-39.

Rosen, A. (2003). For-profit teacher education. *Chronicle of Higher Education, Colloquy Live. Thursday September 4th 2:30pm. Transcript was retrieved from http:// chronicle.com.colloquylive on 6/9/2003.*

Rothstein, R. (2004) *Class and schooling: Using social, economic and educational reform to close the Black white achievement gap.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Rothstein, R. & Wilder, T. (October, 2005). *The many dimensions of educational inequality across races.* Paper presented at the 2005 symposium of the social costs of an inadequate education. Teachers College Columbia University, New York City. Retrieved July 14, 2006 from www.tcequity.org.

Smith, M. & Pandolfo, N. (2011). For-profit certification for teachers is booming. *New York Times,* November, 27th national edition, p. A33A.

Suggs, C. & deMarrais, K. (July, 2011). *Critical contributions: Philanthropic investment in teachers and teaching,* Atlanta: Kronley & Associates.

Sykes, G. (2004) "Cultivating teacher quality: A brief for professional standards." In F. Hess, A. Rotherham, K. Walsh (Eds.) A qualified teacher in every classroom? (pp. 177-200). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Sykes, G. & Dibner, K. (March 2009). *Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal.* Washington, D.C: Center on Education Policy.

Sykes, G.; Bird, T. & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(5), 464-476.

Tatto, M. (2006). Education reform and the global regulation of teachers' education, development and work. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45,* 231-241.

Tucker, M. (May, 2011) *Standing on the shoulders of giants: An American agenda for*

education reform. Washington, D.C: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Tyack, D. (2003). *Seeking common ground: Public schools in a diverse society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

UNESCO (2006). *Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015.* Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2010*. Washington, D.C: Author.

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.

Vedder, R. (September, 2011). Who should educate the educators? *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations

Walsh, K. (2004) "A candidate-centered model for teacher preparation and licensure. " In F. Hess, A. Rotherham, & K. Walsh (Eds.) A qualified teacher in every classroom? (pp. 223-254). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Will, G. (2006, January 16). Ed schools vs. education. *Newsweek.*

Wilson, S. & Tamir, E. (2008). The evolving field of teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith; S. Feiman-Nemser, & D.J. McIntyre (Eds). *Handbook of research on teacher education (3rd edition).* (pp. 908-935). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice.* New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2010a). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance

and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(8), 1544-1553.

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. Published in Spanish in 2010 in *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formacion del Profesorado 68*(24.2), 123-150 (Spain). Published in 2010 in Portuguese in Revista Educação (Brasil).

Zeichner K. (March, 2010c). *Preparing effective teachers for everyone's children: The role of alternative routes into teaching.* Keynote address presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Chicago.

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., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education.* New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. Ndimande, B. (2008). Contradictions and tensions in the place of teachers in educational reform: Reflections on teaching and teacher education in the USA and Namibia. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice 14*(4), 331 – 343.