

## ***Different Conceptions of Teacher Expertise and Teacher Education in the USA***

***Ken Zeichner***

*University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA*

### ***Abstract***

*This paper describes the implications for the work of teaching and the curriculum of teacher education programs of three different views of teaching expertise and teacher education (professionalization, deregulation and social justice) that have competed with each other for dominance in the USA since the inception of formal teacher education in the nineteenth century.*

### ***Introduction***

Since the beginning of formal programs for teacher education in the USA in the mid nineteenth century, there have always been debates about the knowledge, skills and dispositions that teachers need to begin teaching in the public schools. For example, when some educators began to establish normal schools to provide special preparation for elementary teaching that included instruction in pedagogy and classroom management they were challenged by others who argued that no special preparation was needed for teaching beyond mastery of a body of content knowledge to be taught (Lucas, 1999).

Throughout the development of teacher education in the USA there have been at least three distinct agendas for reform in American teacher education, each one emphasizing a particular idea of teacher expertise and a particular view of where this expertise can best be acquired by novice teachers (See Zeichner, 2003).<sup>1</sup> The professionalization agenda for reform has emphasized the articulation of a knowledge base for teaching in the form of competencies or standards that address many different aspects of teaching. This paradigm for reform has argued for a significant place for professional content in a teacher preparation program. The deregulation agenda has focused on the importance of content knowledge and verbal ability in teaching and has asserted that most of the professional content about pedagogy, learning, classroom management, etc. can best be learned on the job through an

apprenticeship rather than in a teacher education program. Advocates for deregulation have pushed for eliminating state licensing of teachers<sup>2</sup> and for the establishment of alternatives to college and university based teacher preparation programs. Finally, the social justice agenda has focused on the development of sociocultural consciousness and intercultural teaching competence among teachers to enable them to teach the increasingly diverse population of pupils in U.S. public schools. In this paper, I will discuss and illustrate each of these three major positions on teacher expertise and show how they have influenced teacher education programs in the U.S.

### ***Reforming Teacher Education through the Articulation of Teaching Competencies or Standards***

Since the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there have been efforts in the USA to establish a 'scientific' basis for the teacher education curriculum. The idea has been to teach novice teachers the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that research has shown to be related to effective teaching. One of the earliest efforts to establish the basis for the teacher education curriculum on research was the Commonwealth Teacher Training Study carried out between 1925 and 1928 by researchers at the University of Chicago (Charters & Waples, 1929). In this massive study that was referred to by Saylor (1976) as an 'orgy of tabulation', researchers attempted to discover the traits and characteristics of excellent teachers at different grade levels and in different kinds of communities by conducting interviews throughout the country with teachers, parents, administrators, teacher union officials, professors of education and students. They then employed a panel of 21 judges to utilize a method of reaching consensus to determine the traits of effective teachers. Each of the 83 effective teacher traits was defined by a list of indicators. Some examples of the traits of effective teachers that emerged from this process were:

- Adaptability- does not dance or play cards if the community objects.
- Tact- handles angry parents effectively.
- Calmness- Does not try to cover up the noise of pupils by talking louder than they do.

Although some of these traits may seem amusing in today's context, in the list as a whole there are items that are remarkably similar to current statements of teacher standards.<sup>3</sup> In addition to the statement of

effective teacher traits the researchers conducted a job analysis of the activities engaged in by teachers perceived to be effective by mailing surveys to teachers in 42 states. The researchers reduced the list of over 200,000 statements submitted on the surveys to a final list of 1,001 activities that were subdivided into seven major areas including classroom management and instruction. Examples of the activities associated with teacher expertise in their analysis included selecting types of instruction adapted to the needs of the class, and selecting effective illustrations.

The idea here was that teacher education programs would incorporate the 83 traits and 1,001 activities to revise their existing courses and to develop new courses. Although this research effort had little influence on teacher education programs throughout the U.S. it set a precedent for the kind of thinking about how to determine the curriculum for teacher education programs that continues to the present day. Ways of conducting research and for reaching professional consensus may have become more sophisticated today, but the idea persists that there is professional content that should be part of preservice teacher education and that this content should reflect all of the different things that effective teachers should know and be able to do.

In the 1960s and 1970s, performance or competency-based teacher education (P/CBTE) dominated the literature in the U.S. even though the actual implementation of these programs was limited. P/CBTE was contrasted with a course completion model of teacher education where prospective teachers were given a teaching license based on the completion of a set of state approved college or university courses. In a P/CBTE approach teachers were to be licensed on the basis of demonstrated performance of a series of predetermined teaching competencies (Gage & Winne, 1975).

In performance-based programs, performance goals are specified in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. The student must be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He will be held accountable, not for passing grades, but for attaining a given level of competence in performing the essential tasks of teaching (Elam, 1971, p.1)

In the 1960s and 1970s version of P/CBTE, there was extensive use of behavioral psychology and systems theory where the competencies were often stated in behavioral terms and elaborate management systems were developed to monitor novice teachers' mastery of these

competencies (McDonald, 1973). The competencies themselves were allegedly based on the findings of process-product research on teaching which attempted to connect specific teacher behaviors to student achievement which usually meant scores on standardized achievement tests. One major criticism of P/CBTE at the time was the proliferation of long lists of competencies (Michigan State University had over 1,500 in its programs) which it was argued presented a fragmented view of teaching that was limited to teaching as 'telling' (Broudy, 1973). One of the reasons that there was very little implementation of P/CBTE in American teacher education programs, in addition to the high costs involved and the extra demands it made on faculty time, was the skepticism about the research base for the competencies. Heath & Nielson's (1974) comprehensive review of the research base for P/CBTE concluded that overall there was no empirical basis for the prescription of competencies in teacher education programs.

Since the 1990s P/CBTE has emerged once again in the form of performance-based assessment in teacher education programs based on standards presented to teacher education institutions by their state education departments (Valli & Rennert-Ariev, 2002; Zeichner, 2005). Here instead of lists of hundreds of teaching competencies that are to be mastered by prospective teachers to receive an initial teaching license, the dominant approach has been to specify a few standards in a teacher education program that are then elaborated through the articulation of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that define those standards.

In the early 1990s the Council of Chief State School Officers, the professional organization for the heads of education in each of the 50 states, sponsored a project that led to the development of a set of model standards for beginning teacher licensing that would serve as a resource to the states in developing guidelines for performance-based assessment systems in teacher education programs. These standards, commonly referred to as the New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium or 'INTASC' standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1992) and the standards that were subsequently developed for teacher licensing in a number of specific subject areas such as science and mathematics, have been very influential in the development of performance-based teacher education requirements in almost every state. The original model INTASC standards consisted of 10 standards each defined by a statement of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were thought to define a common core of knowledge and skills that should be acquired by all new teachers. This common core was to be followed by the

identification of standards for various disciplines and levels of schooling. The eventual goal was to have all of these various standards taken into account in the initial licensing of teachers.

Unlike in the 1970s when assertions were made about the direct empirical warrants for the competencies in teacher education programs, the INTASC standards were developed by panels of academics and practitioners who employed a consensus model not all that different from the consensus process used in the Commonwealth Teacher Training Study. The panel developed the model standards in relation to five core propositions about excellence in teaching borrowed from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards which offers an advanced level certification of teaching expertise. These five core propositions are:

- Teachers are committed to students and their learning
- Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to diverse learners
- Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning
- Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience
- Teachers are members of learning communities

The 10 model standards cover a broad range of the elements of teaching such as knowledge of content, learning, development, teaching, and assessment strategies. Here are two examples of these standards with one of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions listed under each one.

**Standard #2** – The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

#### Knowledge

- The teacher understands how learning occurs—how students construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop habits of mind—and knows how to use instructional strategies that promote student learning.

#### Disposition

- The teacher is disposed to use students' strengths as a basis for growth, and their errors as opportunities for learning.

### Performance

- The teacher stimulates student reflection on prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas, making connections to student experiences, providing opportunities for active engagement, manipulation, and testing of ideas and materials, and encouraging students to assume responsibility for shaping their learning tasks.

**Standard #3** – The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

### Knowledge

- The teacher understands and can identify differences in approaches to learning and performance, including different learning styles, multiple intelligences, and performance modes, and can design instruction that helps students use strengths as the basis for growth.

### Disposition

- The teacher believes that all children can learn at high levels and persists in helping all children achieve success.

### Performance

- The teacher seeks to understand students' families, cultures, and communities, and uses this information as the basis for connecting instruction to students' experiences (reg., drawing explicit connections between subject matter and community matters, making assignments that can be related to students' experiences and cultures).

These standards and the standards that were developed from them in many states reflect what has been called a pedagogical progressivism (Labaree, 2004) or a learning-centered and learner-centered approach to teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2000) They focus on adapting instruction to individual students and on the understanding of content. Teacher education programs throughout the U.S. have developed elaborate assessment systems where documentation of students meeting these standards is recorded in teaching portfolios which are usually electronic.

Another strategy that has been used to articulate the knowledge base for teaching and teacher education that includes substantial attention to pedagogy and professional content in a teacher's education is to assemble a commission of recognized experts in various aspects of teaching, learning, and the social context of teaching and charge them with presenting in narrative form the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that they feel novice teachers need to begin teaching. Similar to the standards panels that developed the INTASC standards, these panels have drawn in part upon the research in a given area, but they also have exercised their professional judgment about what teachers need in areas where the research has not been definitive. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the major professional association for Schools of Education in the U.S., sponsored an effort like this in the 1980s that culminated in the publication of a book laying out what it was felt teachers needed to know to begin teaching (Reynolds, 1989).

Recently, the National Academy of Education (NAE) sponsored a 4-year project where a panel of 27 academics and expert teachers reached agreement on an extensive body of material that they felt needs to be mastered by teachers prior to assuming full responsibility for a classroom. The report of this committee (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) addresses a variety of aspects of teaching including the teaching of subject matter, teaching diverse learners, assessment, classroom management, theories of learning and development, the development of students' language, and developing a curricular vision for teaching.

The detailed discussions of the knowledge base for beginning teachers that is presented in the 1989 and 2005 reports could be converted into lists of standards or competencies if someone wanted to do so. I was a member of the NAE committee and we discussed the value of our report in helping teacher educators examine their programs in relation to the knowledge presented in the report. The goal was to stimulate self-study about teacher education within teacher education institutions like that which was stimulated by the 1989 AACTE report. Since then however, Linda Darling-Hammond, one of the chairs of the panel, has proposed that the knowledge detailed in the report be used as the basis for a new national examination that would be taken by all graduates of teacher education programs and as the basis for mandatory national accreditation of teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005).<sup>4</sup>

While it is unclear what will happen with the findings of the report issued by the National Academy of Education, it is clear that the professionalization agenda has had an enormous impact on teacher education programs throughout the U.S. By 2004, 49 of the 50 states had developed standards that prospective teachers must meet to obtain an initial teaching license (Spellings, 2005). State approval of teacher education programs and national accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the larger of the two accrediting agencies, require extensive documentation by teacher educators of how standards are covered and assessed in the teacher education curriculum. A whole industry has arisen in the U.S. devoted to the production of electronic teaching portfolios which are currently used in over 90 per cent of American teacher education programs as a way of assessing the mastery of teaching standards for initial certification.

### ***Reforming Teacher Education by Strengthening Teachers' Content Preparation and Limiting Professional Education Coursework***

Before the development of formal programs for educating teachers in the U.S., a classical liberal arts education served as the only preparation for teaching (Borrowman, 1965). In 1930 Abraham Flexner who is often noted in the U.S. for his study of medical education that led to a major restructuring of the field, published a study on higher education in the U.S., Britain, and Germany that included a point of view on teacher education that has been in conflict with the professionalization agenda for reform for many years (Flexner, 1930). This view holds that academic content knowledge and general intelligence is all that is needed to begin teaching and all the rest that teachers need to learn can be acquired on the job.<sup>5</sup>

Why should not an educated person, broadly and deeply versed in educational philosophy and experience, help himself from that point on? Why should his attention be diverted during these pregnant years to the trivialities and applications with which common sense can deal adequately when the time comes? (S. 99-100).

There have been several consequences for teacher education of this belief that knowledge of academic content and general intelligence and verbal ability are the most critical aspects of teacher expertise. First, since the 1980s, there have been efforts in some states to increase the emphasis on liberal arts and academic subject matter courses and to

reduce credits in professional education courses. Some states (e.g., Texas) have even passed laws limiting the number of professional education courses that can be located within preservice teacher education programs (Imig, 1988). Along with these efforts, many teacher education programs raised the standards for admission into and completion of programs demanding higher grade point averages and test scores. Currently, most states now require the passing of academic content examinations in the areas in which teachers are certified to teach. Both advocates of the professionalization agenda and deregulation agendas have agreed on the importance of these measures of teachers' knowledge of academic content. Where they disagree is on whether there is additional professional education content that teachers need to have prior to assuming responsibility for a classroom. Additionally, some have argued that requiring more academic content courses in a preservice teacher education program does not necessarily address the acquisition of the pedagogical content knowledge that is needed to be able to teach the academic content to diverse learners (Shulman, 1987). However, despite all the efforts to promote academic content courses in the preservice teacher education curriculum, still only about 47 per cent of secondary teachers today hold an academic major in their subject assignments (Spellings, 2005).<sup>6</sup>

Another implication of the deregulation perspective is that since the 1980s a number of private foundations, state governments and the Federal Department of Education have actively encouraged the development of alternative certification programs where individuals can obtain certification to teach in the public schools through programs that include less emphasis on professional education content apart from that which is acquired while teaching. In one kind of alternative program universities and colleges have developed certification programs at the post-baccalaureate level that are usually more school-based and include less professional education coursework than a traditional 4-year or 5-year undergraduate program.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the Ford Foundation spent over \$70 million dollars on initiatives that encouraged the development of post-baccalaureate programs on top of an undergraduate degree with a full academic major (Stone, 1968). Currently, about one third of those who enter the teaching force do so through a post-baccalaureate program (Feistritz, 1999), and the most recent survey of these programs listed 290 such programs (AACTE, 2000).

In addition to these alternative certification programs administered by colleges and universities a number of school districts and private providers have initiated preservice programs in recent years and special projects like 'Teach for America', the 'New Teacher Project' and 'Troops to Teachers'"(Feistrizer, 2005) have focused on recruiting specific populations into teaching such as recent graduates from elite universities and retired military personnel. The federal education law 'No Child Left Behind' requires that all teachers meet certification requirements in the states in which they are teaching, but beyond this there is great variation across the nation in what prospective teachers need to do to meet these requirements. One program, The American Board for the Certification of Teaching Excellence (ABCTE) <sup>7</sup> is currently recognized in five states and provides certification to teach in those states to individuals who can pass two paper tests, one on academic content, and the other on professional education content. Absolutely no teacher preparation is required by the ABCTE.<sup>8</sup>

Some critics of college and university-based teacher education programs have even gone so far as to call for the elimination of state licensing of teachers and would give the public schools the right to hire whomsoever they wish. They argue that high quality will be assured because if teachers are not successful, they will not be rehired (e.g., Hess, 2001).

### ***Reforming Teacher Education through the Preparation of Culturally Responsive Teachers who Work for Greater Social Justice***

Since the beginning of formal teacher education in the U.S. there has always been a group of educators who have tried to connect teacher education to the building of a more just and humane society. As part of this social reconstructionist or social justice strand of reform there have been individual teacher education programs since the early 1900s that have focused on preparing teachers to be agents of social change (e.g., Limbert, 1934; McDonald, 2005; Oakes, 1996; Smith, 1980)

Currently, there are two aspects to the social justice reform agenda in teacher education in the U.S. First, given the increasingly diverse population in U.S. public schools and the predominately white, monolingual English teaching population, an emphasis has been placed on the development of sociocultural consciousness <sup>9</sup> and intercultural teaching competence among prospective teachers (e.g., Cochran-Smith,

Davis, & Fries, 2004; Ladson-Billings, & Zeichner & Hoefft, 1996). Second there have been efforts to recruit more individuals of color <sup>10</sup> into the U.S. teaching force and a number of special programs have been initiated that focus specifically on minority teacher recruitment (Villegas & Lucas, 2004).

A substantial literature has emerged in recent years on the attributes and skills associated with what has come to be called 'culturally responsive teaching'. A number of researchers (e.g., Gay, 2000; Gonzalez, Moll, & Armenti, 2005; Haberman, 1996; Irvine & Armento, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Villegas, 1991) have documented the importance of knowledge, dispositions and skills that go beyond the kind of generic standards like the INTASC standards that are used in most teacher education programs. For example, these researchers have stressed the importance to student learning of teachers learning how to build on the cultural resources that their pupils bring to school in their teaching to build bridges between the home and school. This requires that teachers need to learn how to learn about the cultures and communities of their students and to translate this knowledge back into their classroom teaching practices, curriculum, and classroom social relations. Some teacher education programs have developed standards for their students to meet that are more explicitly focused on issues of culturally responsive teaching. One example of such a program is Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington (Vavrus, 2002). The following are a few examples of teacher standards that address issues associated with culturally responsive teaching that were developed in a national teacher education reform network focusing on urban education to which my university belonged for a number of years.<sup>11</sup>

**Knowledge:** The teacher understands the ways in which life is organized in the communities in which his or her students live, how students use and display knowledge, tell stories, and interact with peers and adults.

**Performance:** The teacher is able to incorporate aspects of his or her students' abilities, experiences, cultures, participation styles, frames of reference, and community resources into the class in ways that enhance student learning.

**Disposition:** The teacher sees resources for learning in all students rather than viewing student differences as problems to overcome. The teacher believes that he or she is responsible for making a difference in his or her students' learning.

It is believed that this focus on culturally responsive teaching will help reduce the achievement gap between students in U.S. schools, especially those with poor access to qualified teachers and a high proportion of poor coloured students (Education Trust, 2000; Kozol, 2005). Along with the focus on culturally responsive teaching within the classroom, many of the social justice oriented teacher education programs attempt to prepare teachers who will work in the broader schools and societal contexts for social change.

Research has illuminated some of the factors in teacher education programs that have been effective in developing both culturally responsive teachers and teachers who work for social justice. These include such things as admissions criteria that screen applicants on the basis of their commitment to teach all students, carefully monitored and analyzed field experiences in culturally diverse schools and communities, the use of non certified adults in communities to teach prospective teachers cultural and linguistic knowledge, and teaching teachers how to use various teaching and assessment strategies that are sensitive to cultural and linguistic variations (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

### ***Conclusion***

The history of teacher education in the USA has involved a continuing struggle among the advocates of these different notions of teacher expertise and teacher education. During different political and economic moments in the country's history, different resolutions of this struggle among these competing visions have emerged. For example, in times of severe economic crisis or racial tension, the social justice agenda has received more visible support (See Liston & Zeichner, 1991). In times like the present with a conservative federal government, as was the case in the 1950s, the deregulation camp has received much support. The professionalization agenda has been persistent in pushing for longer teacher education programs and for higher standards to enter and complete them.

It has always been the case that teacher education programs and the work of teachers have been affected by elements of all three reform agendas. Currently, as was mentioned above, just about every preservice teacher education program in the U.S. has incorporated a performance-based assessment system based on students' demonstrating proficiency on a set of teaching standards, an influence of the professionalization

agenda. Student teachers in most states also have to pass academic content examinations in the areas of certification in order to receive an initial teaching license, a consequence of the deregulation agenda. Finally, since the 1960s, both state and national teacher education program approval processes have required that teachers be prepared in aspects of multicultural education.

There is some variation among states in how these reform agendas have come together. One dimension of variation is the extent to which states have allowed alternative routes to teacher certification to be implemented. In states like Texas and California, the majority of teachers who enter the schools do so through an alternative certification program that includes less involvement from colleges and universities in the preparation program. In some instances, teachers complete an alternative certification program without any college or university involvement. In other places like my state of Wisconsin, the state education department has been very resistant to the idea of alternative certification programs except in areas of high need for teachers and even then, states usually hold the alternative program graduates to the same standards as those who complete traditional college and university programs.

Currently, the Bush administration, under its 'No Child Left Behind' federal education act, has increased the focus on the standardized testing of pupils in the public schools and has attempted to narrow the definition of successful teaching to teachers who are able to raise the scores of their pupils on these tests. Increasingly scarce resources are being allocated to support this testing apparatus and the training of teachers in 'best teaching practices' that have allegedly been shown to raise pupils' achievement test scores. Despite the lack of empirical evidence supporting this direction (e.g., Haney, 2000; Sirotnik, 2004), the same logic has now been applied to teacher education programs using the higher education act as the vehicle. If colleges and universities want to continue to receive federal money for student aid and research, they must comply with the federal regulations regarding the reporting of information about teacher education.

For the last few years, the Secretary of Education in Washington, D.C. has issued a report on teacher quality (e.g., Spellings, 2005) that has included a listing of the pass rates on teacher examinations for each state. Each state is required to issue a teacher education report card that ranks teacher education institutions according to the pass rates of their graduates and identifies 'low performing institutions'. There is also a

movement in the country to require the standardized achievement test scores of the pupils taught by the graduates of different teacher education programs to be taken into account in the program approval process. This 'positive impact mandate' (Hamel & Merz, 2005) will be extremely costly to implement if it becomes the norm as is predicted. There are also major conceptual and technical issues involved in being able to attribute the achievement test scores of pupils to the particular teacher education program from which their teacher graduated. (McCaffrey et.al. 2004).

At the same time that emphasis is being given to teacher tests of content knowledge and to minimizing the role of colleges and universities in teacher education by the federal government and its supporters, <sup>12</sup> there have been increased pressures on college and university-based teacher education programs, through many state education departments, to implement aspects of the professionalization agenda. Some have argued (e.g., Johnson, et.al. 2005) that the hyper rationalization now associated with gaining national accreditation of teacher education programs through the major accrediting agency, NCATE, has actually served to undermine teacher education program quality.

Amid these battles between those who would do away with Schools of Education and require only the passing of an academic content examination and a criminal background check to get an initial teaching license, and those who would limit teacher certification to those who have completed programs that require the demonstration of competence in numerous teaching standards, teacher educators in college and university programs have been incorporating elements of the social justice agenda into their programs. This trend has been confirmed from both the literature in teacher education where teacher educators write about their practices and from conservative critiques of teacher education programs who charge that this emphasis on social justice fails to prepare teachers for the practicalities of teaching and abandons a concern for academic rigor (e.g., Steiner & Rozen, 2004).

It has become almost impossible today to find a college or university-based teacher education program in the U.S. that does not claim to have an emphasis on preparing teachers for social justice. As I point out in my analysis of this movement in American teacher education (Zeichner, in press, b) there is often a lack of clarity in reports of programs about what is meant by 'teaching for social justice' and there is wide variation in what actually happens in these programs. Some of the dimensions

along which this variation occurs include: (1) the degree to which a program focuses on preparation to teach specific groups of students such as African Americans vs. the degree to which a program focuses on the building of general intercultural sensitivity and competence; (2) the degree to which a program provides students with direct contact with various cultural groups vs. just reading about other cultures and (3) the degree to which the program models the kind of culturally responsive teaching it seeks to impart to its students (Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

Currently, the future of college and university-based teacher education in the U.S. is uncertain despite the fact that programs across the country have incorporated standards, content examinations and multicultural education content in response to the requirements imposed by states, national accreditation agencies and actions initiated internally by teacher education faculty. The basic reason that this is that, despite the fact that more than enough teachers are being prepared to fill every elementary and secondary school classroom in the U.S., in many urban and remote rural schools there are shortages of qualified teachers who have been prepared in a teacher education programs prior to becoming classroom teachers. The mostly poor students of color who attend public schools in these areas, including many students from homes where English is not spoken, are the ones who are given the least experienced and least prepared teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Critics of Schools of Education argue that if they cannot supply the public schools with the teachers they need then other agencies will.

A wide variety of alternative certification programs have arisen to prepare teachers to fill these empty classrooms including preservice teacher education programs run by states, individual school districts and private providers, some of whom do this work for a profit (Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). As was mentioned earlier, these programs like traditional programs in colleges and universities, vary widely in the amount of preparation for teaching provided before an individual assumes responsibility for a class, and the preparation of the subject matter taught.

Along with this proliferation of alternative providers of teacher education has come an emphasis by the federal government on the preparation of teachers who are 'good enough' to follow a scripted curriculum designed to raise standardized test scores.<sup>13</sup> This limited view of teacher expertise- as that which raises standardized achievement test scores - ignores a whole range of things that the public wants from its public schools for children. These include forms of academic learning

that focus on critical thinking and problem solving, and social, aesthetic, and civic learning (Goodlad, 2004).

The 'good enough' teachers do not need to be prepared to exercise their judgment in the classroom and to make adaptations in instructional practices and curriculum to meet the needs of their pupils. They do not need to be reflective and analytic and to be able to learn from their experience or know much about the cultures and communities of their students. All that they need to know is how to implement the scripted curriculum with which they are provided. Advocates of the professionalization and social justice agendas have strongly challenged this view.

This struggle over the definition of teaching expertise will surely continue as advocates for the various reform agendas continue to clash over the nature of the work of teachers, what constitutes teacher expertise, and the purposes of teacher education programs.

## REFERENCES

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2000) *Alternative paths to teaching: A directory of postbaccalaureate programs*. (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Borrowman, M. (1965): Liberal Education and the Professional Preparation of Teachers. In M. Borrowman (Ed). *Teacher Education in the U.S.: A Documentary History*. New York Teachers College Press. S. 1-53.
- Broudy, H. (1973): *A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, M.K. (2005): Researching Teacher Education in Changing Times: Politics and Paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds). *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the American Educational Research Association Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. S. 37-68.
- Cochran-Smith, M.; Davis, D. & Fries, K. (2004): Multicultural Teacher Education. In J. Banks (Ed). *Handbook of Multicultural Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). San Francisco: Jossey Bass. S. 931-975.
- Charters, W.W. & Waples, D. (1929): *Commonwealth Teacher Training study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (1992): *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue*. Washington, DC: CSSO.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000): *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education Programs*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001): In *Equality in Access to Knowledge*. In J. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds) *Handbook of Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan. S. 465-483.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005): *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers Our Children Deserve*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005) (Eds): *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Earley, P. (2000): Finding the Culprit: Federal Policy and Teacher Education. In *Educational Policy*, 14(1), S. 25-39.
- Education Trust (2000): *Honoring the Boxcar: Equalizing teacher quality*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Elam, S. (1971): *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art?* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990): Teacher Education: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives. In W.R. Houston (Ed): *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan, S. 212-223.
- Feistritzer, E. (1999): *The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Preparation in the U.S.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.
- Feistritzer, E. (2005): *Alternative Certification: A State by State Analysis*, 2005. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.
- Flexner, A. (1930): *Universities: American, English, German*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Gage, N. & Winne, P. (1973): Performance-Based Teacher Education. In K. Ryan (Ed). *Teacher Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. S. 146-172.
- Gay, G. (2000): *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gonzalez, N.; Moll, L.; per cent Amanti, C. (2005) (Eds) *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households and Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Haberman, M. (1996): Selecting and Preparing Culturally Competent Teachers for Urban Schools. In J. Silula (Ed). *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Macmillan. S. 747-760.
- Haney, W. (2000): The Myth of the Texas Miracle in Education. *Educational Policy Research Archives*. 41.
- Hamel, F. & Merz, C. A. (2005): Reforming Accountability: A Preservice Program Wrestles with Mandated Reform. In *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(2), S. 157-167.
- Hartocollis, A. (2005): Who Needs Education schools? *New York Times Education Life*. Sunday July, 31, 2005. S. 24-28.
- Heath, R.W. & Nielsen, M. (1974): The Research Base for Performance-Based Teacher Education. In *Review of Educational Research*, 44 (4), S. 463-484.
- Hess, F.M. (2001): *Tear Down this Wall: The Case for Radical Overhaul of Teacher Certification*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Imig, D. (1988): Texas Revisited. In AACTE Briefs, 9 (7), S.2.
- Irvine, J., & Armento, B.J. (2001): *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Lesson Planning for Elementary and Middle Grades*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

- Johnson, D.; Johnson, B.; Farenga, S.; & Ness, D. (2005): *Trivializing Teacher Education*. Lanham, MA: Roman & Littlefield.
- Kozol, J. (2005): *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in the U.S.* New York: Crown.
- Labaree, D. (2004): *The Trouble with Ed Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994): *The Dream Keepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995): Multicultural Teacher Education: Research, Policy and Practice. In J. Banks (Ed). *Handbook of Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan. S. 747-759.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999): Preparing Teachers for Diverse Student Populations: A Critical Race Theory Perspective. In A. Iran-Nejad & D. Pearson (Eds) *Review of Research in Education*. Vol. 24. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association. S. 211-248.
- Limbert, P. (1934): Political Education at New College. In *Progressive Education*, 11(2), S.118-124.
- Lucas, C. (1999): *Teacher Education in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1991): *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- McDonald, M. (April, 2005): The Joint Enterprise of Social Justice Teacher Education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- McCaffrey, D.F.; Lockwood, J.R.; Koretz, D.M.; & Hamilton, L.S. (2004): *Evaluating Value-Added Models for Teacher Accountability*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Oakes, J. (1996): Making the Rhetoric Real. In *National Association of Multicultural Education Journal* 4(2), S. 4-10.
- Reynolds, M. (1989) (Ed).: *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher*. Oxford, U.K.: Pergamon.
- Saylor, J.G. (1976): *Antecedent Developments in the Movement to Performance-Based Programs of Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Shulman, L. (1987): Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. In *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, S.1-22.
- Sirotnik, K. (2004) (Ed).: *Holding Accountability Accountable: What Ought to Matter in Public Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smith, W. (1980): The American Teacher Corps Programme. In E. Hoyle & J. Megarry (Eds) *Professional Development of Teachers*. London: Nichols. S. 204-218.
- Spellings, M. (2005): *The Secretary's Fourth Annual Report on Teacher Quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Steiner, D. & Rozen, S. (2004): Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: An analysis of syllabi from a sample of America's Schools of Education. In F. Hess, A. Rotherham, & K. Walsh (Eds). *A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. S. 119-148.
- Stone, J.C. (1968): *Breakthrough in Teacher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Valli, L. & Rennert-Ariev, P. (2002) New Standards and Assessments? Curriculum

- Transformation in Teacher Education. In *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34 (2), S. 201-206.
- Vavrus, M. (2002): *Transforming the Multicultural Education of Teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Villegas, A. M. (1991): *Culturally Responsive Pedagogy for the 1990s and Beyond*. Princeton N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
- Villegas, A.M. & Lucas, T. (2002) : Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers: Rethinking the Curriculum. In the *Journal of Teacher Education*. 53(1), S.20-32.
- Zeichner, K. (1983): Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education. In *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (3), S. 3-9.
- Zeichner, K. (2003): The Adequacies and Inadequacies of Three Current Strategies to Recruit, Prepare and Retain the Best Teachers for All Students. In: *Teachers College Record*, 105 (3), S. 490-515.
- Zeichner, K. (2005) Learning from Experience with Performance-Based Teacher Education. In F. Peterman (Ed). *Designing Performance Assessment Systems for Urban Teacher Preparation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. S. 3-20.
- Zeichner, K. (in press a): Reflections of a University-Based Teacher Educator on the Future of College and University-Based Teacher Education. In *Journal of Teacher Education*.
- Zeichner, K. (in press, b): What is Social Justice Teacher Education? In K. Zeichner *Action Research and Teacher Education for Social Justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zeichner, K. & Hoeft, K. (1996): Teacher Socialization for Cultural Diversity. In J. Sikula (Ed). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Macmillan. S. 525-547.
- Zeichner, K. & Schulte, A. (2001) What We Know and Don't Know from Peer Reviewed Research about Alternative Teacher Certification Programs. In *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), S. 266-282.

## NOTES

- 1 Although there have been other similar formulations in the literature of alternative approaches to teacher expertise or quality, including some of my own, (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Zeichner, 1983; Liston & Zeichner, 1991) the framework discussed in this paper captures the major distinctions concerning teacher expertise that have existed in U.S. debates.
- 2 In the U.S. the individual states rather than the federal government is responsible for education. Since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century the states have set regulations to govern the licensing of teachers within their borders. Despite the lack of authority in education within the individual states, the federal government has begun to play a more active role in both k-12 education and higher education through its power to withhold federal funds if the states do not comply with its wishes (Early, 2000). Currently any state is free to decline to participate in the 'No Child Left Behind' testing mandates from the federal government, but they do so at the risk of losing substantial amounts of funding from Washington.

- 3 For example, 'inspiration' which means encouraging pupils to investigate  
problems themselves and 'alertness', reacting quickly to new trends of  
thought brought up by pupils, are both elements of the learner-centered  
approach to teaching embedded in current standards.
- 4 Currently, national accreditation of teacher education programs is voluntary  
in most states and overall about ½ of teacher education institutions seek  
accreditation from one of the two agencies offering this service, NCATE, and  
TEAC.
- 5 Recently, the passing of a criminal background check has been added to this  
list by critics of formal teacher education programs.
- 6 Part of this can be explained by the absence of a requirement in some states  
for secondary teachers to have an academic major in the areas in which they  
are certified. Another part of the problem though is that teachers are assigned  
to teach in areas in which they are not certified to teach because of the lack of  
enough certified teachers in those subject or geographical areas.
- 7 See <http://abcte.org>
- 8 The U.S. Department of Education has given at least \$35 million dollars to  
the ABCTE on a non competitive basis as part of its strategy to encourage  
alternatives to Schools of Education for obtaining a teaching license.
- 9 Villegas & Lucas define sociocultural consciousness as 'an understanding that  
people's ways of thinking, behaving, and being are deeply influenced by  
factors such as race, ethnicity, social class, and language. (p.22).
- 10 The term individuals 'of color' in the U.S. refers to people who are African-  
American, Hispanic, Native American and Asian.
- 11 This network is called Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education .
- 12 One sign of the uncertain future of Ed Schools in preservice teacher education  
in the U.S. is the recent New York Times feature story entitled ' Who needs  
education schools?' (Hartocollis, 2005) See Zeichner in press for further  
elaboration.
- 13 The term 'good enough teachers' was actually used by a high ranking member  
of the U.S. department of Education at a June, 2002 meeting in Palo Alto  
California on research on teacher quality and teacher education.