

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 080

SP 040 416

AUTHOR Glenn, Allen D.
TITLE Lessons in Teacher Education Reform: A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education in the United Kingdom and the United States.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2001-12-00
NOTE 50p.; Produced in cooperation with the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET).
CONTRACT ED-99-CO-0007
AVAILABLE FROM AACTE Publications, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005-4701 (\$10). Tel: 202-293-2450; Fax: 202-457-8095; Web site: <http://www.aacte.org>.
PUB TYPE ERIC Publications (071) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Politics of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Reform Efforts; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

This report examines similarities and differences between teacher preparation systems in the United States and the United Kingdom. The first section discusses initiatives to renew and reform teacher education, highlighting four interrelated factors that provide insight into the reasons for conflicting demands for change (public expectations about education, the politicizing of teacher education, differing views about implementing change, and differing philosophies about teacher preparation). The second section discusses implementation of reform, highlighting government and educational policy. The third section describes teacher education's response to implementing reform. For example, educators in both countries are addressing reform issues from institutional and national perspectives. The fourth section describes similarities and differences in teacher education in the two countries. The countries are similar in the declining support for higher education, perceived loss of academic freedom, increased demand for teachers, distaste for high stakes testing and monitoring, and lack of recognition for improvement. The countries differ in school reform, centralization, funding and resources, and focused criticism. The fifth section examines trends for the future. Appended is a presentation by the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers, delivered at the 2000 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (Contains 45 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Lessons in Teacher Education Reform

A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education in the United Kingdom and the United States

Allen D. Glenn

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



Produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education
In cooperation with the Universities Council for Teacher Education and the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

December 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lessons in Teacher Education Reform
*A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education
in the United Kingdom and the United States*

Allen D. Glenn
University of Washington

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1307 New York Avenue, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
www.ericsp.org
Mary E. Dilworth, Director
Deborah M. Newby, Associate Director

Prepaid orders for additional copies of this publication may be mailed to:

AACTE/Publications Dept.
1307 New York Avenue, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 293-2450

\$10.00 per copy, plus \$5.00 shipping & handling (within the U.S.) for up to five copies

This project has been funded, at least in part, with federal funds from the U.S Department of Education under contract number ED-99-CO-0007. The content of this paper does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Single Copy Price: \$10.00

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Introduction	4
Initiatives to Renew and Reform Teacher Education	6
Implementing Reform: Government and Educational Policy	13
Implementing Reform: Teacher Education's Response	17
Teacher Education in the United Kingdom and the United States: Similarities and Differences	19
Trends for the Future	26
Conclusion	28
References.....	29
Appendix A: UCET Symposium	32

Foreword

The Universities Council for the Education of Teachers in the United Kingdom and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education have participated in each other's conferences and conventions for the last four years and maintained close contact between events. We have also held a number of joint seminars in London and Washington, D.C., which included visits to institutions on both sides of the Atlantic. We have watched with interest what has been happening in the other's country, learning sometimes what to avoid and often what to emulate.

Teacher education is constantly developing and changing. Indeed, so constant and speedy are the changes in the United Kingdom that conditions have been evolving continuously during the production of this monograph. For example, the Government Circular with which teacher education in England has had to comply since 1998, together with its attendant inspection process, is currently undergoing a major revision. Teacher education in Scotland has historically been differently organized to that in the rest of the United Kingdom, but that, too, is in the process of change. Teacher education in Northern Ireland began to diverge a few years ago from the English model, and in Wales it is now developing its own unique character instead of reflecting that of England, as has been the case in the past.

In the United States, the past two decades have seen increased public scrutiny of K-12 education. Reform efforts have led to ongoing examination of student learning, the quality of teaching, and effectiveness of teacher education programs. Recent federal legislation (Title II of the Higher Education Act) has introduced new accountability requirements for schools, colleges, and departments of education.

This monograph examines the similarities and the differences between the systems of teacher preparation in the United States and the United Kingdom. Perhaps the most significant similarity is that the ultimate goal of our teacher education systems is to produce the best teachers possible. That is the very least the students in our schools rightly expect of us.

Mary Russell
Secretary
Universities Council for the Education of Teachers

David Imig
President and CEO
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Introduction

Almost all citizens in both the United Kingdom and the United States would agree that educating their nation's children and youth is vital to the future. They would also agree that having well-qualified teachers is important. But opinions about who can be a teacher and how the teacher should be prepared or trained would vary widely. Some might contend that a teacher needs sound preparation in the arts and sciences together with pedagogical knowledge grounded in a school-based experience. Others might believe that preparation in the arts and sciences is sufficient, and that additional training ought to take place in a school setting apart from the university.

In both countries, teacher preparation has been the domain of university-based departments of education. These units are charged with preparing individuals to teach children and young adults. They do so by linking content and pedagogical knowledge through a series of classes, seminars, and in-school experiences. Contemporary teacher education, at its best, is a blend of theory and practice.

Also in both countries, teachers are public employees. Thus, the state has a responsibility to ensure that teacher candidates are qualified to teach. In the United Kingdom, a system of peer assessment and professional inspectors determines the quality of the overall university programs (peer assessment) and the teacher preparation programs (external inspection). In the United States, the governments of the 50 states determine whether or not teacher education programs meet their standards and are accredited to offer teacher preparation programs. Whether American or British, a teacher candidate must meet the requirements of both the academy and the government before being permitted to teach.

The relationship between teacher preparation programs and government oversight has always been tenuous. Teacher educators have traditionally enjoyed the academic freedom afforded those who teach and conduct research in higher education, and they tend to view teacher education broadly, as holistic professional development rather than as a set of skills that can be broken down into specific behaviors. State agencies or professional inspectors, on the other hand, often rely on standards and rules that can be measured and documented.



During the last several decades in both the United Kingdom and the United States, considerable attention has been focused on student learning, teachers, and teacher educators. There has been significant questioning of higher education's role in teacher preparation, an increase in government regulation over teacher education, and a belief that lower (K-12) schools should have more responsibility for training new teachers and the continuing education of current teachers. In the United Kingdom, especially England, an external inspection system has led to what one British educator calls "one of the most regulated systems for education and training of teachers in the world today" (Newby, 2000). Colleagues in the United States, however, might also contend that they, too, are becoming more and more regulated, counted, and ranked.

This monograph is a brief analysis of teacher education in the United Kingdom and the United States. (In general, the United Kingdom refers to England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. However, some of the policies discussed in this monograph apply to England only.) The monograph was written primarily in response to a set of papers prepared by British teacher educators describing teacher education in the United Kingdom and presented at the 2000 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, found in Appendix A. This analysis comes at a time when both countries are attempting to find "the right balance between the need to take complete professional responsibility for our students as we help them become new teachers, and the right and proper expectations of the public that we'll produce the kind of teachers for their children that they demand" (Newby, 2001).

Initiatives to Renew and Reform Teacher Education

In both the United Kingdom and the United States the past 30 years have witnessed a change in government policies toward universities and teacher education. In the United Kingdom, there has been a trend by government to more closely examine the role of teacher education in higher education institutions and to increase its control over it (Moon, 1998). For teacher training colleges, the 1970s were years of closures, restructurings, and integrations into the university sector. During the 1980s, the English government in particular began an effort to pull back some of the responsibility for initial teacher training from the universities with the creation of the Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, whose purpose was to review current policy and recommend changes concerning initial teacher preparation.

In the 1990s, the Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education was abolished, and the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) was created to oversee teacher training. This agency developed new rules, regulations, and inspection guidelines for teacher education. New regulations included recommendations for alternative routes to teaching, a significant increase in the amount of time spent in schools by teacher candidates, and the granting of more authority to the schools for teacher candidate placements. In addition, teacher education units were expected to pay schools for training their teacher candidates.

Similar trends can be seen in the United States. Major efforts to reform schools and teacher education programs occurred just before the turn of the 20th Century (Rice, 1969), in the late 1950s (Ravitch, 1983), and in the 1980s with the United States Office of Education's publication *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983). The reform efforts begun in the 1980s have led to an examination of student learning, the impact of the teacher on student achievement, and the effectiveness of teacher education programs.

According to Marilyn Cochran-Smith (2000), recent education reform efforts in the United States have focused on four general questions: (1) What are the attributes and qualities of good teachers, prospective teachers, and/or teacher education programs? (2) What are the teaching strategies and processes used by effective teachers, and what teacher education processes ensure that prospective teachers learn these strategies? (3)

What should teachers know and be able to do? Or, what should the knowledge base of teacher education be? And, (4) How will we know when – and if – teachers know and can do what they ought to know and be able to do?

Education reform efforts in the United Kingdom and the United States share a number of common characteristics. The first is the strong political nature of the reform activities. Policy makers from the national level to the local level are involved in shaping educational policies that impact teacher education. Second, in both countries there is a concerted effort to create a common set of academic standards for students and teachers and accompanying accountability mechanisms for student and teacher learning. Finally, the national governments in both the United Kingdom and the United States are closely examining what is happening in teacher education (Wilkin, 1999; USDE, 2000).

Meanwhile, the socio-political climates in the United Kingdom and the United States have created an environment of contradictory messages and demands for all those involved in education. Michael Apple (2001) labels this era as one of “conservative modernization” (p.182) that is driven by market-based reforms, support by vocal critics for a strong central cultural authority, and an emphasis on technical and managerial solutions to moral and political problems. Apple observes that educators are confronted with messages that imply that competition and alternatives are good, while at the same time, policy makers are saying that all must adhere to a common set of standards, rules, and regulations created by a central authority that uses managerial techniques to assure accountability.

Four interrelated factors provide some insight on the reasons for the conflicting demands for change. They are: (1) public expectations about education, (2) the politicizing of teacher education, (3) differing views about how to implement change, and (4) differing philosophies about teacher preparation.

Public Expectations

Virtually everyone, British or American, has an opinion about education based on personal experience in school. Some students are successful and continue their education at a technical school, community college, or university. Others complete their lower education and go on to make a life of their own. For some, the school experience is

painful, embarrassing, and filled with negative memories. However, regardless of their personal experiences, almost all citizens believe a good education is the stepping stone for a better life. This belief means that most people have high expectations for education. Parents want schools to prepare their children for successful lives, universities want lower schools to prepare students for more advanced study, and businesses want schools to produce highly skilled workers. Better quality, alternatives, accountability, and access are the hallmarks of current reform in both the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Politicizing of Education

Schools and politics have always been intertwined to some extent because schools serve as a major socializing agency for the society. As Jonathan Rabin wrote in *Bad Land: An American Romance* (1996):

The schoolhouse was an emblem of the fact that people were here for keeps. And the schoolhouse was where people. ...learned how to work the American system of do-it-yourself grass-roots democratic government.” (p. 144)

Political campaigns commonly address education and the status of schools. Why? Because education, whether in the United Kingdom or the United States, is an issue that sparks considerable public attention. In the most recent national elections, President George Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair spoke of education as a top priority and advocated for continuing the reform efforts of earlier administrations. For example, President Bush’s education policies continue the work of earlier administrations, beginning with George Bush, Sr.’s education summit in 1989 (Foxwell, 1993), followed by President William Clinton’s administration, during which the Higher Education Act of 1998 was passed, *Goals 2000* was published, and funding was allocated for the Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology Program.

Because of the political attention given to education, citizens of both countries expect that education reform is still needed and that government has a responsibility to mandate the changes as quickly as possible.

As Margaret Wilkin (1999) of Homerton College, Cambridge, wrote:

This is government in a hurry, intolerant of any impediment in the pursuit of its targets, and untrusting of the motives and capabilities of the HEIs (higher education institutions) which are perceived as fomenting disruption to this process, and who therefore must be brought into line. (p. 2)

Similar feelings can be found quite easily among policy makers in the United States. Describing this new environment, Ann Matthews (1999) wrote:

For 30 years, campuses have played a public game by private rules, but alumni and corporate donors are less awed by the campus than they used to be. (p. 215)

Academic administrators everywhere.... know campus autonomy is under sporadic, uncoordinated but continuing attack, less from the public and the media than from government. (p. 216)

In both countries productivity, efficiency, and accountability have become the trinity of higher education reform. Higher education, like its counterpart the public school, is being pushed, not ever so gently, to utilize a business mode of operation rather than management strategies traditionally used by public non-profit institutions.

Teacher education within the university is also under examination. The American Council on Education (ACE), which represents approximately 1,800 accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities in the United States, established a task force to review the university's commitment to teacher education (ACE, 1999). The report called for teacher education to be a priority across the campus, with more attention given to the content future teachers receive in the academic disciplines. The report re-affirmed the concept that preparing good teachers is a university-wide issue, but also turned the university's attention to the quality of teacher education occurring in the schools, departments, and colleges of education.

Similar discussions occurred in the United Kingdom under the leadership of Prime Minister Thatcher. During her tenure, the government scaled back the array of preparing institutions and placed a greater emphasis on the apprenticeship model of teacher training. As a result, all faculty in higher education institutions “live in an era in which public funding is scarce, and quite rightly, accountability is high” (Wilkin, 1999, p. 2).

Methods to Implement Change

Policy makers’ impatience with higher education grows out of demands from the broader community and from the fundamental difference in how policy makers and institutions of higher education view the change process. While institutions recognize the government’s responsibility to ensure a population that is well educated and able to contribute to the public good, they believe there should be autonomy in how a particular institution seeks to meet a given goal. However, whether in the United Kingdom or the United States, it is widely acknowledged that some institutions have higher standards than others, and that their teacher candidates are better prepared to meet the challenges of the classroom than are candidates from other institutions. For example, a recent study of teacher quality in the United States stated, “... the effectiveness of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in preparing teachers varies greatly” (Wenglinsky, 2000, p. 31). Similar findings have been reported in the United Kingdom. The conclusion in that country was that “Across institutions, there has been variation in the curriculum of training and also variation in the intellectual and professional standards achieved by students” (Wilkin, 1999, p. 2). What this has done, Wilkin continues, is lead to a belief that “Expressed in the terms of the market, the quality of the product, the student, has been unreliable.”

Another factor that contributes to policy makers’ impatience with higher education institutions is the speed with which policy makers want change to occur. In a world where e-commerce and dot.com companies rise and fall with incredible speed, universities are seen as racing turtles. In an academic world in which consultation, collaboration, discussion, and research are commonplace, significant change cannot be achieved quickly. Time and careful study are needed. However, most policy makers favor a much shorter time line. In the United Kingdom, “Government requirements for rapid

change and close adherence to prescribed detail render institutions vulnerable and more liable to critical inspection reports” (Wilkin, 1999, p.3). And in the United States, impatience with the pace of change prompted the demand for public accountability and institutional ranking now embodied in Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1998 (Title II).

Philosophical Differences

There are fundamental and longstanding differences in beliefs about how an individual should be prepared to become a teacher and the nature of knowledge (Berliner, 2000). Critics of teacher education in both countries contend that the programs over-emphasize methods in place of content knowledge, place too much emphasis on child-centered learning, and deter bright students from entering the field because of rules, regulations, and program length.

Advocates of less teacher education suggest that a degree in an appropriate content area plus guided work in a school is sufficient to begin a career (Abell, 2001; Raymond, 2001). Others suggest elimination of the elementary education major and mandatory testing as a means to improving teaching (Koppich, 2001). Both groups favor alternatives for existing teacher preparation programs. And, if there is a conflict between teacher quality and a need for more teachers, many who advocate high standards will favor expediency in placing someone in the classroom.

Teacher educators, on the other hand, believe that teaching is a profession and preparation is more than academic learning in a specific discipline (NCTAF, 1996). They argue that high-quality teachers are needed to meet the challenges of today’s classrooms. Preparing high-quality teachers requires an integrated teacher education program based on sound content and pedagogical knowledge supported by placements in professional development schools where effective modeling of instruction can be observed and where guided practice may occur. Teacher educators believe that pedagogical knowledge is more than simply knowing the content of a field of study. Teaching young children mathematics, for example, demands knowledge beyond mathematics. As Malcolm Lewis (2001), a United Kingdom teacher educator, notes:

The atomization of professional knowledge, judgment and skill into discrete competencies inevitably fails to capture the essence of professional competence.

Both teacher educators and those who advocate alternative routes into the classroom seek highly qualified teachers for the classroom, but they are caught in what anthropologists call systematic misunderstanding. This arises when one person's framework and another person's framework are so fundamentally different that understanding or agreement will not be achieved by simply providing more information (Friedman, 2000). Consequently, teacher educators continue to seek data and information to inform education policy, education reform groups seek to influence lawmakers with different advice, and policy makers move forward with rules, regulations, and laws to address what they believe to be the means to improve education.

Implementing Reform: Government and Educational Policy

In both the United Kingdom and the United States, teacher candidates, teachers, and teacher educators are being asked to meet higher academic standards, are being tested to ensure that they meet those standards, and are being held accountable for the results. Both systems are subject to supervision and approval by external governing bodies over which they have limited authority. However, the nature of the supervision and approval processes is somewhat different in the two countries.

The United Kingdom

In England, external inspection of teacher education can be traced back to the 19th century. Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) began inspecting schools in 1830 and teacher training institutions in 1846. For much of this history, teacher educators were given considerable autonomy to create programs that they believed prepared the best teachers. During the 1990s, external audits and inspection became more politicized. In 1992, the Education (Schools) Act established the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED). The major objective of OfSTED was to ensure higher standards for England's schools. In a related action in 1996, OfSTED, together with the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), created a new inspection framework for teacher training institutions. Rules and regulations were updated in 1998 (Blake, 2001) and will be updated again by September 2002.

Minimum standards for a Qualified Teacher Status (a permit to teach) were put into place in May 1998. In January 2000, the TTA initiated a monitoring process. In September 2000, a General Teaching Council (GTC) was established in England. The GTC(E) is a professional body with elected membership including teacher training faculty whose role is to advise the Secretary of State, who has a specific responsibility for ensuring a supply of teachers for the schools in the public sector. Consequently, the Secretary acts to determine the criteria for entry into teacher education.

The GTC(E) is involved, along with many other organizations, in the consultations regarding changes in the OfSTED initial teacher education framework. The implementation and inspection system has attracted considerable attention and criticism,

especially among faculty at teacher training institutions. As one British educator noted, "It is not the Framework itself which has attracted most criticism. Rather, it is the way it has been put into operation which has caused some providers to question OfSTED's effectiveness" (Blake, 2001, p. 31). Criticisms include too many inspections, too narrow a focus, a lack of qualified inspectors, bias, an immediate impact on funding, and a move to an atomistic view of teaching rather than a holistic one. Mike Newby, UCET's chair (1998-2001), summarized the teacher educator's view of the current system in a letter to the Rt. Honorable Estelle Morris, MP, then Minister of State Department of Education & Employment, in the following manner:

In summary, it has been our experience that the current system of OfSTED inspections: a) is far too frequent, b) is over zealous in re-inspecting provision already found to be 'good,' c) is inconsistent, frameworks having changed frequently, sometimes even during an inspection, so making robust comparisons difficult to achieve, d) inhibits improvement because of its frequency. (Newby, 2000)

In England, OfSTED's inspection model and the TTA's implementation of policy are seen by many teacher training faculty as authoritarian. Mr. Chris Woodhead of OfSTED and Ms. Anthea Millett of the TTA were viewed as anti-teacher education and not interested in creating a dialogue or partnership with the providers. Tensions between both organizations and faculty at teacher training institutions have been quite sharp. As one educator noted, "Any flaws in the operation of the Framework have been exacerbated by an approach to management within OfSTED, which has been widely regarded as unsympathetic and harsh in its view of teacher education providers" (Blake, 2001, p. 34). Now that Woodhead and Millett have left their positions, the dialogue appears to have softened.

Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland are under similar inspection systems. Higher standards, quality assurance methods, and inspection are common characteristics; however, the acrimony between government agencies and teacher training institutions appears to be less than in England. Collaboration across the system appears to be the

goal, with a basis of teaching seen as an explicit commitment to high professional values. Criticism among teacher training institutions also appears to be less. This may be in part due to the fact that Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland have smaller educational systems with fewer institutions and schools.

The United States

Compared to the United Kingdom, the inspection and approval system in the United States is a more decentralized system with considerable control by the individual 50 states. Each of the states has an agency whose purposes are to oversee the education of children and youth and to ensure that qualified educators are in the schools. Universities that provide teachers for the state must meet standards established by the state. On a regular schedule, each teacher education program is reviewed by the state to determine whether or not the program meets minimum state standards. In between site visits, institutions provide reports and updates to the state. While the de-certification of a teacher education program is rare, it can occur.

Compared to the United Kingdom, especially England, individual U.S. teacher education programs have more freedom in determining how best to meet state teaching requirements. Curriculum remains the purview of the faculty in the program, as does the length of the program. As a result, there is diversity among teacher education programs within a particular state, but state licensure examinations constrain variability.

The decentralized authority and the diversity in teacher education programs does not mean that the 50 states do not share a set of common standards, because in reality they do. The National Council for the Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE), one of two national accrediting agencies, sets standards for teacher education and shapes teacher education programs nationally. NCATE accredits about 600 teacher education programs, out of a total of about 1,300. These programs represent a wide range of institutions from small liberal arts colleges to large research universities. NCATE has experienced an increase in membership and in the number of institutions seeking membership during the past decade.

The federal government also shapes teacher education policy. Title II requires states and institutions to report on teacher licensing. Institutions must report how well

individuals who complete a teacher preparation program perform on certification assessments and other factors (USDE, 2000). This national report card will show how teacher candidates in various programs across the nation compare on a set of indicators. The first report under this legislation will be sent to Congress in April 2002.

Implementing Reform: Teacher Education's Response

In both the United Kingdom and the United States, teacher educators are responding to demands for reform on both an institutional and national organization level. In the United Kingdom, teacher education programs have modified curricula and sought to strengthen teacher education programs. A considerable amount of time and resources are allocated to ensuring that OfSTED inspections go well, that the institution is assessed fairly, and that communication with the OfSTED is maintained. At the national level, the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) provides the organizational structure for teacher educators to meet, discuss, and attempt to shape educational policy. During the past 15 years, the focus has been on addressing the advancing authority of the OfSTED and the TTA. Teacher educators have also sought to influence government policy and actions relative to teacher education, particularly the frequency and methods of government inspections.

American teacher educators are also responding to the call to enhance the quality of teachers. Like their colleagues in the United Kingdom, American teacher educators address reform issues from both institutional and national perspectives. Individually, each teacher education program addresses state standards and provides documentation to the state regarding its success in doing so. Ensuring that graduates meet licensure requirements is a major stimulus of curriculum reform and renewal at the institutional level. Compared to the United Kingdom, inspections come less often in the United States and are more global in their assessment of the various teacher preparation programs. However, with the emergence of the accountability measures of Title II, university departments of education may begin to feel additional pressure.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) represents teacher education programs at the national level. More than 740 liberal arts colleges, state universities, and research institutions are members of AACTE. These institutions produce about two thirds of new school personnel each year. As the sole national organization representing the institutional interests of collegiate-based teacher education, AACTE gathers and disseminates data, proposes and analyzes public policy

initiatives, supports professional advancement and networking, and represents the teacher education community before state and national governments.

Teacher Education in the United Kingdom and the United States: Similarities and Differences

Teacher education is being carefully and critically examined in both the United Kingdom and the United States. Reform efforts have impacted teacher education somewhat differently in the two countries, but there are also many similarities in the nature of teacher education. The following is a brief summary of similarities and differences in what is happening with teacher education in the two countries.

Similarities

- *Declining support for higher education.* Teacher preparation does not exist as an isolated unit. The plight of the university as a whole impacts what happens to teacher education. In the United States, most state allocations to higher education institutions have remained constant or declined in recent years, with state funds representing a smaller percentage of an institution's budget than in the past. Thus, private donations and federal support in the form of research grants have become crucial. At the same time, the public is demanding that tuition costs be reduced and that higher education provide better services for the cost (Matthews, 1999). The United Kingdom is also exploring how higher education can be supported. The London *Times* suggested that "privatized universities and a graduate levy are two of the favoured options for higher education over the next decade" (Goddard, 2001).
- *Perceived loss of academic freedom.* The tradition of higher education in both countries has been that of academic freedom. Newby characterized the period in the 1960s and before in the United Kingdom as one "of almost complete *laissez faire*, in which the universities and teacher training colleges could do much as they wished" (Newby, 2000). This was also the case in the United States. As governments in both countries began scrutinizing teacher education programs, many teacher educators felt the autonomy they previously enjoyed was being threatened (Imig, 2000).
- *Increasing demand for teachers.* Both countries are experiencing teacher shortages. In the United Kingdom, the highest demand is in urban schools. In the United States, there is an aggregate over-supply of elementary teachers in most states, but a shortage

of special education teachers and teachers in the sciences and mathematics. Urban areas and some states with rapid population growth face shortages (Laitsch, 2001).

- *Holistic vs. atomized views of teacher education.* In both countries, there are conflicting views of teacher education. Teacher educators' view the preparation of teachers as professional development (holistic perspective) rather than as a training program that can be broken down into a set of skills and actions (atomized perspective) (NCTAF, 1996; Berliner, 2000; Reid, 2001). Some policy makers and reform groups adopt the atomized perspective, and view teacher preparation as a program to develop a set of specific teaching skills to be learned and continued in the classroom (Abell, 2001). This dichotomy of beliefs permeates the literature in both the United States and England.
- *Distaste for high stakes testing and monitoring.* The teacher education literature in both countries reflects concern about high stakes testing and monitoring (Kohn, 2001; Ohanian, 1999). In the United States, teacher educators have been concerned that the emphasis on standardized tests designed to measure student knowledge leaves too much of what a student knows untested. A similar distaste exists for the inspection-linked-to-funding model employed in the United Kingdom. Today, preparation programs must comply with the inspection standards or face the possibility of reduced funding or withdrawal of accreditation to offer initial teacher education programs. However, even though most teacher educators share a general distaste for tests, inspections, and rankings, this is an issue that can divide teacher educators. David Imig spoke to this issue as it relates to the reporting system for Title II in the United States. He wrote:

Perhaps the fallout from the Title II reporting was inevitable – with institutions using the results to set themselves apart from their “competitors.” The same people who previously denigrated single measures and standardized tests now claim the tests actually say something meaningful about the quality of their programs. (Imig, 2001)

While the literature in teacher education cautions about the impact of testing on students, testing continues as a major means for accountability. And there are many outside the teacher education community who view testing as positive (Phelps, 1999).

- *Lack of recognition for improvement*¹. Teacher educators in the United States and the United Kingdom frequently contend that teacher educators get little credit for the improvements that have been made in the preparation programs over the past years (McDavis, 2000). They assert that beginning teachers are better prepared than ever before in history; they know more content, and they know more about how to teach the content. Nevertheless, this fact is not always recognized, and advocates for change seldom seek out those in charge of the current system for advice and counsel. While such little attention to past performance is not unique to teacher education, many teacher educators feel that the steady progress made in improving the profession should at least be acknowledged, and that those who suggest that little improvement has been made do not understand the complex nature of teaching and teacher education (Ben-Peretz, 2001).
- *Changing relationships with schools*. In both the United Kingdom and the United States, public schools are becoming more influential in the preparation of beginning teachers and the on-going training of practicing teachers. Initial teacher preparation was once the purview of higher education in collaboration with selected schools, where students were placed to practice under the guidance of experienced teachers. However, the balance of university work and experience in the classroom for preservice teachers is shifting. In England, the Secretary of State increased the number of hours students must spend on-site in the schools and established additional criteria for what the students must do to qualify to become a teacher. Teacher training institutions are required to pay their partnership schools a sum of money for each student placed in a school. These funds must be taken from the institution's own funding base.

The relationship between teacher education programs and schools is also changing in the United States. Since the 1980s, teacher education renewal literature

¹ The comments here are based in part on conversations with teacher educators in the United Kingdom and the United States, and the author's personal experiences as Chairman of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1998-1999.

has recommended new collaborative partnerships with public schools that would create sites for initial preparation, continuing professional education, and educational research. Drawing upon the English experiences in developing partnerships with schools, the leaders of the Holmes Group (1986) designed a partnership model for the United States. At approximately the same time, John Goodlad (1994) made school-university partnerships a core element of his school renewal model. Discussion surrounding these models led to stronger working relationships between teacher preparation institutions and schools, and the actual time preservice teachers spent in schools increased dramatically.

American policy makers have moved directly to ensure that higher education and public schools collaborate. Many federal programs for teacher preparation – for example, programs funded by the National Science Foundation – require K-12 and higher education partnerships. And emerging legislation continues to trend toward shifting funds away from higher education and to the public schools.

- *A common set of national organizational goals.* The national organizations representing teacher educators in the United Kingdom (UCET) and the United States (AACTE) share common goals. Both organizations and the individual institutions they represent seek to provide high quality teachers for the classrooms of the United Kingdom and the United States. They share their respective governments' goals of encouraging high-quality entrants to the profession, improving initial teacher education, and providing rigorous and relevant professional development for in-service teachers. The UCET and AACTE also share frustration that they are not always included in discussions that shape policy. As representatives of institutions involved in teacher education and training, critics see them as proponents of the status quo.

Both organizations represent a broad range of institutions, which do not all share the same traditions, status, and level of resources. The institutions have different missions and sizes that may lead to varying views of teacher education. The 90 institutions in the United Kingdom are probably more closely aligned when compared to the over 1,300 institutions in the United States. Both UCET and AACTE, however,

are confronted with the issue of how best to build a stronger community of common interests.

Differences

While teacher educators in the United Kingdom and the United States share similar perspectives on the current teacher education reform agenda, there are some differences in the two countries.

- *School reform.* The United Kingdom has been involved in school reform longer than the United States. Standards-based testing and inspections, a part of the teacher preparation system in the United Kingdom since the mid-1800s, was implemented long before such efforts in the United States. Similar events are taking place in the United States today, but because of the size of the country and the autonomy of the states, the issues of standards, assessment, and accountability have moved forward at a more uneven pace. And as high-stakes testing becomes prevalent across the country, concerns are being voiced. For example, in the state of Washington a coalition of parents is seeking to have the Washington Assessment of Standard Learning (WASL) stopped. In Maryland, some observers argue that because of the emphasis on testing in the schools, by eighth grade some “students have become cynical and even hostile toward their schools and the adults in them” (Chenoweth, 2001, p. T19). In addition, professional journals contain an increasing number of articles about the negative impact of standardized testing and accountability systems (Kohn, 2001).
- *Centralization.* The systems of government and higher education in the two countries are also quite different. The United Kingdom has a more centralized government with fewer institutions of higher education than in the United States, and those institutions are regulated by government agencies that can directly determine the fate of an institution. The British also have a more uniform teacher education curriculum for all institutions to follow. Student choice in the teacher education curriculum is much more limited than in the United States.

The American system of government and higher education is more decentralized with greater flexibility among teacher education institutions. States retain final say in the accreditation of teacher education programs and teacher licensure, however, and

there is a strong trend toward a common licensure structure, certification standards, and examinations related to content and pedagogical knowledge. Currently, American faculties, compared to their British colleagues, have more choice about program and courses; however, the variance is becoming smaller. This trend may continue as schools and teachers' unions become more powerful in shaping teacher training and professional development. For example, the American Federation of Teachers' report *Assuring Teacher Quality: It's Union Work* presents a set of recommendations for teacher education (AFT, 1998). The National Education Association's *Keys to Excellence For Your Schools* is a self-assessment instrument that provides guidance for continuing professional education (NEA, 2001). Colleges and universities are linking with the unions to become the providers for the prescribed professional development.

- *Funding and resources.* For institutions in the United Kingdom, major funding comes from one source: the government. In England, the TTA serves as the funding body for teacher training. A single assessment grade on a particular standard can have dire funding consequences for the institution. The TTA's funds go directly to teacher preparation and cannot be used for other higher education needs at the providing institution. Funding in the United States is more diverse. A teacher education program is part of a school, college, or department of education in a college or university. The college or university is funded from a variety of public and private sources. Funds allocated to the university are then distributed to the teacher education unit. While failure of teacher candidates to pass certification can have dramatic implications, most programs are given an opportunity to make the needed changes in order to comply. Also, national accreditation remains voluntary in most states; therefore, failure to be accredited by NCATE does not result in program termination.
- *Focused criticism.* Two government agencies – OfSTED and the TTA - are largely responsible for teacher education in England, and teacher education professionals can respond to these two agencies when criticisms are directed at teacher education. Teacher educators in England also seem quite comfortable criticizing government agencies and government leaders personally. In the United States, critics of teacher education are widely dispersed across the states, the federal government, think tanks,

and accrediting agencies. Thus, while colleagues in the United Kingdom have few authorities to whom they report, American teacher educators have many.

Trends for the Future

Current education reform efforts are likely to continue well into this decade. The United Kingdom, especially England, is farther along in their inspection system than colleagues in the United States. National testing of American teachers is yet to be implemented, and the impact of Title II has just begun to be felt across the field. Teacher educators in the United Kingdom are currently meeting with the government to assess the first full round of the assessments on the new system, and it is expected that similar assessment efforts will occur in the United States.

The push for indicators of quality will mean that teacher educators on both sides of the Atlantic must address the question “Do certified teachers make a difference in student learning?” As Wilkin (1999) notes, “The socio-political and economic conditions of the present time require us to speak more effectively and more accessibly to the wider community” (p. 2). While philosophical discussions should continue, the public is more interested in successful student achievement than in broad issues of teacher preparation. Teacher educators must be willing and able to talk with the public about why an investment in teacher preparation is necessary.

While grappling with how to effectively respond to demands for reform, teacher educators in the United Kingdom and the United States will also face continued pressures from new education providers who want a piece of the huge teacher education marketplace. In both countries, significant resources are spent on preparing new teachers and providing professional development for inservice teachers. As global conditions call for increased competition, and access to information and learning materials become easier with new technologies, new players will enter the market and compete with traditional teacher education programs.

In the United Kingdom, the Open University has a long history of providing alternatives to traditional models. In the fall of 2003, Britain will open a new university – the Combined Universities of Cornwall – that will offer both traditional classroom courses and a distance-education curriculum (Birchard, 2001). There is a high probability that other online programs will be developed to enable students to meet TTA standards without having to attend the university. Schools in alliance with these providers and

universities will be able to offer programs that meet government standards and teachers' needs.

The growth in nontraditional teacher education programs is even more evident in the United States. AACTE, in response to this growth, recently amended its membership policy to allow for-profit institutions to join the association. As some traditional higher education institutions face declining enrollments, they are exploring new ways to enroll students from around the world. The teacher shortage is another impetus for creating nontraditional programs. The state of California, in response to its teacher shortage, has created Cal State Teach, a program utilizing both Web-based and campus-based programs.

Because the United Kingdom has been dealing with school reform issues somewhat longer than the United States, teacher educators in the United States should watch the outcomes of the educational reform efforts occurring in the United Kingdom. Is education improving? Or, are the divisions increasing between the rich and poor? Is teaching and teacher education becoming a set of skills learned during practice? Or, is there a more innovative model for preparing teachers for a very complex classroom environment?

Finally, UCET and AACTE face a challenging future as they attempt to represent diverse teacher education programs that are tied to the broader issues of the academy. England's assessment and priority system clearly marks "winners" and "losers." Winners get high marks, funding, and possibly less inspection. Losers are threatened with loss of livelihood. Such means of accountability make it difficult to bring members together. The same conditions hold true for AACTE, which represents the full spectrum of institutions of higher education. Divisions among schools, colleges, and departments of education at these institutions are based on a long history of differences in missions, student populations, and perceived academic status. The reporting requirements of Title II reports, as noted earlier, may further fuel divisions among members.

Conclusion

Teacher education is in the midst of significant change resulting from a variety of social and political factors. The long-term impact of current education reform efforts is still unknown, but what is evident is that teacher education on both sides of the Atlantic is in transition; it is in that no-man's-land between an old system and a new reality. The old system in which teacher education programs operated with greater autonomy is gone, and many teacher educators are concerned about what the new reality may be. As William Bridges notes, however, "... the neutral zone (that place between the old reality and the new) is the individual's and organization's best chance for creativity, renewal, and development" (Bridges, 1991). All of these will be needed for teacher education to remain a relevant force in preparing educators for the classroom.

References

- Abell (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore, MD: Abell Foundation.
- ACE (1999). *To touch the future: Transforming the way teachers are taught*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- AFT (1998). *Assuring teacher quality: It's union work*. New York, NY: American Federation of Teachers.
- Apple, M. (2001). Markets, standards, teaching, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 52(3): 182-195.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2001). The impossible role of teacher educators in a changing world. *Journal of Teacher Education* 52(1): 48-56.
- Berliner, D. (2000). A personal response to those who bash teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 51(5): 358-371.
- Birchard, K. (2001) The new British university, in Cornwall, will offer classroom and distance courses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 9, 2001.
- Blake, D. (2001). *British perspective on the inspection of initial teacher education*. London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.
- Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Chenoweth, K. (2001). In wake of MSPAP testing, cynicism and secrecy in abundance. *WashingtonPost.com*. May 10, 2001.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). The questions that drive reform (editorial). *Journal of Teacher Education* 51(5): 331-333.
- Earley, P. (2000). Finding the culprit: Federal policy and teacher education. *Educational Policy* 14(1): 25-39.
- Foxwell, E. (1993). Making the grade: Teacher education's role in achieving the national education goals. ERIC Digest. (ED358069).
- Friedman, T. (2000). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goddard, A. (2001). Graduates' levy may fill £1billion gap. *London Times, Higher Education Supplement*. London, England.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

- Imig, D. (2000). Shifting accountability expectations. *AACTE Briefs* (21)3: 2.
- Imig, D. (2001). We're in this together: Building a community of common interest. *AACTE Briefs* 22(5), 2.
- Imig, D. (2000). Education schools nationwide faced with year of challenges. *AACTE Briefs* (21)9: 1.
- Kohn, A. (2001). Fighting the tests: A practical guide to recusing our schools. *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(5), 348-257.
- Koppich, J. E. (2001). Investing in teaching: A common agenda. Washington, DC: National Alliance of Business.
- Laitsch, D. (2001). Press club panel discusses teacher shortages. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Lewis, M. (2001). Remarks: UCET Symposium. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Dallas, Texas.
- Matthews, A. (1999). *Bright college years: Inside the American campus today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McDavis, R. (2000). Notes from the chair. *AACTE Briefs* (21)8: 2.
- Moon, B. (1998). The English exception: International perspectives on the initial education and training of teachers. London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.
- NCEE (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- NEA (2001). Keys to excellence for your school. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Newby, M. (2000). Making a difference in the learning of all students: An English perspective. Symposium at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago. (See Appendix A.)
- Newby, M. (2000). Letter.
- Newby, M. (2001). Saving private time. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Dallas, TX.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). Teaching for America's future. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Ohanian, S. (1999). News from the test resistance trail. *Phi Delta Kappan* (82)5: 363-366.
- Phelps, R. (1999). Why testing experts hate testing. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

- Rabin, J. (1996). *Bad land: An American romance*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Ravitch, D. (1983). *The trouble crusade: American education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Raymond, M. (2001). *Teach for America: An evaluation of teacher differences and student outcomes in Houston, Texas*. Palo Alto, CA: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Reid, I. (2001). *The neglect of the ITE student in the reform of ITE in England and Wales in the 1990s*. London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.
- Rice, J. M. (1969). *The public school system of the United States*. New York: Arno Press.
- US Congress (1994). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC: United States Congress.
- US Congress (1994). *Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology (PT3)*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress.
- US Department of Education (2000). *Reference and reporting guide for preparing state and institutional reports on the quality of teacher preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act, NCES 2000-089*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *Teaching the teachers: Different settings, different results*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Services.
- Wilkin, M. (1999). *The role of higher education in initial teacher education*. London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

Appendix A: UCET SYMPOSIUM

A presentation delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 2000, Chicago.

Making a Difference in the Learning of All Students: An English Perspective

Mike Newby

Dean: Faculty of Arts & Education, University of Plymouth

Chair: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)

Welcome to this Symposium. I'm the Chair of the British equivalent of AACTE – UCET: the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers. I'm here to set the scene and to introduce my colleagues.

All of them will briefly address the Symposium and then I shall invite discussion. I do hope you will feel able to contribute to what we intend should be a sharing of views across the Atlantic. I expect that, as we do from our side, so you from yours will find it valuable to look at your own experience through the mirror of someone else's, being able to see in that your own situation in a new way. And this, reciprocally, is what we hope for, too, on our side.

For our situations, though different, are of course largely similar in that they aim for the same things: the education and training of the next generation of teachers, the professional development of those already in the profession, the undertaking of research into the nature, processes and function of education in our society; and through all this, better education for our children and young people, and a better education service for those who work within it.

We in the universities, on both sides of the Atlantic, have a powerful responsibility: it is to us, finally, that politicians, funders and policy-makers look as they test the value of their education service. For if things are not seen to be going right, eventually the problem is (so they would like to think) traced back to its source - which is the beginning of it all, here in the universities and colleges of education. If we get things wrong, then the next generation of teachers will, in some way, be flawed - so runs the argument. And for that reason if for no other, we find ourselves the constant object of scrutiny, regulation and legislation.

In the UK, at least in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland (for Scotland is a northern place with a law of its own), we have moved from a situation in the 1960s and before of almost complete *laissez faire*, in which the Universities and Teacher Training Colleges could do much as they wished, to the present situation, in which there is very little we may do without permission. We must surely be one of the most regulated systems for the

education and training of teachers in the world today. Our funding depends on our meeting strict standards and we are inspected regularly to ensure it. It has been called 'funding with menaces.'

This poses a question of *balance*. Where, on the continuum between *laissez faire* (some call it, proudly, 'academic freedom,' meaning: 'Keep your distance! You outside the academy have no right to a view since you are not experts as are we inside,' to, at the other end, *complete regulation*, in which we in the universities and schools may only do as we are told to do, and may not do what has been prohibited (and in which those outside the academy say: 'Do as you're told if you expect us to pay your wages!'))?

Now, in the UK we have not yet reached that second, melancholy position. But some of us think we have moved perilously close. One of the main tasks of the organisation we represent is to try to persuade our politicians and policy-makers that, unless some halt is called to this tendency to the extreme ends of regulation, we will end up killing the very organism we are trying to cure. We will find an increasing number of talented men and women turned away from preparing to teach because they do not find the training process (surely, a window to the profession as a whole) sufficient to tempt their talents and convictions and their wish to make personal decisions and explorations. We will also find a Higher Education sector unprepared to innovate, experiment or take risks for fear of regulatory reprisal.

So what exactly is the nature of the possible over-regulation about which I am talking? And what are doing in our country to try to keep the flame alight? Where is the ghost in the machine? It is largely around these questions that our speakers today will talk to you, and after which we can talk together.

*

Our first speaker is **Mary Russell**, the Secretary of UCET. Rather as is David Imig for teacher educators in the USA, so Mary, as its Secretary, is for their colleagues in the UK. She stands at the hub of most of what goes on in the education and training of teachers in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. It is to Mary that UCET members from around the country turn when they need advice about how to respond to the latest government agency directive; Mary to whom government agencies address their requests for information; Mary to whom the press will often come in the hope of news unknown to others, and of comment on current issues regarding teacher training. No one has a better view of the system as a whole.

Mary Russell
Secretary: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)

Mike has mentioned and Malcolm will also refer to the very regulated system of teacher training we have in England and Wales, and the stranglehold the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) and the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) have on how we run

our courses. As you know, all courses of initial teacher training offered by higher education institutions in England and Wales are run in partnership with schools – a system which universities had, in fact, been working towards long before the creation of the TTA and the decision by the government to impose a (very different) system of partnerships.

UCET members agree that, properly organised and properly funded, partnerships between HEIs and schools are the most effective way of training students to become teachers. Where we disagree with the government is with the particular model they have imposed through their agencies and the minute detail in which they are inspected by OfSTED. We have to work in far too tight a straitjacket, and are pushed towards a very technicist model of teacher training – not teacher *education*, please note. This is despite the fact that even research recently commissioned by the government from Hay McBer shows that knowledge of one's subject is not sufficient to make a good teacher.

For instance, we feel that the system we have makes it difficult for student teachers to develop the necessary conceptual and analytical abilities.

Our constant reiteration of the reductionist effect of the current model has helped to lead towards a review of the Circular that determines the ITT requirements which we have to fulfill in every detail and on which providers are minutely inspected. This review will take effect by September 2002. Too slow for many of us. Some changes, however, will take effect this September, as the government realised – mainly because people like our Academic Secretary, John Tomlinson, pointed it out to them – that the new routes into teaching that they had created would not fit their own requirements as set out in Circular 4/98. Thus, as you see, changes we in the system want will take three years, while changes having to be made because the government's own bright ideas won't fit their own requirements can be made in nine months!

Changes we want to be made to the requirements, and which we feel will lead towards a more effective process of teacher education and training and of students' learning to become more effective teachers, should include the opportunity for institutions to develop courses with curriculum breadth, depth, and balance and not be limited to the core subjects and ICT. This is especially important in primary courses which have gradually been squeezed to such an extent that we fear that they can no longer develop teachers capable of teaching the whole primary curriculum. This, in turn, is producing an increase in the dropout rate from able students dissatisfied with the narrowness of the curriculum provision (as Ivan will show in his talk). We think the standards in Circular 4/98 should be revised and streamlined, and the tension between the interpretation of the standards by TTA and by OfSTED through inspection methodology should be resolved. Institutions often feel caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

Most particularly we feel that the current developments in identifying standards across the profession – for qualified teacher status through initial teacher training, for induction, for special needs co-ordinators, for the performance thresholds teachers will now need to

cross to achieve higher pay, for headship – should all reflect common values and understanding about the nature of teaching.

The government, through TTA, has created several routes into teaching in an attempt to bring in people who do not want to, or cannot, take the traditional routes (the three- or four-year undergraduate route leading to a bachelors degree plus qualified teacher status; or the one- or two-year postgraduate certificate in education, leading to QTS). Several new routes have been tried, and currently these include the graduate employment route, whereby graduates can, in effect, go into a school, be paid as an unqualified teacher and do their training simultaneously – this route, not surprisingly, has caused great interest amongst debt-ridden students. There is also the postgraduate modular route. The latter caused great interest amongst universities initially, as they were all aware of groups of people they could bring in through such a route, but the interest waned to some extent when it was realised that the emphasis was to be on training tailored to individuals, not to groups. This of course is extremely expensive in time, effort and cost for the HEI. Quite how it will work out, we will have to wait and see.

The government is keen on diversity of routes, to reach the thousands of brilliant people they are convinced are out there somewhere, waiting for the chance to come into teaching, but who are not prepared or not able to take the traditional routes. And they are prepared to provide money in the form of bursaries, golden hellos, etc., etc. – though only for those going into the teaching of shortage subjects (maths, science, modern foreign languages). There are two points here I feel:

- one is that, whilst clearly different models have to be considered, one person's diversity may be another person's chaos;
- the other is that I'm sure that the money would be better spent in going towards a teacher training salary for all student teachers, thus putting teaching on a par with most other professions, and helping to solve the financial constraints which lead to problems of recruitment and retention².

*

Mike Newby

Mary has given you a brief view of some of the frustrations which we in the profession feel at some of the attempts by successive UK governments to encourage more people into an ever more regulated and inspected system. But all is not gloom! Universities are too ingenious for that. Our next speaker, **Malcolm Lewis**, is responsible for a programme of teacher education in the University of Bristol, which, while observing the government's requirements, nonetheless does all it can to keep faith with the realities of

² Since preparing this part of the symposium, the government has announced that training salaries *will* be paid to all those training on the postgraduate route (the PGCE) from September 2000. In the case of primary trainees, this will be for a one-year pilot. So UCET's long-argued case has finally been won. However, the victory is only partial: we had argued that trainee salaries should also be paid to those on the final year of the four-year undergraduate route, the BEd or the BA (with QTS). Government has not gone this far, and we are now very anxious about the future of the undergraduate route. It is not impossible that this announcement will have the effect of swapping one crisis for another.

the profession to which its students aspire. He's called his talk: *Beyond regulation: retrieving professionalism in teacher education in England and Wales.*

Malcolm Lewis

Director: Post Graduate Certificate in Education, University of Bristol

Chair: UCET Secondary Committee

I will briefly address the training curriculum imposed on teacher education in England and Wales, which many of us feel is unwieldy, over-prescriptive, and mechanistic. We find ourselves having to work with a model of teacher education and professional qualification which is almost entirely functional and instrumental in conception. A colleague of mine calls it the 'teacher as technician' model. The question we wrestle with every day is: 'How do we meet all the statutory requirements but at the same time remain faithful to what we believe professional education should also include?'

I need to start by saying something about the regulations in force in England and Wales. Initial teacher training is governed by statutory requirements which have the force of law. They control, among other things, the length of courses, their content, the system of external inspection of their quality and compliance with the requirements, the academic qualifications needed to enter training, and the standards new teachers must achieve for professional qualification. At the heart of the regulations are these Standards for Qualified Teacher Status. The standards are an attempt to list all the capabilities a teacher must demonstrate under four headings:

- subject knowledge
- planning, teaching and class management
- monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting and accountability
- other professional requirements

Here are a few examples. Newly-qualified teachers must:

- have a detailed knowledge and understanding of the National Curriculum for schools
- plan opportunities to contribute to pupils' personal, spiritual, moral, social and cultural development
- plan their teaching to achieve progression in pupils' learning
- monitor and intervene when teaching to ensure sound learning and discipline
- use teaching methods which sustain the momentum of pupils' work and keep all pupils engaged
- mark and monitor pupils' assigned classwork and homework, providing constructive oral and written feedback, and setting targets for pupils' progress
- have a working knowledge and understanding of teachers' professional duties and their legal liabilities and responsibilities
- set a good example to the pupils they teach, through their presentation and their personal and professional conduct.

There are well over 60 standards like this, together with detailed curricula for English, maths and science teachers, and information and communications technology for everyone. In addition, national tests of numeracy, literacy and information technology are being introduced, which all teacher candidates must pass. It is a formidable set of requirements, particularly for one-year post-graduate training courses.

Looking at those standards, you may be thinking, 'What's wrong with any of that?' The problem is that the QTS standards see only the individual trees and never the whole wood. The list atomises professional competence into discrete functional prescriptions without suggesting what is vitally needed to forge such discrete elements into effective professional practice. What concerns me most about the standards is their almost total omission of those skills, habits of mind, and personal qualities which are central to the development of truly professional expert teachers. There is no vision of what is needed for teachers to go beyond mere competence and become truly creative in their work, or, indeed, to be inspired by it and to inspire their pupils. I do not believe the government's model can properly be called a framework for new teachers' *professional education*. I would call it a framework for *occupational training*. It is highly significant that all the official documents call our beginning teachers *trainees*. I insist on calling them *students*. They see our beginning teachers as people proving their fitness to be licenced. I see them as students within a higher education system, at the beginning of an engagement in career-long professional learning and development. The government's approach is driven by standardisation, compliance and point-in-time assessment. Ours is driven by inquiry, mentoring, and progressive and continuously assessed professional, personal and academic development.

So, how are we dealing with this deficient model of initial teacher education? The course I run at Bristol University is a one-year postgraduate course training secondary school teachers. The course must be at least 36 weeks long, and students must spend at least 24 weeks of this in our partnership schools. We are left with 12 weeks of university-based work, of which just over half is timetabled for work in the subject a student will be teaching.

Alongside the subject method work there is a core programme for all students called Educational and Professional Studies (EPS). The vast majority of the work is done in schools, supervised by teacher-mentors, and is essentially practical. The whole programme is designed to start every beginning teacher on becoming a reflective practitioner, taking students beyond the standards into areas of professional learning which the standards ignore. You could also see it as being concerned with developing what a colleague calls 'pedagogical intelligence.' There is, of course, a whole literature on professional learning which underpins this, but I'm sorry to say the government has consistently poured scorn on much of this, stigmatising it as 'barmy' or 'wacky' theory. That does not help.

Our EPS programme is divided into four Strands:

- Frameworks for Learning
- Pastoral Care in Schools

- Developing as a Professional
- Special Educational Needs

Frameworks for Learning is concerned with the learning process and with the business of classroom observation: developing good eyes and ears with which to learn about the relationship between what a teacher does and what (and how) children learn. Students undertake lesson observations and document them in observation instruments they must design, and write analytically about their own professional learning.

Pastoral Care in Schools requires students to investigate such things as child protection, bullying, equal opportunities, behaviour and discipline policies, counselling, home-school links. The tasks here include data-gathering by interviewing experienced teachers, direct observation and role shadowing, and personal experience of class tutor work. We run a day-long intensive introduction to child protection involving social workers, police, medical experts, and others.

Developing as a Professional requires students to turn the spotlight on themselves, analysing critical personal incidents which raise issues of status, or self-image, or professionalism, or role demarcation. 'My preferred dress code is at odds with what my practice school expects'; 'A supervising teacher intervened in one of my lessons and completely undermined my authority. What can I do about this?' Very recently a student came to discuss how to deal with a case of sexual harassment from an established teacher in the practice school. These are real and pressing issues for novice professionals.

Special Educational Needs requires students to investigate the learning profiles of two or three individual pupils, developing an understanding of their personal, social, and educational histories, as well as building knowledge of the school's special needs support structures, procedures and methods.

What all this is designed to do is to ensure that every student embarks on professional behaviour which they can build on throughout their career. Essentially, we encourage them to be researchers of their own and others' practice. Through it, students develop dimensions of professionalism which are almost completely absent from the government's QTS standards. It requires them to be *enterprising, self-aware, enquiring, intuitive, analytical, methodical, reflective, imaginative, creative, sceptical, aware of alternative approaches, responsive to guidance, and independent*. You will not find any of these words in the language of the QTS standards. And yet, these are precisely the kind of qualities that we all know expert professionals need.

The strange thing is that within the United Kingdom there is an alternative framework to the QTS standards. The picture in Northern Ireland is rather different from England and Wales. One of the working papers leading to the formulation of the Northern Ireland framework includes this very reassuring sentence:

The atomisation of professional knowledge, judgment and skill into discrete competences inevitably fails to capture the essence of professional competence.

The Northern Ireland version of the formal requirements is called Arrangements for Initial Teacher Education. Please note: teacher *education* and not *training*. This speaks volumes. Second, and unlike the English/Welsh version, the approach sees beyond pre-service training to the teacher's first appointment and, further, to the early years of professional development. It presents an integrated vision of professional learning which is *developmental* and *progressive*, to which new teachers can aspire over time. It reflects a sophisticated view of professional socialisation. Most important of all, there is a list of the 'underlying qualities of the teacher which enable him or her to pull together the individual competences and apply them in the professional context.' Here is a flavour of some of those 'underlying qualities' included in the Northern Ireland document:

- likes and cares for children, and seeks to promote the development of the whole child
- is enthusiastic about teaching and is committed to the value of the educational process
- possesses high professional standards
- is open to the possibilities of change and innovation
- has a lively mind and a range of cultural, intellectual and other interests
- has self-confidence arising from the ability to give a reasoned justification for actions
- is sensitive to the emotional dimension of interaction with children and others
- is able to integrate a wide range of knowledge and skills

There are ten or so more like these. This, it seems to me, gets close to what characterises powerful professionals - teachers whose command of essential functional skills and knowledge is underpinned by the skills, habits of mind, values, and attitudes which enable them to develop 'pedagogical' and professional intelligence.

Unfortunately, the Northern Ireland framework is not available to teacher educators in England and Wales, and we have to find our own ways of resolving the tension between what we *have* to do and what we *want* to do without falling foul of inspections and the funding controls they drive. There are, in this situation, issues relating to 'academic freedom.' But beyond questions about regulation, compliance and academic autonomy lies a more mundane, yet equally important, question: 'What are the qualities we really want our children's teachers to possess?'

*

Mike Newby

Our next speaker is **Arlene Gilpin**, also from the University of Bristol. As higher education responds to government demands for ever-higher standards of accountability, as it presses more and more students into universities, so the quality of teaching across all

disciplines has come under ever more exacting scrutiny. This has meant that education departments within universities find themselves in a new potential role of much importance: that of being the department most expert within its institution in the theory and practice of learning and teaching. Funding Councils have recently put out to tender for contracts for Subject Centres – expert centres which would see their role as being principally to collect, disseminate and advise members on good practice – and one such is education. For the first time, UCET was approached by a consortium of universities to become a partner in one such bid. It succeeded, and Arlene Gilpin is responsible for its development. The Centre is called *Escalate*.

Arlene Gilpin

Manager, Escalate, the LTSN Centre for Education

Schools and initial training of teachers have been increasingly called to accountability over the past two decades, following a general trend across all the professions. The universities have not been immune to the trend, but the ways in which they have been asked to account for quality have differed.

Britain is seeing a massive change in university education, from an elite system, where thirty years ago about a tenth of school leavers were able to go to university, to a mass system today in which more than thirty percent proceed to university - and not necessarily straight from school. Professions which at one time were trained to certificate or diploma level, such as nursing, are now moving towards being all graduate, with the result that mid-career experts must study for a degree or lose the promotions battle to younger 'better qualified' peers. There is also a growth of numbers from access courses, from people seeking to further their education after a period in work, for a career change, or as a response to redundancy.

Massification and more open access could result in falling standards in universities, and have certainly created the need to re-examine the basic concepts of higher education, its purposes, and the ways in which these can be achieved through teaching and research. This is a debate which is on-going. The question of how to persuade these autonomous universities to regulate themselves for quality has been a stern task for the universities funding councils in England (HEFCE), Scotland (SHEFC), Wales (HEFCW) and Northern Ireland (DENI).

The approach has been varied. Inspection has been a feature, but it has been a different system from that used in schools and initial training in England. In universities, peers from other institutions evaluate teaching in subject areas against the aims and objectives the latter have set themselves. Certainly the framework has been developed by the Quality Assurance Agency (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/>) but through - mostly - consultative means.

However, there has been a trend to try and improve teaching through example and inspiration, based on the funding of different kinds of projects, for example: the *Fund for Developing Teaching and Learning* (FDTL), the *Computers in Teaching Initiative* (CTI) and the *Teaching and Learning Technology Project* (TLTP). These important initiatives have had a strong IT element - responding to the need to provide more teaching to larger

numbers of students as well as the prevailing need for IT-literate workers. However, their influence has been much weaker than was desired.

The CTI was established in 1984 by the Computer Board for universities and research councils and was maintained by the University Grants Committee (UGC). CTI is now funded jointly by the UK funding councils and DENI and aims to encourage the use of computers in the teaching process. CTI supports subject-based project centres. Each centre aims to gather and disseminate information and advise individuals/ departments. CTI provides an important complementary service to TLTP by providing expertise and advice to subject-based user departments, thus increasing the output of TLTP projects (source: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Initiat/CTI/default.htm>).

In February 1992, the Universities Funding Council (UFC) launched the first phase of the *Teaching and Learning Technology Programme*. The UFC allocated £7.5 million a year over three years and universities were invited to bid for funding for projects to develop new methods of teaching and learning through the use of technology. Approximately 160 submissions were received by the UFC, and in August 1992 it was announced that 43 projects were to receive funding under this first phase in 1992-93. Around one quarter of these projects are addressing problems of implementation within single institutions, with staff development being a major component. The remainder of the projects are concerned with courseware development and involve academics from different institutions working as consortia. The size of consortia range from two to 44 members and the projects cover a wide range of subject disciplines.

In April 1993, the Universities Funding Council was split into the four national funding councils, and they agreed jointly to fund a second phase of the programme. The second phase was launched with the same aim as the first, but with the intention of building on the work already being undertaken by the Phase 1 projects. In August 1993 it was announced that a further 33 projects were to be funded totalling £3.75 million in their first year, 1993-94. In Phase 3, announced in February 1998, the focus is on supporting institutions in embedding the use of TLTP materials developed in the earlier phases (source: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Initiat/TLTP/default.htm>).

The *Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning* (FDTL) was launched by HEFCE and DENI in December 1995 to support projects aimed at stimulating developments in teaching and learning and to encourage the dissemination of good practice across the higher education sector. A total of £14 million has been allocated over four years - £8.6 million was allocated to the first phase of projects and £4.1 million for the second phase. Bids were invited from higher education institutions that were able to demonstrate high quality in their educational provision, as judged by the teaching quality assessment exercise. FDTL is the first programme to link quality assessment results to the allocation of funds to the higher education sector.

The FDTL projects are engaged in a wide range of different activities related to teaching and learning. Dissemination of the outcomes of the projects takes many forms, for example: training events, workshops, production of training materials including text and CD-ROM, web sites, email discussion groups, conferences and newsletters. There is a natural link between many of the projects working in the same subject area but also many

projects have come together because they are working on similar educational themes such as:

- lifelong learning
- peer assessment and observation
- transferable skills
- student groupwork.

(source: <http://www.ncteam.ac.uk/fdtl.html>)

The boldest move came in 1999, when the four funding councils agreed jointly to fund a major new initiative: the *Learning and Teaching Support Network* (LTSN) which was to comprise 24 Subject Centres, one Generic Learning and Teaching Centre, and one Technology Implementation Centre (<http://www.ilt.ac.uk/ltsn/index.htm>).

The strategic context of the development of the LTSN includes learning and teaching developments including those referred to above, the funding councils' strategies based on the interest of the wider public, the Government's policy and agenda, the increasing diversity of the student population which has led to new and different approaches to T&L, and the funding councils' interest in assuring high quality teaching in all subjects in all universities.

The LTSN proposes a subject-based route to change, since most academics have subject affiliations, rather than external teaching and learning ones; more resources are therefore needed at this level.

The Subject Centres have a common remit, reflected in a set of principal functions and activities. The precise balance of each Centre's activities should reflect variations in learning and teaching practices across the subject discipline. The principal functions of each Subject Centre will be:

- networking
- promotion and sharing of good practices in learning and teaching
- knowledge brokerage.

Each Subject Centre's principal activities will be:

- Supporting academic practitioners in the subject disciplines by maintaining (and, where appropriate, establishing) networks and effective contacts with relevant higher education institutions (HEIs) throughout the UK.
- Collating and promoting information on good practices for all aspects of teaching, learning, and assessment in the Centre's subject disciplines.
- Promoting C&IT-based approaches to teaching, learning, and assessment including, for example, the use of the World-Wide Web and materials to support distance learning.

- Providing opportunities for professional development in learning and teaching through, for example, workshops, institutional visits, roadshows, swapshops, and consultancy, including an advice service to support practitioners.
- Maintaining effective liaison with relevant professional bodies and subject associations, both within the UK and internationally.
- Ensuring that practitioners in the subject disciplines are aware of current and potential future pedagogic developments, including the use of C&IT.
- Collaborating with cognate Subject Centres to support inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary learning and teaching activity.
- Collaborating with the GLTC to ensure that subject centre staff are aware of pedagogic and technological issues that are generic to all or many subject disciplines.
- Reviewing, advising on, and encouraging discipline-based research and development on learning and teaching, including the use of C&IT, to meet the needs of the disciplines supported by the subject centre.

The LTSN is intended to be the principal route for promotion, dissemination, and transfer of good practice: not just one-stop-shops but first-stop-shops at subject level. The Subject Centres will provide a service known of and used by all academics and support staff in HE.

Escalate, the Education Subject Centre to advance learning and teaching in Education (<http://www.escalate.ac.uk> - from May 1st 2000), is managed by the Universities of Nottingham, Bristol and Oxford Brookes, with the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) and The Universities Association of Continuing Education (UACE) as partners.

Education plays a pivotal role in the development of a learning society, and the work of the Education and Continuing Education departments is of central importance to society's and to the government's plans for this. The context in which professional educators work is rapidly changing and pluralist, reflecting the changes in the professions we serve. The nature of such change needs to be reflected in responsive learning and teaching provision which is accessible and flexible.

Escalate is a resource on innovative practice and theoretical perspectives for educators in all sectors and educational contexts that, in order to help them,

- provides high quality, relevant and appropriate differentiated support for learning;
- identifies points of articulation between the curricula of compulsory and non-compulsory education so as to develop lifelong learning;
- provides support that meets the diverse range of learning needs of an extremely heterogeneous student population.

The Centre is independent of individual institutions, and will become a Centre for all those engaged in Education in Higher Education. Its functions will be threefold:

- the collection of insights, experience, and resources from all sources within the subject, and from all regions – **input**
- the collation of the resources gathered into high-quality support materials – **process**
- the dissemination of material and the promotion of good practice through a variety of knowledge brokerage activities, involving as wide a constituency as possible – **output.**

To put the vision into practice, the Centre will strive to provide the kinds of activities and focus the sector requires, and ensure that all colleagues who wish to contribute to its work know how to do so. To do this they are consulting widely across all Education Departments within the UK. The Centre will be a resource for all Education and Continuing Education Departments, and has a vision of wide participation in its work, facilitating the dissemination of good practice and strengthening the ability of the profession to have a collective role in influencing policy.

It is very early days: *Escalate* was established in January 2000, but already all departments nationwide have been contacted, a web site is close to launch, regional seminars begin in May, a user survey will be circulated in April, and a newsletter is being developed.

The challenges to the Centre are manifold. Education is a complex discipline, with multiple levels, subject affiliations within it and so on. Continuing Education is even more complex. Finding common themes to energize the early work of the Centre has not been an easy task. Furthermore, educators are widely dispersed around the four countries of the UK and Northern Ireland, there are important links with schooling and with the Further Education sector. Creating a dynamic centre to engage with this varied membership will be a challenge.

If the Centre is to be truly effective it must also engage with the wider world of governments, work, commerce, and other professions. We shall certainly be scrutinized, as Education always is, by wider numbers of non-specialists, and part of the function of *Escalate* will be to provide a shop window for Education in Higher Education, not just a first-stop-shop for our membership.

*

Mike Newby

Our final speaker is **Ivan Reid**. Ivan is the Vice-Chair of UCET, a leading researcher into education in the UK, and a sociologist. He is going to talk about some research he's recently completed on the effects of all these policies and practices on the students themselves. They, after all, are what we are all about, so it is fitting that we end our part of the symposium in considering them. He's called his talk *Don't Forget the Students: Ever!*

Ivan Reid

**Schofield Professor of Education at the University of Loughborough
Vice-Chair: UCET**

Experiences prior to and at the AACTE meeting in Chicago quickly convinced me that what I had prepared was very culturally bound. First, because I assumed that 'students' referred to those in higher education, since in England we use the word 'pupil' to denote those attending school. Second, well-hosted visits to Alverno College and University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, demonstrated that U.S. teacher preparation was currently in little danger of forgetting its students. Third, the sessions I attended on alternative programmes showed a sensitivity to and deep involvement with the concerns which had led me to write about what I view as the neglect of the student in the recent and ongoing reform of teacher education in England (Reid, 1999 and 2000, Reid and Thornton, 1999). Nevertheless, what follows may serve as a cautionary tale about what can happen when teacher education is taken over by central government and when many well-informed and involved voices are ignored, among which are the students.

There is a considerable irony in the fact that in nearly all of the wide-ranging discussion over the reform of teacher education and training in the 1990s one, almost certainly the central character, the student, has been neglected. While there has been almost endless concern over the curriculum, the balance between time in school and time in HEI, not to mention inspection and funding, the ITE student has tended to be seen as an unproblematic, standard unit of input, who with suitable treatment will emerge as a competent teacher. Of course such thinking fits in with the general tenor of the concepts behind policy thinking in respect to education in the 1990s. Teachers and teaching are seen as the vital, determining aspect of classrooms with a neglect of pupils and learning and context in which they are found. Hence teachers are held responsible for pupils' learning, while consideration of other factors is dismissed as part of the culture of excuses, or the forces of conservatism.

The reforms have concentrated on raising standards, both in teacher education and as part of the government's overall concern with school standards. One result has been an overloading of students' timetables, especially in respect of that part of their course undertaken in university/college (for postgraduate students this is 12 weeks from 36, the rest being in school). Many areas of past study now receive superficial treatment, while the recent imposition of national tests for student teachers in numeracy this year, and literacy and Information and Communication Technology next year, impose an additional burden. Not only have these tests been viewed by students as an affront, but the logic of them has passed most by. At the same time students have begun to express concerns about the lack of time and opportunity to reflect on their practice and to study underlying theory and knowledge. The prescriptive nature of the National Curriculum and its delivery (both that for schools and teacher preparation) may be attractive to some looking for an easy life, but for others is a straight-jacket which restricts what they had perceived as their professional role.

Examples of the above are legion, but space here precludes but two examples. The first is close to my professional concerns and is equal opportunities (see for example Reid, 1993 and 1998). Prior to 1992 (when the current reforms commenced) I used to have seven lecture slots together with seminars to deal with this topic. Now there are none that specific. Students are likely to be required to look at the policy of the two schools in

which they are placed. They are extremely unlikely to consider the reasons and history of why such a policy was needed or exists or to evaluate whether such a policy meets its principles in writing, spirit, or practice. The second is that some students are questioning the learning theory assumptions implicit in the schools' National Curriculum, especially the effectively prescribed literacy and numeracy hours. It is not necessarily that they object to these but merely that as intelligent beings they would like to experience their justification. Similarly, students continue to experience classroom difficulties and many would welcome the opportunity to meet these from a fuller understanding of the psychological and sociological foundations than are and can be provided on their present courses.

A further aspect of the neglect of students in the reforms has been the failure to identify the heterogeneous nature of student teacher intakes to ITE courses. The results of a large survey into students' reasons for choosing primary teaching as a career illustrates this well, and in fact surprised me in the extent of the range of differences within the sample (Reid and Thornton, 1999 and Thornton, Reid and Bricheno, 1999). Among the most significant differences for our purpose were those of age, education, experience of parenthood, of family which included teachers, of previous work in primary schools and in other occupations. To illustrate through actual extremes, a course may include a mature student with experience of living with a parent who taught, of parenthood, with previous education well-related to the National Curriculum and with work experience as a parent helper and a classroom assistant. Alongside can be another student without any or most of these attributes. Such a range and diversity of backgrounds, qualifications, experience, and expertise might well be expected to lead to some caution in adopting a single, uniform, and prescriptive course of training as the most effective and efficient method of preparing people for the profession. Yet that is what at present we have, and this appears to pose some problems for those experiencing it.

Interestingly enough, this rich diversity is recognised perhaps, and certainly belatedly, by the policy makers in the proposals for the modular PGCE; recognised, that is, to the extent that these, in common with some other alternative routes into teaching, are to be delivered on an individualised rather than a cohort basis. Regulations are to be revised in order to take account of the needs of the student and the delivery of a course that meets them, and enables the student to meet the required standards and competencies. The logic involved appears sound, and it is to be hoped that its application will be extended to ITE Partnerships. Such an extension holds a number of possibilities, including attractiveness of courses to students, heightened utility, appropriateness and quality of courses of preparation for entry into the profession. However, it leaves unrelieved the generic situation. Perchance the future holds a proper place for the consideration of the student in teacher preparation course design and delivery. As I have remarked elsewhere, the progress (if that is what it is) of teacher education is characterised by hoops, roundabouts, and swings (Reid, 1986). For the sake of students and pupils we must hope that rectification is soon and comprehensive.

At the commencement of the current reforms, Taylor (1993) asked three questions: Will they 1) attract good candidates? 2) produce better and more competent teachers? 3)

provide a sound basis for continued professional development? These are salutary questions which should be continuously applied and answers to them found through research. The major aspect of such research needs to be the student. It is further hoped that, in what increasingly appears to be a global concern with the reform of teacher preparation, the central place of the students will not be as neglected as it has been in the English experience.

References

- Reid, I. (1986). Hoops, roundabouts and swings in teacher education: A critical review of the CATE criteria. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 10(1).
- Reid, I. (1993). The lost opportunity? The relative failure of British teacher education in tackling the inequality of schooling. In Verma, G.K. in *Equality and teacher education: an international perspective*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Reid I. (1998). *Class in Britain*. Malden (USA): Blackwell and Oxford: Polity Press
- Reid, I. (1999). The neglect of the ITE student in the reform of ITE in England and Wales in the 1990s. *Joint UCET/HMI Conference*, Edinburgh, December (to be published by UCET in an *Occasional Paper*, June 2000).
- Reid, I. (2000). Accountability, control and freedom in teacher education in England. *International Conference on the Sociology of Education*, Sheffield, January (to be published in the *International Journal of Sociology of Education* Autumn, 2000).
- Reid, I. and Cauldwell (1997). Why did secondary PGCE students choose teaching as a career? *Research in Education*, 58.
- Reid, I. and Thornton, M. (1999). *Students reasons for choosing primary school teaching as a career*. The final report for the TTA. Loughborough University and University of Hertfordshire.
- Taylor, W. (1993). In *Times Educational Supplement*, 5th November.
- Thornton, M., Reid, I. and Bricheno, P. (1999). Why students choose primary teaching as a career. *British Educational Research Association Conference*, Brighton, August.



*U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*



NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").