

SPECIAL ISSUE
**Navigating the Contested Terrain of
Teacher Education Policy and Practice**

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 25

March 5, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341

**Navigating the Contested Terrain of Teacher Education
Policy and Practice: Introduction to the Special Issue**

Elena Aydarova

Auburn University



David C. Berliner

Arizona State University

United States

Citation: Aydarova, E., & Berliner D. C. (2018). Navigating the contested terrain of teacher education policy and practice: Introduction to the special issue. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(25). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3739> This article is part of the Special Issue, *Navigating the Contested Terrain of Teacher Education Policy and Practice*, guest edited by Elena Aydarova and David Berliner.

Abstract: In the policy climate where various actors claim to have the solutions for the enduring challenges of teacher education, policy deliberations sideline certain voices. This introduction to the special issue explores policy contestations surrounding teacher education and highlights some of the perspectives overlooked by policy debates. It lays out new priorities for the teacher education community to ensure that the profession's collective voice would be heard by policy-makers and by the public at large.

Keywords: education policy, teacher education

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>

Facebook: /EPAAA

Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 1/23/2018

Revisions received: 1/26/2018

Accepted: 1/26/2018

Navegando en el terreno disputado de la política y la práctica de la formación docente: Introducción a la edición especial

Resumen: En el clima político en el que varios agentes aseguran tener las soluciones para los desafíos que persisten en la formación del profesorado, las deliberaciones sobre políticas dejan atrás ciertas voces. Esta introducción al número especial explora los conflictos de políticas que rodean la educación de docentes y resalta algunas de las perspectivas que pasan por alto los debates sobre políticas. Establece nuevas prioridades para la comunidad de formación docente para garantizar que la voz colectiva de la profesión sea escuchada por los responsables políticos y por el público en general.

Palabras-clave: política educativa, formación docente

Navegando no terreno disputado da política e prática da formação de professores: Introdução à edição especial

Resumo: No clima político em que vários agentes afirmam ter soluções para os desafios que persistem na formação de professores, as deliberações políticas deixam certas vozes. Esta introdução à questão especial explora os conflitos políticos em torno da formação de professores e destaca algumas das perspectivas que ignoram os debates políticos. Estabelece novas prioridades para a comunidade de formação de professores para garantir que a voz coletiva da profissão seja ouvida pelos decisores políticos e pelo público em geral.

Palavras-chave: política educacional, formação de professores

Navigating the Contested Terrain of Teacher Education Policy and Practice

The last 20 years have been tumultuous for university-based teacher education in the United States (Baltodano, 2012; Bullough, 2014; Sleeter, 2008; Weiner, 2007; Zeichner, 2010) and around the world (Beauchamp et al., 2016; Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2012; Ellis & McNicholl, 2015; Furlong, Cochran-Smith, & Brennan, 2013; Trippstad, Swennen, & Werler, 2017). Debates over the quality of education contributed to reframing of teacher education as a policy problem, in which changes in parameters could produce better results (Cochran-Smith, 2004). This reframing ushered in an increased focus on deregulating entry into the teaching profession, privatizing teacher preparation, as well as decreasing autonomy of university-based teacher education (Baltodano, 2012; Bullough, 2016; Zeichner & Peña-Sandoval, 2015). Teachers and teacher educators have become subject to increased surveillance, micro-management, and scapegoating for educational and societal ills that are often beyond their control, such as poverty (Zeichner, 2009) or social stratification (Kumashiro, 2015). At the same time, urgent calls for increased accountability have facilitated the proliferation of bureaucratic machines that support the heavy-handed and often punitive data-driven policy infrastructure (Allington, 2005; Anagnostopoulos, Lewis & Young, 2013; Rutledge, & Jacobsen, 2013; Wilson, 2014). Of course, struggles over teacher education are not happening in a vacuum. Public higher education overall has witnessed years of defunding and weathered multiple attacks on programs with low utilitarian value that allegedly fail to prepare their graduates for jobs.

In consideration of these challenges, we framed this special issue as an attempt to consider how educators and educational researchers navigate the contested terrain of teacher education policies and practices. Among the numerous submissions we received, a number of manuscripts focused on the challenges associated with the implementation of performance assessments for teacher licensure. These manuscripts constitute the first part of our special issue. In this

introduction, we want to situate the challenges associated with performance assessments and described in these manuscripts in the broader contestations over teacher education.

Contestations over Teacher Education Policies and Practices

One of the responses to the attacks unleashed against teacher education as a low-quality institution (for example, Levine, 2006) has been a growing focus on the issues of design (Floden, Richmond, Drake, & Petchauer, 2017). Various groups have been exploring how to improve teacher education systems and structures so that program graduates will be prepared for the task of teaching on day one. For instance, focusing on practice, TeachingWorks headed by Deborah Ball at the University of Michigan championed the work on high-leverage practices, whereas Core Practices Consortium has promoted the work on the core practices of teaching. Texas Tech launched U.S.PREP – a coalition of universities seeking to transform teacher preparation through university-school partnerships, structured management of teacher candidates' clinical practice, along with a strong focus on data collection. In this context, performance assessments developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) align with the other transformations in the field that seek to redesign teacher education based on more clearly articulated constructions of teaching and learning.

Yet the focus on design alone does little to address educational reformers' successes in challenging university-based teacher education and framing it as irrelevant. When reformers, economists, and conservative think-tanks refer to teacher education as "low quality," their goal is not just to improve quality but rather to promote low-cost alternatives. The struggle over teacher education is not only a matter of human capital (how to improve the quality of those who enter) but also a matter of resources (how to decrease financial and time investments but receive the same returns). Consider, for example, how economists' research comparing the achievement of students taught by different groups of teachers concludes that there is "little difference in the average academic achievement impacts of certified, uncertified and alternatively certified teachers" (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2008, p. 629; also see Diaz, 2014). If students of the teachers who did not go through four or six years of teacher preparation do as well as or not as bad as the other students, then it is not clear that teacher education is worth the investment it currently requires. A recent report from Bellwether Education Foundation expresses the same sentiment in more direct terms:

Every year, new teachers collectively spend about \$4.8 billion on their training requirements, nearly all of which goes to teacher preparation programs. Unfortunately, it's unclear whether that is money well spent. (Mitchell & King, 2016, p. 2)

Hardly any design change in university-based teacher education can make it a cheap pathway into the profession. This underlying assumption facilitates the proliferation of alternative routes into teaching.

Reformers' attempts to bypass university-based teacher education and introduce shortened versions of job training for teachers have now been enshrined in federal legislation, despite growing evidence about the ineffectiveness of independent teacher education programs (Zeichner, 2016). The *Every Student Succeeds Act* (U.S. Department of Education, 2015), for instance, equates the preparation of highly qualified teachers with a total bypassing of university-based teacher education. Teacher and principal preparation academies advocated by ESSA are not supposed to be burdened by "unnecessary restrictions" (U.S. Department of Education, 2015, p. 150) of having faculty with advanced degrees or engaged in research, of having basic expectations of infrastructure, or meeting

any credit hour or accreditation requirements. The problem is that teachers who are expected to take such fast tracks into the profession are supposed to teach in hard-to-staff schools, which could magnify existing inequities. Even though the provisions stipulate that teachers have to raise student achievement in order to receive a certificate from the academy, it is unlikely that in a highly segregated society where students' achievement is often correlated with their race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status, a teacher with abridged preparation will undo the effects of massive social, political, and economic inequities. Ultimately, it is ironic to see the pursuit of quality take the path of decreased standards, lowered expectations, and eliminated provisions.

The introduction of performance assessments was meant to accomplish the opposite – to increase standards and raise expectations about teachers' effectiveness (Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2012). While this change was applauded by some in the reformers' circles, others responded to them as an unjustifiable squandering of resources (yet again). Kate Walsh of the National Council for Teacher Quality in her blog post on edTPA commenting on Goldhaber's findings that edTPA results are predictive of teacher effectiveness in reading but not in math, raised the question:

Given that the edTPA is a lot of work for programs and is costly to boot, is this enough bang for the buck? After all, instructions for candidates entail 40 pages and candidates are alerted that they can be evaluated on the edTPA on nearly 700 different items. The process consumes the attention of teacher candidates and teacher educators in their programs for a good share of candidates' semester-long student teaching placement. (Walsh, 2016)

A conservative education news group, *The 74 Million*, publicized a report produced by Bellwether Education Partners as a well-reasoned argument for relaxing entry requirements but making it harder for teachers to stay in the profession if they cannot improve students' achievement¹. The authors of this report pointed out that a lack of external research supporting the use of edTPA suggests that increasing barriers for entry into the profession is not the way to improve the quality of teaching (Aldeman & Mitchel, 2016).

Reformers' claims about a lack of research evidence to support teacher education practices, policies, or innovations are not new. In fact, contributors to this special issue raise similar concerns about the lack of research conducted by scholars outside of SCALE's sphere of influence on the effectiveness and usefulness of performance assessments. Yet responding to critics would require the kind of research that would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out without substantial external funding. Opportunities for large-scale funded research, however, tend to decline (Sleeter, 2014). Instead, most support is directed towards a limited number of research areas. Most recently, the Department of Education has set aside funding to support the development of teacher academies (see above), confining most funding for teacher education research to STEM fields, special education, or English language learners. For example, the Education Secretary's proposed priorities for Department of Education competitive grant programs released in 2017 for public discussion mentions teacher preparation only once: "Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of science, technology, engineering, and math subjects" (U.S. Department of Education, 2017, p. 47490). Such a narrow funding focus increases the risk that important questions raised by the critics of teacher education will remain largely unanswered due to a lack of support from federal funding.

¹ <https://www.the74million.org/article/a-radically-sensible-proposal-for-training-teachers-make-it-easier-to-enter-harder-to-stay/>

Philanthropic foundations often step up to the plate and offer financial support for research in teacher education. Their funding, however, tends to support projects that align with the ideologies they promote, and generate evidence for the market-based policies they support (Au & Ferrare, 2015; Scott & Jabbar, 2014; Zeichner & Conklin, 2016). In particular, philanthropic funding has been instrumental in advancing privatization and technocratization of teacher education. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, for example, has provided funding not only for TeachingWorks run by University of Michigan and U.S.Prepare run by Texas Tech, but also for Relay Graduate School of Education, National Center for Teacher Residencies, Inc² as well as Elevate Preparation, Impact Children (EPIC), led by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The latter awardees represent a move towards a greater involvement of private actors in teacher preparation, whereas the 'Transformation Centers' overall focus on improving teacher preparation through data use, clinical practice, and measurable replicable practices captures a technocratic approach to teaching.

Reformers' successes in advancing their agendas are due in part to their ability to organize and mobilize resources in support of fairly standard talking points. Non-profit or private sector actors focus on network-building, coalition development, and targeting policy-makers with easily accessible messages. Consider, for example, the Hunt Institute – a non-profit organization in North Carolina – one among many actors engaged in disseminating policy proposals for teacher education reforms. The Institute's vision is to influence policy and it does so by "conven[ing] governors, policymakers, and legislators, as well as business, education, and civic leaders across the nation to provide them with the best information to make informed policy decisions" (Hunt Institute, 2014). That vision becomes enacted through legislators' retreats and governors' symposia that the Institute organizes. Unlike typical academic conferences, such events allow policy ideas to reach policymakers directly – the very audience that has the power to enact and implement them. The Hunt Institute's initiative to provide 30-minute webcasts during lunch hours speaks to their readiness to deliver messages in ways that accommodate their audience's busy schedules.

In the context of these broader contestations, the teacher education community needs to consider a new set of priorities. To the matters of design it has to add the matters of public policy engagement to demonstrate its relevance to broader communities than just the readers of highly specialized journals. In other words, a pursuit of better models needs to be accompanied by activities that can help the teacher education community to reclaim a collective voice over the directions of change and its future. Reclaiming this voice requires building coalitions both within the field of teacher education and beyond it. Within the field itself, it is important to create spaces for dialogue about professional, moral, ethical, and democratic goals of teacher preparation. As it has been observed before, the field lacks a shared vision and a shared language about the teaching profession (Grossman & McDonald, 2008). To generate those, it is paramount for teacher educators to engage substantively with each other about the problems that plague the field and about the criticisms leveled against it. These dialogues, however, cannot be conducted *pro forma*. For example, AACTE claims that edTPA emerged out of consultations with teachers and teacher educators, yet contributors to this volume (along with others in the field – see Au, 2013; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016) report on the marginalization and silencing that they experienced.

² <https://nctresidencies.org/>

Performance Assessments: Marginalized Voices and Underrepresented Perspectives

Nick Henning, Alison Dover, Erica Dotson, and Ruchi Agarwal-Rangath (this volume) describe their struggles with teacher performance assessments and ways in which their critiques were silenced or sidelined. Using the methodological tools of counternarratives to document and critique the impact of teacher performance assessments on their work as teacher educators, they show how at the department, institution, and even professional organization levels, they were treated as “trouble-makers” and “cranks” because of their critical appraisal of performance assessments. In the context of widespread standardization of teacher education curriculum driven by external assessments and constant critiques of the field, performance assessments constrained the authors’ work, restricted the curriculum they had to teach, and limited the depth of their students’ engagement with the issues of diversity and social justice. Their responses to the imposition of performance assessments varied from covert subversion to overt resistance. It is for these acts of insubordination and disobedience that they became penalized.

Christine Clayton (this volume), on the other hand, attends to the voices of student teachers over three semesters of edTPA implementation at her institution. Surveys and interviews with student teachers revealed that they saw misalignment between the feedback they received in their prior courses and on edTPA. Because student teachers felt unsupported by school mentors who were not familiar with the assessment and had to focus on what the assessment required rather than what their students needed to learn, they came to see their work on edTPA as a subtractive experience. As such, it reduced student teachers’ learning instead of supporting it to strengthen the profession.

Supplementing students’ perspectives with their own reflections, Martha Donovan and Susan Cannon (this volume) examine how they experienced edTPA as a dilemma that overshadowed the student teaching experiences of the teacher candidates they worked with. They address how their supervision of student teaching experience became transactional because of student teachers’ constant worry about edTPA results. According to Donovan and Cannon’s observations, student teachers’ focus on edTPA requirements, along with its price and failure rate, has turned teacher candidates into customers engaged in an economic transaction rather than professionals ready to embark on a long-term commitment to the ethical and democratic commitments of education.

Finally, Stephanie Cross, Alyssa Dunn, and Erica Dotson (this volume) position their concerns about edTPA in the broader context of neoliberal transformations in teacher education. Framing those transformations as the “hydra of teacher education,” the authors record their experiences of hopelessness, silence, and acquiescence to the institutional policies that go counter their ethical commitments as social justice educators. The methodological tools of poetic inquiry afford the authors an opportunity to take an innovative approach to policy analysis and to chart pathways for collective resistance. As the authors describe the acts of resistance that they engaged in, such as a teach-in on the ban of ethnic studies in Arizona, they note the challenges and risks they faced. The backlash they experienced sent them back to the place of hopelessness and fear. While they seek to reclaim their positions as scholar activists, they also contemplate how challenging it is to struggle with the hydra whose heads grow back after they are cut off.

To facilitate scholarly dialogue on the issues raised by these manuscripts, we invited the team from the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity to comment on the manuscripts included in this issue. We also encouraged the authors to respond back. The thoughtfulness of this dialogue and the diversity of perspectives it captures are a sign of health for a field in which it is hard to define what experiences make for a quality teacher education program or what practices can ensure equitable outcomes for students. The fact that quality and equity can be achieved in so many

different ways creates situations in which what looks to be disarray or poor choices by one scholar, is really thoughtfulness about the profession from another vantage point. Yet to ensure teacher education's continued future, we hope that scholarly interactions that demonstrate ability to hear across difference and to negotiate the establishment of common ground will become much more common.

Moving Forward

Dialogues within the field are important as stepping stones towards building collectives that work to disrupt the dismantling of teacher education and public schooling. This work is underway in many corners of the US. For example, Tuck and Gorlewski (2016) described the work of a collective of teacher educators in New York that combined efforts to counter the hegemonic logic of edTPA that they saw as a colonizing force. The Teacher Education Collective that brought together scholars from across the country published a sobering critique of Betsy DeVos's candidacy for the Education Secretary in a regional newspaper.³ A group of junior scholars who comprise the Teacher Education Thought Collective responded to the new funding priorities by challenging its market-based logic. Another notable group active in opposing neoliberal education reforms is Deans for Justice and Equity. Their *Declaration of Principles on Public Education, Democracy, and the Role of Federal Government* issued in January 2017 demonstrates their commitments to the struggle against the dismantling of public education at large. Moving beyond the individualizing structures of academia, these various groups have undertaken the task of public intellectuals who "offer critique of policies and practices that are problematic in terms of logic and evidence or that will not serve the best interests of schoolchildren, families, and teachers" (Cochran-Smith, 2006, p. 203).

Finally, it is important to reach beyond the field of teacher education to build alliances, networks, and coalitions that will strive towards a greater public good. These alliances can support underserved communities who seek just and equitable education for their children (Sleeter, 2008), reach out to policy-makers, or join activist groups in defending the rights of marginalized populations (Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton, 2006). Coalitions and alliances with social movements, policy communities, and grass-roots organizations could mobilize resources and generate long-lasting cultural changes that are necessary to address the inequities that exist in U.S. public education (Oakes & Lipton, 2002), to prevent deprofessionalization of teaching, and to preclude elimination of university-based teacher education. Echoing Bourdieu's (2000) call for scholars to use their intellectual and social capital to support social movements that fight against the degradation and disruption of human life caused by neoliberalism, we encourage our readers to consider the struggles around them as opportunities to engage in a fight for a better future. Given all the contestations surrounding public education and teacher education in particular, now is not the time to remain silent.

³ <https://www.tennessean.com/story/opinion/2017/01/27/betsy-devos-unqualified-lead-education-department/97135790/>

References

- Aldeman, C. & Mitchel, A. L. (2016). *No guarantees: Is it possible to ensure teachers are ready on day one?* Boston, MA: Bellwether Education Partners.
- Allington, R. L. (2005). Ignoring the policy makers to improve teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 199-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105275845>
- Anagnostopoulos, D., Rutledge, S. A., & Jacobsen, R. (2013). *The infrastructure of accountability: Data use and the transformation of American education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this? The edTPA and corporate education "reform." *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4), 22-27.
- Au, W., & Ferrare, J. J. (Eds.). (2015). *Mapping corporate education reform: Power and policy networks in the neoliberal state*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25(4), 487-507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2012.673025>
- Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M., Jephcote, M., & Kennedy, A. (2016). *Teacher education in times of change*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). For a scholarship with commitment. *Profession*, 40-45.
- Bullough Jr, R. V. (2014). Recalling 40 years of teacher education in the USA: A personal essay. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 40(5), 474-491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2014.956537>
- Bullough, R. V. (2016). Status and quality of teacher education in the US: Neoliberal and professional tensions. In J.C.-K. Lee & C. Day (eds.), *Quality and Change in Teacher Education* (pp. 59-75). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24139-5_4
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). The problem of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(4), 295-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487104268057>
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). Teacher education and the need for public intellectuals. *The New Educator*, 2(3), 181-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15476880600820136>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Lieberman, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Teacher education around the world: Changing policies and practices*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Diaz, V. (2014). Teach for America teachers are well trained, highly qualified, and get amazing results. In D. C. Berliner and G. V Glass, *50 myths and lies that threaten America's public schools* (pp. 67-73). New York, NY: Teachers College Press
- Dover, A. & Schultz, B. D. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *Educational Forum*, 80(1), 95-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2015.1102368>
- Ellis, V., & McNicholl, J. (2015). *Transforming teacher education: Reconfiguring the academic work*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Floden, R. E., Richmond, G., Drake, C., & Petchauer, E. (2017). How teacher education can elevate teacher quality: Evidence from research. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 360-362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117721190>
- Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Policy and politics in teacher education: International perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greenblatt, D., & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 45(2), 57-67.
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184-205. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312906>

- Hunt Institute. (2014). Getting teachers learner-ready: Reforming teacher preparation. *ReVision* 4(4). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED559388>.
- Kane, T. J., Rockoff, J. E., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. *Economics of Education Review*, 27(6), 615-631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.05.005>
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2015). *Review of proposed 2015 federal teacher preparation regulations*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/ttr10-tchrprepregs_0.pdf.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.
- Lewis, W. D., & Young, T. V. (2013). The politics of accountability: Teacher education policy. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 190-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812472725>
- Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (2002). Struggling for educational equity in diverse communities: School reform as social movement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 3(3-4), 383-406. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021225728762>
- Oakes, J., Rogers, J., & Lipton, M. (2006). *Learning power: Organizing for education and justice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Scott, J., & Jabbar, H. (2014). The hub and the spokes: Foundations, intermediary organizations, incentivist reforms, and the politics of research evidence. *Educational Policy*, 28(2), 233-257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813515327>
- Sleeter, C. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(8), 1947-1957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.04.003>
- Sleeter, C. (2014). Toward teacher education research that informs policy. *Educational Researcher*, 43(3), 146-153. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X14528752>
- Trippestad, T. A., Swennen, A., & Werler, T. (Eds.). (2017). *The Struggle for teacher education: International perspectives on governance and reforms*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tuck, E., Gorlewski, J. (2016). Racist ordering, settler colonialism, and edTPA. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 197-217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616483>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2017). Secretary's proposed supplemental priorities and definitions for discretionary grant programs. *Federal Register*, 82(196). Retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/10/12/2017-22127/secretarys-proposed-supplemental-priorities-and-definitions-for-discretionary-grant-programs>.
- Walsh, K. (2016). *Three reasons why every teacher prep program should adopt edTPA... or not*. Retrieved from <https://www.nctq.org/blog/Three-reasons-why-every-teacher-prep-program-should-adopt-the-edTPA-or-not>.
- Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to US teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), 274-286.
- Wilson, S. M. (2014). Innovation and the evolving system of US teacher preparation. *Theory into Practice*, 53(3), 183-195.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1544-1552. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004>
- Zeichner, K. (2016). *Independent teacher education programs: Apocryphal claims, illusory evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.
- Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. G. (2016). Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Raising the quality of the debate in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 118(12), 1-38.

Zeichner, K., & Peña-Sandoval, C. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the US: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*, 117(6), 1-44.

About the Authors/Guest Editors

Elena Aydarova

Auburn University

eza0029@auburn.edu

Website: <https://elenaaydarova.com>

Elena Aydarova is Assistant Professor of Social Foundations at the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University. Her interdisciplinary research examines the interactions between global social change and the work of teachers, teaching, and teacher education through the lens of equity and social justice. Her projects have explored teacher education reforms in Russia and the US, internationalization of education, teacher retention, as well as privatization of teacher preparation. She has recently completed a book manuscript "Teacher Education Reforms as Political Theater: Policy Dramas in Neoliberal Contexts." Throughout her career, Dr. Aydarova has taught in the United States, Ukraine, China, and the United Arab Emirates.

David C. Berliner

Arizona State University

berliner@asu.edu

David C. Berliner is Regents' Professor Emeritus of Education at Arizona State University. Dr. Berliner is a member of the National Academy of Education (NEA), the International Education Academy (IEA), a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and a past president of both the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Division of Educational Psychology of the American Psychological Association (APA). He is the recipient of awards for distinguished contributions from APA, AERA, and the National Education Association (NEA). Dr. Berliner is co-author (with B. J. Biddle) of the best seller *The Manufactured Crisis*, co-author (with Ursula Casanova) of *Putting Research to Work*, co-author (with Gene Glass) of *50 Myths and Lies that Threaten America's Public Schools*, and co-author (with N. L. Gage) of six editions of the textbook *Educational Psychology*. He is co-editor of the first *Handbook of Educational Psychology* and the books *Talks to Teachers*, and *Perspectives on Instructional Time*. Professor Berliner has also authored more than 200 published articles, technical reports, and book chapters. He has taught at the University of Arizona, University of Massachusetts, Teachers College and Stanford University, as well as universities in Australia, Canada, The Netherlands, Spain, and Switzerland.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Navigating the Contested Terrain of
Teacher Education Policy and Practice

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 25

March 5, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A2 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join EPAA's Facebook community at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and Twitter feed @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Iveta Silova, Maria Teresa Tatto** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University, UK

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider College of the Holy Cross

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride** (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon** (Universidad de Granada), **Angelica Buendia** (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **José Luis Ramírez** (Universidad de Sonora)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad
de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia Universidad
de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad
Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez Instituto
Nacional para la Evaluación de la
Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,
México

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre
la Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,
Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de
Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional
de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves
Instituto para la Investigación
Educativa y el Desarrollo
Pedagógico (IDEP)

Paula Razquin Universidad de
San Andrés, Argentina

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de
Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de
Investigaciones sobre la
Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo,
España

Jurjo Torres Santomé,

Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales
Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de
Barcelona, España

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil