

Developing internships in the Netherlands: new concepts, new roles, new challenges¹

Introduction

One of the most pervasive challenges in pre-service teacher education concerns internships and their alignment (or lack thereof) with the university-based part of the teacher education program. It seems there have been complaints about internships ever since they were introduced as a component of teacher education. These complaints concern, for example, the lack of sufficient alignment between school (practice) and teacher education institute (theory), the quality of the mentoring and the timing of internships, and are voiced by school mentors, teacher educators and student teachers (Bullough & Gitlin, 2010). In addition to such complaints, also the changing insights into preparing student teachers contributed to a rethinking of internships. For example, the emerging notion that schools should become learning environments where student teachers can integrate learning and working instead of places where theory can be applied (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Menter, Hulme, Elliot & Lewin, 2010) contributed to this rethinking. Internships, and particularly their relation to institutional curricula, have been one of the major themes in the debate on problems in teacher education for more than 30 years.

In this chapter, we address how Dutch teacher education dealt with this pervasive challenge. We do so by comparing existing forms of internships with emerging forms that emphasize internships in formal school–university partnerships¹ that have been launched during the last decade, as they have been in most Anglo-American countries

Dutch school–university partnerships aim at a closer and better alignment between university-based learning and school-based learning. Moreover, many of these partnerships are not restricted to improving the alignment and thus better educating the next generations of student teachers, but focus on even more challenging goals, namely the establishment of collaborations in which student teachers, teachers and teacher educators learn and work together to improve teaching practice and develop evidence-based and practice-informed pedagogies. An important condition for flourishing school–university partnerships is the close collaboration

¹ Van Velzen, C., & Van der Klink, M. (2014). Developing internships in the Netherlands: new concepts, new roles, new challenges. In: J. Calvo de Mora & K. Wood (Eds.), *Practical knowledge in teacher education Approaches to teacher internship programmes* (pp. 180-194). London: Routledge

between schools and universities, and their ability to abandon the notions and routines attached to organizing traditional internships. They also need to fulfil a number of requirements and provide certain conditions in order to encourage close partnerships.

We begin this chapter by discussing the main problems related to traditional internships, and then introduce the different types of school–university partnerships that have been implemented over the last ten years. Although a decade seems a long period, we do not yet know whether and, if so, how these partnerships contribute to solving the abovementioned problems related to traditional internships. We do know, however, that they contribute to improving the quality of the internships. In particular, these partnerships positively affect the development of schools into learning environments for student teachers (Van Neygen & Belmans, 2011). We also pay attention to the main principles of school–university partnerships, and make clear that even within partnerships fruitful internships are beneficial but difficult to establish. We conclude the chapter by briefly describing directions for the further development of internships in school–university partnerships.

Teaching practicum in teacher education: why it had to change

First, we address the terms used in this chapter. In the literature, different terms are used to refer to the part of the curriculum that is reserved for learning in professional practice, such as internship (Darling-Hammond, 2000), practicum (Mule, 2006) or field-based experiences (Zeichner, 2010). These terms sometimes refer to slightly different phenomena, but sometimes more terms are in use to refer to the same phenomenon. We prefer ‘practicum’ as a general term for all guided and unguided activities that student teachers are involved in at school during their initial teacher education.

The notion that learning in professional practice should be an integral part of one’s professional education is now generally accepted, but there is much less agreement about the what, how, when and why of learning in teaching practice as an integral part of teacher education. The discussion on learning in the teaching practice became a topic of paramount importance during the 1990s, when concerns were expressed about teacher education not delivering graduates who were sufficiently prepared for teaching practice. Novice teachers appeared to find it difficult to synthesize their subject matter expertise and their pedagogical and

classroom management competencies, and to adjust these to the different classrooms and school situations they faced in their daily work (Van Velzen, Bezinna & Lorist, 2009). As a result, newly appointed teachers faced many problems when they took up their first position at school. In his international review study, Veenman (1984, p. 143) mentioned classroom discipline, motivating students, dealing with individual differences, assessing students' work, relationships with parents, organization of class work, insufficient and/or inadequate teaching materials and supplies, and dealing with the problems of individual students. These problems too often resulted in early attrition of these teachers.

It was generally accepted that one of the main underlying causes of this inadequate preparation of novice teachers lay in teacher education, and more specifically in the disconnect between learning at the university and learning in schools during practicums. Similar concerns regarding the lack of connection were expressed in many European countries, as well as in the United States (see e.g. Zeichner, 2010).

The alignment between learning in practicum and learning at the university also suffered because of the backgrounds, professional experiences and competencies of those responsible for teaching, supervising and mentoring student teachers. Faculty members who do not have a teaching background but are academics specialized in a single subject, lack coherent notions about the work and life of a teacher. On the other hand, teachers promoted to faculty positions in teacher education often did not receive sufficient opportunities to acquire the theoretical knowledge that would be useful to further broaden and deepen their previous practical teaching experiences (see Van Velzen, Van der Klink, Swennen & Yaffe, 2010). Moreover, experienced teachers who were asked to mentor student teachers during their practicum were usually volunteers who were hardly provided with the kind of preparation and support they needed to implement a more active and educative conception of mentoring (Van Velzen et al., 2012; Zeichner, 2010). Thus, all those involved in teaching and mentoring student teachers, whether working at universities or schools, were inadequately equipped to perform their duties in preparing, guiding and coaching student teachers and thus make their teaching practicum a success.

Another aspect that became clear during the 1990s was that common notions concerning the practicum were too restricted. Becoming a teacher is not a matter of merely applying during teaching practicum what is learned at the university, which was more or less the underlying

assumption in many traditional internships. Nor is it just learning by doing and imitating experienced teachers. Both ideas are gross oversimplifications that do not acknowledge the complexity of becoming a teacher – especially since the theories that students usually learn at the university are only partially transferable and applicable at school, where teachers rely on theories-in-use that also incorporate their own work and learning experiences (Eraut, 2004).

Last but not least, the issue concerning how the teacher education curriculum prepares novice teachers and the alignment between the university-based part and the teaching practicum was not only a debate in which educational arguments were exchanged. It was held, at least in the Netherlands, against the background of repositioning the hegemony over the teacher education curriculum. School boards demanded a more significant say in how to prepare future teachers in order to forge a closer link between the teacher education curriculum and what school boards expect from teacher education.

This brief description underlines that focusing only on the teaching practicum as such would not result in a significantly better preparation of novice teachers, and also clarifies the need to take a broader perspective on the entire teacher education programme. This need for more advanced solutions, beyond the notion of focusing only on improving the teaching practicum, is echoed in the various solutions that have been proposed to enhance bridging with the TEI-based components of the curriculum. In England, for example, school-based teaching education that emphasizes that teacher education should be based on the real problems student teachers need to address in order to do their work in schools and classrooms became popular (Benton, 1990). In the United States, the Holmes Group (1990) advocated the establishment of professional development schools. Both developments inspired the progress of school–university partnerships and the rethinking of the traditional practicum in the Netherlands.

Practicum in school–university partnerships

An important condition to improve the practicum at school, and hence the quality of teacher education, was the establishment of school–university partnerships. In this section, we highlight the main features of three models of collaboration between schools and universities in the Netherlands. The models were proposed by Maandag, Deinum, Hofman and Buitink (2007), whose work highlights the divisions of roles between schools and universities. We then describe the main characteristics of the practicum in those partnerships

Partnerships usually consist of just one university (but not always) and a number of schools, usually located in the same geographical region. There are interesting stories to share, especially from an organizational theory perspective, about the entire process of establishing partnerships, but in this section we restrict ourselves to the main features of the ultimate partnerships. Table 1 represents the three main models in the Netherlands.

Table 1 *Three Models of School–University Collaboration*

Model	Description	Typing
A*	School provides practicum opportunities. One specially appointed teacher maintains the relation with the university and coordinates the mentoring of student teachers.	Coordinator model
B*	School-based teacher educators are responsible for the professional development of staff members and student teachers. They cooperate with institute-based teacher educators.	Partner school model
C*	Teams of school-based teacher educators, institute-based teacher educators and day-to-day mentors are responsible for the professional development of student teachers and the staff development within the school.	Network model

Note Type A resembles the more traditional relationship between schools and universities. Types B and C can receive funding from the government after a process of assessment by the Dutch–Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO).

At the moment, 56 school–university partnerships in teacher education are acknowledged by the Dutch–Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO) and hence funded by the Dutch government. In these partnerships, schools bear increased responsibility for the teacher education curriculum. This increased responsibility is reflected in the redesign of several aspects of the curriculum, including significant changes to the traditional practicum. This redesign changes the balance between the numbers of hours spent on learning at school and learning at the university, with more emphasis on learning at the former. One could argue that because of this revised balance there are fewer hours available for teaching students the theoretical and academic aspects of the profession at the teacher education institute. But this is not the case. On the contrary, teacher educators not only perform their teaching work at the university, but also enter the schools and coach and teach their students there. It is not the intention that their teaching and coaching at schools occur in isolation; rather, the aim is for teacher educators together with their students and school mentors to closely work together to ensure that student teachers’ learning at

schools is better aligned with the more theoretical parts that are taught at the university. As a consequence, teacher educators need to adjust their teaching activities. Traditional lectures seem less appropriate, whereas teaching activities that allow higher levels of student interaction become more common. In addition to adjusting their teaching styles, teacher educators are also challenged to ensure that their theoretical knowledge is more closely linked to the particular school. The establishment of school–university partnerships not only forces teacher educators to change their way of working, but also means that more emphasis is placed on schools, mentors and the coaching of student teachers during practicums. This is reflected in the changing roles of schools and mentors.

As well as being divided into three models, the 56 school–university partnerships can be distinguished regarding their focus. When the focus is on preparing student teachers and on staff development, we call them *Opleidingsscholen*. Twenty-two of these partnerships decided to strive to achieve even more challenging goals, namely a strong collaboration that also aims at school development and advancing pedagogies, research and theories. We refer to these partnerships as *Academische Opleidingsscholen*.

Before we describe the practicum in *Opleidingsscholen* and in *Academische Opleidingsscholen*, we provide in Table 2 an overview of the more traditional practicum in model A.

Table 2 *Traditional Practicum Arrangements*

Collaboration between school and TEI based on	Informal agreements between TEI and school
Jurisdiction on teachers' final qualification	TEI
Monopoly on teacher education	TEI
Autonomy related to curriculum	TEI (within the legal framework of the Dutch government)
Role school in student teachers' education	Providing opportunities to experience practice, mainly based on TEI driven assignments
Notions related to cognition and the transfer of knowledge between education and work	Application-of-theory model: acquisition metaphor
Activities by student teachers at school	Experiencing practice (based on TEI assignments)
Guidance provided by	Institute-based teacher educators Subject teachers (mentors)
Activities related to student teachers' guidance	<i>Institute-based teacher educator:</i> – Visiting schools – Observing student teachers – Feedback based on observations <i>Mentor (subject teacher):</i> – Introducing student teacher at school, – Providing opportunities to experience teaching, – Emotional support, – Feedback based on observation.
Competences needed	<i>Mentor teacher:</i> Skills related to: – Observation – Reflection – Communication and feedback – Building safe relationships Knowledge related to: – School organisation – Some knowledge on curriculum teacher education institute.
Conditions needed	Coordinator school communicates with coordinator Institute

Changing roles of schools and mentor teachers in school–TEI partnerships

The shared responsibility for the education of student teachers – which is laid down in a law that prescribes that at least 40% of the curriculum must be taught in schools – encouraged schools to rethink what more they could offer student teachers than merely places to work on their assignments from their teacher education institute (TEI) and experience teaching.

A practicum in a school–university partnership is now based on opportunities for student teachers to participate in all kinds of activities related to teaching, both guided and unguided (e.g. Billett, 2002; Edwards, 2005). Together, this guided and unguided participation is intended to transform student teachers’ ideas, concepts and behaviours into an increased understanding of context and its demands (Edwards, Gilroy & Hartley, 2002). Guidance allows student teachers to participate in a legitimate and an either more or less peripheral way (Billett, 2001a) in the community of school practice (Ten Dam & Blom, 2006; Lave & Wenger, 1991/2002). Student teachers’ learning is no longer an individual endeavour, but is embedded in the school community, which is developing into a professional learning community (see e.g. Stoll, 2010).

Based on these ideas, the practicum in school–university partnerships should be forms of ‘work-based learning’, that is, a learning process based on the integration of learning and working by participating in actual school practice (Van Velzen, Volman & Brekelmans, 2012). Work-based learning reflects the growing importance of the workplace in vocational education and professional development (Imants & Van Veen, 2010) and particularly to the formalization of learning at work (Streumer & Kho, 2006).

It is obvious that work-based learning asks for another pedagogy than the one implemented at the teacher education institute. The opportunities to participate and the access to guidance is part of what Billett (2001b) described as the ‘affordance’ (or invitational quality) of a partner school. The second aspect of such pedagogy is the ‘agency’ of the student teacher, that is, the ways he or she elects to participate and make use of the affordances of the school. The third important aspect of this pedagogy is the way in which the work is structured and the guidance offered by school-based teacher educators (SBTEs) and mentors. In partnerships, student teachers are usually involved in three types of activities:

- The actual teaching of pupils
- Participation in non-teaching activities
- Participation in sessions on particular themes

Student teachers receive guidance at school to support them in mastering teaching situations. Examples are teaching pupils supervised by a mentor and lesson-based conversations with the mentor aimed at preparation and evaluation. Co-teaching sometimes provides guidance during actual lesson enactment.

Participation in non-teaching activities refers to such activities as attending staff meetings, meetings with other professionals at school and meetings with parents. Student teachers are also engaged in sessions on themes relevant to the school context and, related to the forfeited curriculum content, derived from the institutional programme. Examples of such themes are communication and interaction with pupils, pupil mentoring and methods of activating pupil learning. These sessions are meant to prepare student teachers for assignments in actual practice (Van Velzen & Volman, 2009). They mediate between the education at the teacher education institute and learning from actual teaching, and demand specially educated teachers, namely SBTEs.

This shift to work-based learning will only flourish if school mentors are able to offer their student teachers not only the opportunity to participate in actual teaching practice, but also access to various forms of guidance that will help them to transform their participation into meaningful learning. To realize this, some teachers trained to become SBTEs.

SBTEs collaborate with institute-based teacher educators (IBTEs) at school and at the institute. Their collaboration is mainly focused on the development and assessment of the student teachers. To a lesser extent, they also offer input for the further development of the part of the teacher education curriculum that takes place at the school, and even for the part that is carried out at the teacher education institute. In the Netherlands, there is a registration procedure for institute-based teacher educators and for teachers who become SBTEs (Koster & Dengerink, 2000).

Until now, the attention has mainly been focused on the professional development of SBTEs, whereas implementations of professional arrangements to advance mentors' competencies remain limited to some aspects of the mentor's work, such as coaching, observation and providing feedback. Table 3 summarizes important aspects of school–university partnerships, including the roles of SBTEs, mentors and institute-based teacher educators.

Table 3 *Internship in School-University Partnerships*

Collaboration between school and TEI based on	Formal agreements on collaboration in teacher education between TEIs and schools
Jurisdiction on teachers' final qualification	TEI
Responsibilities for student teachers' education and (final) assessment	Shared between TEI and schools
Monopoly on teacher education	Partly forfeited to schools
Autonomy related to curriculum	Shared between TEI and schools within the legal framework of the Dutch government
Role school in student teachers' education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Realising an authentic learning environment for student teachers – Thematic sessions near the workplace
Notions related to cognition and the transfer of knowledge between education and work	<p>Sociocultural and cognitive perspectives</p> <p>Participation next to acquisition metaphor</p>
Valued type of knowledge	Research based propositional knowledge next to practical knowledge and situated cognition
Activities by student teachers at school	<p>Participating in real practice (guided and unguided)</p> <p>Attending sessions at school</p>
Guidance provided by	<p>School-based teacher educators</p> <p>Mentors (subject teachers)</p> <p>Institute-based teacher educators placed at school</p>
Kind of activities related to guidance provided	<p><i>School-based teacher educators: guidance on some distance of actual practice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Introducing student teacher at school – Reflective conversations based on observation and/or videotaped lessons – Coaching sessions (individual or small groups) – Thematic sessions (with IBTE) – Assessment conversations based on student teacher's portfolio (with IBTE) <p><i>Mentors: guidance in actual practice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Introducing student teacher in school team – Providing student teachers with opportunities to meet and observe experienced teachers and other practitioners at school – Collaboratively, reflective preparing and evaluation of lessons – Collaborative teaching (not regularly done) – Informing SBTEs on student teachers' development – Organise opportunities to meet parents and prepare these meetings with student teachers. – Organise opportunities to meet other practitioners. – Organise opportunities to attend staff meetings and prepare this meetings with student teachers <p><i>Institute-based teacher educators (placed at school)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Collaboration with SBTEs in designing and enacting thematic sessions – Collaborating with SBTEs in final assessment conversations – Support the professional development of staff members –

Table 3 *Internship in School-University Partnerships*

Competences needed	<p><i>School-based teacher educators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to national standards for teacher educators. <p><i>Mentors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Likewise regular mentors – Informed experts in school subject and developments in their subject domains – Able to share practical knowledge in critical, reflective conversations about teaching and in actual teaching – Recognising student teachers’ learning needs – Making role transitions between being a teacher and a teacher educator <p><i>Institute-based teacher educators placed at school</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Competences related to supporting further development of (experienced) professionals
Conditions needed	<p><i>All practitioners with a function or tasks related to student teachers education:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Visible in school with an acknowledged position supported by school management – Time and (roster) space for collaboration <p><i>Mentors and SBTEs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Careful chosen based on transparent competences – Time for further education <p><i>Student teachers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seen as (future) colleagues, not as guests – Prepared to integrate learning and working at the TEI – Portfolio and related assessments provide space for work related learning outcomes.

Practicum in Academic School–University Partnerships

We have so far discussed the main features of school–university partnerships in the Netherlands. In this section, we elaborate on the features that are only observed in the *Academische Opleidingsscholen*. As mentioned, 22 of the 56 partnerships decided to become ‘academic’, meaning that in addition to performing all the activities described in the previous section, they also aim at developing new insights and theories through inquiry by collaborating teacher educators, teachers and student teachers. This inquiry fosters school development (Cochran-

Smith & Lytle, 2009; Geijsel & van Eck, 2011; Vrijnsen-de Corte, 2012) and is considered an impactful strategy that encourages the further professional development of teachers and the improvement of their daily teaching practices (Van Veen, Zwart & Meirink, 2012).

Conducting practical inquiries is mandatory for all student teachers. In the traditional internships, the student teachers' own interests are leading in formulating the research questions, and the role of schools is mainly limited to serving as a setting for collecting the research data. In academic school–university partnerships, however, student teachers need to connect their research questions to the agenda of the school, and they preferably become members of a community of teacher–researchers who share the same research interests. These teacher–researchers support the student teachers in conducting research in addition to the guidance they receive from SBTEs and mentors. Teacher–researchers who conduct research and guide student teachers in their research activities are a new and emerging phenomenon in Dutch education, and the launch of academic school–university partnerships promoted its emergence.

Table 4 depicts the special features of the practicum in an academic school–university partnership.

Table 4 *Internships in Academic School-University Partnerships*

Role school in student teachers' education	Realising environment for practice based inquiry aimed at developing and innovating of teaching practice
Notions related to cognition and the transfer of knowledge between education and work	Collaborative inquiry as means of knowledge generation
Valued type of knowledge	Inquiry-based knowledge
Activities by student teachers at school	Participating in collaborative inquiry teams
Guidance provided by	Coordinator inquiry communities Teacher researchers Institute-based researchers
Kind of activities	<i>Coordinator inquiry communities</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Relating individual research questions to school development issues – Connecting student teachers research to teachers research – Organising opportunities to share inquiry results <i>Teacher researchers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (Learn to) use practical inquiry as means of development of (own) practice – Guiding student teachers inquiries especially related to their overall development <i>Institute-based researchers</i>

Table 4 *Internships in Academic School-University Partnerships*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Guiding (student) teachers’ inquiries – Assessing inquiry process and product
Competences needed	Competences related to practice-based inquiry as: planning, methodology, evaluation, organising shared ownership, implementing outcomes.
Conditions needed	<p>Competences related to guidance of practice-based inquiry</p> <p><i>All practitioners with a function or tasks related to being a member of a community of inquiry</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Time and (roster) space for performing inquiries and experiencing innovation – Space for sharing and communicating inquiry-based insights (inside and outside school) <p><i>Student teachers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prepared to perform practice-based inquiry

Advantages and challenges

The practicum as part of teacher education in school–university partnerships differs from the practicum (i.e. the traditional internship) in conventional teacher education. Building partnerships and changing teacher education is a time-consuming and complex process. Nevertheless, there are several advantages to the process, such as the growing collaboration between partners, the building of robust guidance structures in schools aimed at staff development, the development of a critical, reflective culture, and the lived responsibility for student teachers’ development, resulting in the better preparation of student teachers for actual practice (Van Neygen & Belmans, 2011). Nevertheless, there are also serious challenges, which will be briefly outlined hereafter.

In school–university partnerships, different stakeholders need to work together, and this appear to be a rather complex challenge (see Vandyck, De Graaff, Pilot & Beishuizen, 2012). Although collaboration is seen as very important until now neither TEIs nor schools seem very successful in educating their student teachers how to fruitfully collaborate with each other. As a result community building is hard to realise (Vandyck, 2013).

As stated by Sandholz and Finan (1998), partnerships are based on the premise of equal partners. In actual practice at school (or at a TEI where SBTEs become involved in the programme), however, collaboration means working together from different institutional backgrounds, cultures, expertise, methods and values. Working together hence implies, among other things, learning to understand each other’s language and to relate the ideas of one practice to the other, a process that is referred to as ‘boundary crossing’ (e.g. Bullough & Draper, 2004;

Zeichner, 2010). Boundary crossing is a trending topic in inter-organizational learning and vocational education (see for a review study on boundary crossing, Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). What this notion means for teacher educators' activities and student teachers' learning is a rather new and under-researched issue, and one of the challenges faced by school–university partnerships.

The second challenge is even more substantial, particularly for those involved in academic school–university partnerships. In addition to supporting student teachers in developing their teaching competencies, these partnerships also emphasize the need to conduct practice-based research aimed at improving individual student teachers' practice in a systematic way and at innovating teaching practices at school. Being engaged in research is a novelty for most teachers and schools, and has not been properly addressed in teacher education curricula. The development of academic school-university partnerships requires a culture change in schools. Realizing a culture with 'inquiry as a stance' (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) is a process that takes many years. However, this development of also requires a change in institute-based teacher educators' conceptualizations of research. One of the main potential pitfalls is that the nature of practical inquiry is not really acknowledged, but is merely equated with conventional, traditional academic research. Inquiry as a stance, however, will flourish only if all the involved participants – namely teachers, SBTEs, mentors, student teachers and IBTE – collaboratively adopt boundary crossing as a way to further and deepen our thinking on the meaning of inquiry. It goes without saying that this requires significant changes in our work activities, attitudes and identities.

The third challenge concerns the need for research. So far, there has been discussion on the possible merits and pitfalls of school–university partnerships, but research evidence remains scarce. In our view, several aspects deserve more attention from researchers. Firstly, hardly any data are available concerning the enrolment of student teachers in these partnerships. Do they favour this new way of teacher education? There are some indications that student teachers who do not opt to enrol in school–university partnerships emphasize the freedom they experience in conventional teacher education programmes (Geerding & Van Uum, 2008). Being engaged in a school–university partnership is perhaps more challenging, but also more demanding. Some student teachers opt for more freedom and do not want to have too many obligations to prepare for and to have to show up on time at schools. Second, one of the main reasons for promoting school–university partnerships is the assumption that this will contribute to educating better

teachers who will stay in the profession for a considerable time. However, the research evidence concerning the long-term effects of these partnerships on, for example, the teaching performance of novice teachers and their teaching careers is almost entirely absent.

The fourth challenge concerns the necessary resources. Partnerships are likely very cost-effective in educating student teachers, but only if sufficient attention is paid to the further professional development of all the involved participants, which requires schools and TEIs to allocate sufficient time and money for this endeavour.

Finally, we feel there is need for international comparison of school–university partnerships in different countries. Learning with and from each other should not be restricted by geographical frontiers. Here, boundary crossing – in perhaps a slightly different meaning than explained earlier in this section – might be very fruitful too, and we truly hope that this chapter is a modest contribution to the international debate on school–university partnerships and the development of ‘new’ ‘internships’.

References

- Akkerman, S. F. & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 132-169.
- Benton, P. (1990). *The Oxford Internship Scheme: Integration and partnership in initial teacher education*. London: Calouste Gubbenkian Foundation.
- Billett, S. (2001a). Knowing in practice: re-conceptualising vocational expertise. *Learning and Instruction, 11*, 431-452.
- Billett, S. (2001b) Co-Participation: Affordance and Engagement at Work In: T. Fenwick (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education, no. 92, special issue: Socio-cultural perspectives on learning through work* (pp. 63 – 72). Wiley Online Library.
- Billett, S. (2002). Toward a workplace pedagogy: Guidance, participation and engagement. *Adult Education Quarterly, 53*, 27 – 43.
- Bullough, R. V., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad - Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*, 407 - 420.
- Bullough, R., & Gitlin, A. (2010). *Becoming a student of teaching*. New York: Routledge Falmer Press.

- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or for worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34, 3-17.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 166- 173.
- Edwards, A. (2005). Let's go beyond community and practice: the many meanings of learning by participating. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16, 53-69.
- Edwards, A., Gilroy P., & Hartley, D. (2002). *Rethinking teacher education: collaborative responses to uncertainty*. London: Routledge.
- Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2), 247-273.
- Geerdink, G., & Uum, M. van. (2009). Wel of niet kiezen voor opleiden in de school door pabostudenten. Een onderzoek naar het keuzeproces [To choose or not to choose work-based learning by student teachers' in primary education A study in a selection process]. *Tijdschrift voor Lerarenopleiders*. 30, 41-51.
- Geijsel, F. & Van Eck, E. (2011). *Duurzaam vernieuwen. Leren van Expeditie durven, delen, doen [Sustainable innovation What can we Learn from the expedition dare, divide and do]*. Utrecht: VO-raad.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI. Available at: http://www.holmespartnership.org/Tommorows_Schools.pdf
- Imants, J., & Van Veen, K. (2010). Teacher learning as workplace learning. In E. Baker, B. McGaw & P. Peterson (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 3rd Edition (part 7, pp. 569-574). Oxford: Elsevier Scientific Publishers.
- Koster, B., & Dengerink, J. (2000). *Towards a professional standard for Dutch teacher educators*. Paper presented at the ATE conference February 2000, Orlando, USA
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991/2002). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Maandag, D.W., Deinum, J.F., Hofman, W.H.A., & Buitink, J. (2007). Teacher education in schools: an international comparison. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, 151–173.

- Menter, I., Hulme, M., Elliot, D., & Lewin, J. (2010). *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century*. Edinburgh: Education Analytical Services, Schools Research, Scottish Government. Available on: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/09/24144019/0>
- Mule, L. (2006). Preservice teachers' inquiry in a professional development school context: Implications for the practicum *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 205–218.
- Sandholtz, J.H., & Finan, E. C. (1998). Blurring the boundaries to promote school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 13–25. Stoll, L. (2010). Professional learning community In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* Third Edition (pp. 151-157). Elsevier Ltd.
- Streumer, J.N., & Kho, M. (2006). The world of work-related learning. In J.N. Streumer (Ed.), *Work-related learning*, (pp 3-49). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Ten Dam, G., & Blom, S. (2006). Learning through participation. The potential of school-based teacher education for developing a professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 647-660.
- Vandyck, I, De Graaff, R., Pilot, A. & Beishuizen, J.J. (2012). Community building of (student) teachers and a teacher educator in a school-university partnership. *Learning Environments Research*, 15,299-318.
- Vandyck, I. (2013). *Fostering community development in school-university partnerships*. (Doctoral dissertation). Amsterdam: VU University.
- Van Neygen, A., & Belmans, R. (2011). Opleiden in de school: succesfactoren en bedreigingen Reflecties naar aanleiding van de NVAO-beoordeling [School-based teacher education: Success factors and threats Reflections on the NVAO review]. *Tijdschrift voor Lerarenopleiders (Velon / Velov)*, 32, 37 – 41.
- Van Veen, K., Zwart, R. & Meirink, J. (2012). What makes teacher professional development effective? A literature review. In M. Kooy & K. van Veen (Eds.), *Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 3–21). New York: Routledge.
- Van Velzen, C. (2013). *Guiding learning teaching: Towards a pedagogy of work-based teacher education*. Doctoral dissertation VU University Amsterdam: VU University.
- Van Velzen, C., Bezzina, C. & Lorist, P. (2009). Partnerships between schools and teacher education institutes. In Swennen, A. & Van der Klink, M. (Eds) *Becoming a teacher*

- educator. Theory and practice for teacher educators*, 59-73. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media BV.
- Van Velzen, C., Van der Klink, M., Swennen, A. & Yaffe, E. (2010). The induction of teacher educators: The needs of beginning teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1/2), 61-75.
- Van Velzen, C., & Volman, M. (2009). The activities of a school-based teacher educator: a theoretical and empirical exploration. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 345 - 367.
- Van Velzen, C., Volman, M., Brekelmans, M., & White, S. (2012). Guided work-based learning: Sharing practical teaching knowledge with student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 229-239.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 143-178.
- Vrijnsen - De Corte, M. (2012). Researching the teacher-researcher Practice-based research in Dutch professional development schools. Doctoral dissertation Eindhoven: Eindhoven University.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 6, 1-2, 89-99.

ⁱ Dutch teacher education is organized in both research universities and universities of applied sciences. Both types are also known as teacher education institutes.