

Paper Presented to Australian Association for Research in Education

Brisbane, 2-6 December 2002

Those who can, do!

Teacher education as an act of personal and institutional reflexivity.

Brenda Cherednichenko and Tony Kruger

School of Education

Victoria University of Technology

Abstract

Teacher education is more popular than ever as a career and employment rates for Australian graduate teachers are increasing. The impact of globalisation, however, disturbs any sense complacency. Teacher education in Australia continues to be under challenge from the inevitable disruptions created by yet another round of government reviews as well as the emergence of dynamic developments in schooling. The paper will argue against defensiveness as a strategy for teacher education in asserting its active place in higher education. It will outline a proposal for reform which locates teacher education within the reflexive relationships of student teachers and school students, their teachers and with teacher educators. Reconstructing teacher education so that its primary goal is the learning of school students will establish the school-university partnership as a powerful, institutionally reflexive actor in the proposition of new educational policy and organisational techniques. Reformed teacher education will result from the application of the theoretical understanding often derided in the good humoured dig at teacher educators, 'those who can't teach, teach teachers!' If framed by Bernstein's cautionary analysis of curriculum forms and power, theory can initiate teacher education characterised by the agency of 'those who can, do!'

Contact:

B. Cherednichenko/T. Kruger

School of Education

Victoria University

PO Box 14428 MCMC 8001

Ph: 0397477583/0397477486

Brenda.Cherednichenko@vu.edu.au

Tony.Kruger@vu.edu.au

Introduction

...innovation is mostly 'bottom-up' and small scale. It is what the imaginative and responsive school (university) does when it encounters problems and challenges when it thinks out a different and potentially better way of doing something that has become stated by custom or tradition. (Hargreaves 1999: 54)

Research and policy in education has asserted the need for substantial school reform while teacher education has been characterised by a tinkering at the edges of formal university programs (see for example Ramsey 2000). Perhaps more significant change is hindered by what Calderhead and Shorrock (1997) highlighted as a critical problem for universities in developing reflective practice as the basis for teacher education, that is, the loss of teacher educators' status in the role of 'gatekeeper' (p17) to the profession and as facilitators of reflection.

We recognise that practice-theory teacher education is a risk, but our experience as well as our reading of the US Professional Development School literature (Ohanian 2001) and the accounts of partnerships in the UK (Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting and Whitty 2000, Dadds 1997, Furlong, Whitty, Barrett, Barton and Miles 1994) have given us signposts for a reconstruction of teacher education. What follows is a proposal for a way forward which draws on all that we know about good teaching and learning: learner responsive education, practice-theory and inquiry driven as it nurtures reflexive relationships between student teachers and school students. The experience of Project Partnerships, the inquiry basis of the Bachelor of Education P-12 at Victoria University, suggests that when development of the partnership is focused on the learning needs of students, the traditional separation (Eraut 1994) of propositional and process knowledge dissolves as clearly defined zones of action and thinking are not distinguishable or appropriate. It builds on the work of Elliot (1993: 69) who calls for the development of teacher education which is personal, reflexive and critical. Further the work of research teams, comprising school and university colleagues, indicate that collaborative analysis and theorising in practitioner research can initiate a discursive environment inclusive of practitioner and academic research interests. Such a discursive environment supports the generation of theoretical knowledge about teaching and learning. Partnership-based teacher education constructed as collaborative practitioner inquiry about practice and learning establishes the potential to change and improve the practice of all participants: students, teachers, student teachers and teacher educators.

The thinking reported here emerges from School of Education research and practices, such as Project Partnerships (Carpenter et al 2000), the DETYA funded Site-Based Teacher Education Project (Kruger et al 1999) and the ARC Longitudinal Study of School Restructuring (Kruger et al 2001) as well as sustained collegial reform work through the NPDP Innovative Links Project and the Australian National Schools Network. The work of the Innovative Links Project directly informed our initial work. We note in particular the review of partnership-based teacher education by Gore (1995) and the telling distinction she drew between partnerships in teacher education and site-based teacher education.

As an idea for debate and, we hope, trials by colleagues, the paper posits the risky notion that collaborative practitioner inquiry in teacher education can form the basis of practice in teacher preparation: that it will enable the construction of a teacher education curriculum

which is responsive to the needs of learners: these are all involved in teacher education including school students, practising teachers, student teachers and teacher educators. In keeping with other teacher education programs, we could characterise our intention that teacher education at Victoria University is 'reflective practice', 'action research' or 'social inquiry'. What we are suggesting is that defining the nature of the practice or action into which student teachers inquire is at least as important - arguably more so - than the processes of reflection, research and inquiry. The starting point for us is that teacher education should focus its inquiry on, and engage its resources in, enhancing the learning of school students. Working with school students is the authentic interest of student teachers. The problem is for universities to construct an authentic pedagogy to sustain that interest and to initiate a process where student teachers' sense of commitment and responsibility drives a deep inquiry to improving school students' learning and welfare.

Consequently, what we are proposing constitutes a call for reform in university based learning in teacher education. Based on research and practice, this discussion paper raises the possibility of extending the practices of school-university relationships and traditional views of reflective practice to support learning centred, inquiry-led teacher education. It is proposed that such a teacher education curriculum is needed for the development of a socially just society in which teachers, and student teachers too, play a leading role in creating opportunities for all young people to participate, contribute to and lead social reform. In an inquiry-led course the nature of participation will need to be driven by the inquiry not by pre-determined structures. Doing this work appears to be risky business. But no one argues that the conventional university teacher education program is better because it is free from change and risk.

Arguably, the future of the school-university partnership being worked out at Victoria University is consistent with the kind of diagnoses (Giddens 1990, Beck 1998 and Baumann 2000) which discern shifts in the form of social interaction and politics, including globalisation. Indeed, Baumann's 'liquid modernity' - order in localised interaction, within a shifting and uncertain social order - appears to be an apposite description of the nature of the school-university partnership. Challenging the conventional distinctions, however, between tradition and innovation, change and tried practice, process and propositional knowledge cannot be left to local risk management - or aversion strategies. What is needed, we argue, is that local action be characterised by enhanced, educationally explicit and politically debatable connections between local and institutional reflexivity: teacher education in and for reflexive modernisation (Giddens 1990; Beck 1998)!

Learning about Teaching: Why change?

Recent emphasis has focused the discourse of education on notions of excellence and competency and has placed teachers and the teaching profession at the centre of debates over standards and schooling outcomes (Kemp 1997, Ramsey 2000, Sachs, 1997). The result has been a call for tightening of control over curriculum, assessment and accountability. Despite the rhetoric and the claim that common approaches to educational organization will see the improvement of teachers making a difference (Cuttance and Stokes 2001), the goals of schooling are not the same in practice, an argument well made by Connell et al (1993) and more recently by Teese (2000). How does teacher education then respond with appropriate programs which prepare teachers who can teach for equity?

Bernstein asserts that...

'How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control... Formal educational knowledge can be considered to be realised through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge and evaluation defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge on the part of the taught.' (Bernstein 1971: 47).

If Bernstein is correct, then the way in which knowledge is accessed, shaped and made powerful is through the decisions about what and how to teach, the teaching and learning environment and the understandings about what is learned and how it is learned. The traditional separation of practice as school-based learning and theory as university-based learning imposes an exclusivity about the knowledge generated in each site and serves to exclude student teachers from access to the profession until after graduation. Thus a hierarchy of professional knowledge is created which serves to deny access to those who would most value it. It creates a class system within the profession - those who have access to the practices and discourse of schools and classrooms and those who do not. 'It is as if pedagogic discourse is itself no more than a relay for power relations external to itself...' (Bernstein 1990: 166). Within a discourse of postmodernity, Beckett and Hagar (2002) make the point that the knowledge paradigm to be valued in the future will be the organic learning which emerges from workplaces. It is time for a thorough-going re-construction of teacher education, and by extension other professional preparation courses.

Reflecting the practice of the traditional construction of professional learning in universities, Eraut has proposed that the accumulation of professional knowledge is a carefully managed acquisition of both process and propositional knowledge, i.e. the knowledge formally acquired in universities and that acquired through its application in practice. The assumption is that such knowledge is present in significantly different forms in different locations and is mastered separately at a time decided by the university program. Eraut acknowledges the contradictions implicit in learning one without the other, nevertheless claiming each as a discrete knowledge to be explicitly *connected* to the other through practice experiences.

Eraut's position is questioned by the argument presented in this paper. Professional teacher learning, we argue, occurs through the investigation of the social practices of learning and teaching, situated in classrooms. New practices can be delivered through collaborative inquiry partnerships, so fusing the traditional dichotomy and eroding the separation of *process/propositional* knowledge in schools and university which represents learning as segmented and divisible (Eraut 1994: 116). The paper contends that learning is not the product of a practice-theory or theory-practice nexus. Rather learning occurs through exploring and understanding practice, i.e. *praxis*. The relationship between practice and theory mirrors what Bauman has labelled 'liquid modernity' as reflexive practice shapes 'the patterns of communication and co-ordination between individually conducted life policies on the one hand and political actions of human collectives on the other' (Baumann 2000: 6).

The Bachelor of Education at Victoria University attempts to challenge the top-down, university driven curriculum of teacher education as teachers in the University, its partner schools and other educational settings engage with difficult questions of pedagogy, curriculum and the essential knowledge base of teacher education. This knowledge base, often conceived as professional or procedural, *process or propositional* (Eraut 1994), *academic or operational* (Hager 2000), and academic research as either pure and quantitative research, *mode 1*, and qualitative or *mode 2* research (Gibbons et al 1994), is explored as an integrated complementary development. These dialectics are dissolved

through a dialogue of inquiry in which contrasting and conflicting experiences and views are 'worked out' among participants (Schon 1991).

Drawing on the understanding of Bernstein by Moore and Paton (2001), what is proposed here is a pedagogic discourse constructed from the social practices of teachers and learners that reflects relations within education practices and enables the production of new educational knowledge which is not hierarchically bound. In this context, the experience and ideas speculated in this paper reflect the beginnings of an educational development which supports a partnership of inquiry between the individuals in a learning community: school students, school teachers, student teachers and teacher educators. It outlines a proposal for a professional community of inquiry about student learning, for enhanced school student learning, as the central problem of teacher education, constructed as a *discursive environment* (Kruger et al 2001).

School Students as the focus of a Discursive Environment for Teacher Learning

Re-structuring teacher education as inquiry-oriented and based on reflective practice is one goal. Kosnik (2001) describes work at OISE as building on Schon's work through the development of an inquiry community for linking practice and theory in a teacher education program. This paper suggests however that the critical focus for restructuring teacher education is not only around the notion of reflective practice: it must be focussed on the learning needs of school students and the student teachers' response to them as the central issue for reflection. When the reflection is focussed on the needs of the student teacher, or the teacher educator, the central purpose of teaching, ie school student learning, is not central to the inquiry.

Eisner (2001: 371) has described learning as a social practice, arguing that learning, the real measure of educational achievement, is 'what students do with what they learn when they can do what they want to do'. Similarly, teaching is a practice which results from teachers' intentions and their understanding of students, curriculum, school organization and the development of their professional knowledge. The critical teaching questions are therefore about students and their learning: 'what do the students need to learn and why?; how do we know they have learned?; and how do we help all children learn?' (Stoll and Fink 1995: 122).

The Longitudinal Study of School Restructuring (LSSR) offered an approach to investigating classroom practices which supported democratic collaborative practitioner inquiry (Kruger et al 2001). This approach enables teacher and student teacher learning through the shared focus on school student learning and rigorous reflection and discussion of the outcomes of teaching practice. The research of the LSSR demonstrated that the practices of teaching and learning go far beyond the design of the curriculum, teacher intent or even the lesson plan.

Understanding how teaching affects learning, and teachers and learners impact the outcomes for each (Darling-Hammond 1999, Serpell 2000), is to explain the social practices of the classroom. Arguably, the active participation of practitioners in inquiry about their own practices is essential in understanding how teaching affects learning. As a result, to understand how professional learning affects student teacher quality and so student learning, a form of inquiry is required which enables the description and interrogation of the social practices of classrooms. Such inquiry will itself also be professionally developing for teachers, leading to their renewal as they become researchers of their own learning.

This reflective and reflexive action, it is argued, is the basis for teacher education constructed as collaborative practitioner inquiry: reflective, iterative, practice-centred and drawing on teachers' theories of teaching, their subject knowledge and responsive to school organizational issues (Brookfield 1995, Stein et al 1999). Informed by the school reform work of school classrooms the pedagogy for teacher education proposed here is scaffolded by concepts and practices such as: authentic learning, pedagogy and practice (Newmann and Associates 1996), productive pedagogies (Luke, Ladwig and Lindgard 2000) and the recognition of essential areas of learning (Brennan 2000).

Building from these pedagogies, the discursive environment provides a place in teacher's work for the discursive consciousness Giddens (1984) stresses and Kincheloe's (1993: 109) *critical constructivism* to be influential in stimulating change for improvement and for dialogic inquiry about practice, ie as *praxis*. It is important to note that teacher knowledge development is not challenged here; it is more a matter of the trajectory of inquiry through which knowledge is appropriated and how is it constructed.

Changing Practice in the Bachelor of Education P-12 at Victoria University

Situated within the western region of Melbourne, the Bachelor of Education must take account of the personal, educational and social conditions within its community, most often identified as disadvantaged and which are ever present drivers for improved curriculum for teacher preparation. The response proposed here is for a teacher education pedagogy which inquires about praxis: that *connects* practice/theory, school (workplace) and University, propositional and process knowledge, critique and social action through shared inquiry about school student learning..

In 2002 the challenge has been to develop a framework which supports an integrated set of attitudes, practices, understandings and skills which stimulate the discursive environment and co-inquiry about the social practices of classrooms. Such engagement about learning improvement stimulates the social responsibility of education to socially just processes and outcomes. While the common curriculum delivers educational and social disadvantage (Teese 2000) as does the pedagogical context (Morais & Neves 2001), Project Partnership Learning Teams, the practice base of the B. Ed, arguably has the potential to contribute to a student responsive curriculum in schools. Initiated by the learning needs of school students, the 'working out' of the learning need is the place where propositional and process knowledge are integrated through collaborative practitioner inquiry. What is proposed is a new pedagogy in teacher education which shapes *learner responsive teacher education* and centers on *praxis inquiry* in a discursive environment: a professional discourse and practice that is reflexive and critical, inquiry and learner responsive, not practice-led.

Figure 1: A Learner Responsive Pedagogy for Teacher Education

Student teachers in

Partnerships

Student teachers generate Student teachers respond to inquiry

Inquiry from Partnerships seeking knowledge, theory, etc

**Developing an Inquiry Focused Learner Responsive Pedagogy for Partnership Based
Teacher Education**

Praxis Context

Applying insights gained through unpublished research for the Innovative Site-Based Teacher Education Project Report (Kruger et al 2000) to the Bachelor of Education, *praxis* in partnership-based teacher education is conceived as the working out of a 'problem' of school student learning for teacher education. The partnership is not geographical, it centres on the fundamental relationships generated to 'solve' the problem, i.e. to enhance school student learning through the collaborative work of teachers, student teachers and teacher educators, in school, at the university and in the community.

Figure 2: The Partnership: Localised Action - Described, Interpreted, Theorised

The University Program

- Generalised practices and academic discourses
- **Practice-theory related to formal theory**
- Propositional knowledge (Eraut 1994)
- Valid or Mode 1 research (Gibbons et al 1994)
- Course structures
- Reward as Assessment
- Teaching program time/space organisation

The Educational Setting

- **Collaborative Inquiry into personalised, localised practices and discourses**
- Theory in practice
- Procedural Knowledge (Eraut 1994)
- Action or Mode 2 research (Gibbons et al 1994)
- Setting/School/System structures
- Reward for competence in performance
- Setting (eg school) time / space organisation

Note: this diagram is adapted from earlier work by the authors.

Establishing the basis for teacher education as the problem of enabling school student learning demands a new relationship between school students, student teachers, teachers and teacher educators. Figure 2 suggests the connected relationship and outcome for stakeholders and proposes rethinking the traditional divisions between theory and practice, school and university, etc in establishing a partnership relationship centred on student learning and suggests appropriate outcomes for teacher education. An essential characteristic of the partnership is the initial requirement for understanding the *personal* and *local* needs of learners and teachers. The development of the relationship between all stakeholders is nurtured then through formal and informal mentoring and the opportunity for mutual benefits to be achieved. Authority and responsibility afforded to student teachers for school student learning enable the university curriculum to be located in the school classroom, in professional dialogue in the staffroom as well as reflective workshops located at the university. In this way all stakeholders are involved in responsive teaching and learning, rather than being subject to measured and timed doses of practice and theory.

Figure 3: Learning Model in Partnership Based Teacher Education

The above model conceptualises the engagement of teacher education with school education, establishing what will be the form of the relationship between student and teacher, structures (school and university principally) and agents. The experience of each organization and its members is connected through and influenced by shared experience and inquiry about practice: an inquiring community whose primary goal is the enhancement of learning of all participants, through a focus on the moral responsibility for the learning needs of school students. The partnership is essentially a moral relationship between educators, not the economic rationalist financially motivated version of partnership which universities favour.

There is fluidity, as Baumann (2000) suggested, within teaching that both purposively challenges and responds to learners. In this way, within a collaborative team of student teachers, teachers and teacher educators, the student teacher learns through engaging school students in learning, and in discursive reflection on that learning is also stimulated to seek new knowledge, to examine existing research and to explore innovative practices. Thus, the resolution of the problems of partnerships in teacher education provides the possibility of the construction of a *discursive environment* involving all stakeholders. Here, *discursive* means being able to explain and give evidence for why things occur as they do in practice. Such an approach stimulates 'just in time' or *student responsive* learning as a response to personal challenge, development and reflection. It offers an interpretation different from the suggestion that teaching and learning about teaching is *isidiosyncratic* as

suggested by Elliot and Calderhead (1995) who explained the inability of teacher education programs to prescribe the knowledge that is required for successful teaching. Rather the discursive environment is the place of the construction of learning, drawing on past theory and research, current experience with the learning of school students and then reflexively considering future approaches to learning and so stimulating further inquiry, research and practical theorising of teachers.

One distinctive outcome of working this type of learning structure is that it demands new ways of working at the university. Eraut's approach, based on a divide between the knowledge gained in practice and that delivered through theory, is irrelevant and gets in the way of student teachers engaging with the problem of teacher education as a key stimulus for their own learning. The discursive environment also provides a framework for substantive teacher reflection and learning in the 'long durée' (Giddens 1984) of the education of student teachers and career long professional development of teachers. We argue that it satisfies the demanding theorising offered by Hager and Beckett (2002) for an approach to workplace learning in which practitioner judgement is organically and holistically integrated into learning.

In establishing this kind of partnership-based teacher education, the problem is constructed as one for the University, its structures and traditions. How then does inquiry about the nature and outcomes of practice lead to improved learning for all? The challenge exists to enable personalised, localised and relationships centred practice, the dependent nature of partnership-based teacher education to construct a form of learning engagement or *praxis inquiry* which leads to publicly verifiable and validated outcomes, eg the practices associated with professional competence - however defined. This research focus for partnership based learning enables the development of both process and propositional knowledge through the investigation of local practice.

Developing praxis inquiry

Universities solve the problem of what to teach and what students should learn by dividing up the curriculum into subjects with specified content and assessment to match. Normally the subjects are organised into hierarchies of difficulty from Year 1 to Year 3 of a course. Such an essentialist arrangement is not tenable in the kind of partnership-based teacher education which we are proposing.

Not surprisingly, we have found the solution to the problem of inquiry in teacher education from the best work being done in school education. We suggest that the New Basics trials in Queensland stand as a model for teacher education: that the productive pedagogies and rich tasks in the Queensland New Basics should not only be content **taught in** teacher education courses. Teacher education should also be reconstructed so that the conceptual foundation of their curriculum and pedagogy are organised around productive pedagogies and rich tasks.

In terms of developing a university course structure which satisfies course approval processes, we face a major hurdle. The question is can a university course be written by specifying a form of inquiry into particular but undefined school student learning questions and does not detail content in subjects. The strategy which follows is our current best thinking; and it reflects our hope that we want to also 'do' as well as teach, and teach teachers!

As there are questions over the appropriation of the 'rich task' terminology, we have decided to employ the term 'praxis inquiry' to define the scope of the work of the student teacher. We recognise that in commencing from practice, the danger exists that teacher education can be

reduced to the development of 'skills and technical expertise' associated with 'training' (Gore 1995: 13). So the challenge is to take as a starting point what might initially be a narrow question about schools students and their learning and to construct a form of inquiry into teaching and learning characterised by the demanding and intense inquiry which we associate with the Queensland productive pedagogies.

We are proposing a formal inquiry structure which would guide course development, but would also be the content for a program of teacher education which each student teacher - or teams of student teachers - would negotiate and review with teacher educators during each university year. Praxis inquiry would expect student teachers to develop a program of practice, research and study with the following interconnected levels:

Technical: the behaviour of effective teaching in a particular setting; generalised forms of behaviour (eg the early years), curriculum, technologies of control, progress through hierarchies of attributes.

Task: to plan and teach within a formal or prescribed curriculum framework.

Epistemological forms of knowledge, theories of learning, forms of teaching; theorising teaching and learning.

Task: to construct curriculum, pedagogy and assessment which meet the learning needs of a particular group of school students.

Ontological the nature of existence: humanity, society, morality/equality, emotion/desire communication; philosophy of action/structure. Nature of relationships, interests and commitments

Task: to understand students, their families, local communities and the action of education in the world as a basis of curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and classroom practice.

A structural basis to teacher education of this kind, we argue, transforms what a university program will achieve. As Beckett (2000: 79) has argued when we both the ontological and epistemological dimensions of workplace activity are open to examination

... we may now conclude now that it is the working body that learns - in (mainly) social activity, some of which is mental, some of which is physical. Through this activity mental and physical aspects are intertwined. The educational significance for us when we are conceptualizing working knowledge is that these activities are

experienced holistically, by people in daily life, in social interrelationships, and often through the leadership of work-based colleagues, who track through these inevitably embodied experiences with the learners.

We are a good distance from putting this idea into practice. But Figure 4 indicates how a practice, teaching and learning program using praxis inquiry might emerge for student teachers. What we see is that the resources for teaching in the university - classes, workshops, texts, online - will need to respond to the demands of student teachers; and not the other way around!

Figure 4: Praxis Inquiry in the Bachelor of Education: enabling the Discursive Environment

| Practice | Discursive Environment | Course Features |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>School proposes curriculum focus, i.e. project which will enhance learning of school students</p> <p>Student teachers work on practical component of Praxis Inquiry in school.</p> <p>University-based</p> | <p>Team of student teachers negotiate Praxis Inquiry which structures their learning and school-based practice</p> <p>Structures, practices, resources required for student teacher inquiry in Praxis Inquiry.</p> <p>Discursive Environment requires student teachers to <u>describe</u>, <u>interpret</u> and <u>theorise</u> practice: Praxis Outcomes.</p> | <p>Project criteria defined (Stage 1) for establishment of Partnership</p> <p>Criteria for Praxis Inquiry (Stage 2)</p> <p>Participation in school, university teaching program, online learning, peer mentoring support action research and Praxis Outcomes (Stage 3)</p> <p>Praxis Outcomes achieved through course teaching and learning as inquiry/reflective</p> |

Defining praxis outcomes to guide student teachers' inquiry and to be references for assessment. Praxis outcomes will have similar structural characteristics to praxis inquiry and reflect and demonstrate the achievement of learning goals set for school students through the project initiation and for the student teacher.

Action:

Praxis outcomes at each year level defined as relating currently to the National Competency Framework for Beginning Teachers, the formal summative framework applied in the B.Ed. Student teachers negotiate the direction of their learning at the university as a response to their own needs and those of their Project Partnership. Teacher educators engage in teaching which is focused and responsive to student teachers' professional development. A range of formats and structures are required to support this at the University. The processes of negotiating praxis outcomes with student teachers are reviewed, refined and documented as the basis for improving school-university partnerships. Academic advice from the teacher educator, as part of the partnership team, is an essential support for achievement of student teacher learning and so the delivery of learning outcomes for the school student.

Stage 4:

The university program is reorganised so that selecting, establishing and managing the input features which enable student teachers to complete praxis inquiry, participate in the discursive environment and meet negotiated praxis outcomes.

Action:

Teacher educators and teachers reflect on the personal professional development which they have achieved through the work with student teachers as they engage with school student learning. This reflection supports an extended review of possibilities for university teaching and learning. The aim will be to maximise student teacher agency within a flexible program which provides explicit opportunities for a range of inputs and extensive development in student teachers' reflective practice. Online, burst mode, school-based, etc and other flexible structures will be utilised.

Stage 5:

The evidence of praxis outcomes, i.e. student teacher competence, curriculum knowledge and practical theorising is presented in a range of media. Assessment in this pedagogy appears as a defence of practice and understanding, reported in a Portfolio, and reported within a 'colloquium' at the end of the period working on the project.

Action:

The development of a portfolio process reports praxis inquiry, progress in achieving praxis outcomes and includes reference to the Framework for Beginning Teacher Competence. On-going review of the development of the portfolio throughout the partnership provides the evidence basis for discursive

conversation about praxis. The portfolio, elaborated in the colloquium, is the evidence of teacher readiness and demonstrates the acquisition of both propositional and process knowledge through the achievement of teaching competence.

Proposal for Educationally Responsive and Responsible Teacher Education: Master of Education (Teaching)

The theoretical basis for the proposal outlined in this paper is that teaching and learning about teaching can be understood only as social practice and as such must be conducted as an inquiry with practitioners. Collaborative practitioner inquiry has been successful in researching the teaching and learning practices of classrooms (Kruger et al 2001, Kemmis 2000, Stein et al 1999, Sachs 1997). Such research forms the basis of this new teacher education program and the practices which frame it.

A significant impact of the DETYA Site Based Teacher Education research was the establishment of a review of pedagogy in the Bachelor of Education initiated in July 2000. This review explored the conditions of teaching and learning in teacher education; with a later review of the other pre-service course in the School of Education in mind. The working party proposed two significant developments:

- a. a two year post-graduate program with multiple pathways for students wishing to develop pre-service and post-registration education.
- b. a model for this program inspired by authentic pedagogy, was outcomes focused and build flexible arrangements for learner responsiveness across a range of pre-service education programs - early childhood, primary and secondary.

Course Goals

Significantly, our proposal extends the vision of the pre-service undergraduate Bachelor of Education to a more appropriate set of goals for post-graduate study and is strongly focused on the development of **scholarship and research** as professional endeavours for both the advancement of the individual and the profession. The extension of the role of **information and communications technology** is seen as central to the professional work of teachers as they prepare young people for teaching and learning environment which are increasingly global and undefined. In conceiving the future of teacher education it has been critical to understand that university learning, as with the learning of school students, has fundamentally shifted from the central control of the institution to the complex and intricately balanced responses to the needs of students. As such innovative **student responsive pedagogies** focused on student led and negotiated inquiry and outcomes focused assessment practices will be embedded in this new program. Such practices reflect the Personalised Access and Study practices of the University and extend them to include all participants in teacher education - student teacher and teacher educator, as well as school student and mentor teacher.

Development Practices

Praxis inquiry is a pedagogy which fuses practice and theory within a discursive environment based on Project Partnerships which are constructed as negotiated research, planning, action and reflection on practice. The goal of the praxis inquiry in teacher education is to enable improved learning outcomes for school students and so the achievement of equity

and social justice. Such praxis inquiry enables the development of the following course attributes

- Reflexive/reflective engagement with practice
- Flexible selection of 'real' and 'virtual' inputs
- Assessment as description, interpretation, theorising / change of practice

The development of a discursive environment is evident when the professional conversation and reflective dialogue are extended to focus not only on immediate problem solving, but identify substantive teaching and learning issues resulting from inquiry about student learning needs through continuous practice. It is an active engagement with practice. Responsibility for learning of students is the focus of the inquiry and is shared by and inclusive of all partners. In such an environment the inquiry is generated from critical reflection on the documented descriptions, achievements and dilemmas of practice. The discursive environment has the potential to connect the individual in an increasingly globalised yet isolated community of inquiry and to generate shared vision and practices for improvement. The desired achievement of this proposal and the resulting teacher education program is perhaps not so much as to enable 'those you can teach, to teach!' but rather 'those you do teach, to teach well!'

Organising Praxis Inquiry: What do teaching and learning look like?

Negotiating praxis inquiry as an educational development of partnership based teacher education is **essential** as beginning teachers are increasingly required to be responsible for the education of young people emerging in a radically changing social context. Is such a development representative of Touraine's argument that society no longer shapes and construct individuals and their identity? Rather, he proposes 'the defence, by all social actors, of their cultural and psychological specificity... can be found within the individual, and no longer in social institutions of universalistic principles' (Touraine 1998, cited in Baumann 2001: 22).

In any context the practice of teaching and learning in praxis inquiry will focus on the school. In pragmatic terms it will involve professional learning teams organised at both the school and the university and structured class/meeting times for building and utilising the possibilities of a discursive environment. Essential material will be available in flexible forms, such as on-line, and large periods of time will be spent responding to the needs of learners, researching issues, developing curriculum plans and evaluating and identifying student learning outcomes.

Reforming the University's role in Teacher Education

The advancement of the reflective practitioner assumes reflection on practice, any practice. Like Kosnik (2001) and others, we are attempting to change an entire program and the way University learning is structured. We are also attempting to change the perspective of teacher education. While student teacher learning is the obvious goal, we argue that this is most evident in the learning of school students. If we are only seeking learning in student teachers, we do not go far enough. Student teachers will learn with or without teacher education. In doing so we challenge Grimmatt's (1995) suggestion of a proposed merging agendas for teachers and teacher educators. We suggest a merger is not necessary, what we need to do is be explicit about the agenda we already share: not the teaching of teachers and student teachers, but the learning of school students.

What is missing from the reflective practitioner research is the school student. Calls for the reconstruction (Elliot 1993), reconceptualizing (Wideen & Grimmatt 1995) and rethinking

(Darling-Hammond 1999) of teacher education are all restrained by the practices of universities which drive the curriculum and more importantly relegate practice to a few weeks in schools each year. The suggestions here are about overturning the organization of university knowledge and deciding the university curriculum as a response to the learning needs of student teachers as they in turn meet the learning needs of their school students. When student teachers are committed to the advancement of school student learning, through on-going committed practice in schools established in partnership based teacher education, the resultant demand is for university learning which supports practice driven inquiry, in an organic and holistic way (Beckett and Hager 2002). And so the construction of the university program becomes essential in the development of teacher knowledge, but not in the traditional form or shape.

References

- Baumann, Z. 2000. Liquid modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beckett, D. 2000. 'Eros and the virtual: Enframing working knowledge through technology'. 66-83 in Symes and McIntyre.
- Beckett, D. and Hager, P. 2002. Life, work and learning: Practice in postmodernity. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein B. 1990. Class, codes and control. London: Routledge and Kagen Paul
- Bernstein, B. 1971. 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge.' In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control. (pp. 47-69). London: Collier MacMillan.
- Brookfield, S. 1995. Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brennan, M. 2000. 'A new generation of high schools for the ACT.' Discussion paper developed for the ACT Department of Education and Community Services Project: High Schools for the New Millenium. University of Canberra.
- Calderhead, J & Shorrock, S. B. 1997, Understanding teacher education: Case studies in professional development of beginning teachers, London, Falmer Press.
- Carpenter, C., Cherednichenko, B., Davies, A. and Kruger, T. 2000. 'Liaising dangerously? A decade of practice-based learning in teacher education.' Keynote Paper presented at the Rethinking Teacher Education Conference, Melbourne, 11-12 Oct.
- Connell, R. W. 1993. Schools and social justice. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation. Monograph Series No 12. Victoria: ACER.
- Cuttance, P. and Stokes, S.A. 2001. 'Innovation and best practice.' In Cuttance, P. (Ed) School innovation: Pathway to a knowledge society. Canberra: DETYA.
- Dadds, M. 1997. 'Continuing professional development: nurturing the expert within.' British Journal of In-service Education. 23 (1), 31-38.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1999. 'Teacher education: Rethinking practice and policy.' Unicorn, Journal of the Australian College of Education. 25 (1), 30-48.

Eisner, E. 2001. 'What does it mean to say a school is doing well?' Phi Delta Kappan 82 (5), 367-372.

Elliot, J. 1993. 'Professional education and the idea of practical educational science.' in Elliot, J. (ed) Reconstructing teacher education: Teacher development. London, Falmer Press.

Elliot, J. (ed) 1993. Reconstructing teacher education: Teacher development. London, Falmer Press.

Eraut, M. 1994. Developing professional knowledge and competence. London: Falmer Press.

Gibbons, M. Limoges, C., Nowotny, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. 1994. The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies. London: Sage.

Giddens, A. 1984. The constitution of society. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gore, J. 1995. Emerging Issues in Teacher Education. Murdoch University: Innovative Links Project.

Grimmett, P. P. 1995. 'Reconceptualising teacher education: Preparing teachers for revitalised schools', in Wideen, M.F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds) Changing times in teacher education: Reconstructing or reconceptualizing. London, Falmer Press.

Hager, P. 2000. 'Knowledge that works: Judgement and university curriculum', in Barnett, R. (Ed). Working knowledge: The new vocationalism and higher education. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Kemp, D. 1997. 'Supporting quality teaching' Unicorn, Journal of the Australian College of Education. 23 (2), 3-11.

Kincheloe, J. L. 1993. Towards a critical politics of teacher thinking. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Kosnik, C. 2001, 'The effects of an inquiry-oriented teacher education program on a faculty member: some critical incidents and my journey.' Reflective practice. 2 (1), 65-81.

Kruger, T., Millwater, J., Yarrow, A., Short, J., Cherednichenko, B., Hooley, N. and Moore, R. 2001. Report of the longitudinal study of school re-structuring. Australian Research Council, Canberra.

Marais, A. & Neves, I. 2001. 'Pedagogic social contexts: Studies for a sociology of learning' in Marais, A., Neves, I., Davies, B & Daniels, H. (Eds) Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research. 185-222.

Moore, R. and Paton, K. 2001, 'Founding the sociology of knowledge: Basil Bernstein, intellectual fields and the epistemic divide', in Marais, A., Neves, I., Davies, B & Daniels, H. (Eds) Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research. 153-182.

Newmann, F., King, M. B. and Rigdon, M. 1997. 'Accountability and school performance'. Harvard Educational Review. 67 (1), 41-69.

Ohanian, S. 2001. 'News from the test resistance trials'. Phi Delta Kappan. 82 (5), 363-366.

Ramsey, G. 2000. Quality matters. Dept of Education, NSW.

Sachs, J. 1997. 'Re-visioning teacher education'. Unicorn, Journal of the Australian College of Education. 23 (2), 46-57.

Schon, D. 1991. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. London: Arena

Schools Council, National Board of Employment, Education and Training. 1990. Australia's teachers: An agenda for the next decade. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Serpell, Z. 2000, Planning teacher induction: A review of the literature. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. ERDS.

Stein, M., Smith, M. and Silver, E. 1999. 'The development of professional developers; learning to assist teachers in new settings in new ways.' Harvard Educational Review. 69 (3), 237-261.

Syme, C. and McIntyre, J. 2000. Working Knowledge: The new vocationalism and higher education. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Teese, R. 2000. Academic success and social power. Camberwell: ACER.

Touraine, A. 1998. 'Can we live together, equal and different?' European Journal of Social Theory, November. p.117

Wideen, M.F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds) 1995. Changing times in teacher education: Reconstructing or reconceptualizing. London, Falmer Press.