Course Plan

TE 970, Curriculum and Pedagogy in Teacher Education

Spring semester, 2004; Thursdays 7-10 p.m., 222 Erickson Hall

Instructor: Tom Bird, 116R Erickson Hall, 432-2367 (office), 336-7972 (home), tombird@msu.edu

I. Bases for the course plan

A. Related courses. The plan for the course should take into account the existence of several related courses; their course descriptions can be considered as a survey of a field:

TE921. LEARNING TO TEACH. Intellectual, practical, and moral dimensions of teaching and learning to teach. Impact of formal and informal influences on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

TE922. THE CONTEXT AND MICRO-POLITICS OF TEACHER EDUCATION. Historical and contemporary forms of teacher education in relation to social and institutional contexts. Relation of traditional and innovative programs to basic tensions and issues in field.

TE923. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHING, CURRICULUM, AND TEACHER EDUCATION. Constructing national responses to universal questions. Links among education and other nation-building institutions. Organization and distribution of knowledge. Organization of, preparation for, and practice of teaching.

TE 971. TEACHER LEARNING IN SCHOOL SETTINGS. Research about school-based learning by prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers. Observation, conversation, writing, and classroom research as tools for improving teaching.

TE 970. CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY IN TEACHER EDUCATION. Teacher learning opportunities at the preservice, induction, and inservice levels. Intended and enacted curriculum, sources of pedagogy, and their impact on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

From this array, I conclude that our shared work in the course should focus on the curriculum and pedagogy of *preservice* teacher education: What should be taught, and how should it be taught? Members' individual projects may range more widely in the course description.

B. Topology for the course? Even if we restrict the field to preservice teacher education, we face a potentially bewildering array of topics we might attend to. Here's a partial list:

Traditions of teacher preparation (From Feiman-Nemser, 1990)

- The normal school tradition
- The liberal arts tradition
- Professionalization (through scientific research and graduate preparation)
- [Will there have been a "postmodern" tradition of teacher education someday?]

Structural alternatives for teacher preparation (From Feiman-Nemser, 1990)

- Undergraduate programs
- Extended (5 year) Programs
- Graduate-level programs
- Alternative certification programs.

Conceptual orientations (and aims) in teacher preparation (From Feiman-Nemser, 1990)

- The academic orientation
- The practical orientation
- The technological orientation
- The personal orientation
- The critical/social orientation

Perspectives on learning to teach (from Feiman-Nemser and Remilllard, 1996):

- Times and places in learning to teach.
- Teacher candidates as learners
- The content of learning to teach
- Processes and opportunities in learning to teach

Modes of discourse in teaching and teacher preparation: (from Sykes and Bird, 1992)

- Foundations (theory into practice)
- Pragmatic deliberation and action
- Narrative knowing as a natural kind
- Casuistry--cases as knowledge

Images of knowing, learning, and practice (from Sykes and Bird, 1992, and Feiman-Nemser and Remillard, 1996)

- Prior beliefs and conceptual change
- Cognitive flexibility in advanced knowledge acquisition
- Situated cognition and action
- Reflection-in and –on action
- Expertise in teaching

Elements of designs for teacher preparation courses and programs:

- The immediate and ultimate AIMS that we [higher education-based and school-based teacher educators] pursue.
- The SUBJECT MATTER (phenomena, ideas, materials, etc) that we invoke, present, represent, and otherwise attempt to bring to teacher candidates' attention.
- The TASKS we ask teacher candidates to perform--how, where, and when.
- The DISCOURSES (patterns for communicating, inquiring, persuading) that we promote.
- The PARTICIPATION STRUCTURES (patterns for interaction and relationship) that we promote.
- The ROLES AND MOVES that we employ.
- The ways we ASSESS AND EVALUATE teacher candidates' performance, practice, and learning, within the current environment of "accountability" and of alignment of standards, requirements, and program evaluation.

C. What's going on now at MSU

The course could take advantage of the fact that a lot is happening right now at MSU:

- In the Teachers for a New Era (TNE) project, Carnegie Corporation's assessment is that there is not, in the US, consensus about good teacher preparation programs and this lack of consensus is hindering development of the field. Carnegie aims to induce consensus by funding some good programs to become exemplary and to show that to others. We have taken on quite a lot
- TNE subject matter teams (Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies) comprise members from Education and from other colleges. Their current work is to develop standards, after which they will move on to examination of the curriculum.
- TNE includes an assessment team; one part of it is working with the teacher preparation team leaders on an "embedded evaluation"--an evaluation that

3

would operate as a normal part of the program, and contribute to the program at the same time as it collects data about the program.

- TNE has an urban education team that's just getting started. . . .
- TE Department has launched a task force on Standard 7 (technology) of the Entry Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT). It meets for the first time on January 14. We have an invitation to contribute, which I describe below in the section on shared projects.

Such local activities could provide us concrete bases for discussion, reading; conversely, a group of 14 persons who allocate some if their time in the course to what's going on might make material contributions.

D. Environment. Probably we should at least notice what's going on in the environment of teacher preparation:

- External critique: National Center on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) [http://www.nctq.org/] (while there, sign up for their Teacher Quality Bulletin); National Center for Alternative Certification [http://www.ncei.com/]; No Child Left Behind, [http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml]
- Burgeoning standards, accreditation: Michigan Periodic Review: [http://edweb1.educ.msu.edu/MSUReview/website/default.asp (give username "msu" and password "staples"; check out "specialty area program descriptions, esp. section 7, the standards matrix)]; Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) [http://www.teac.org/ (MSU is affiliated, might have to submit "Inquiry Brief" in 2005-2006)].
- In relation to both of the above, the on-going argument about argument: what is "scientific," what is good or good enough evidence to provide a basis for policy, practice, etc.?

E. Framing the problem of the course

In pragmatic and specifically Deweyan terms, I might say that the problem of the course is something like this:

> How can persons who intend to educate prospective schoolteachers design and enact educative environments for them?

or

> What happens when an experienced student with strongly continuous experience of schools meets the materials and activities of a teacher preparation program?

The latter formulation is employed in most of the topics in the schedule, below; the cue is the verb "meets."

Schedule of activity

Week Date	Topics and Reading	Due
1 1/15	Introductions Examine and refine the course plan Projects: Shared, member, tp course design projects	
2 1/22	*Shared project: web-surfing social e-mailer meets "the seventh standard"* Blanton 1998 Telecommunications and teacher education Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (PDF) Member contributions to the project	
3 1/29	*Survey of preservice teacher education:* Feiman-Nemser, S. (1989). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, and Janine Remillard, (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. National Center for Research on Teacher Education. Findings from the teacher education and learning to teach study. Wideen, Marvin, Mayer-Smith, Jolie, & Moon, Barbara, (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach. Wilson, Suzanne M., Robert E. Floden, & Joan Ferrini-Mundy (2001). Teacher Preparation Research: Current Knowledge, Gaps, and Recommendations. (PDF)	
4 2/5	*Program evaluation (accreditation, accountability, etc.)* TEAC Accreditation System (http://teac.org/accreditation/index.asp) Michigan Periodic Review (http://www.michigan.gov/mde/ , then choose programs and offices, then professional preparation services, then teacher prep programs-standards and approval) MSU's 2001-2002 MI Periodic Review (http://edweb1.educ.msu.edu/MSUReview/website/default.asp, give username "msu" and password "staples") Cochran-Smith 2001 Outcomes question in TE Zeichner & Wray 2001 Teaching portfolio	Member project: problem and plan
5 2/12	*Shared project: embedded program evaluation:* Bird (2003). A conception of the embedded program evaluation Bird (2004). A rubric for a science teaching cycle. Member contributions to the project	
6 2/19	*Long apprenticeship & common sense meet reading, writing, discussion, reflection, deliberation, etc.* Dunn 1999 Deliberate practice Fendler 2000 Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors Gitlin 1999 Pre-service teachers' thinking Holt-Reynolds 2000 What Pintrich 1993 Beyond cold conceptual change	

	Richardson 1996 Role of beliefs in learning to teach	

7 2/26	*Student experience meets novice teacher experience* Bransford 1999 Rethinking transfer Feiman-Nemser 1985 Pitfalls Rosaen 1998 Becoming Sykes 1994 Some Wilson+ and Wideen+ reviews, sections on practica	Suggestions for week 7 reading
8 3/4	*Good student meets teaching for understanding* Shulman 1987 Knowledge Holt-Reynolds 1999 Good readers, good teachers? Wilson 2001+ Teacher knowledge, sections on subject matter prep Member suggestions for reading	
3/11	**MSU spring break**	

TE 970 Revised schedule: 11 March 2004 tb

9 3/18	*Student experience meets novice teacher experience* Tom's project: Learning through field experience in TE 301 *Bird 2003 Metacognitive meddling (from Angel site) *Bransford 1999 Rethinking transfer Jackie's project: 301 instructors use of field experience *Feiman-Nemser 1985 Pitfalls	Add: the anno-tated bibliog-raphy
10 3/25	*Learning from experience, cont'd.* Han Han's project: Learning through field exp. in Myanmar *Wilson+ and Wideen+ reviews---sections on practica John's project: Teacher study groups *Rosaen 1998 Becoming *Reading?	
11 4/1	*Encapsulated candidate meets preparing teachers for diversity* Leah's project: Preparing gen ed teachers for spec ed students *Givvin 2001 In the eyes of the beholder: how teachers see motivation Joyce's project: Transition from school to higher ed and work *Zohar 2001 Teachers' beliefs about low-achieving students	
12 4/8	*Diversity, cont'd* Nina's project: Differentiated instruction in literacy *Ladson-Billings 1999 Preparing teachers for diverse . . . *Weiner 2000: Research of the 1990s: implications for urban . . . Suzanne's project: *Sykes 1994 Some aspects of change *reading?	
13 4/15	Ilene's project: *reading? Sue & Jennifer's project: Teacher community for work in Africa *reading?	
14 4/22	Annah's project: *reading? Nyna's project: *reading?	Add: The work
15 4/29	Aman's project: Course in technology for teacher candidates *Reading? *re-visit Blanton 1998 Telecommunications and teacher education Survey of the projects	Add: The rest
Last	Thursday, May 6, 8-10 p.m.	
	Unassigned topics and readings: *Good student meets teaching for understanding* Holt-Reynolds 1999 Good readers, good teachers? Wilson 2001+ on subject matter prep Zeichner 1996 Teacher socialization for diversity	

Joint projects

Approach to the "seventh standard" of the ELSMT. The teacher preparation program's current technology requirement is about 7 years old (see it at http://ott.educ.msu.edu/ctt/requirements/summary.asp). The Michigan Department of Education, having aligned the seventh section of the Entry Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) with ISTE's standards for new teachers, is promoting activity in this area. A current PDF of ELSMT is in our Angel site. The TE Department has just launched a faculty task force to look at Section 7 of the ELSMT and make recommendations. The task force chair, Andy Anderson, invites us to try to contribute. His first thought is that a pair of us could take each of the sub-statements of section 7 and ask "what it might mean to address that problem of practice in a 'technology enhanced' manner." I might have a more developed assignment from the first meeting.

Here's Section 7 of the ELSMT:

> *7. An ability to use information age learning and technology operations and concepts to enhance learning and personal/professional productivity, including the understanding and ability to:*
>
> a. Demonstrate an understanding of, and continued growth in, information age learning and technology operations and concepts;
>
> b. Plan and design effective technology-enhanced learning environments and experiences aligned with the State Board's policy on learning expectations for Michigan students and the Michigan Curriculum Framework for all students;
>
> c. Implement curriculum plans that include technology-enhanced methods and strategies to maximize student learning;
>
> d. Apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies;
>
> e. Use technology to enhance professional development, practice, and productivity; and
>
> f. Understand the equity, ethical, legal, social, physical, and psychological issues surrounding the use of technology in P-12 schools and apply that understanding in practice.

Teacher preparation program evaluation. I'm working for Sharon Schwille (TE's Coordinator of Teacher Preparation) and the teacher preparation team leaders on an "embedded program evaluation"--an evaluation activity that is intended to become part and parcel of normal program operations and to contribute to them instantly and immediately as well as at the ends of semesters. In this conception, "curriculum," "pedagogy," and "program evaluation" come so close together it is hard to tell them apart. We could contribute materially to the construction of the embedded program evaluation by generating a set of rough rubrics that potentially satisfy the principles being suggested for the embedded program evaluation:

> Principle One. Construct the embedded program evaluation to provide information about *distributions* of program qualities, of opportunities to learn, and of learned outcomes, for programmatically meaningful sets of interns. That is the information our learning organization most lacks and needs.

> Principle Two. Make the program evaluation contribute instantly to instruction, offer immediate displays of information that are useful to the persons who provided it, and deliver useful reports one day after grades are due at the end of a semester, especially the spring semester.

> Principle Three. Express our intentions to interns and mentor teachers mainly in images of the teaching repertoire, and to accrediting agencies and others mainly in terms of our/their standards. Gather evaluation data mainly by asking program personnel to rate elements of the repertoire in terms of the standards, on rubrics to be constructed.

> Principle Four. Vary data collection by instructor group (teams, subject matters): Address their current questions, base data collection on their staple assignments and routine operations, and use their vocabularies to construct protocols and rubrics.

> Principle Five. Aggregate and analyze data mainly at the level of the instructor group in whose operations and language the data collection is constructed. Often, that level of aggregation will suit the level at which we have to report. The rare need for summary across instructor groups can be met by writing about their separate reports.

Shared summaries of literature. On sabbatical in 2002-2003, I was trying to bring my reading into a productive relationship with my re-thinking of the design for TE 301 (Team 2, elementary), which I teach 2 or 3 times a year. I was dissatisfied with anything I had tried, up to that time, to organize literature as resources in that design work, so I undertook a different kind of summary than I had theretofore produced. I was heartened by the result, and eventually pro-

duced about 20 summaries all organized along the same lines. They appear at [http://tp.educ.msu.edu:82/coursedesign/index.htm], and you are, of course, welcome to browse them--recalling that they are drafts.

At some point in your work with the literature, please produce a similar summary for one piece of literature and send it to me; I'll add it to the collection, for consideration by all.

Member project

Each member should complete a personal project. In that project, you will identify a problem or issue or question in the curriculum and pedagogy of teacher education; make and follow a plan for addressing the problem, issue, or question deliberately; systematically consult and use literature relevant to the issue or problem; produce a work called for in your plan; and finish by evaluating the work and summarizing what you learned by undertaking the project.

Design or inquiry projects. Suitable projects can vary a good deal. You can elect to place either *design* or *inquiry* in the foreground and the other in the background; this is a matter of emphasis, not of categories.

Option for "design": Contribute to "tp course design projects". In summer, 2003, when I thought I would teach a section of the TE 994 course for new doctoral student course instructors, I put my own current noodling about the design for TE 301 (Team 2, elementary) and summaries of related reading into a website called "tp course design projects."
[http://tp.educ.msu.edu:82/coursedesign/index.htm] I projected that the new instructors would join me by developing and posting projects there. The 994 section did not materialize, but the website remains. I would be very happy to have members of 970 who elect to undertake design projects to participate in the site.

Projects in stages; cumulative reports. Projects are likely to share common stages of work. These should be the sections of a *cumulative* report. In that sentence, "cumulative" is intended literally: That is, you should add each stage of the project to the end of the same (growing) file and send it for comment. This will produce a record of the work, as distinct from the reconstructed accounts of such work that we present for publication. Here are the major stages.

A. Select and clarify the problem, issue, or question you will address

- In what context did/does the problem, issue, question arise? Place the problem or issue in its practical and organizational context. For example, is the problem or issue located within a teacher education program? Where? When? Is the problem or issue situated within a course? If so, what were the topics and purposes of the course? Does the problem or issue emerge out of

11

professional development work that takes place in a school? If so, who are the central characters and what is the nature of the endeavor at the school?

- How does the problem, issue, question appear, concretely? Who is saying or doing what to whom or what? To what phenomena would you point if you wanted to show another person the problem or issue? Describe the "problem" facing the teacher educator.

- Up to now, how have you labeled, framed, or explained the problem, issue, or question? What vocabulary(ies) have you used to talk about the problem, issue, or question? What assumptions and propositions have you considered? It might be helpful to use some topological scheme like Schwab's (1973) commonplaces--student, teacher, subject matter, context--to identify the nature of the problem. Is this, for example, a problem related to getting more information about what students know? Is it a problem about teaching prospective teachers about subject matter? Or how to teach diverse populations of students? Is it a problem about teacher beliefs? If so, what types of beliefs? Alternatively, one might use Schon's (1990) notion of problem framing, figuring out what to focus on and why, determining what is problematic and how to examine that, and beginning to understand what you are including in the problem and what you are leaving out.

B. Make a plan for addressing the problem, issue, question

- Going into the project, this section is a set of decisions about what you will try to do to address the problem, issue, or question. The plan makes decisions about the remaining sections of this outline. You should think carefully about what is possible to do in a semester's work and plan specifically so that you can have some assurance, in advance, that you can pull it off. The plan will remain in the cumulative report as one basis for assessing the result.

C. Find and analyze relevant literature (annotated bibliography)

- In any project, you will want not to reinvent the wheel; rather, you will want to draw on (or criticize) and build on (or depart from) work to date. So an early stage of the work is to survey the literature and make notes (annotations) about its meaning and bearing on the problem/issue/project you're working on. By the middle of the semester, you should construct an annotated bibliography of texts that you have selected to help you explore the problem, issue, or question you chose. For one of those texts, you should make the summary called for in the joint project "summaries of literature."

- If you find little or nothing on the specific issue as you have framed it, normally you would consult broader or parallel literatures and alternative frames. For example, if you were to search the literature and discover that little or nothing had been written on groupwork or cooperative learning in

teacher preparation, you would move to parallel or broader categories, such as groupwork in K-12 teaching, higher education instruction, classroom interaction, intellectual development among young adults, or small groups. Before you declare that you have found unexplored territory, note that that is a claim that something does <u>not</u> exist.

- An annotated bibliography would be the product of this stage of work. In such a bibliography, for each piece cited, you would want to (a) capture accurately its sense or argument and (b) indicate specifically its bearing or possible bearing on the problem or issue as you have presented it. One possibility is that the consultation with the literature will offer alternative ways to frame the issue or problem; your framing might change as a consequence.

D. The work--your contribution

The work you produce might take a variety of forms. If you put DESIGN in the foreground, the general question probably is something like, WHAT COULD COUNT AS A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CURRENT STATE OF <u>PRACTICE</u>? You might choose to work more on decisions and actions concerning pedagogy, or work more on curricular decisions (phenomena, topics, readings, materials, etc.), or on the intersection of decisions and actions about pedagogy and curriculum as they relate to issues of teachers' contexts or personal realities. In such projects you might, for example:

- write a CASE OR OTHER PIECE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL for prospective teachers or teacher educators, accompanied by a COMMENTARY that tells why you have constructed the case as you have, how it might be used to address the problem or issue with which you began, and how you would assess its worth.

- construct a course SYLLABUS, PROJECT, OR ASSIGNMENT, accompanied by COMMENTARY that tells how the course materials might be used to address the problem or issue you began with, and how you would assess their worth.

[Somewhere in here, I need to talk about uncustomary genres that we might have to use in order to play for keeps. What "The work" could look like. Maybe use Ilene's "quasi-design" and Joyce's "proposal to Troy" as examples.]

If you put INQUIRY in the foreground, the general question is something like, WHAT COULD COUNT AS A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CURRENT STATE OF <u>KNOWLEDGE</u>? You might choose to work more on the theory pertaining to your problem, or work more on getting data about the problem, or more at arranging a fruitful encounter between theory and data. In such projects, you might, for example:

- draw on relevant literature to formulate a RESEARCHABLE QUESTION, accompanied by a commentary that tells why the question has been formulated as it

has and suggests how the inquiry could be carried out. You might complete a small study during the semester.

- write an ANALYSIS OF TEACHER LEARNING based on interviews with teacher candidates or readings of their written work (already in hand, or obtained during the semester), and discuss the bearing of that analysis on the problem or issue you're working on.

In the planning you will need to do some careful thinking about the kind of product that will enable you address the problem or issue effectively and/or to achieve greater understanding of it.

E. Assessment and reflection

- The work being done-for-now, you mentally stand back from it; decide on a set of principles, standards, or criteria by which to assess it; and then do so carefully, in writing.

- One nice thing about this stage is that you can make progress and get credit (in the universe, with your colleagues, and in the course) by a carefully reasoned conclusion even that the work you produced is junk and ought to be thrown away. (Not all projects turn out well.)

- Here at the end-for-now, what are you saying and thinking about the particular problem, issue, or question that you addressed, as compared to what you were saying and thinking when you began? What did you learn about the problem, issue, or question?

- Here at the end-for-now, how would you characterize the process of work that you went through in this project? What alternative approaches and might-have-beens can you now describe? What have you learned about doing such work?

F. References

- Provide the complete list of literature that you consulted, as distinct from the annotated bibliography of work that you relied on heavily.

Requirements and evaluation

As instructor, I am obliged to require something of all the members and to evaluate that work in accordance with suitable considerations. Here are the requirements and relative weights that I have in mind:

- MEMBERSHIP (20%). I would try to make what I hope will be a reasonable judgement of contributions to joint projects and course meetings.

- PROBLEM AND PLAN (10%)

- ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY (20%).

- THE WORK (35%)

- ASSESSMENT AND REFLECTIONS (15%)

I hope that the suitable considerations for evaluating the work have been becoming clearer herein, and will become yet clearer as the course proceeds

Literature named in the course schedule

Blanton, William E., Gary Moorman, and Woodrow Trathen (1998). Telecommunications and teacher education. Review of Research in Education, 23, 235-276

Bransford, John D. and Schwartz, Daniel L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with multiple implications. Review of Research in Education, 24, 61-100.

Cochran-Smith, Marilyn (2001). The outcomes question in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(5), 527-546.

Dunn, Thomas G. & Shriner, Constance (1999). Deliberate practice in teaching: What teachers do for self-improvement. Teaching and Teacher Education 15,(6), 631-651.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1989). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In Sikula, Buttery, and Guyton (eds), Handbook of research on teacher education, second edition. New York: MacMillan. Also (Issue Paper No. 89-5). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. Teachers College Record, 87, 53-65.

Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, and Remillard, Janine (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. In The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fendler, Lynn (2001). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Epistemological and political reverberations. Unpublished manuscript.

Gitlin, Andrew, Barlow, Linda, Burbank, Mary D., Kauchak, Don, and Stevens, Tracy (1999). Pre-service teachers' thinking on research: Implications for inquiry oriented teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 15(7), 753-769.

Givvin, Karen, Deborah J Stipek, Julie M. Salmon, Valanne L MacGyvers (2001). In the eyes of the beholder: Students' and teachers' judgments of students' motivation. Teaching and Teacher Education 17(3), 321-331.

Holt-Reynolds, Diane (1999). Good readers, good teachers? Subject matter expertise as a challenge in learning to teach. Harvard Educational Review 69(1), pp 29-50.

Holt-Reynolds, Diane (2000). What does the teacher do? Constructivist pedagogies and prospective teachers' beliefs about the role of a teacher. Teaching and Teacher Education 16, 21-32Ladson-Billings, G.J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations. Review of Research in Education 24, 211-258.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. Review of Research in Education, 24, 211-247.

MacIntyre, D. John, Byrd, David M., & Foxx, Susan F. (1996). Field and Laboratory Experiences. Handbook of research on teacher education, second edition. New York: MacMillan

National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (1992). Findings on learning to teach. East Lansing: Author

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. Review of Educational Research, 63 (2), 167-199.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitude and bleiefs in learning to teach. IN J. Sikula, T Buttery, & E. Guyton (eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed, pp. 102-119.) New York: Macmillan.

Rosaen, Cheryl L. & Schram, Pamela (1998). Becoming a member of the teaching profession: Learning a language of possibility. Teaching and Teacher Education 14, 3, 283-304.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review 57(1), 1-21.

Sykes, Gary (1994). Some aspects of change: Loss, conflict, and reward. A paper derived from a speech given originally at a leadership institute sponsored by the Michigan Partners for New Education. Unpublished manuscript.

Sykes, G., & Bird, T. (1992). Teacher education and the case idea. NCRTL Special Report, August.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (2001). Foundations of an innovative accreditation system. Author.

Weiner, L. (2000). Research in the 90s: Implications for urban teacher preparation. Review of Educational Research 70(3), 369-406.

Wideen, Marvin, Mayer-Smith, Jolie, & Moon, Barbara, 1998. A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 130-178.

Wilson, Suzanne M., Robert E. Floden, & Joan Ferrini-Mundy (2001). Teacher Preparation Research: Current Knowledge, Gaps, and Recommendations. A Research Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education and the Office for Educational Research and Improvement by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy in collaboration with Michigan State University. February 2001. (Document R-01-3) (Available in .pdf at http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/

Zeichner, Kenneth M, and Hoeft, Karen (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In Sikula, Buttery, and Guyton (eds), Handbook of research on teacher education, second edition. New York: MacMillan.

Zeichner, Ken and Susan Wray (2001). The teaching portfolio in US teacher education programs: What we know and what we need to know. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 613-621.

Zohar, Anat, Adi Degani, & Einav Vaaknin (2001). Teachers' beliefs about low-achieving students and higher order thinking. Teaching and Teacher Education 17(4), 469-485.