SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER TRAINING: WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD

by ANNE EDWARDS

It was the poet Alexander Pope who first wrote ‘fools rush in where angels fear to tread’. The aphorism was later used by E.M. Forster as the title of a novel. In the novel the English heroine imposes an English interpretation on an Italian domestic problem, with tragic consequences. She foolishly rushed in when it would have been wiser to wait. So while I’m going to suggest that you don’t rush to embrace increased school-based training without a lot of careful thinking, I’m also reminding myself that only a fool would think that the experiences from England would apply directly to Holland. My purpose is to hold up the English experience of a strong role for schools in the initial training of teachers, in order to illuminate the choices to be made in the Netherlands. The illumination will reveal some quite fundamental questions for you to consider. One should always return to fundamental questions at times of change to avoid offering instrumental responses to instrumental questions. The fundamental questions include the following:
- What kinds of teachers do you want for what kind of society?
- How can the increased involvement of schools in training help to produce the kinds of teachers needed?
- What are the implications for schools?
- What are the implications for higher education?

I’ll start with an advance organiser. What my own research reveals, is that stronger school involvement in teacher training:
- is a serious shift in training - relationships will change;
- has the potential to be beneficial for student teachers, for schools and also for higher education;
- will mean that the benefit isn’t easily achieved and some of the compromises are actually detrimental to the quality of training.

What Kinds of Teachers for What Kinds of Learners in What Kind of Society?

I want to start with this question, because any proliferation of training routes will only work if there is a commonly agreed set of beliefs about the goals of training. This values statement signifies a third way between the excesses of both modernist and post-modernist solutions (Edwards et al, in press) to the latest education crisis. In England the question about learners is never debated. The government provides the answer. But the Netherlands are a better place to start thinking about schools’ involvement in initial teacher training than was England under a conservative government in 1992. We should take what the Netherlands need as a starting point. Holland as a ‘technologically advanced economy’ (Castells 2000, p. 270) is a key player in the international knowledge economy and its success in the foreseeable future is likely to depend on it maintaining that position. But the new knowledge economy offers huge challenges to teaching and teacher education. From some perspectives these challenges simply reinforce the idea of schools as ‘warehouses’ for children (Castells, 2000, p. 428) and a limited educational role for teachers. From others they sharpen the importance of teaching as informed, risky interactions with learners as they learn to relate to knowledge as both users and producers of knowledge (Bereiter, in preparation; Edwards, in press). Let us pursue the second and more educational option a little further. In order to participate in the new knowledge economy, pupils need to learn how to produce as well as use knowledge. This relationship with knowledge posits shifts in relationships between pupils, teachers and knowledge. A few pointers from recent research are beginning to identify what these might mean. Heather and David Wood have noted that children’s capacity to seek help is a characteristic that distinguishes between more and less successful learners (Wood and Wood, 1999). This finding places teachers quite clearly as resources to support learning. The work of Bert van Oers in Amsterdam and Bereiter and Scardamalia in Toronto is demonstrating how useful it can be even for elementary school children to see themselves as producers of local knowledge and what
the implications are for how we think about interactive teaching (Scardamalia and Berieter, 2001). Francois Tochon has been pressing us for the last decade to think about risky pedagogic interactions as the way to really engage pupils as learners (Tochon, 2000; Tochon and Munby, 1993). These pointers are indicating that teaching is no longer simply a question of enthusing pupils with a love of the subject. Nor is it, as lists of teachers’ skill might imply, simply a competent performance that can be easily assessed. Instead teaching is a highly complex activity, which requires teachers to interpret learners, contexts and curricula and to be able to select from a range of possible responses when reacting to their interpretations.

I’m labouring this point for two reasons. Firstly, any rethinking of teacher education relationships between schools and higher education needs to regard the increasing complexity of teaching as a core issue. Secondly, as a sociocultural researcher, I’d argue that we need to see learning to teach in terms of teacher identity and the development of a capacity to be, see and respond in increasingly informed and sensitive ways to that complexity. Both reasons remind us that teaching, and particularly learning to teach, is an extremely risky business. Good teacher education therefore needs to be founded on a coherent view of professional learning, which allows risk-taking to develop. And if we are to ensure opportunities for risk we need trust. One of the dangers of a dispersed system of teacher education, with a greater role for schools, is that trust becomes a luxury and is replaced by methods of surveillance against lists of competence, which emphasise low risk in teaching and highly visible polished performance.

The English experience

In England in 1992 we had very little time to ask these important questions about what kinds of teachers we need when we were told that training for teaching in high schools in England had to be based on training partnerships between schools and higher education (DES 1), 1992). Requirements for training for elementary education followed in 1993 (DfE 1), 1993). We now have a situation where student teachers spend around sixty percent of their time in schools being largely supervised by class teachers (called teacher mentors 2) whether they are on four year undergraduate programmes or one year post-graduate courses. In addition the higher education tutor role has been radically reduced because money has to be paid to schools without an increase in funding.

The changes had to be organised rapidly in order for courses to be deemed compliant with government regulations. Most courses already were heavily school-based. But the new requirements meant that schools and higher education were to become ‘partners’ in the training of student teachers, with schools as lead partners.

Partner is a slippery word and I know it is used differently in teacher training in Holland. One reading of the new arrangements in 1992 was that teacher training was to be removed from the control of higher education and the critique it offered (Gilroy et al, 1994). That was quite clearly the original intention of the Tory government. But schools were experiencing so many other pressures that they were unwilling to take on a major responsibility for training (though there were exceptions). A large-scale study of the new arrangements undertaken during the 1990s by John Furlong and others (Furlong et al, 2000) found three types of partnership in operation.

They are careful to call them ideal types, which would signify a way of operating. The types are: complementary, Higher Education-led and collaborative partnerships. The research team found very few complementary partnerships where schools and higher education worked in parallel and with schools operating with little guidance from higher education. The majority of the partnerships were Higher Education-led. In these higher education tutors 3 trained the teacher-mentors to monitor student teachers’ competent performance. Higher education documentation defined tasks, roles and responsibilities. Higher education staff undertook quality control visits to schools, organised students’ assessments and at most consulted with small groups of teachers on course development. In Higher Education-led partnerships schools co-operated with higher education, but initial teacher education did not become incorporated into school goals and practices.

In my own research in Higher Education-led partnerships we found two worrying features. In the first place the theory practice gap was wider than ever. Mentors saw the higher education role to be to supply the theory that the student teachers could then apply in school. The teachers did not see that they had a role to play in helping the student teachers to theorise their practices in order to understand them better. But schools played a hugely reduced role in training and had far less opportunity to help student teachers to theorise. Secondly Higher education (because it was dependent on the good will of schools) operated partnerships by making every effort to not disrupt the rhythm of school life. One consequence we noticed was how much student teachers and their teacher mentors were desert-islanded or isolated in activities which were not incorporated into the functional systems of the schools.

Collaborative partnerships were apparently rather different. Furlong and his colleagues found that higher education argued for these. But very few partnerships
actually operated collaboratively. They were not easy to achieve. Their features are outlined in Figure A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Emphasis on giving all tutors and mentors opportunities to work together in small groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education tutor visits to schools</td>
<td>Collaborative discussions to discuss professional issues together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Paperwork codifies emerging collaborative practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Schools and higher education recognise the legitimacy of differences in an ongoing conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Student teachers gain access to teachers’ professional knowledge and mentor training is professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Carried out collaboratively between tutors and mentors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual relationship</td>
<td>Negotiated and personal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation</td>
<td>Commitment to collaboration in initial teacher training education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A:**
A Collaborative Partnership (from Furlong et al, 2000)

But this model rested on a number of assumptions that should be questioned.
- Relationships were between higher education tutors and mentors. That is, they were at the level of individuals or discrete groups of individuals in schools and higher education.
- The training of teachers was not incorporated in any meaningful way into the schools’ own development planning and thinking about learning and teaching.
- All that needed to happen to get good mentoring was that teachers were able to make explicit their knowledge about teaching.

This rather thin notion of collaboration also raises other questions. Why were collaborative partnerships, even as they have been described here, so difficult to achieve? Why was teacher training not incorporated into the goals of the schools? Why did most higher education institutions operate HE-led partnerships despite advocating collaborative partnerships? The answers rest on an English preference for pragmatic compromise over radical change.
- **Haste.** Higher education was obliged to set up partnerships rapidly and doing so did not spend time negotiating responsibilities with schools.
- **History.** By 1992 higher education courses were already placing student teachers in schools with good teachers. These teachers reported in interviews after 1992 that they did not see any change in their roles under the new partnership arrangements. At most they were doing the same as before, only more so (Edwards and Collison, 1996).

- **Politeness.** The schools held all the cards. Higher education could not impose on them. Consequently schools’ responsibilities were presented lightly to them. Politeness means that even now all we can do is encourage particular forms of mentoring. We cannot require teacher mentors to attend training sessions (though keeping some funding to enable payment for attendance helps), and higher education is still held responsible when things go wrong in school.

- **Expense.** These changes were low cost. Income passed from higher education to schools. There was no chance of investment in Professional Development Schools.

- **Learning.** Teacher education in the UK was rarely underpinned by a coherent view of professional learning. Consequently partnerships were frequently organised with mechanistic quality assurance rather than professional learning in mind and discussions with schools rarely addressed how schools might support student teachers as learners.

So to some extent I am saying don’t do as we did. Don’t rush in. But do argue for time to think about student teachers’ learning and what kinds of teachers are needed for what kinds of learners. Find time to consider how a vision of teaching for tomorrow’s world might become central to training relationships with schools. Stronger relationships with schools, if they are to be worth the effort, need to be based on an understanding of how tomorrow’s teachers can benefit as learners from their time in school classrooms and staff rooms. And now we know a lot more about how people learn in the workplace.

**How do we get the kinds of teachers we want?**

So how do student teachers learn? Teacher training for all teachers became compulsory in England in the late 1960s. It was introduced because it was argued that all teachers needed educational theory in order to deal with the demands of teaching in an education system that was becoming increasingly socially inclusive. The idea was that the theory could then be applied in schools. But the initiative did not seem to be successful and from 1970 to the 1990s student teachers argued that theory was irrelevant and couldn’t be applied in teaching.
A sociocultural response would be ‘well what would you expect?’. Theory cannot be applied to practice like paint can be applied to a wall. Therefore I’m going to leap straight over the theory practice gap to work with the idea of the theorising teacher. I’ll first explain what I mean by that term. Theorising teachers make informed interpretations of teaching situations and make strategic choices about how to respond. They take what Charles Taylor calls ‘deliberative’ action (Taylor, 1985) in order to engage pupils as learners. So how does one become a theorising teacher? Let us start by looking at some key features of a sociocultural view of learning as it might be applied to the learning of student teachers.

A sociocultural view of learning sees ...

- ... learning as increasingly informed participation in the practices/discourses of a community; (In teacher education we need to contrive opportunities for informing participation as teaching is rarely a communal activity.)
- ... learners as people who are acquiring new ways of interpreting and responding to their environment and a new strategic awareness;
- ... knowledge as something acquired and also generated through participating in the practices/discourses of a community;
- ... a community as a set of practices e.g. a mathematics community, a professional community of teachers;
- ... teachers (and teacher educators) as those who assist the interpretations and responses of learners, by modelling, explaining, manipulating the environment etc.;
- ... the practice of teaching as a process of making judgements about the strategies to be used to assist learners’ increasingly informed interpretations and responses.

Figure B: A sociocultural view of learning

So a sociocultural understanding of learning is based on a belief that learning is a matter of increasingly informed participation in a discourse community (Resnick, 1991). That community may be elementary school teaching, mathematics teaching or history teaching. Or it may be a school or a particular classroom. Discourse communities are marked by the language used by participants, the meaning the language has when used, how people engage with the material resources and what kinds of identities are allowed. A shift in emphasis from higher education to schools in teacher training will mean that student teachers will engage more with local discourse communities e.g. schools or subject departments than with the more general and powerful discourse communities, with all their schisms, to be found in higher education.

This sociocultural understanding of learning is supported by ideas currently emerging from studies of robotics and connectionist psychology, which are helping us understand the human mind in new ways. The new model of mind sees mind as a decoding, sense-making mechanism (Clark, 1997). It is a very different version of mind from the information-processing model. The latter model sees the mind as a carefully organised store of knowledge to be applied and emphasises a capacity to encode, to classify and to call up knowledge efficiently. It is the model of mind that lies behind the idea that theory can easily be applied in practice. The sociocultural version of mind, on the other hand, is more outward looking and engages with and is shaped by its world (hence the concern with discourse communities). It is an interpreting mind, which ascribes or gives meanings to events and objects. It seeks familiar patterns and responds to them by using the resources it recognises to be available to it in a context. It seeks features in the environment that will support its action. It is a mind at grips with the world.

Information processing model of mind

| The mind is a system of stored facts etc. which we can call upon to solve problems; |
| The main function of the mind is therefore to encode the information that it meets and store it efficiently; |
| Mind, body and environment need to be considered as separate systems; |
| Knowledge is carried in the mind and is context free; |

Sociocultural model of mind

| The mind is a mechanism for interpreting the potential for action available in the environment; |
| The main function of the mind is to decode the environment to assist the selection of worthwhile responses; |
| Mind is embodied and learns how interpret specific types of environment; |
| Mind is primed to look for familiar patterns when it moves to a new environment and tries to interpret it |

Learning is therefore heavily dependent on contextual cues.

Figure C: Two models of mind

When a sociocultural model of mind is used we begin to recognise that acting effectively in the world involves a capacity to recognise, approach and use resources to deal with what is unexpected as well as what is
expected. It involves a disposition to engage responsively with the world, which is particularly important in teaching.

For example, a student teacher may notice that pupils in a mathematics class are noisy. She may interpret that as a learning issue. Perhaps the pupils are not engaging with the maths task using the mathematical concepts she had hoped to see. Or she may interpret the noise as a discipline issue. For example, she might have a history of discipline difficulties with that class. Her responses as a teacher will depend on her interpretation of the situation and what she interprets as possible action in the context of that classroom in that school, i.e. on her theorising of the situation.

So if she sees the noise as a learning problem she may stop the class and start again with a fresh review of the topic. Or she may be able to bring together the pupils who are having most difficulty to a discussion space in the classroom where she can talk to them separately. Or she may feel obliged to continue with the planned lesson and keep the pupils in the classroom during break while they finish the work with a lot of support from her. Teachers are making these kinds of interpretations and decisions continuously while teaching. The theorising is rarely made explicit and is therefore rarely shared. At best it involves engaging with generic principles and weighing them against local possibilities for action and it is at the core of teaching.

The task of teacher education is to help student teachers to become informed theorisers in the act of teaching. I’ll return to the fool metaphor again and this time call on William Blake. His observation that ‘the fool sees not the same tree that the wiseman sees’ illustrates perfectly how expertise is tied up with a capacity to read environments in informed ways. We need expert teachers who can access generic principles as well as understand what is possible in their immediate workplaces, who can read environmental cues and are able to respond to what they see and interpret in ways that support pupils as learners. In teacher education our task is to help student teachers to become practitioners whose minds are outward looking and geared towards identifying ways in which they can engage pupils as learners. The teacher education task is to create responsive and thinking practitioners. It is a tall order. It makes huge demands on schools if we are to expect the identity transformation to happen there with teacher mentors as the first line of support for student teachers.

The implications of new training roles for schools

But it is unlikely that these transformations in professional identity can occur anywhere else. Our role as higher education tutors who simply visit schools to look at student teachers in action is limited. The best we can do is offer opportunities for reflection on practice to assist the theorising and, as Fred Korthagen has put it, bridge ‘the theory-practice gap’. But teachers working in schools have the potential to do far more. They can model and make explicit their interpretations and their responses in the acts of teaching. Kathy Carter and Walter Doyle in the US argue that teachers’ knowledge is episodic i.e. embedded within contexts and events (Carter and Doyle, 1989). If they are right, and current work on the situated nature of thought and action would suggest they are, teacher mentors are supremely well-placed to help student teachers identify the important patterns of action and reaction that make up teaching and learning.

- Teachers can help student teachers to interpret and respond in classrooms.
- Teachers can make their own interpretations and responses explicit.
- Teachers can begin to induct student teachers into the professional language of teaching.
- Teachers can help student teachers to build their capacity to recognise similar patterns in other settings.

Are you beginning to see some problems here? What professional language of teaching? Should we expect teachers to co-teach with student teachers and explain their actions? How much can we ask of schools? How is quality ensured when almost all teachers are mentors? What is the role of higher education tutors? I’m not arguing for a pragmatic solution, but a radical one which requires a great deal of thought.

The English politely pragmatic solution did not involve a radical response. We did not leap the theory practice gap and focus on theorising teachers. Instead we abandoned theory by default. Teacher education in England still draws on the information-processing model of mind, looks for the appli-
cation of university knowledge in schools and rarely finds it. Teacher mentors can’t reinforce higher education sessions and instead focus their advice on local issues - on these children and this part of the curriculum (Edwards and Ogden, 1998). While tutors, with reduced roles, have less opportunity to help student teachers to bridge the theory-practice divide. The result is that students now engage far less with theory than they did before 1992. Instead teacher education focuses on helping student teachers to fit in with the local demands of their placement schools. They are creating local identities for local schools.

Let us look in a little more detail at some of the problems that have arisen. The identification of the problems draws on nine years of studying school-based training and particularly looking at how student teachers learn about pupil learning while in school. The findings are based on detailed content analysis of conversations between mentors and student teachers, interviews with student teachers and mentors and observations of student teachers.

Mentors seemed locked in past practices. They modelled their behaviour on higher education tutors and focused their support on observation and feedback i.e. on the visible performance of the student teachers. They very rarely taught alongside student teachers and if they were teaching a group in the same classroom, teacher mentors rarely spoke to the student teachers while they were teaching (Edwards and Collison, 1996; Edwards and Ogden, 1999). They were not helping student teachers to interpret and respond in the act of teaching.

Feedback from teacher mentors to student teachers after they had observed the students teaching emphasised how well student teachers had kept to their lesson plans and how the pupils were getting through the curriculum. It did not emphasise how student teachers were interpreting and responding to events, or how they might inform the interpretations and responses of pupils (Edwards and Protheroe, 2000). This focus on curriculum delivery was entirely understandable, as the teachers’ first priority was to get the pupils through the curriculum regardless of who was teaching them and they seemed to see the students as proxies of themselves.

Mentors’ conversations with student teachers were heavily situated in their own settings. They very rarely talked about general principles of pupil learning, which would inform student teachers’ interpretations and responses in other classrooms. The few mentors who did attempt to share general principles about learning found it extremely difficult to do. They tried to talk grand theory (e.g. Piaget) and found it impossible. The alternative to grand theory, identifying general principles and sharing them, was rarely heard (Edwards and Collison, 1995; Edwards and Ogden, 1999).

Student teachers worked through detailed lesson plans and were apologetic when they deviated from their planned performance of curriculum delivery. The student teachers tended to avoid unanticipated events as these might prevent their polished performance of curriculum delivery. So they avoided risky teaching interactions, which might engage pupils and curricula, and which is the kind of teaching we think will be required in schools (Edwards, in press).

Student teachers were not positioned as learners in classrooms. There was no space in classroom discourse for adults to be learners. Classrooms were places where the only legitimate learners were the pupils. We found that student teachers often assumed the position of experts bringing curricular ‘gifts’ from outside the school who did not require helping in order to have a legitimate position in the classroom (Edwards, 1997a).

Student teachers and the documentation they carried with them were often the main links between schools and higher education. Once in school the student teachers were obliged to fit in, consequently the linkages were frequently flimsy.

We caught the paradoxical position of student teachers in schools in a set of interviews we carried out with head teachers and mentors soon after training partnerships were established. The student teachers were welcomed because of the ‘fresh ideas’ they brought into schools. At the same time it was important that the teacher training function of the school did not ‘rock the boat’ (i.e. disturb the main functioning of the school). Student teachers, it seemed, had to slide seamlessly into the rhythm of schools while at the same time reinvigorating them. That would be difficult enough. But the new training partnerships actually required the schools to take on a hugely enhanced training role, which should not only rock the boat but also call for a nautical refit (Edwards, 1997b).

What can be done?

Goodlad, writing about stronger links between schools and higher education in the US, has suggested that closer links with higher education would enhance the quality of schooling (Goodlad, 1991). He is probably right. But the rationale in England, under the Tories, was that teacher education should be wrested away from the dangerous politically left wing ideas to be found in higher education. Under New Labour the rationale is that increased school-involvement will help to get more people into teaching as a career.
But Goodlad’s suggestion is worth returning to. Greater involvement in teacher training can benefit schools. Training needs to take place in environments which support student teachers as learners, in discourse communities geared to practices which support pupils as learners. Some schools are very good at that. But not schools all are. Poor school placements where tutors have little control can be disastrous for student teachers. Tighter quality control is not the only answer. Instead perhaps we do need to think about how schools can be helped to develop as learning environments which produce the kinds of teachers we need. Taking on a school-improvement role is a lot to ask of higher education tutors. But it may be the best way forward.

Let us look at the options available if higher education is to maintain a strong role in a teacher training which produces theorising teachers who are able to responsively engage pupils as learners. There seem to be at least three ways. All three attempt to clarify the role of higher education supporting teachers as professionals. They all involve tutors spending time in schools working with teachers to enrich the discourse communities in which student teachers are becoming professionals. Which is just what would be expected of a sociocultural solution.

Option one involves tutors spending time in schools with teachers and student teachers so that they can work with both student teachers and practising teachers to support their theorising about practice in the site of practice. The focus is on individual teachers or mentor-student teacher dyads. It can be expensive and does not have the advantage of ensuring that teacher training becomes embedded in the organisational goals and systems of the school.

Option two does involve strong links at an organisational level. It is seen in the US in Professional Development Schools. The 1995 Holmes Group Report in the US (Holmes Group, 1995) was dismissive of any other kind of training relationship. But the general verdict on is that although Professional Development Schools do have a lot to offer the teaching profession they make so many demands on both schools and higher education that they are rarely feasible (Labaree and Pallas, 1996). They are also expensive.

Option three is a softer version of option two. It is an extension of the collaborative partnerships found by Furlong and his colleagues. It depends on strong institutional commitment from schools and higher education to take the schools’ training role seriously. But it does not go all the way to Professional Development Schools. It is likely to involve formal research relationships and formal links on continuing professional development in the area of teaching and learning. It can perhaps be seen as a flexible but formal way of ensuring that the communities of practice of schools, higher education and research overlap to the benefit of all three communities (Edwards, 1997c). It is not necessarily additionally expensive and is perhaps the minimum necessary if student teachers are to learn to become informed theorisers.

What are the implications of option three?

For schools
(i) Teacher training needs to be incorporated into the organisational goals of schools so that schools provide environments where student teachers are legitimate learners.
(ii) Commitment to teacher training needs to be at an organisational level and visible in the experiences of student teachers as they interact with all teachers. The discourse community as a whole needs to be committed to the induction of new professionals.
(iii) The role of the supervising teacher/mentor should be embedded in schools’ systems of roles and responsibilities and not simply an additional role, which has primary responsibility to higher education.
(iv) Schools should grasp opportunities to develop teachers’ understandings of learning and teaching through research and continuing professional development.

For teachers
(i) Teacher mentors/supervising teachers should be encouraged to work alongside student teachers and to make explicit the decisions they are making in the act of teaching. This is a new and contrived skill for mentors.
(ii) Student teachers should be encouraged to observe their mentors/supervising teachers and to ask them questions, which encourage experienced teachers to share their interpretations and responses to events.
(iii) Feedback on teaching should aim at enabling students to theorise their interpretations and responses rather than simply being conversations where supervising teachers re-describe the observed session in an encouraging way and note how well pupils are covering the curriculum.

“Taking on a school-improvement role is a lot to ask of higher education tutors. But it may be the best way forward”
(iv) Teachers should develop their own understandings of practice.

**For higher education**

(i) Higher education should not politely underplay the importance of an enhanced training role for schools. If done well it will disrupt schools.

(ii) Teachers become fellow teacher trainers who are treated as colleagues.

(iii) Teachers’ knowledge about their own practices needs to be enhanced through continuing professional development which focuses on teaching and learning and their principles.

(iv) Continuing professional development is likely to involve teachers in small-scale classroom research, which should be recognised by higher education awards.

(v) Higher education and particularly the universities will need to recognise the value of small-scale close-to-practice research done by tutors in classrooms and schools, perhaps in partnership with teachers. This research does not need to be low grade. It can be heavily theorised and can check assumptions on which larger scale research is based.

**For tutors**

(i) When tutors work with mentors/supervising teachers they should focus more on the processes of teaching, how it is learnt and developed, than on the quality assurance mechanisms required for managing a dispersed system of teacher training.

(ii) When visiting schools tutors should focus on the supervising teacher and how s/he can be helped to support student teachers as learners.

(iii) Tutors can play an important part in informing the discourse communities of schools by engaging in close-to-practice research in schools in collaboration with teachers. This will take time.

Most of these points require a quite radical re-thinking of the purposes and positions of everyone involved in the training process. Tutors, mentors, student teachers, deans, headteachers and finance officers will all need to reconsider their relationships in the teacher training endeavour. New relationships will mean that the old ways cannot be perpetuated. But new relationships are not necessarily welded by modernist quality control systems set up to guard against the excesses of a rapidly growing number of routes.

Any rethinking is not something that should be rushed. Instead it should be based very firmly on a set of beliefs about how the kinds of teachers you want are likely to learn. In England the anti-intellectual modernist response won the day. So let us return to foolishness and another observation from William Blake, which might justify your learning something from the English experience: “If others had not been foolish, we should be so”.

**Notes**

1) DES - department for Education and Science (no longer in use). DfE - Department for Education (also no longer in use)

2) Mentors are school-based teachers who work in partnership with university-based tutors to provide support and guidance to student teachers while the student teachers are undertaking teaching practice (a practicum) in school. Mentors have responsibility for assessing the practical performance of student teachers and have a greater responsibility for the progress of student teachers than did supervising teachers in the period prior to the 1992 reform of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in England. Schools now receive payment for their involvement in ITT. In most schools some of that payment provides some mentors with time to talk with student teachers.

3) The term tutor in this paper refers to university-based tutors involved in the training of student teachers. The amount of time that tutors spend in schools with student teachers varies from university to university. But all tutors now spend less time in schools giving advice to student teachers than they did in the period prior to the 1992 reform of ITT.
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