

TOWARD A PRELIMINARY UNDERSTANDING OF TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM IN ANGLOPHONE CANADA

ARDRA L. COLE *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*

ABSTRACT. This article provides an overview and preliminary analysis of the nature and progress of programmatic reform efforts underway in anglophone faculties and departments of education across Canada, and raises relevant issues for consideration and debate. It reports on the first phase of a larger, in-depth study of teacher education reform. The overview and analysis are intended to inform discussions about programmatic changes and associated concerns. Implicit in the analysis is a challenge which, hopefully, will stimulate conversation and debate among those involved in reform efforts.

RÉSUMÉ. Cet article propose un aperçu analytique de la nature et de l'état d'avancement de la réforme des programmes en cours dans les facultés et départements de sciences de l'éducation anglophones du Canada et soulève quelques questions dignes d'intérêt qui se prêtent à un débat. Il rend compte de la première étape d'une étude approfondie portant sur la formation des maîtres. Il vise à documenter le débat sur la modification des programmes d'études et d'autres questions connexes et, implicitement, à stimuler le débat parmi ceux qui participent à cette réforme.

The purpose of this article is two-fold: 1) to provide an overview and preliminary analysis of the nature and progress of programmatic reform efforts underway in faculties and departments of education across Canada; and, 2) to raise relevant issues for consideration and debate by those invested in programmatic teacher education reform efforts at Canadian universities.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

In Canada, since the late 1980s, nearly every education reform document released by a provincial or territorial government has included a call for changes to teacher education. Across the country, faculties of education, as institutions with primary responsibility for the initial preparation of teachers, are caught in a maelstrom of political, public, and internal pressures to

improve teacher education. And, within the current political context of economic rationalism, this usually means doing so with substantially reduced financial means. One of the central arguments upon which the broad education reform agenda is, in part, based is that school (and therefore education) reform is dependent on the reform of teacher preparation (e.g., Ministry of Education, Province of British Columbia, 1990; Royal Commission on Learning, 1994; Quebec, 1992).

The literature on teacher education is replete with calls and suggestions for reform. Some suggestions focus on the “products” of teacher education institutions, calling on schools of education to consider the kind of teachers they want to produce (e.g., Alberta Education, 1996; Hughes, Irvine, Jansson, Long, & Stapleton, 1993; Thiessen & Pike, 1992). Some suggest that improvement of the quality of the teaching profession should reasonably begin with a focus on the candidates admitted to preservice programs – including their age, ethnicity, academic standing, and experience profile, (e.g., Bowman, 1991; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990; New Brunswick Commission on Excellence in Education, 1991). Similarly, it is suggested that consideration be given to the kinds of teacher education faculty have recruited—their ethnicities, professional and academic backgrounds, and orientations to teaching and teacher education (e.g., Bowman, 1991; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990).

For other critics, a reorientation of the teacher education curriculum is the key to reform. For example, Hughes et al. (1993) propose a normative framework inspired by Shulman’s (1987) notions of a professional knowledge base; Grimmitt (1995) proposes the incorporation of “craft knowledge” in the teacher education curriculum; the Division of Teacher Preparation, University of Calgary (1996) advocates a practice- and problem-based curriculum; Munby and Russell (1994) maintain a central role for “the authority of experience”; and Knowles and Cole (1996; Knowles & Cole with Presswood, 1994) promote a curriculum that takes into account the personal and socio-cultural dimensions of teaching as well as the contextual complexities of educational institutions and communities in which they are located. Knowles and Cole, along with others such as the Division of Teacher Preparation, University of Calgary (1996), suggest that teacher education curriculum be more integrated, learner-centred, inquiry-oriented, and field-based.

Related to the call for curricular reorientation is a call for a change in the structure of preparation programs. Some suggest a time reallocation to program components. For example, New Brunswick Commission on Excellence in Education (1991), Prince Edward Island Cabinet Committee on Government Reform (1992), Royal Commission on Learning (1994), Ratelle (1994), and Shapiro, Clandinin, Gaskell, Crocker, Currie, and Fullan (1994)

call for an extension of the field experience component. Others focus on the nature and quality of the experience in an extended practicum (Division of Teacher Preparation, University of Calgary, 1996; Knowles & Cole, 1994, 1996).

There are those whose prescription for reform involves a reconceptualisation of teacher education as a career-long process so that preservice preparation is followed by a substantial commitment to continuing inservice education (e.g., Cole & McNay, 1988; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990; Knowles & Cole with Presswood, 1994; Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994; Saskatchewan Education, 1986). And, following along this line of thinking—that teacher education is a responsibility shared by universities and schools—are those who advocate a focus, in the reform agenda, on the conditions of schools as places to assist and support the day to day work and ongoing professional development of teachers (e.g., Cole, 1990, 1992). Numerous other related efforts to strengthen school-university relationships (e.g., Watson & Fullan, 1992) are listed on most reform proposals and represent perhaps the most pervasive suggestions to improve teacher education.

While the literature on teacher education reform in Canada collectively represents very diverse perspectives, authors, individually, are clear on their stance; reform documents written at the institutional level for internal circulation and use are often less clear about the approaches to be taken, and, overall, little public knowledge exists about reform efforts underway at teacher education institutions. The goal of this article is to provide information about teacher education reform in Canada.

METHODOLOGY

The data reported on were gathered as the first phase of a larger, in-depth study of teacher education reform in Anglophone teacher education institutions in Canada. (A recognised limitation of this study is the lack of involvement of Francophone teacher education institutions.) Letters of initial contact were sent to every dean or department of education chairperson in English speaking universities across Canada. In the letter I explained my interest in understanding teacher education reform across Canada and requested an opportunity for a telephone interview on the topic particularly as it pertained to individual teacher education programs. The letters were followed up by electronic mail messages (in some cases, several) and, as a result, 22 out of a requested 30 interviews were conducted with 13 deans of education and nine designates, all of whom held some kind of administrative role within the faculty or department of education. Conversations, ranging from one to two hours, were organised around the following questions:

- What kinds of changes in teacher education are underway at your faculty or department (description, goals of the changes, scope of efforts)?
- How did the idea for the changes come about (reasons, impetus, origin)?
- Can you briefly describe the process undertaken to initiate and facilitate change?
- What is your role in that process?
- How are the plans/changes proceeding?
- What do you see as some of the key factors which make it possible to achieve the reform goals?
- What are some obstacles or challenges?
- Is there anything else you can tell me that will help me better understand what is going on in teacher education reform at your institution?
- Do you have any written information that would further inform me?

In many cases the conversations were supplemented with the provision of copies of relevant documents, such as discussion papers, working policy documents, memoranda, to further explain such efforts.

The broad purposes of this phase of the research were to gather preliminary information about how teacher education institutions are responding to calls for reform (either self- or other-motivated), to gauge the nature and extent of those efforts and the processes associated with their facilitation, and to identify perceived key obstacles and enablers of change. This phase of information gathering was also intended to identify 'sites' of programmatic innovation for further in-depth study. The telephone interviews were transcribed and returned to the participants for clarification and approval. The data were then organized according to the main questions posed in the interviews and summarized. The result, presented in the next section, is an overview of teacher education reform efforts based on a summary analysis of individuals' descriptions and supplementary policy documents.

Given the prevalence of reform efforts across the country and the tendency for there to be little communication about such efforts by those involved, the overview and analysis are intended to encourage discussion about programmatic changes and associated challenges. Insights into the prospects and often persistent problems associated with reform efforts within the Canadian context have the potential to facilitate forward movement. Since the practical value and overall purpose of this research relates to its potential to facilitate the improvement of teacher education in Canadian universities, the focus of the analysis is on key issues that seem to be at the heart of much of the progress (or lack thereof).

AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM EFFORTS

I have not made a concerted effort to offer a detailed numerical analysis (percentages, frequency counts, tallies) nor do I attach names to the data and analysis. My intention is not to provide a detailed accounting of who is doing what. Additionally, because of the exploratory nature of this phase of the study and my interest in getting a general rather than a particular view of teacher education reform efforts, it would be remiss of me to make any claims about particular programs or institutions. To do so would require more in-depth and extensive research—which is currently underway (see, Cole, 2000). My intention, here, is to present the broad picture. This article, then, reports on teacher education reform efforts across Canada (including impetus, nature, scope, and procedural approach), provides an analysis of some of the key enablers of and obstacles to change, and includes a brief discussion of prospects for teacher education reform in Canadian Anglophone universities.

Impetus

The current impetus for programmatic change in the majority (17/22) of education faculties is external, a result of either direct government intervention in the form of forced program closure, institutional amalgamation, or control over curriculum, structure, and enrolment, or as a result of reduced government funding. In many cases the government mandated changes have followed a government commissioned report on education. While in many instances such government intervention was (and is) met with considerable resistance, in some cases mandated changes coincide with internally recognized needs for programmatic reform and are perceived as important facilitators of change. For example, one dean spoke at length about the “hands-on” interventionist approach adopted by the government and his role in trying to “keep everybody happy on both sides [government and faculty]. . . . As far as program change it’s mainly tinkering now to fix up what we have and we continue to try to keep the interventionists out of the program if we possibly can.” In contrast, another dean, referring to a severe budget cut that necessitated dramatic programmatic change, stated, “We felt hard done by but we picked ourselves up by our bootstraps and undertook the task of trying to develop a program as best we could under the financial contingencies. . . . Now we feel pretty good; we are going to do some things we could not do in the past.”

Faculties and departments of education in all provinces have been affected by government policies and actions; yet, in at least five instances, substantial programmatic change has been internally motivated and initiated quite apart from the results of government actions. Some efforts are long-standing attempts at structural and curricular change within teacher education or attempts to more closely align preservice and graduate education; other

more recent efforts also are in response to a recognized need or drive to reorient or strengthen the teacher education program. And, in at least five cases, substantial change has coincided with the appointment of a new administrative head – a factor that seems to be significant in understanding the nature and extent of reforms underway and that bears closer consideration.

Nature and scope of change

As expected, the nature of programmatic change across the country is wide ranging. Change efforts are variously focused on: school-university relationships; program coherence; conceptual reorientation of program (each of these, with varying degrees of intensity and commitment, was identified in eight programs as a major area of change focus); program duration (either an extension or reduction to length of program was an identified focus for six programs); curriculum (five programs identified curricular change as a central focus); consolidation or maintenance of existing programs including recent changes (three programs were described as being in a period of consolidation); working conditions for faculty involved in teacher education (an explicit focus for one program); and, coping with financial cuts (although a challenge identified by all, this was identified by only one person as a focal point of their change efforts). The extent of or investment in change efforts also varies, ranging from minimal efforts mainly aimed at warding off government interference (two programs), to slight tinkering with and consolidation of earlier program modifications (two programs), to extensions or reductions in course offerings and/or time allocated to field experiences without any other conceptual redesign (12 programs), to a complete overhaul of programs often involving an ideological shift either toward a new “model” of teacher education or a reconceptualisation of the role and philosophical and political location of teacher education within the broader education faculty or department and university. The latter kind of change project clearly represents the most substantial commitment with the most inherent challenges but also, as I will discuss later, the most promise for teacher education. This kind of commitment was identified in five faculties or departments of education.

Procedural approaches

A few faculties or departments of education are still involved in some form of needs assessment or internal review process to determine future programmatic directions. Most, however, are well underway in a change process. The approaches to facilitating change, which reflect different leadership stances, range from an imposition of administrative fiat to various ways of garnering support and faculty-wide commitment to programmatic reforms. It is possible to speculate about the potential success or effectiveness of the

various approaches to change based on commonsense, what is known about organisational development and change facilitation in general, and on what is known about change within universities in particular. An analysis of this kind is beyond the scope of this article; however, I will briefly comment on the various approaches to change facilitation and their potential for substantive programmatic reform.

There appear to be four main kinds or clusters of procedural approaches to teacher education reform operational across the country. By far the least common approach to facilitating change is by administrative fiat, although in three cases changes to teacher education programs have been imposed solely by the administrative head of a faculty or department of education or in consultation only with other administrators within the program. This approach has mainly been taken in response to externally imposed changes such as budget cuts whereby the administrative head made changes within the program to accommodate financial cutbacks. A more common approach to handling externally imposed changes is to delegate some authority to a committee of faculty charged with the responsibility to consult among their peers and prepare a strategy for programmatic change. This was the approach to change described as undertaken in six institutions. Delegation of responsibility to a faculty committee is also an approach typically taken when change initiatives are motivated from within by a small group of faculty. In these instances, it is not uncommon for a dean or chairperson to endorse a pilot project followed by an invitation to those involved in the pilot project to propose more widespread changes to faculty council. Interestingly, it is precisely this approach to change that some deans made a point of dismissing as a recipe for failure.

Equally prevalent, but just as questionably efficient or effective, is a democratic process involving a relatively large committee with education stakeholder representation from the university and field in a lengthy (two to five year) process of consultation and design usually followed up by another coordination or implementation committee to oversee and monitor program changes. This approach to programmatic reform was described by one dean as a "surefire way to preserve the status quo."

The fourth kind of approach to teacher education reform is the most demanding of faculty and administrators alike and, not surprisingly, the one that seems to hold the most promise for effecting substantial and systemic change. It was described by four administrative leaders as guiding changes at their institutions. Critical in this approach is the centrality of the administrative leader's vision of and for change to teacher education, her or his visible commitment and direct involvement in the change process, and ongoing support of faculty efforts. While a faculty-wide commitment to substantial change is, itself, non-negotiable in this approach, the dean or

chair typically initiates a process of discussion and planning with full faculty involvement usually in a series of retreats or extended sessions. Much effort is invested in the change process and in encouraging faculty commitment to the “project.” The main distinction between the non-negotiable stance of this approach and the one described in the first cluster is the nature of the commitment to the change process in all its complexities.

Enablers and obstacles

For some change efforts it is perhaps too early to comment on progress; for others it seems like the writing is on the wall. And the message reads like the adage, *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose* (the more things change superficially, the more they are fundamentally the same).

Analyses abound of teacher education reform initiatives and innovations. Most such analyses acknowledge the fact that, despite persistent efforts over several decades to effect change in teacher education, the way teachers are prepared in university-based teacher education programs in North America has basically remained unchanged for generations. Also typical in these analyses is the identification of reasons for the lack of change in teacher education. For example, based on an extensive review and analysis of literature in the area of teacher education reform and program innovation, and empirical research involving fifteen teacher education reform specialists engaged in reform initiatives, Portman (1995) developed a rank ordered list of 28 barriers to change in teacher education. Nolan (1985) conducted an in-depth case study of teacher education curriculum reform at a large university in the United States and identified five main obstacles to reform and suggestions for their removal.

In a first attempt to make sense of the progress of and potential for change in teacher education in Anglophone Canada, I analysed the interview transcripts to determine what was helping and what was hindering reform efforts. When I turned to the literature on teacher education reform, not surprisingly, I discovered that the list of obstacles I came up with more or less matched up with those identified elsewhere in the literature. For example, the obstacles to reform identified by Nolan (1985) – lack of time; varying degrees of personal commitment; lack of reward at the university level; the isolationist tradition of university culture; and lack of discussion and confrontation over program development issues – are persistent problems in Canadian teacher education institutions. Similarly, the 28 barriers identified by Portman (1993) and clustered in five categories – barriers related to sponsorship, support, programmatic concerns, personal concerns, proposal deficit, and university milieu – are mostly evident and name the challenges faced in efforts to change teacher education in Canadian universities. This kind of analysis, however, seems of limited help, at a pragmatic

level, for propelling reform efforts except, perhaps, for the value inherent in naming problems as a first step toward solving them.

Also noteworthy in my analysis is the important role that perception and context play in advancing change. Of the 16 barriers to reform that matched up with Portman's analysis, ten of those were also perceived as facilitators or enablers of change! For example, conditions of or approaches to change such as assigning responsibility for program planning and redevelopment to a small group or initiating pilot projects as a first phase of reform activity were identified by some as key obstacles to change (also identified by Portman as the most significant and prevalent barrier to change). These same approaches were identified by others as important facilitators of reform efforts. Similarly, the imposition of reforms, especially by government, was cited by several individuals as a major obstacle to change (a condition also well supported in reform literature and among the most significant and prevalent in Portman's analysis); others perceived government intervention as a welcome catalyst to change. Is change potential dependent on whether the cup is perceived as half-full or half-empty?

Clearly it is much more complex than these factors suggest, although it is safe to say that perception and attitude are key elements in any change effort. After all, it is people who do or do not effect change. Given the intention of this research to inform the improvement of teacher education in Canadian universities, there are limitations in this kind of laundry-list analysis of helps and hindrances. The complexities and challenges of reform are context-specific and people-driven. As indicated earlier, what is perceived in one context and by one person as a hindrance to reform might be seen by another in another context as a help. It seems more appropriate, therefore, to offer a broad theoretical interpretation of teacher education reform efforts and to highlight some issues that seem potentially meaningful to change in some contexts. Implicit in my discussion is a challenge which I hope will stimulate discussion and debate among those involved in reform efforts.

MINDEDNESS OF CHANGE

The rhetoric of teacher education reform proliferates institutional policy documents, reports, and mandates; the nature, scope, and substance of changes taking place are divergent. Changes range from staffing cuts or program closures to deep conceptual shifts in program orientation, design, and delivery. To quote Cornbleth (1986, p. 13), however, "The present flurry of activity ought not to be mistaken for change," at least fundamental and substantive change. The changes in teacher education taking place across Canada can be broadly delineated into two categories or kinds of change: response-minded changes and reform-minded changes. For this

subsequent analysis I draw on the distinction Clark Kerr (1986) makes between response- and reform-minded changes:

Reform is something someone wants to do in relation to a set of values; response is something someone must do in reaction to the situation. Both involve change. But the first is active and by choice, and the second is reactive and of necessity. (p. xvi)

Elements of both, he adds, may be the most effective of all. Indeed, to suggest otherwise is to reduce an incredibly complex phenomenon into inappropriately simplistic terms.

Response-minded change

For varied and complex reasons, most of the changes in teacher education underway in Canadian Anglophone universities can be characterised according to Kerr's definition of response-minded change – a reaction to an externally imposed mandate or an internal effort perceived as a top-down initiative, the needs for which are unclear or unmet. In most cases these kinds of responses are to cuts in government funding to universities in general or directly to schools of education which typically result in dramatic reductions in faculty complement and which precipitate necessary programmatic changes. In other cases, responses are to government mandated structural or curricular changes. Change efforts in these faculties or departments of education are mainly directed at coping, survival, and resistance to government interference. They tend to translate into curricular and structural changes not necessarily tied to any identified principles or to tinkering with elements of the program to create an illusion of change. These kinds of responses are the most predictable. As Cornbleth notes:

Most teacher education institutions will likely respond to the recent and forthcoming calls for reform by adopting proposals for change that are congruent with their pre-existing norms, interests, and structural arrangements while resisting others. (1986, p. 10)

She goes on to state:

Reform of teacher education might be stimulated by the recent and forthcoming calls for its reform, but it is not apt to be appreciably furthered by them. . . . Where reform occurs, the initiative will likely be local and from within the organization. (pp. 13, 12)

The above observations aptly describe the situation in Canadian Anglophone teacher education institutions. While it is important to acknowledge the limited capacity of external systems to advance or effect real change, it is worth noting the possible responses to such impositions. In a number of cases government sanctions such as funding cuts, program closures, and institutional amalgamations provide an impetus for change that is welcomed by some, demanding a renewed commitment of energy to long-

standing recognised needs or desires to change teacher education programs. Within the university, too, directives from central administration can provide the kind of kick-start necessary to help propel some reform-minded efforts.

Reform-minded changes

Regardless of the impetus for change and whether it is internally or externally motivated, it is the subsequent action taken that is most important. And in fewer than half of the teacher education institutions involved in the study does it appear that the change actions being taken are reform-minded, that is, rooted in a set of coherent and articulated set of values related to the improvement of teacher education. Predominantly, the focus of these efforts is conceptually driven, taking varied forms of strengthening school-university relationships, striving towards program coherence, and making ideological shifts to new “models” of teacher education programs. In a very few cases education faculties and departments are involved in a complete overhaul of their program’s orientation, design, structure, curriculum, and delivery and in redefining the nature of the work that teacher educators do. These are bold efforts that merit attention because their success (or failure) has important implications for the potential for real teacher education reform. Because of the enormous commitment required to effect such substantive and systemic change and because, historically, such efforts are relatively rare it is crucial for us to observe, support, and gain insight from such attempts. There is much to learn from those seriously engaged in reform-minded efforts (the second part of this research currently in progress, see Cole, 2000).

Rios, McDaniel, and Stowell, three pre-tenured (at the time of their writing) teacher educators hired at a new university to lead program development and help shape institutional culture, describe and analyse their efforts at teacher education reform at California State University San Marcos. In their inspirational account (Rios, McDaniel, & Stowell, 1996) they share some of the lessons they learned about teacher education reform – that it is an ongoing and recursive process, pragmatically evaluated (the proof is in the pudding), politically loaded, requiring a commitment by individuals to the development of shared vision and values and a commitment by the university to appropriate rewards for individuals’ efforts. Their story, replete with risks, challenges, and uncertainties, is one of success. In their closing comments they reflect:

Success is empowering. With success we have more efficacy in the college. We ourselves are more emboldened to take another risk and trust our own judgments. With this confidence we have cajoled other untenured professors to join in our proactive, political stance, and we find with each year that we are taking greater strides down our path. (p. 35)

There are few such success stories of change in teacher education. Indeed, most of what is written about change and teacher education reform highlights failures or reasons for lack of movement (*plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*). We know enough about why “despite a great deal of ferment [teacher education] programs at the basic level remain the same” (Portman, 1993, p. 16). Perhaps it is time to focus research attention on change efforts that have strong potential for success and that have, at their centre, intentions to fundamentally change the way teachers are prepared and the way teacher educators work. For it is these kinds of reform-minded efforts that hold promise for teacher education in the future.

THE FUTURE OF TEACHER EDUCATION: A BROADER CONSIDERATION

Virtually all of the programs of which I was able to catch a glimpse have been beset by reduction in financial resources and some kind of government interference related to accountability. Education and, by extension, teacher education, are situated within and influenced by their socio-political contexts. This is the case in teacher education institutions in Canada and it is the case the world over. Education, as both an affair of the state and a phenomenon of the everyday, has little independent authority. It is at the whim of any change in political structure, ideology, or economic well-being. Few, if any, decisions related to education (and the preparation of teachers) are based on sound educational reasoning; indeed, educators usually have very little say in education decision-making at a state level. Whether it is a move, in Britain, to what John Elliott (1993) calls a “social-market view of teacher education,” essentially leading to what Sharpe and Gopinathan (1993) term a “de-universitisation” of teacher education, or a move, in Singapore, toward a greater role for the university in teacher education (Sharpe & Gopinathan, 1993), or, in Japan, to increased government intervention and control (Shimahara, 1993) the motivations for such moves invariably can be traced to money, accountability, and political control. As poignantly stated by Ivan Holowinsky (1993, p. 215), commenting on the future of education reform efforts in post-Soviet Ukraine:

The changes taking place in Ukraine . . . after more than seventy years of Soviet-Russian domination, are profound. The extent of the success of these initiatives, however, will still depend upon political stability and the growth of a market economy. . . . The process of democratisation, in general, and reconstruction of education and teacher education, more specifically, will be either enhanced or reversed depending on the elections' outcomes.

In North America, on a less dramatic scale, we continue to experience the rise and fall of education reform in our respective provincial and state contexts as influenced by changes in government and market economies. Just as the oceans' tides will continue to rise and fall, so will we continue

to experience the ebb and flow of efforts to reform (teacher) education. Our challenge as teacher educators within universities, where teacher education is (for now) situated, is to know how to respond to the inevitable and persistent politically- and economically- driven pressures.

External forces aside, it is still the case that, in spite of all that is known about teacher education reform (see, e.g., Blackwell, 1996; Bush, 1987; Clark, 1993; Cornbleth, 1986; Cuban, 1990, 1999; Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991; Holmes, 1995; Kettlewell, 1996; Sarason, 1990), teacher education in North America has remained essentially unchanged for generations. External forces still aside, one wonders whether this lack of change is perhaps due more to a lack of collective will than to a lack of ability. As Cuban (1999, p. 194), speaking about the stability of higher education in North America in general, reminds us:

University-colleges . . . have been places where century-old contradictions produced an enduring stability in beliefs, structures, and cultures that have enabled faculties to design again and again many symbolic curricular and pedagogical changes but sustain few deep and lasting reforms.

As teacher educators we need to ask ourselves whether or not we really are interested in and committed to the improvement of teacher education or whether we are content, as Cornbleth (1986, citing Deal, 1984) suggests, to continue to engage in the reform ritual and ceremony as a “dance of legitimacy, not a strategy of change” (Deal, 1984, p. 128).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend my appreciation to Maura McIntyre for her assistance with the data analysis, and to all those who provided information for this study.

REFERENCES

- Alberta Education (1994). *Meeting the challenge: Three-year business plan 1994/5 to 1996/7*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Education.
- Blackwell, P. (1996). Reform under adversity. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 19-26.
- Bowman, J. (1991). *Report to the College of Teachers on teacher education in British Columbia*. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia College of Teachers.
- Bush, R.N. (1987). Teacher education reform: Lessons from the past half century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 13-19.
- Clark, S.M. (1993). Higher education and school reform. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(1), 1-20.
- Cole, A.L. (1990). Personal theories of teaching: Development in the formative years. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 36(3), 203-222.

- Cole, A.L. (1992). Teacher development in the workplace: Rethinking the appropriation of professional relationships. *Teachers College Record*, 94(2), 365-381.
- Cole, A. L. (2000, April). *An overview and analysis of processes of programmatic and curricular reform in teacher education in Anglophone Canada*. Invited paper presentation, Canadian Association of Teacher Educators, at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Cole, A., & McNay, M. (1988). Induction programs in Ontario schools: Issues and possibilities. *Education Canada*, 28(4), 4-11,44-45.
- Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. *Educational Researcher*, 15(4), 5-14.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), 3-13.
- Cuban, L. (1999). *How scholars trumped teachers: Change without reform in university curriculum, teaching, and research, 1890-1990*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Deal, T. (1985). National commissions: Blueprints for remodeling or ceremonies for revitalizing public schools? *Education and Urban Society*, 17(2), 145-156.
- Division of Teacher Preparation, University of Calgary (1996). *Proposed of Teaching (MT) Program (Draft)*. Calgary, AB: Faculty of Education, University of Calgary.
- Elliott, J. (1993). The assault on rationalism and the emergence of the social market perspectives. In J. Elliott (Ed.), *Reconstructing teacher education: Teacher development* (pp. 20-30). London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M., Connelly, F. M., & Watson, N. (1990). *Teacher education in Ontario: Current practices and options for the future*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Ministry of Education and Ministry of Colleges and Universities.
- Grimmett, P. (1995). Crafting the curriculum of teacher education. In S. Majhanovich (Ed.), *Re-forming teacher education: Problems and prospects*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Holmes Group (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- Holowinsky, I.Z. (1993). Ukraine's reconstructive process in education: School reform, teacher education, and school psychology. In N.K. Shimahara & I.Z. Holowinsky (Eds.), *Teacher education in industrialized nations: Issues in changing social contexts* (pp. 195-223). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Hughes, J., Irvine, J., Jansson, L., Long, J., & Stapleton, J. (1993). *Final report of the task force on initial teacher education programs*. University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 154).
- Kerr, C. (1986). In L. Cerych & P. Sabatier, *Great expectations and mixed performance: The implementation of higher education reform in Europe*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.
- Kettlewell, J. (1996). The Miami (Ohio) University Story. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 27-33.

- Knowles, J.G., & Cole, A.L. (1996). Developing practice through field experiences. In F.B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 648-688). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Knowles, J.G. & Cole, A.L. with Presswood, C. (1994). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry*. New York: Merrill.
- Ministry of Education. (1990). *Year 2000: A framework for learning*. Vancouver, BC: Ministry of Education, Province of British Columbia.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a Physics Methods course. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(2), 86-95.
- New Brunswick Commission on Excellence in Education. (1991). *Schools for a new century: Issues paper 1*. Fredericton, NB: Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Nolan, J.F. (1985). Potential obstacles to internal reform in teacher education: Findings from a case study. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 36(4), 12-16.
- PEI Task Force on Education (1992). *Education: A shared responsibility: The report of the PEI Task Force on Education*. Charlottetown, PEI: Prince Edward Island Cabinet on Government Reform.
- Portman, P.A. (1993). Barriers to change in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(1), 14-21.
- Québec. Ministère de l'Éducation. (1992). *The challenge of teaching today and tomorrow: Renewal and recognition of the teaching profession*. Québec: Ministère de l'Éducation.
- Ratelle, L.F. (1994). Quebec's Education Minister unveils major reform of teacher training. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 40(33), A49.
- Rios, F.A., McDaniel, J.E., & Stowell, L.P. (1996). Making the path by walking it. In A.L. Cole, R. Elijah, & J.G. Knowles (Eds.), *The heart of the matter: Teacher educators and teacher education reform* (pp. 237-254). San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
- Royal Commission on Learning (1994). *For the love of learning: Report of the Royal Commission on Learning*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Saskatchewan. Core Curriculum Policy Advisory Committee. (1986). *Program policy proposals: Report of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee*. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Education.
- Shapiro, B., Clandinin, J., Gaskell, J., Crocker, R., Currie, E., & Fullan, M. (1994). *Teacher education in Nova Scotia: An honourable past, an alternative future*. A report to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education. Halifax, NS: Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education.
- Sharpe, L., & Gopinathan, S. (1993). Universitisation and the reform of teacher education: The case of Britain and Singapore. *Research in Education*, 50, 5-16.
- Shimahara, N.K. (1993). Teacher education reform in Japan: Ideological and control issues. In N.K. Shimahara & I.Z. Holowinsky (Eds.), *Teacher education in industrialized nations: Issues in changing social contexts* (pp. 155-193). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Thiessen, D., & Pike, R. (1992). *Project 95 + Images of the future teacher*. Toronto, ON: Teacher Education Council, Ontario.

Watson, N. & Fullan, M. (1992). Beyond school district-university partnerships. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change* (pp. 213-242). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

ARDRA L. COLE is a Professor in the Department of Adult Education, Community Development, and Counselling Psychology, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.

ARDRA L. COLE est professeur au département d'éducation des adultes, de développement communautaire et de counselling de l'Institut ontarien d'études en sciences de l'éducation de l'Université de Toronto.