BETWEEN THE "NO LONGER" AND THE "NOT YET":

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT IN TEACHER EDUCATION

by

Judith Lynn McPhie

B.A., Queen's University, 1964

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1987

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Faculty

of

Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

December 1992

APPROVAL

Name: Judith Lynn McPhie

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Title of Thesis: Between the "No Longer" — and the "Not Yet": a Description and Analysis of a Collaborative Effort in Teacher Education

Examining Committee:
Chair: Marvin F. Wideen

Allan MacKinnon
Senior Supervisor

Michael Manley-Casimir
Professor

Celia Haig-Brown
Assistant Professor

Jane Gaskell
Professor
University British Columbia

Peter Grimmett
Associate Professor
Internal External Examiner

Dr. Judith Warren Little
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
University of California
External Examiner

Date Approved December 14, 1992

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Between the "No Longer" -- and the "Not Yet" : a Description and Analysis of a Collaborative Effort in Teacher Education

Author: _____
(signature)

Judith Lynn McPHIE
(name)

December 7, 1992
(date)

Abstract

Worthwhile programs leading to teacher certification require a collaborative effort between educators based in schools and educators based in universities. These educators hold and develop knowledge that provides conceptual frames to guide inquiry into education, as well as knowledge that informs an understanding of the complex and value-laden contexts in which education takes place. The integration of these different kinds of knowledge within a collaborative effort can repair the discrediting of school and university knowledge that the traditionally isolated practicum and campus components of teacher education programs have engendered. Facilitated as well is an ongoing examination of educational thought and action that can include a critique of practice and a social critique of the structures that support and constrain educational work.

This outcome is contingent on other conditions being met, conditions that define a standard for a reasonable collaborative effort. Participants must view themselves as learners, committed to suspending judgement and listening reflectively. It is an attitude necessary to the acquisition of critical self-knowledge as well as knowledge of the perspectives and understandings of others. Collaboration requires reciprocity—the equal opportunity for participants to both speak and to listen—and signals a shift in roles and relationships within the educational enterprise that disrupts traditional divisions of work, status and power. Commitment to this reflective and reciprocal discourse implies a view of knowledge as socially constructed and historically situated and, therefore, requiring ongoing dialogue.

This thesis describes and analyses the collaborative effort of two groups of school-based and university-based teachers who developed and implemented, and subsequently modified a curriculum for student teachers. This inquiry takes as its central reference the discourse of the experiencing participants at the sites at which their relationships with one another intersect. Their roles, relationships and responsibilities shift as they contribute their different knowledge and experience and negotiate a curriculum.

The findings suggest that such an ongoing and critically informed examination of education is characterized by tensions and conflicts. These tensions provide fertile ground to examine competing knowledge claims and to reach towards new knowledge and possibilities. They confirm as well knowledge as fragmented and agreement as tentative, requiring continuous negotiation to ensure meaning is not appropriated.

Such an effort has the potential to increase participant ability and commitment to work with differences and to view the consequences and possibilities of educational work from a "wider surround." As participant/researcher within this school-university collaboration, there is a responsibility to write myself into the narrative as influencing and being influenced by the work as we join, break apart and join again. Given the context and purposes of this work, five claims are made that I suggest could constitute a standard for a reasonable collaborative effort in teacher education.

Dedication

To the many classroom teachers who structure learning environments for children in life-enhancing ways that frame their intellectual experiences in terms of the effect on their social and emotional well-being.

Acknowledgments

This study was possible because of the many school-based and university-based teachers willing to publically examine their, and my, educational work. I would like to acknowledge and thank the "originals" of NWTEC—educators in the Prince Rupert, Terrace, Kitimat and Smithers School Districts, and New CALTEC—educators in the Nechako, Burns Lake, Prince George, and Quesnel School Districts who worked with Simon Fraser University, and the "original" faculty associates with whom I (tried to) share this work, and sometimes succeeded, and to the coordinator of New Caltec who has carried on and wonderfully extended the original work. You have all taught me many personal and professional lessons, and I wouldn't have missed it for anything.

Thanks to my doctoral committee who gently, and with persistence stretched my understanding of the project I had undertaken, and my ability to describe and analyze it. They modelled among themselves a collegiality and interest in a diversity of opinion that made meeting with them collaboration in action. And a special thanks to Allan MacKinnon whose wise and patient paths helped me find my way through.

A special thanks to colleagues at Simon Fraser University, Faculty of Education who have sustained and supported my practice and my research in life-enhancing ways over the past five years.

And to my family who have also sustained and supported me through the roller coaster ride that is doctoral work.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Chapter I

Moving Sites/Sights

The time is at hand for the development of a new relationship between the profession at large and faculties of education. This should not be a relationship founded on the twin solitudes of university and school, or on a dichotomy between research and teaching, or on some artificial hierarchy of profession and craft. Instead it must be a relationship of equals—different because the cultures in which teachers and teacher educators work are different in many respects—but equal nevertheless. Thus the preparation of teachers must be a collaborative relationship and one of joint responsibility. [Report to the College of Teachers of British Columbia, 1991, p. 34]

If we are to educate teachers effectively and efficiently, we must see the task as a single piece and not be satisfied to assign separate parts of the process to the different levels. Collaboration is a solution. The [school-based] teachers' participation in the development of student teachers used to consist largely of hosting observations, maybe participating in some workshops. The way this program is being set up, it is developed, discussed and evaluated by the combined effort of the school-based teachers and university-based teachers. [school-based teacher, 1991]

Being a school associate means finding time to give serious attention to my own work. Everyone needs opportunities for self renewal but those of us responsible for developing other human beings need them most of all. Thinking deeply about what we are doing leads to asking better questions, breaking out of unnecessary routines, making unexpected connections and experimenting with fresh ideas. We must consciously create spaces in which to think about the meaning and purpose of our work. [school-based teacher, 1991]

The effect of this model of teacher education on my personal growth as an educator has been great due to the reflective nature of the process. I feel I will change my way of thinking and assessing my job in a manner which is more critical and self-evaluative than before. [school-based teacher, 1990]

There is no doubt in my mind about the value of collaboration. Yet it is harder. It is incredibly demanding of time. And it is the ongoing nature of collaboration that I don't think I was prepared for and did not anticipate. [university-based teacher, end of semester, 1991]

The most positive aspect of the program for me, a view also held by others I spoke with, was the opportunity to meet colleagues from different towns and settings within the school system to discuss our common concerns and goals of the process called education. [school-based teacher, 1990]

Traditional Sites/Sights

The challenge is ongoing in the field of teacher education to achieve balance and coherence in programs developed for the preparation of teachers. It is an assumption of this thesis that this is most likely to be achieved by a collaborative effort between school districts and universities. Teacher education has commonly been divided into two components: course work and seminars with university-based teachers, and experiences afforded by the practicum

with school-based teachers. There has been little exchange between these school and university teachers regarding the perspectives and understandings that guide the work they undertake in the service of their common task—the education of new teachers. It should not come as a surprise then that student teachers do not experience balance and coherence between the course work and practicum of their professional programs: "Studies of successful practitioners continue to reveal that most regard university course work as the least valuable component of their preparation" (Barth, 1991, p. 114).

I would suggest that the main cause of this is the continuing artificial separation of educators into those who "think" about education—in universities, and those who "do" education—in schools. Ultimately the knowledge held by educators in schools and in universities is discredited. Britzman (1991), in her study of student teaching, highlights this problem of divorcing what we know from how we came to know it:

> They [teacher and student teacher] come to accept the institutional fragmentation that bestows on the theorist the power to know and on practitioners the power to feel. As feeling is severed from cognition, each comes to be accorded an unequal status. Such a division of labor can only perpetuate misunderstandings and resentments and, in each case, encourage politically regressive practices. (p. 217)

Lieberman (1992), in laying out arguments for school-university collaboration, would agree:

> The necessary and important contributions of school people themselves in the construction of knowledge have been largely ignored and the influence of and respect for the university diminished. (Lieberman, 1992, p. 11)

In the main, thinking about education within universities tends to be abstract and generalized. The resultant knowledge claims appear to serve an interest in prediction and support an assumption that such knowledge is value free and objective. Given the legitimated structures of institutions of education that define the source of knowledge production as being the university, and given that this academic knowledge is viewed by school-based teachers as "homeless" (Berger et al, 1973), removed from the particulars of everyday school work and difficult to access, public school teachers are unlikely to "talk back," to challenge these claims. Thus the values, beliefs, assumptions underlying research and study in the university, as well as the real impact of that knowledge on the thinking of practicing teachers is difficult to know.

In the main, knowledge developed by school-based teachers serves their interest in understanding and interpreting their complex relationships with students and with curriculum. It is clearly value-laden and represents moral as well as intellectual positions. Academics often regard these claims as too context-bound, too intuitive, thus the importance of the impact of human interest on what we know has been denied. Not surprisingly, knowledge claims arising from an interest in interpretation have not found the conduit for contributing jointly and equally to decision-making within the educational enterprise.

The unfortunate outcome of these stereotypical views is captured by Barth (1991) as he searches for ways for university and school district members to work together to improve schools:

> Most researchers work under the assumption that practitioners will welcome and accept new knowledge and put it to some kind of use in the field...[while] school people develop elaborate defenses with which to deflect new ideas imposed from outside. (Barth, 1991, p. 109-110)

The involvement I am proposing here, and the work described in this thesis, is a collaborative effort that challenges this hierarchical relationship to knowledge production that Barth describes and that has been the common way of doing business in education in general as well as in teacher education. Such an effort requires that school-based and university-based teachers come together as learners, willing to suspend judgement and listen deeply and reflectively to one another. It requires that they develop an increased awareness and appreciation of the understandings and perspectives of the other. And as the tensions and conflicts inherent in entertaining the "horizons" of others are experienced, the biases and prejudices that limit one's own horizon are more likely to become known. In short, assuming the attitude of a learner fosters the necessary development of critical self-knowledge (Ricoeur, 1981).

This reflective and reciprocal discourse provides the structure for collaborative work. It requires more of participants than simply *explaining* their work to one another, it requires an *understanding* of what Habermas (1979) calls "first level constructs," those "inherited values and world views, institutionalized roles and social norms" (p. xi) that influence one's work.

The discourse requires an environment of trust and mutual respect. And it requires more: language needs to be "bent" to new inclusive purposes that enable all participants to listen to a variety of perspectives and to expect to be heard; prevailing roles and relationships are disrupted, and assumptions that have prevented this dialogue from being sustained in the past, assumptions regarding the status and power of different educational work and the concomitant role in educational decision-making must be put aside. In other words, it requires according different status to the every-day work of the participants and altered positions of power whereby participants can both develop understanding, and have the opportunity to effect change. Moving to sites where this discourse and action can take place is to be open to new perspectives and possibilities: to abandon the possibilities of such a dialogue would be tantamount to abandoning the goal of education (Burbules & Rice, 1991).

To embrace this dialogue is to assume that knowledge is socially constructed and historically situated, in short that knowledge is produced and legitimated to serve particular human interests (Habermas, 1972; Kemmis, 1985). A discourse based on this assumption must be organized differently from those that isolated university and school educators from each other in the past. Britzman (1991) describes such a discourse to engage diverse perspectives:

> [It is] dialogic restructuring of teacher education that begins with the recognition that multiple realities, voices, and discourses conjoin and clash in the process of coming to know. Such a restructuring is necessary for the goal of a more democratic schooling and for the creation of democratic pedagogies that value the struggle for voice and make available the discursive practices necessary for the struggle of social justice. (p. 33)

A dialogue embracing the tensions of multiple voices and contested practices is fertile ground for the development of knowledge that serves the interest in emancipation. This discourse provides university and school-based educators with the opportunity to explore together the dilemmas and questions of practice; the articulation of successful practice; and the rendering as problematic the contexts in which teaching and learning take place (Erickson & MacKinnon, 1991; Cinnamond & Zimpher, 1990; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991). The

transformation of practice, and of some kinds of research, depends, in part, on this ongoing dialogic relationship.

New Sites/Sights

This collaborative discourse defines the sites of contestation where different knowledge claims can conjoin and clash that I explore in the body of this thesis. These are sites where participants attempt to move outside the "bound" discourse of institutional roles and relationships and create opportunities for individual voices with diverse perspectives and understandings to make a contribution. The quality of knowledge which emerges from this site will be directly related to the quality of the relationship between participants (Berg & Smith, 1985; McEwan & Bull, 1991).

The thesis describes the collaborative effort to develop, implement, and subsequently modify two teacher education programs by groups of school-based and university-based educators who acknowledged shared responsibility for the education of student teachers. The thesis: (a) examines an argument for collaborative efforts between universities and school districts in teacher education; (b) describes the complexity of that collaboration in action as different perspectives and kinds of knowledge both conjoin and clash, and there is an attempt to negotiate new understanding; (c) provides an analysis and makes recommendations regarding the worthwhileness of this challenging manner of "doing" teacher education; (d) proposes a "standard of the reasonable collaborative effort"; (e) examines the role of the participant-researcher in a collaborative effort between the schools and the university.

There are two consortia on teacher education referred to here, both are affiliated with, but geographically separate from, Simon Fraser University. The Northwest Teacher Education Consortium (hereafter referred to as NWTEC) began in 1989 with the four British Columbia school districts of Prince Rupert, Terrace, Kitimat and Smithers, and the regional college which serviced these Districts, Northwest Community College. The New Caledonia Teacher Education Consortium (hereafter referred to as New Caltec) was created in 1990 with the four

school districts of Prince George, Nechako, Quesnel and Burns Lake and their regional college, College of New Caledonia. These programs provide ten of the twelve months required for completion of SFU's Professional Development Program leading to teacher certification. Students receive the majority of their coursework, and their two practicums, in their local region and come to the main SFU campus in Burnaby for the remaining two months of coursework. Support from the Ministry of Education in British Columbia to develop the Consortium arrangement was forthcoming to address the shortage of teachers in the province in its more northern regions. By making this certification program available, many local residents unable to travel to the main campus could become teachers.

Being in a consortium arrangement enables communication across the broad community of educators from a variety of institutions. If there is the interest and the expertise, it can serve to break down some of the traditional barriers to communication between universities and colleges and school districts that have prevented discussion about teacher education from being pursued with shared understanding. In both NWTEC and New Caltec, school district superintendents, the university-based teachers, the president of the regional college and other college staff (academic and counselling) formed Steering Committees that facilitated the ongoing work of the teacher education programs. These committees provided a forum where the needs and concerns of each of the parties could be heard, and considered in subsequent decisions. This closer communication has meant, for example, colleges consult with the university regarding course work for prospective student teachers and provide projections about future student demand for the consortia programs; superintendents can encourage the participation, with first-hand knowledge of the program, of schools and teachers within the districts; and university persons can approach practitioners in the field with a greater understanding of the demands and conditions that describe these contexts.

Combining the similar work of the two consortia, this thesis describes and analyzes the activities of a university-school district collaborative effort in teacher education. The teacher educators included school-based teachers (called "school associates" in the SFU program),

invited by their districts to work with student teachers; university-based teachers (called "faculty associates" in the SFU program), who had been seconded by the university from local school districts; and the Coordinator of these Consortia (who is also the author of this thesis). In NWTEC there were 25 school associates, two faculty associates and the coordinator; in New Caltec there were 28 school associates, 3 faculty associates and the coordinator. A regular faculty member was assigned to each Consortia. This person joined in discussions regarding overall planning, and provided some seminars for student teachers, but was not involved in the collaborative effort to develop curriculum for the student teachers.

Theoretical Perspectives

How do we know?

> Doubts concerning the correspondence between knowledge and reality arose the moment a thinking individual became aware of his [of her] own thinking. (Von Glasersfeld, 1984, p. 25).

This line of thought can be extended to suggest that the way in which one sees the world depends in good measure on the particular theoretical perspectives and orientations one holds. The matter of collaboration between school and university partners in the interest of teacher education can be addressed from several schools of thought, and justified on the grounds of sociological, political, moral and ethical, or pedagogical dimensions. For example, the matter of school-university partnership can be informed by a literature outlining sociological and cultural dimensions of schools and university faculties of education as workplaces, drawing attention to structural elements of institutions that constrain the collaborative effort and sustain hierarchical stratification and individualism. Similarly, the study of collaboration in the setting of teacher education could be informed by a literature on the nature of learning a profession, arguing for inclusion of school partners in the education of teachers on the grounds that individuals and groups learn about teaching from their experiences in the practice setting. Thus, the collaborative effort of school and university-based teachers would be seen as complementary activity aimed at providing particular understandings and

capacities in the practice setting. The particular interests of this study concern the collaborative endeavor as a means to repair social and institutional power differentials and injustices on the grounds that the practice of teacher education recognize the voices of all participants. The aim of the thesis is to develop a framework for understanding the difficulty and complexity of this endeavor. Thus the principle orienting theoretical framework is focussed here on a critical perspective of knowledge as serving particular human interests—an appropriate orienting frame to begin to speak of emancipation from the conditions that constrain the participation of all stakeholders in dialogues that attempt to achieve understanding about education and society.

There is no reason to believe, with the diversity that exists among human beings, that there could be universal agreement about the way things are or about the way they should be. One describes goals, for instance, as "appropriate" or "inappropriate," actions as "successful" or "unsuccessful" in accordance with a reality shaped by the values and beliefs, the knowledge and experience that make up one's individual reference points, what Ricoeur (1981) refers to as our individual "horizon" and Habermas (1972) as our "internal reality." Our horizons are not, however, simply individual: people come to agreement within societies and nations about how to work and live together. Each of our horizons is, in fact, a "fusion of horizons," an incorporation of "external realities," of the points of view of others, of norms and standards of the society and the institutions and cultures within which we speak and act . Yet our "knowing" and "seeing" remain uniquely individual. What then is to be regarded by a community or society as "true" or "right" or "good" choices or courses of action? In democracies it is, ideally, a matter of discussion and debate reaching toward eventual agreement among citizens (or their representatives) who have had opportunity to voice or register opinion and influence outcomes.

The parallel in teacher education is an ongoing and democratic dialogue among teacher educators based in universities and public schools where "multiple realities, voices and discourses conjoin and clash in the process of coming to know" (Britzman, 1991, p. 33). Inquiry into teacher education begins with university-based and school-based teachers together

reflecting on and articulating their everyday work. "...it is dialogue which is the methodological paradigm for any social inquiry concerned with accessing participants' meanings" (de Castell, 1989, p. 43). This dialogue puts the participants at the centre, as the referents, defining the contexts and issues to which we pay attention.

The goal is to reach towards authentic speech, what Habermas (1972) refers to as "undistorted" speech, the result of a person's competence in understanding and being able to name those forces which influence his or her personal and social action. To then engage in intersubjective and critical reflection, to deepen self knowledge and appreciate the choices and actions of others, requires the development of what Habermas calls "communicative competence," "the ability to establish and understand those modes of communication and connections with the external world through which speech becomes possible" (Habermas, 1979, p. xviii). These competencies include knowledge of the contexts and the languages of the "other," as well as the skill and attitude necessary to the negotiation of new contexts and language representative of shared power and responsibility.

If this commitment to a reflective and critical discourse were to be disregarded, however, educational decision-making would remain in the hands of the privileged few, their decisions unavailable for examination or critique. This can result in what Habermas calls "pseudo-consensus" wherein certain beliefs and ideas—for instance, an epistemological stance regarding the relationship between knowledge and the learner, are taken for granted and never critically examined. Britzman (1991) illustrates this point as she describes the difficulty for student teachers, struggling to understand teaching, to gain access to the knowledge informing education:

> The press for individual control over the teaching process obscures its social origins; individual notions of power privatize contradictions and thereby thwart those learning to teach from theorizing about and effectively intervening in such contradictory realities. (p. 8)

In recent history, predictive knowledge claims constitutive of study and research within faculties of education have driven the curriculum for teacher education programs. This has not necessarily resulted in "bad" programs, but when conceptual frameworks that are developed

within one context are applied to another context without a critical dialogue, pseudo-consensus—if indeed there is "agreement" to proceed—is the result. Such hierarchical structures, based on a distinction between producers and receivers of knowledge, challenge a view of knowledge as socially constructed and obstruct attempts to critique the social and institutional structures within which such programs are conceived. Collaboration among teacher educators enables such a critique and makes it more likely that the different kinds of knowledge held by group members will be examined, and that agreement will arise out of a joint contribution.

It is important to recognize, however, that such collaborative decision-making does not represent consensus. As Ellsworth (1989) points out : "Pluralizing the concept as 'voices' implies correction through addition. This loses sight of the contradictory and partial nature of all voices" (p.312). Burbules & Rice (1991) in their discussion of a "more inclusive approach to pedagogy" recognize the same partial nature of any decisions:

> ...the promulgation of many voices and the representation of the concerns of different groups extend beyond mere tolerance or the creation of an "open forum" that may be less open than it appears, when judged from the perspective of marginalized persons or groups. (p. 397)

In reaching agreement as to how to proceed, some voices are silenced. It is a point that argues powerfully for the discussion to be ongoing, a critique of received narratives representing different points of view that challenge and creatively spark continued examination of alternative perspectives. It is the necessary counterpoint to the assumption that silence may signal agreement.

For school-based and university-based teachers to join together in this critique requires new patterns of sense-making. Metaphorically speaking, the dialogue needs to move to new sites. The object of this critical look at society, and educational practices within that society, is not to arrive at new resolutions or unities but "to keep things in process, to disrupt, to keep the system in play, to continuously demystify the realities we create, to fight the tendency for our categories to congeal" (Lather, 1991). The collaborative discourse provides some assurance that a variety of perspectives can be offered and considered. Significantly, this discourse

demands the courage to take a position, to determine the "best" solution, while simultaneously calling it into question (Lather, 1991).

Accessing our knowledge—The use of narrative

But it is necessary in the "dailiness" of our lives to have some sense of coherence, of control over the consequence of our thoughts and actions. Human beings seek and provide explanations to reduce uncertainty and to develop and retain a sense of self in relation to other.

> Coherence seems to be a need imposed on us whether we seek it or not. Things need to make sense. We feel the lack of sense when it goes missing. The unity of self, not as an underlying identity but as a life that hangs together, is not a pregiven condition but an achievement. We keep at it. What we are doing is telling and retelling, to ourselves and to others, the story of what we are about and what we are. (Carr, 1986, p. 97)

> Narrative is a form of meaning making which expresses itself by drawing together descriptions of states of affairs contained in individual sentences...and creates a higher order of meaning that discloses relationships among the states of affairs. Narrative recognizes the meaningfulness of individual experiences by noting how they function as parts in a whole...It is particularly sensitive to the temporal dimension of human existence, it pays special attention to the sequence in which actions and events occur. (Polkinghorne, 1989, p.35)

There has been increased interest in the past decade in the telling of teachers' stories (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) as a way of developing this understanding of "what we are about and what we are" as teachers. These narratives can provide a sense of personal and professional coherence, pointing to the influences of past experience as well as an interpretation of present events and of alternative futures. Teachers telling stories is a dialogic method for accessing participant meaning. For many who are interested in this manner of pursuing teacher knowledge, the telling of the stories would seem to be an end in itself, the self conscious reflection on practice providing the process necessary to understanding and growth. It is an assumption of this thesis that personal story-telling is an important step. I would agree with Britzman's claim that "reflection is an exploration of one's biography as a condition for individual transformation" (in Cinnamond & Zimpher, 1990, p.67). It is necessary, however, to move from private to inter-subjective reflection, to what Cinnamond & Zimpher call a model of constructive power. "As a result of reflection, one must continually communicate with others to unify the principles of the communities involved" (p.65). But the project is larger

than simply checking with community members. The project, in the radical tradition, is to generate new communities, to encourage transformative roles. Here is the place for critique and, in this case, critique arising out of the stories of practice. It is within this discourse that, as Ricoeur states, "our prejudices become operative" and there is the possibility of transformative understanding and growth.

An interesting dilemma arises with the use of narrative as a methodology. Our stories or experiences of the past are constrained as well as informed by the language and traditions that interpret the past. Habermas (1972), describing this dilemma, claims he is skeptical of the work of hermeneutics, that it is impossible for those outside the critical tradition doing the work of interpretation to get beyond their own institutionally-bound speech. Yet to participate fully within one's society consists in part in the interpretation of the narratives which have informed past events as well as understanding their influence on present action and on the possibilities of the future. Within a tradition that recognizes knowledge as constitutive of the dominant interests in a society, it is more than simply explaining the past; it requires a critical reinterpretation, an understanding of the past which Ricoeur (1981) defines as "bringing to discourse what is initially given as structure" (p. 92). This signals the emancipatory intent of this activity, by laying bare the hegemonic relationships and interests and language shaping the interpretation of events, points of view previously suppressed or unavailable can contribute to the development of new understanding and knowledge. Lather (1991) speaks of uncovering the "textual staging of knowledge": Ricoeur, of arriving at an understanding of "truth" and method as represented by the text. He cites a tradition of emancipatory action which sets a precedent, within the science of hermeneutics, for critique. Habermas (1972) calls for a "critique of institutionally-bound speech." All are describing processes of emancipatory re-interpretation of cultural and institutional inheritance to provide space for formerly silenced voices or for formerly untold stories, for "moments of invention in which we are becoming something else than what our history has constructed us to be" (Foucault quoted in Rajchman, 1991, p. 161).

The language and frames to support "moments of invention," however, are not yet established: what is the language and what are the structures that confirm the intelligent self-direction of each participant within the group—that facilitate the bringing to consciousness of participant meaning in collaborative efforts? How is agreement reached among diverse participants with unique life experience and interests? It brings to mind a line from a poem by Adrienne Rich (1975): "this is the oppressor's language; and yet I need to talk to you." It is illustrative of the challenge to recognize "moments of invention" from within present perspectives. I view the creation of collaborative communities of teachers based in schools and in universities as a beginning to such critical and creative work. It is emancipatory work where "the as yet unnamable begins to proclaim itself" (Derrida, in Lather, 1991).

The key process that enables this dialogic relationship is critical reflection. It is this critical stance that links knowing to action, action informed by a moral as well as intellectual standard. Greene (1988) reminds us that it is essential to recognize the contradictions inherent in the inter-subjective dialogue and be willing to examine and consolidate what we know in light of that conflict. It echoes Ricoeur's (1981) point that our prejudices only become operative in the examination of tensions between self and other, between past and present; Britzman's (1991) point as she describes the student teacher struggling to understand the unacknowledged dilemmas of practice; Ellsworth's (1989) concern as she points out the fragmented and contradictory nature of all voices. The tension inherent in this collaborative effort, heightened by challenges to traditional positions of status and power, is the fertile breeding ground for new understandings and perspectives.

Methodological Stance

This inquiry into collaborative work takes as its central reference the discourse of the experiencing participants at the site at which their relationships with one another intersect. The complex evolution of this discourse is revealed as particular speakers describe their everyday work and the context within which this work takes place. The roles, relationships and

responsibilities of those involved in the educational enterprise are glimpsed as teachers based in schools and teachers based in universities negotiate new roles and responsibilities in the act of developing a curriculum for student teachers.

As coordinator of this project, as well as participant/researcher, I worked with other participants from the inside, describing and analyzing the meaning we make as we reveal our histories, present circumstances and future expectations. The knowledge we produce is inextricably bound up with our individual and collective histories. Heron (1981) addresses this meaning-making in the context of the participants' inherent right to be active in the generation of new knowledge.

> ...persons, as autonomous beings, have a moral right to participate in decisions that claim to generate knowledge about them. Such a right...protects them...from being managed and manipulated...the moral principle of respect for persons is most fully honored when power is shared not only in the application...but also in the generation of knowledge...doing research on persons involves an important educational commitment: to provide conditions under which subjects can enhance their capacity for self-determination in acquiring knowledge about the human condition. (in Lather, 1991, pp. 34-35)

It is this latter point that highlights for me the commitment of the participant/researcher in a collaborative relationship of school and university teachers. The goal of the project, and of the research into the project become joined. Both seek deeper understanding of the different kinds of knowledge that inform and guide decisions in education. Both seek to understand the processes that enable participants to increase their ability and commitment to effect change. The desired outcome is Freire's (1973) "knowing subject," who both understands the present circumstance, and has the capacity to effect change in that circumstance. Lieberman (1992) describes this evolving role of the collaborative researcher:

> Those university researchers—whose goals are the transforming of schools and universities—find that their goals change the nature of their relationship with schools, challenging them to reevaluate the role of research and the responsibilities of researchers who participate in authentic collaboration with school-based educators. The role of the academic is no longer that of the dispassionate observer, but rather that of an insider and an outsider at the same time: one who dares to "speak the unspeakable," because she must document what she sees, but also one who cares deeply and passionately, and empathizes with the problems of practice. She must hold on to a larger vision of what is possible, while not avoiding or being unaware of the inevitable conflicts that come from being a part of both worlds. (Lieberman, 1992, p. 10)

I would revise Lieberman's description to include—"embracing the inevitable conflicts that come from being a part of both worlds wherein the opportunities for increased self-knowledge, and for new knowledge that is the creative outcome of that struggle embraced."

Working from within those struggles, as participant/researcher, I helped shape and was shaped by our interactions and by our evolving sense of confidence and purpose. Researching from within is to write the tensions, the moments of doubt, the interplay of relationships, subsequently offering to participants, and other interested readers, my subjective and value-based understanding of the process called collaboration.

This collaborative work and the research that accompanied it were both envisioned as providing the opportunity for increased understanding. In the first instance, it was provided through collaborative development, implementation and modification of the program. In the second instance, it was through ongoing private and inter-subjective reflection on and analysis of, our processes and relationships. Thirdly, for interested participants, there were ongoing opportunities to respond to my written accounts of our work. And, finally, for other readers, there is the thick description of the discourse of school and university teachers committed to the collaborative effort.

> As I write, I face the inescapability of reductionism. Language is delimitation, a strategic limitation of possible meanings. It frames; it brings into focus by that which goes unremarked. (Lather, 1991, p. xix)

I am the primary interpreter of the work described in this study. Beyond the conditions that encourage authentic and thoughtful reflection among the group there are the conditions under which I select and interpret the data. I am inescapably implicated in my work and in my writing. The question is, as Lather (1991) puts it; "How do we do 'good,' openly value-based inquiry?" While such research "frees" one to look at difficult issues "truthfully," meaning with as much knowledge and acknowledgement of one's biases and values and assumptions as possible, it runs the risk of shutting off other views. To guard against this risk (which is present, I would suggest, in all research efforts) demands vigorous and public reflexivity on the part of the researcher as well as a willingness to change her mind.

I am struggling here with describing the dialogic relationship that regards the different work of school-based and university-based teachers to be equally necessary and equally subject to fully informed critique, to "learn how to let experience shape and reshape theory...the aim being to *understand* rather than to find methods of justification, verification, and control" (Code, 1989, p. 169). It is the intersection where persons from two institutions and diverse traditions, priorities and perspectives agree to meet, to deepen their mutual understanding and to work together, that defines new sites/sights for teacher education.

The database

As SFU coordinator for two consortia, NWTEC and New Caltec, from 1989 to 1991, I was facilitator of the sessions in which school-based and university-based teachers developed the framework for the teacher education curriculum of the first practicum semester. The Northwest Teacher Education Consortium (NWTEC group) had twenty-five public school teachers (school associates) from four school districts and most grades and two faculty associates who had been seconded to SFU from the local districts. The New Caledonia Teacher Education Consortium (New Caltec) had twenty-eight school associates from three districts, three faculty associates, two working together out of the main SFU site and one working in an adjoining district.

In conjunction with this collaborative effort, nine school associates took advantage of the opportunity to use the sessions as part of an undergraduate course in curriculum development and implementation. The course was taught by the coordinator. The journal entries of those school associates trace their development as teacher educators. They provide a particularly rich individual expression and interpretation of the experience.

The database which informs my description and analysis of the collaborative effort to develop curriculum with school associates and faculty associates includes:

1. Audio tapes of (a) the full group planning sessions in October [APPENDIX A] and November [APPENDIX B] and (b) the practicum semester where we reflect on and modify the program in February [APPENDIX C] and in March [APPENDIX D].

2. Journal entries from the nine school associates enrolled in the undergraduate course.
3. A taped session with the faculty associates seven months after the practicum semester addressing the worthwhileness of the collaborative effort [APPENDIX E].
4. Participant responses to a letter I sent out one year later asking school and faculty associates if our work together had been worthwhile for them professionally.
5. Notes from my journals and research files kept throughout this work.

I have included in Appendix A through D, the transcripts of the sessions with school and faculty associates for one of the Consortia. They are the most complete set of transcripts in terms of the number of sessions taped and in terms of illustrating the sequence and coherence of our collaborative work. They are, in a general sense, indicative of the work and conversations of both programs and are provided for the reader who would wish to gain a sense of our discussions from beginning to end. The inclusion of complete transcriptions of the work of the participants raises methodological and ethical dimensions, thus a set of "transcription rules" precede the appendices. I have not included school associate journals although their comments appear often in the description of our work in Chapter Five and the analysis in Chapter Six. To include the journals in their entirety would have been an inappropriate invasion of privacy in my opinion.

Overview of the Document

Chapter Two portrays my attempt to do "openly value-based inquiry." *"Journeying Alone"* traces my own experience as a school-based teacher and district consultant in First Nations education as I drew conclusions about the status accorded different kinds of knowledge in educational decision-making, and witnessed firsthand the perspectives and understandings of teachers across the range of grades and schools in public education—and the effect of their individual work on a diverse population of children. *"Journeying Together"* refers to my work as a teacher educator and doctoral student at Simon Fraser University, and provides the history of coordinating the beginning of the Consortia arrangements. Both the physical and social environments within which the Consortia operated are described, as are

some of the personalities of the group of school-based and university-based teachers who collaborated in the development of the teacher education curriculum.

Chapter Three describes "*Two Conceptual Frames*" I took into the field as both Coordinator and as researcher of this collaborative project. The first is a framework offered by Habermas (1972) in his book, *Knowledge and Human Interest*, that describes knowledge as developed and legitimated in the service of different human interests. Those different human interests he calls the interest in prediction, the interest in understanding and interpretation, and the interest in emancipation (Lather, 1991, p. 4-5). I use this frame to explore the different kinds of knowledge educators hold and the interests their different knowledge serves. I examine as well as the contribution of these different claims to a deeper understanding of education. I suggest limitations to Habermas' view as a frame to understand collaboration, and explore a post-modern position (Lather, 1991), that can accommodate the diverse perspectives, interests and understandings that contribute to an expanded view of the possibilities and consequences of thought and action in education.

The personal narrative is proposed as a vehicle for inquiry into this diversity. These organized and filtered accounts of how we come to know, provide shape to our present experiencing, and the starting point for our negotiation of meaning.

Chapter Four, "*Researcher as Method,*" extends my ideas about the role and responsibility of the researcher in a collaborative effort between schools and universities. In such an arrangement the goal of the collaborative work and the goal of the research are jointly considered and both must serve the needs of the participants. The complexity of this collaborative work requires ongoing and vigorous reflexivity on the part of the researcher, striving to operate "against a predefinition of matter worth knowing" (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988, p. 138). The challenge is to "capture" the negotiations, to expose the tensions and doubts, to "provide spaces of constructed visibility" (Foucault, in Scheurich, 1991, p. 7) for the reader.

The sources of data are described more fully in Chapter Four as well. These are mainly transcripts of large group discussions, and journals kept by some school associates who used our time together to obtain credit for an undergraduate course. I describe as well the questions that guide my description and analysis of the work.

Chapter Five presents the *"Collaborative Dance,"* the awkward coming together as we attempt to learn new steps and to move together. There are distinct parts to this dance. In the planning semester, teachers examine their own practice and build a curriculum framework to guide their work with student teachers. It is a time of growth in confidence and understanding. There is appreciation and respect for the work we all do. In the practicum semester student teachers join us and the demands of being a teacher educator encroach on our time for reflective dialogue. The dance is sometimes abandoned. The tensions and conflicts of the continuing negotiations to modify our first efforts are fertile ground to examine the dilemmas and struggles that can be attributed to changing roles and relationships and concomitant redefinitions of knowledge and power.

Chapter Six, *"Between the 'No Longer' and the 'Not Yet',"* provides an analysis of the processes of change: of the vision that was offered, of the processes facilitated to develop the collaborative environment, and of the responses forthcoming by school and university teachers in terms of commitment and resistance. The tensions highlight the inter-institutional challenges to collaboration. Five claims are offered that I regard as describing a standard for a reasonable collaborative effort in teacher education. A claim is also made regarding the role of researcher in a collaborative project.

Chapter Seven, *"Toward A Reasonable Standard,"* examines these claims as a guide to thinking about collaborative work. Recommendations are made that I believe could result in a more successful effort. No claim is made that one reaches a resolution of the difficulties recorded here. The goal is a deeper awareness of those difficulties and an appreciation of their potential to further thoughtful and transformative action.

I am interested in displaying a thick description of teachers in schools and universities working together toward a common purpose in teacher education. I am interested in uncovering the tensions, and the underlying causes of those tensions as we negotiated the meaning of worthwhile educational work. I view such description as making a contribution to our understanding of collaboration and of the structures and relationships that support and constrain it. To increase such understanding is to come closer to achieving the balance and coherence required for the fullest development of a knowledge base in and for our professional communities.

Chapter II
The Setting

Journeying Alone

As teller of this tale as well as a character within it, I begin this chapter with a brief description of the events that set me on the path to collaborative work, in order that the reader may know more clearly my biases. In recounting aspects of this journey, I am, of course, recalling (selecting) past events which can suggest in their present unfolding a coherence that was not always evident at the time. It does, however, indicate signposts to which I paid heed, and companions I chose or met who informed and guided me.

In the beginning it was hard. Well, I was told it would be. That's the experience of being a new teacher. Kids don't automatically pay attention, won't settle down because you want them to. They have a dozen other agendas and you may not be any one of them, even if it is your English 11 class. You wrestle behind closed classroom doors, observed by 30 pairs of eyes as you (and they) watch, sense, listen, intuit, learn the "right" tone, the "right" kind of relationship, the "right" standard of discourse and of written expression. And, of course, you find out it changes—each year, each semester, each class, each time certain students attend or not. You find enjoyment in the energy of your students—the exploding exuberance of teenagers in my case. And with time you learn how to harness that exuberance—turn it into expository essays even! You develop a "sixth sense" about when classes are humming, when students are curious and learning and engaged and when the ennui, the polite glazed look, is imminent and there is a need to change gears. Not that it is always possible to pinpoint why it's like that, nor to pull off the necessary transformation. You get to know though—I got to know—what it was I wanted to see and, increasingly, I became able to articulate why it would enhance the quality of both the students' —and their teacher's—lives.

My experience of teacher development and meaning-making in my formative years as a high school English and psychology teacher was, for the most part, a solitary journey. As I bring to mind the context in which I began as a teacher, I experience again the sense of professional isolation from colleagues. Educational decisions were made—both *by* those of us in classrooms, and *for* us as well, without consultation—without the stimulation and challenge of professional talk. What kinds of knowledge informed these ongoing decisions? There was time and support, as I recall, for attending workshops, "professional development" sessions, where outside experts would tell us about the newest teaching technique or curriculum offering. There seemed to be little time or support for the collegial talk among public school teachers that could have encouraged analysis and digestion of these often stimulating ideas. And there was no talk at all with those outside the school whose job would be described as the study and development of knowledge claims about education. As Noddings (1986) put it, on examining the role of teachers in research into teaching: "We rarely ask how things might be changed so that teachers can accomplish the work they see as *teaching*, nor do we ask (them) what this work is" (p. 502).

The conclusion I drew seemed obvious—no one thought it necessary! Teachers carried out programs and policies developed by "others." My colleagues and I appeared to operate in a vacuum, largely cut off from the professional talk or professional contribution that could influence educational decision-making outside our own classrooms. The kind of professional talk I am referring to here is not the practical talk about "how" to do teaching. Rather, I am referring to ongoing dialogues which enable a deeper understanding of and ability to articulate practice, critical dialogues examining why we do teaching, examining the ideas, beliefs, values, in short the different kinds of knowledge claims on which educational decision-making rests. The absence of this dialogue meant large numbers of my colleagues retreated to private meaning-making within their classrooms to nourish their professional souls or, burying deep their unease, found their soul satisfaction elsewhere, outside the classroom. Essentially, I remember feeling, and found many of my colleagues feeling, powerless. Shut out of the

decision-making which could assure us support for what we had come to know as environments which enhanced educational opportunities for children, with no assurance that this pedagogical knowledge would count when educational decision-making took place, we struggled to stem the erosion of confidence in our professional abilities.

During my eight years as a public high school teacher I had opportunities to work with many First Nations students, as students in my classes and, less formally, as counsellor and friend. I helped develop a credit course in Northwest Coast Native art in order that interested First Nations students would have an alternative to art courses emphasizing European traditions. When the position of consultant in what was then called Native Indian education was available, I successfully applied. I was charged with the mandate to work with classroom teachers and administrators and with educational leaders within the Native community to foster conditions for school success for First Nations students (see McPhie, 1989). For the next five years I experienced public education in its variety of schools and classrooms across all grades; I appreciated as I had never had opportunity to do before, both the individual expressions and the common purposes of our educational enterprise. I was profoundly taught by Native people of the Coast Salish Nation. By "profoundly" I mean the following: as I developed a degree of understanding of the interaction of public education with First Nations children, I knew in a deep sense that "right" courses of action in our educational enterprise could not be "known" outside of the collaborative effort. I owe a great deal to the wisdom, patience and humour of Coast Salish teachers who accepted the challenge of teaching me that life-enhancing education requires us to pay attention to many voices and many lived experiences.

Our best classroom teachers know that. As both education consultant and, later, as teacher educator, I watched those teachers structure learning environments in life-enhancing ways that excited my respect. By life-enhancing I refer to an attitude toward teaching that attends to the whole child, that encompasses a caring and compassion that frames the child's intellectual experiences in terms of the effect on the social and emotional well-being of the child. Noddings (1989) describes this pedagogical attention as encompassing the "ethic of

caring," an ethic that requires teachers to begin by questioning "...what effect each instructional move we consider has on the development of good persons" (p. 499). This expertise, developed over time and experience, an expression of moral, spiritual and intellectual understanding, constituted warrants about educational practice that needed to inform decision-making and the development of knowledge claims in education. Again there were many voices and many experiences deserving attention. Yet the opportunity for that knowledge to inform or influence directions in public education continued to be very limited. Clearly, I and many of my public school colleagues regarded this manner of carrying on business in our profession as wrong.

Four years ago, I was seconded to Simon Fraser University's Faculty of Education to work as a faculty associate in the teacher education program. I continued to seek opportunities for my school-based colleagues to influence educational decision-making outside their own classrooms. As a faculty associate, I was responsible, along with other seconded teachers and regular faculty members, for teaching and supervising student teachers. This responsibility was shared with school-based teachers who served as models and mentors for student teachers during the practicum. Practicums constituted fifty percent of the student teachers' year long program. Yet there was little time available for those school-based teacher educators to have input into the program they served. Many of the faculty associates looked for ways to enhance the school-university partnership: competing perspectives about how to utilize the always scarce resources of time and money of universities and school districts made it difficult.

I recall my thoughts as I prepared to take the first group of fourteen student teachers for whom I was responsible into the field. I wanted the best practicum situation I could find for them. The lack of opportunity for discussion with the school districts and with the school-based colleagues who would work with my students was frustrating. I felt our work was fragmented, that it lacked the coherence and balance our student teachers deserved, and our profession required. I wrote a letter to "*Teacher,*" the British Columbia Teachers Federation Newsmagazine: It read, in part:

> There is at present no guarantee that student teachers will be exposed to our best teachers. Where is the recognition and valuing of the contribution those teachers can make to the development of new members of our profession? Teachers asked to participate in the education of teachers should excite the respect of their colleagues, encouraging them to strive for like recognition.
>
> School districts and faculties of education must work together to ensure student teachers learn from our best. That this kind of cooperation requires of the institutions involved some relinquishing of autonomy, should provoke stimulating dialogues that can only enrich our common purpose. (nov/dec, 1988)

What was it I had in mind? My vision was a teacher education program that grew out of a collaborative effort of university and school-based teachers. We would reflect together on "worthwhile" teaching and learning: we would offer our knowledge, our understanding, our differing perspectives. The deeper understanding of the educational enterprise that would result would enable us to develop more coherent, congruent and "worthwhile" teacher education programs. It was an extension of the collaborative way I had tried to work as a district consultant in the previous five years. It required the disruption of traditional and hierarchical relationships among participants.

In my second year at SFU I applied for a Coordinator position—a position with responsibility to support and guide a number of faculty associates and their student teachers. In my interview I expressed my desire to find ways to work more closely with school districts in determining the shape of teacher education. I was offered the job of coordinating the development of two teacher education consortia in northern British Columbia. I was going to be able to try this collaborative approach, but far from home! Because my work was to take place so far from the main campus, I would work largely in isolation from regular faculty members who are able to work closely with programs located near the main campus. I viewed my coordinator role to be that of administrator and of educational leader and was challenged and intrigued to imagine disrupting those roles within the collaborative framework even as I assumed them.

In the next two years I spent a great deal of time residing in northern hotels and flying to and from northern towns. During winter months I often felt I lived in airports waiting to see if my flight would arrive, let alone take off again. I often ended up being bussed to my

location—usually through the night—from alternate airports. Working with my northern colleagues was immensely satisfying—and exhausting. I felt fortunate to have the opportunity to act on my vision.

Fuelling this vision as well were my doctoral studies that had begun at SFU at the same time as my secondment. As I began as Coordinator I was not sure whether the collaborative work I was attempting would constitute my thesis, but I knew I would want to write about it. As I talked and read and wrote about education, its histories, philosophies, research methods, I turned to conceptual frameworks that "fit" my vision of collaborative work in education. Two were particularly important: 1) critical theory as a view of knowledge claims as constructed and legitimated in the service of particular interests (Habermas, 1972; Glasersfeld, 1984) and 2) qualitative research as a methodology that honoured individual understandings of and perspectives on the world and enabled participants to examine how they came to know (Britzman, 1991; Lather, 1991).

As my work and study continued I used these frames to view the processes of collaboration. I believed the strength of the collaborative effort lay in the opportunity it fostered for critical dialogue among colleagues. In an environment that fostered mutual respect and curiosity about education, colleague participants would be supported in examining beliefs and assumptions about teaching and learning as well as raising questions about the structures within which the work of education took place. It was one of my understandings that since knowledge claims were developed in the service of and arose from human interest, that such claims were contingent and in need of ongoing examination. The critical dialogues of collaboration were not for the purpose of arriving at new answers or solutions. "Successful" collaboration would be identifiable as our ability to sustain an ongoing and critical discourse to which participants felt they could contribute. Because we would be searching for new collaborative ways to make meaning, the discourse would necessarily be halting and fragmented, inviting additions or completion by others within the group. New ways of being together would evolve. The purpose of this activity would be to arrive at the deepest possible

understanding of the knowledge we all held, knowledge arising from experience, from history or tradition, from study and research, that guided our work. In the end,we would know, together, what we "ought" to do. I thought of it as moving to new sites/sights where traditional ways of doing our work could be disrupted.

As I began to prepare for a real site, the question persisting in my mind was how best to facilitate these new "sights"—how to honour the differences that distinguish the work that we all do and, at the same time, acknowledge that different work as equally valuable and necessary? I knew I wanted to begin with our unique and personal accounts of our work. Such a beginning served my dual roles as both coordinator and researcher of our efforts. Participants would speak from their own context and with their own "language." This was consistent with a research methodology committed to honoring individual perspectives and knowledge. Just as important, embedded in those narratives were the values, beliefs, and assumptions that informed our view of education. Those "filtered and organized" accounts of our work represented the way in which we made meaning and developed knowledge (Polkinghorne, 1988; Ricoeur, 1981). Such a beginning would serve the goal of equity among participants, and would deepen our knowledge of our own and others' perceptual landscapes. This was a necessary first step to critical understanding of education—and to educational change.

Journeying Together

The details of the geographic locations and the specific institutions involved as well as the Ministry support for the two Consortia for which I had responsibility have been documented elsewhere (chapt one, pp. 5-6). I am interested here in providing some background description: how we got started; where and in what manner we worked; who "we" were, so that the reader might enter as fully as possible into this journey and be able to come to his or her own conclusions as to its worthwhileness.

Agreements had been signed between the school districts (four in each consortium) the regional colleges and SFU's Faculty of Education before I had been hired. I began with the names of the districts and a map of the province of British Columbia on which I located the red dots strung across the middle of the province representing "my" sites. I phoned the superintendents, introduced myself and made appointments to meet. I made the first of many airline and hotel reservations and flew north.

As I think back now on those first meetings, and try to describe them, I am struck by the challenge of beginning a dialogue across different perspectives and interests. I would talk about developing a mutual understanding of our task, of shared ownership in the education of new teachers. Superintendents told me about their districts, the difficulty of getting teachers for certain subject areas (most often it was senior secondary sciences and math). I would emphasize the important role played by their teachers in teacher education and the length of time they spent with the student teachers. Because of this central role, I said to the superintendents, and because of their intimate knowledge of education in practice, I was proposing that the teachers chosen to be school associates work with the university-based teachers to develop the program. Are you aware, they would ask, of the scarcity of qualified substitutes to take over classes while you develop a teacher education program? I requested that I have the opportunity to speak to interested teachers and to school principals so they had a chance to understand such a commitment and approach and decline if they wished. Superintendents talked about the number of teachers they thought were available to be school associates. I talked about the desirable qualities of a mentor of adult students. Superintendents emphasized the importance of the student teachers we chose having a commitment to remain in the north. I spoke of beginning with an elementary program to minimize the complexity of our first efforts. No, they said, our biggest need is secondary teachers.

The "ideal" and the "real"—they were not quite so baldly exchanged nor as dichotomous as the above would indicate, but always it was a challenging tension. It is ironic to think now of the time spent planning opportunities for differing perspectives to be heard

among our teacher educator group, and realize the same attention was not paid to the negotiation of meaning among the management group. It takes time, of course. Every few months district, college and university representatives of the program would meet and discuss the "real" and the "ideal." Through these conversations those of us representing the university developed an appreciation for some of the consequences of our program decisions on other areas of school district life, and the impact of district life on program decisions. Districts began to take more ownership of the program. I recall sitting at a meeting that had been called for school-based teachers and their principals to encourage their participation in the second practicum semester. (Although I had requested it, principals had not been present at the presentation for the first practicum semester in this district). I listened to the superintendent provide an overview of the program and speak to the importance of the school associates to program success. It was, in many respects, the talk I had given a year earlier. And yet it wasn't that talk because it was about that particular district and their involvement in the education of new teachers. It was his talk, and it felt very good to sit back and listen.

But in the beginning...when we were just getting started, it was hard. There was so much to discuss—what were the attributes of a good school associate? of a good student teacher candidate? How many student teachers, in what grades and subject areas, could the district accommodate? Where could we put our "campus"? Were there resources—people and materials—available from districts? Where would school associates stay if there were program development sessions? Who would pay for hotels, meals, substitutes, transportation? Did I realize the driving conditions in northern winters?

But we began. Faculty associates were hired from the districts (two for one Consortia; three for the other). We recruited students (18 in one; 25 in the other—in both cases containing both secondary and elementary student teachers). We found our SFU campuses (a trailer on the grounds of the regional college in one; two empty classrooms in an elementary school in the other). We hired secretaries for each site. We bought, begged, borrowed or, in the case of a photocopier, rented necessary equipment. We made arrangements with the

college to put students up in the dormitories when the students were on their campus. Thank goodness for fax machines and electronic mail. I could keep in touch with faculty associates as they completed the last details that made our sites SFU campuses.

The faculty associates and I toured the countryside, driving to each school district and speaking to the teachers that superintendents (or their designate) had invited to meet with us before committing themselves to work as teacher educators. We spoke to teachers (some accompanied by principals, some not; some superintendents attending sessions, some not) about the program. I spoke of the importance we attached to our shared ownership and respect for one another's knowledge and experience. We talked about eight days being set aside—four days in the semester before the students began, when we would develop the program, and four during the practicum semester for ongoing development, reflection on and modification of our work. The administrators were encouraged to consider becoming part of the program sessions if they could make the commitment (two principals took up the invitation).

Some teachers felt they were too heavily committed already and could not join us now but would be interested at another time. A few felt the classes they had did not lend themselves to a student practicum. For the most part people were intrigued and interested in the idea, but they had concerns. They expressed fear of more and heavy responsibility, of being away from their students, of substitute problems, of the difficulty of travel—all factors that continue to pose difficulties. It was an advantage to have administrators and superintendents in attendance who could demonstrate their support by suggesting strategies that could allay teachers' concerns (for instance, suggesting teachers book their preferred substitute now for all the dates they would be away). There was a valuing of these teachers, and the contribution they could make as teacher educators.

As I listened to potential school associates describe the difficulties of this undertaking, I would entertain doubts about the appropriateness of my enthusiasms.

> It makes me think hard about why I am requesting this type of intense involvement. It may be sensible—my experience tells me—and justifiable—increasingly I can talk about reasons why this is a good idea—but is it educationally the best use of busy teachers' time? Will it,

> in the end, make a difference? And to whom? And how will we know? (notes to file, oct, 1989)

We spoke as well to prospective students in the various communities who were interested in the program and wanted to know if they were eligible to apply. In districts that had publicized the program we would have large turnouts, often overflowing the room set aside to meet. The majority of people we spoke with (mostly women) were already juggling the raising of families along with other careers. Always there were some—men and women—who had taught in public schools, colleges, religious schools, and day care. I was struck by the challenge many had accepted to get the courses and credits they needed to be able to apply. Transcripts came from many institutions and had been gathered over many years. Most were both excited and anxious as they figured out what it would cost them in time, money and energy. It felt very worthwhile for Simon Fraser to be there.

It was an exciting time as the faculty associates and I drove across the province in the warm sunshine of early fall, meeting new colleagues and prospective students, talking about our plans, making endless lists of what we needed to do to begin.

The people

The following semester we were joined by our school associate colleagues and began the collaborative work described in Chapter Five. Who were these teachers who had been encouraged to participate by their superintendents or principals and who had chosen to make the commitment? They represented most grades and all the academic subject areas in the public school system. Most had at least five, some twenty or more, years of teaching experience, mostly in the north. Some had come north after obtaining their teacher certification to teach for a few years and had never left, others had always lived up north. They spoke with pride of their part of the country and the way of life it represented. It was a bond among them, this geographic identity, that I had not experienced in groups of teachers in the south, in Vancouver and surrounding suburban areas. I felt that the trust that developed among the group members and the sense of humour that was pervasive in all our sessions, were present more rapidly,

more solidly, somehow, because of that isolation. I, and the faculty associates to some extent because of their different role and responsibility, were outsiders, welcomed into that place that was the domain of the school associates.

About half of them had worked with teacher education programs before, for other universities, but not in the collaborative manner of this program. The former experiences had not included critical reflection on education with colleagues who were involved in this work. Many clearly felt complimented and valued as a result of having been asked to join the program, a point reinforced by our attention to the experience and knowledge of the group as the central referents for building the program. The majority of school associates were women and, in both consortia, there were more elementary than secondary teachers. Because the fundamental changes being introduced in the province's education system at that time had begun in the primary grades, the primary teachers had particularly strong voices in our groups. They could speak with the most familiarity and confidence about the change—about the student-centred and non-graded approaches to learning and teaching. To some extent, it shifted the traditional balance of power among public school teachers in our group. High school teachers, traditionally holding more status in the school system hierarchy, were not yet part of the educational change in any formal sense: a number had their introduction to the change within our group. As the sessions went on, they would voice their surprise at and respect for the complexity of primary classrooms.

I did not get to know these teachers in their classrooms, so their "portraits" as professionals are uni-dimensional, built for the most part from our work together in the sessions to develop the teacher education program that are described in Chapter Five. Although I liked to go out to schools with the faculty associates and talk with them and the school associates, my presence in classrooms was usually at the request of a faculty associate and was an indication of a student in difficulty. It meant my communication with school associates between sessions was second hand—by letter or by way of the faculty associates. I

would have wished a more intimate involvement in the carrying out of our program but I had too many places, too far apart, that required my attention.

Some school associates in our collaborative work stand out in my mind because they were significant contributors either by way of the discussions during our collaborative sessions, or through their journal writing that I received as part of the undergraduate course attached to our sessions. I would suspect that these school associates had a disproportionate (in relation to their colleagues) impact on my understanding of collaboration as it took place in the consortia—and on the substance of the dialogues that took place in our sessions. Below are brief descriptions of four of those contributors.

Contrary to my description above, Flo was almost brand new to teaching—a second year teacher in a tiny four classroom school. She had a class of 25 students in grades 4, 5 and 6. She was a graduate of the SFU program and had begun her career full of energy that she was now finding hard to sustain in a situation she found isolating and discordant with the approaches and philosophy she had brought to the classroom. She was critical of her district's failure to provide support for new teachers. She hoped this program would provide a way to find colleagues with whom to build a support network. She was a thoughtful listener and contributor and, having recently completed the program, provided a particularly important perspective. Its impact was still strong. On one occasion, when we were discussing the reasons a student might be withdrawn, she spoke with passion about the student's right to stay and keep trying even if others felt she should not. Her school associate had told her she probably couldn't make it. I love teaching she told us and that school associate was wrong.

Julie was a consistent source of positive energy and leadership in our group. She was an intermediate teacher with almost thirty years experience, active in professional development roles in her district and in the province. I was particularly struck by her steadfast allegiance to "kids." No matter what the subject, she would always make the comment or ask the question that kept us focussed on "kids." At one session we were talking about how to communicate to others the worthwhileness of what we were about—that we were not wasting time or money—

that there were others who should understand and appreciate that fact. *"Which others need to know,"* I had asked, thinking superintendents, principals, colleagues...etcetera. *"My kids,"* said Julie, *"they need to know why I am away so much and what I am doing and how it is part of what is important for them too."* As I write this she has moved districts and is now a principal of a elementary-junior high school. She tells me part of the confidence to make the move came from the work we did together in teacher education.

Alison was a primary teacher at the time of our work together although she had taught all elementary grades in her ten years in teaching. She brought insight and positive energy to our discussion. She was infinitely curious about teaching and eager to establish a collaborative relationship with colleagues and with her student teacher. She invited him to comment on her practice and support her learning. She attributed to our collaborative work a development of confidence in her professional abilities:

> *I find myself questioning more than I did before. During a workshop I attended at our district professional day, I actually got up and left a session when I realized I wasn't going to get anything from it. I have never done that before! It was a "liberating" feeling. I feel more confident knowing what I want and need these days. I am sure it has something to do with having a student teacher. [SA journal, feb, 1990]*

This school associate had had a student teacher at another time and had felt "isolated" and "redundant."

I include as one of the portraits a school associate who influenced discussion in one of the groups more than I realized at the time (it became apparent as I reviewed the tapes of our sessions). Emily immediately stood out for me as a high energy, articulate and forth-coming participant. She responded with enthusiasm to the idea of collaborative decision-making and had many questions and suggestions as we began to discuss the shape of the program. She, too, was a graduate of SFU's program—some ten years before—and let us know that her experience had not been easy. Two things particularly stood out as difficulties at that time that she hoped we could overcome: faculty associates who didn't seem to appreciate the "teachable moment" and had ignored the natural interests of the student teacher group, and a number of "irrelevant" and "time consuming" assignments that had interfered with the "real" work of the

practicum in the classroom. She saw in this collaborative approach, with equal voices for school-based and university-based teachers, an opportunity for a new approach and she was full of energy for that. Her opinions about when we succeeded in this approach and when we didn't were strongly voiced at our sessions and, on a number of occasions, determined the direction of our discussions. She was very ready to develop the program with us. Did we fail to meet her halfway? Or did she sabotage her opportunities somehow with an outspoken manner that silenced some opinion? I'm not sure. I only interacted with her in our large group sessions.

Sometimes that fact makes me feel very apologetic. After all, the facts were that I would fly up and talk and "do" collaboration for a number of days. I would facilitate our sessions together. We would discuss what student teachers should observe and demonstrate and understand. I would encourage and support the work of the faculty associates as they implemented the program we had developed. But I could not be there on a day to day basis to continue the discussion and reflection that the ongoing negotiation of what we were about required. That was the responsibility of the faculty associates and school associates and they did the best they could. I cannot comment on what went on in classrooms or between faculty associates and school associates in their daily interactions. I was not part of that. My involvement was in the sessions we all attended together. Those sessions focussed largely on what "ought to be."

Who were these faculty associates who took on the job of fleshing out our jointly developed program framework, and of working with student teachers and school associates on a day to day basis? In the majority of cases they were classroom teachers seconded by the university because they were outstanding teachers and potentially excellent teacher educators. Often they had been school associates themselves and had been encouraged to apply for the faculty associate position because of their particular abilities to mentor student teachers in their own classrooms. Their usual term with SFU was two years. They were responsible for a module of fourteen student teachers providing seminars and workshops on campus and

supervising student teachers in classrooms. They usually worked in pairs, one a first year and one a second year faculty associate.

They were my immediate colleagues in the Consortia and I knew them more intimately than the school associates. The faculty associates and I would spend a week to ten days, three times during the year, at the main SFU campus with other faculty associates and coordinators, and regular faculty members. We would be stimulated by the teacher education talk, coming away with new plans and energy. Throughout the year we spent many hours in hotel rooms planning and debriefing our sessions with our school associate colleagues. I was warmly welcomed into their homes and shared their northern delicacies—moose, salmon, trout, quail—that had been harvested through the year and now were taken from their good-sized freezers.

Mary Jo and I began together as new faculty associate and coordinator and made the first swing through our "territory" in her new Ford Bronco. She had been in elementary education for 17 years and spoke with particular satisfaction of her work with teachers with whom she had shared classrooms and kids. As might be expected, her rapport with the school associates was strong and empathic. She was a warm and generous person and shared my enthusiasm for the assignment of beginning a teacher education program centred in her town. We talked and walked the program through its first go-round. Along with the school associates, we comprised the "originals" and felt pride of joint ownership.

Jim had been both elementary and secondary teacher and a vice-principal. His self-deprecating humour was guaranteed to break up a serious discussion, which he would then bring back on stream with a cogent remark that often provided new insight. He had difficulty being "ongoingly" collaborative he said—it was exhausting work. Nevertheless, he had a deep faith in the experience and knowledge of his teacher colleagues and worked at finding the questions that would extend both their understanding, and his. He made special efforts to make contacts with district principals and find avenues for their input.

There were many more committed skilled thoughtful teachers. Their faces appear before me as I write. Six former school associates have gone on to be faculty associates. We shared important work and most of us continue to reap some benefits.

The place(s)

The sessions with school associates, faculty associates and coordinator were held in big meeting rooms—at the college in one site; in a district professional development centre in the other. In both instances the most central town (district) in the Consortium housed the campus and meeting place to minimize travel from the other three towns (districts) involved. The meeting rooms were big and carpeted and contained moveable chairs and tables. We did all our large group discussion in a circle of chairs (no tables) so everyone was looking at everyone else and no one was "in front." Our small group work, usually five to a group, would be done around a table. Our food got better and better as we learned how to take good care of ourselves. There would be morning and afternoon refreshments as well as an honest northern lunch. The first year I tried to have evening sessions since we were only together a day and a half at a time and most had come a fair distance, but it was too much—our heads would be full. We worked hard all day and deserved the evening off.

Always we began our sessions in our circle, touching base in a personal way with one another. At the opening session we began by giving ourselves descriptive nicknames that represented some aspect of ourselves we were willing to reveal. As one school associate remarked later, it was kind of corny but it worked. There was much laughter and prompting as everyone struggled to remember (you had to repeat all the descriptors and then give your own) and many of the names stuck and became permanent and affectionate "handles" (antique Lillian; fuzzy Mike; chainsaw Wes; blood n' guts Grant).

> Flying back up north I keep thinking how to hook back into the energy and interest, that was evident when we left our last session.
>
> There is thick snow falling. People driving through storms, staying in truck ruts, in convoys behind snowplows. They arrive between 10:00 and 11:30 for a 9:30 start. As we wait for the

> last few, I ask the group if we should start. There is a very strong message to wait for everyone and we do, chatting and reacquainting. When the last snow-covered participants stamp in, they let us know they are very appreciative we waited. They are handed coffee and muffins and we begin. First is a personal "temperature reading"—we all have the opportunity to let others know how we are, how we have been. There have been busy and diverse schedules among us. There is everything from "2 " to "9.5 "(out of 10). This is a roller coaster ride. At breaks I notice special attention given to those who were down. (notes to file, dec, 1989)

These beginnings were important. There was a necessary tuning in to one another, a harmonizing that had to take place. The work we did required what I can only refer to as intimacy, a listening to one another wherein judgement is suspended, the singular purpose being to understand the other as well as possible. It required a feeling of respect for self and for other, and an environment of trust. This was my manner of trying to engender such an environment.

Chapter III
Two Conceptual Frames

A Brief Discussion of Kinds of Knowledge

This thesis is centrally concerned with arriving at a deeper understanding of the activity of collaboration. The illustration of collaborative work informing this thesis is the development of teacher education programs by school-based and university-based teachers. The challenge of this collaborative work, as I have experienced it and understand it, is to enable different kinds of knowledge claims held by participants to jointly inform negotiations regarding what "ought to be done." This requires that group members recognize that what they know is necessarily partial and value laden, and that their different knowledge claims contribute necessary elements in a richer more comprehensive whole that is not available outside of this collaborative effort.

The process of building this richer understanding draws participants out of the isolation of their private experience and work into the larger professional community. The result of commitment to the collaborative process, commitment to listening deeply and speaking reflectively, is personal and professional change. In other words, having entered into the collaborative discourse, it is not possible to know and to view one's work and experience only in the manner that it was previously known. Change is brought about by critical reflection that is both private and intersubjective. The result is a view of educational work from a "wider surround" in which the causes and consequences of actions are more fully appreciated. This new knowledge can be emancipatory and can inform new possibilities and transformative action.

To begin a discussion of the different kinds of knowledge brought to and possibly arising from this collaborative activity, I am utilizing Habermas' view of knowledge as outlined in his book, *Knowledge and Human Interest* (1972). He identifies three categories of

human interest that influence the development and legitimation of knowledge claims: human interest in prediction, in understanding, and in emancipation. Because the focus in this thesis is on the integration of knowledge claims in the service of teacher education, I am most interested in examining the human interests he describes as being served by those claims.

Knowledge claims serving the interest in prediction

Knowledge claims developed in the interest of predicting outcomes of human experience and behaviour are defined in terms of this thesis as claims that are predicated on their generalizability. I would make two points here before describing this claim further: predictive knowledge does not arise solely from academic study; academic research is not solely concerned with claims serving the interest of prediction. Nevertheless, such claims are generally thought to be the province of research taking place in universities, hence the reference to these claims as academic knowledge. Such knowledge is variously described as "homeless" or as being at home anywhere. It "assumes the normative to be unproblematic; taking only empirical questions as being at issue" (de Castell, 1989, p. 46). It signals that the particular values and beliefs of the researcher(s) or of individual participants (if the study involves people) are not considered to affect the outcomes. The claims that are the result do not bear allegiance to a particular context.

This academic knowledge contributes to the discourse in teacher education by offering new ideas and conceptual frames that can spark educational debate and change. Such knowledge is essential to the nourishment of educational thought, but its entry into the collaborative discourse should not be privileged. These claims, if they are able to be discussed within the collaborative group, reside within that group's negotiated system of shared values and beliefs: communication is not possible otherwise. This signals the normative position de Castell describes above. Therefore, the consequences of acting upon any of these claims represents a value position within that system. However, that system itself requires ongoing

examination. In the end, predictive claims need to be subjected to critique arising from knowledge claims that serve human interest in understanding and in emancipation.

Knowledge claims serving the interest in understanding

"Understanding is not concerned with grasping a fact," says Ricoeur, "but with apprehending a possibility of being" (1981, p. 61). Such claims to understanding represent interpretations of social life based on tradition and history and are necessary first steps to an appreciation of the possibilities of the future. The aim of such knowledge is "mutual understanding and wise action within a coherent framework of values" (Kemmis, 1985, p. 144).

The central referent for development of these claims is the individual. Shared values and beliefs provide the social context in which individuals can recount experience to one another and negotiate its meaning. The method to arrive at these negotiated claims is critical reflection "to restore the tension between the self and the 'other'," and to bring our prejudices to light (Ricoeur, 1981). The tensions and contradictions inherent in intersubjective and critical reflection are the creative spark which ignite possibilities and alternative courses of action based on increased understanding of self and self within society. The strength of this method is that "its claims can be verified only in the successful process of enlightenment, and that means, in the practical discourse of those concerned" (Habermas, 1974, pp. 38-39). But in the process of enlightenment "interpretation" can become "generalization," and it can be difficult, in the end, to know if the claims arrived at represent the individual lived experience. Language enables the building of community, but it can also silence community members by restricting the number of interpretations or texts available from which an individual may choose. Some voices, some experiences, may find no reference points, no language that matches theirs, hence their designation as "marginalized." Habermas points to this as a serious limitation to hermeneutics, claiming those involved in interpretive work cannot move outside their own subjectivities. Therefore, the critical re-interpretation of the text necessary to

uncover emancipatory possibilities and alternative futures is not available. This uncovering is done through the development of emancipatory knowledge.

Education and claims to understanding

Before examining such claims, I want to comment on the central place of claims to understanding in education. It appears self-evident to me that it is desirable for all participants in the educational enterprise to be self-consciously aware of the structures in which they operate and of the texts which spell out the rules and regulations within those structures. It seems obvious as well that increased self-knowledge will enable more intentional and, hopefully, effective action. The emphasis on reflection makes it more likely that defensible educational ideals and courses of action will be the result. These claims also support education as a moral enterprise and serve to remind educators that they are in the business of influencing moral as well as intellectual development.

However, the methodology associated with the acquiring of this knowledge is open to abuses of power that are often difficult to detect because they are manifest as the absence of voices. As Ellsworth (1989) points out: "Pluralizing the concept of 'voices' implies correction through addition. This loses sight of the contradictory and partial nature of all voices" (p. 312). In Ellsworth's case, she is referring to abuses of power that arise as a result of race and social and economic position. This central concern for the ever present potential for oppression is one requiring attention within the educational enterprise as well. Differences here in power, status and decision-making opportunities, are played out as a consequence of different institutional affiliations, different levels of formal education, and sex differences. The latter two are exacerbated by status/power differentials accorded placement at a elementary or high school level.

> *If everyone agreed that the primary years are where it is at and that those really are the most important years, then primary teachers should have the most preparation time, the best salaries, the biggest budgets and classes would not only be small but the smallest. But this is not so of course.* [SA journal, feb, 1991]

The questions addressed in education, as in the larger community of Ellsworth's study, are the same: Who can know? and What is worth knowing?

Educational research, in which educators choose the role of participant-researchers, is a case in point. Such qualitative methodology appears to embody the value of shared development of meaning. But at the point of interpretation of that meaning, researchers often "retreat" to a stance associated with predictive knowledge. Participants then are provided with the results of their activity as expressed in "homeless" terms. In other words, the interpretations contributed by individuals are appropriated and individual voices are silenced. The resultant "knowledge" is often no longer accessible to the original participants. The aim of such knowledge, to provide contextual understanding that may inform future action, may be lost.

The point has been made above that such decontextualized claims make an important contribution to educational understanding. The point here is that if the research purports to arise from and embody situated knowledge, the claims made need to be in the service of greater understanding of that context. It is the challenge posed to the researcher to preserve and display the messy and contradictory discourse and action that is the context. Otherwise, there may no longer be a "fit" between the experience and the knowledge claims.

If this challenge is met, the result may be greater freedom of action as the result of increased understanding. There is a sense of belonging that Ricoeur claims is necessary for the projection of future possibilities. What then distinguishes the kind of knowledge claims described as emancipatory from those concerned with understanding? Knowledge concerned with understanding seeks interpretations of social life from *within* an historical context, providing the sense of belonging. Emancipatory knowledge claims seek *freedom from* this historical context by uncovering its hegemonic structures, providing the possibility of choosing not to belong.

Knowledge claims serving the interest in emancipation

This lack of "fit" referred to above, the discrepancy between what is represented as knowledge and what one knows, is the trigger that leads to the search for knowledge claims that will dissolve the feeling of alienation. Knowledge is tentative—"an ordering and organizing of the world constituted by our experience" (Glasersfeld,1984, p. 32)—to be re-examined continuously. This ordering and organizing is goal-directed and assumes an active engagement with and evaluation of the environment: "...the experiencing consciousness creates structure in the flow of its experience; and this structure is what conscious cognitive organisms experience as 'reality'" (p. 38). Glasersfeld acknowledges here the central place of socialization. "Since this reality is created almost entirely without the experiencer's awareness of his or her creative activity, it comes to appear as given by an independently 'existing' world." (p. 39). It is a compelling description of the self inextricably shaped by and part of the social system, what Habermas (1979) describes as the prestructured world the individual brings to his or her definition of a situation.

Since the content and form of our thinking are socially constructed from within the dominant ideological frame and that "reality" is experienced largely as "given," the creation of critical knowledge must proceed negatively by reconstructing what history and our own development have constructed for us. It requires knowledge of the subjective conditions that inform our "seeing" and "knowing." The critical process is reflection, both private and intersubjective reflection: "the unity of knowledge and interest proves itself in a dialectic that takes the historical traces of suppressed dialogue and reconstructs what has been suppressed" (Habermas, 1972, p. 315). It is returning to "sense-certainty," the pre-theoretical, intuitive knowledge individuals possess that represents the closest one comes to "institutionally-unbound" speech. The aim of critical knowledge is to free the individual from traditional structures into the expanded possibilities of *not* belonging, to enable participants to take transformative action, to bring about change.

Education and claims to emancipation

To move to this position where transformative action in education is possible, requires social critique as part of the critique of practice.

> In order for reflective teaching practice to be sustained over time in schools and universities, the reflections and actions of prospective teachers, and teacher educators must be aimed both inward and outward... must confront institutional obstacles to reflective practice...which undermine teacher education. (Liston & Zeichner, 1990, p. 251)

It is within the collaborative and critical process that one's view of self as agent can develop and be sustained.

> It is the collaborative character of reflective teaching that gives teachers power and offers hope that institutional and cultural changes can be realized. (p. 251)

In such a process there can only be participants, and no consensus is expected or sought. The value of the multiple voices is to provide, by the richness of their varied perspectives and understandings, a "thick" description of the usually "taken-for-granted" regulating structures, and embedded norms and values which define and constrain their work.

> We can come to know reflective teaching as "insiders," that is, when we become a part of the process that produces it. The reflective teacher behavior that takes place while we are uninvolved "outsiders," for example, as non-participant observers, is something we can guess about. The critique we offer might reveal something about our own theoretical and ethical frames of reference while missing entirely the point of the action we aim to understand. (Tabachnick and Zeichner, 1991, p. 16)

Collaboration in the interest of developing critical knowledge assumes the intelligent self-direction of all participants. Morality (a kind of critical knowledge of the context) is embedded in the procedures themselves, expressed as an attitude of reciprocity and human agency, an understanding that "we" as knowers require engagement with the "other" to understand our own limits. The process takes time and trust and assumes participants are open to changing their minds.

It is a difficult and challenging discourse that acknowledges voices as "fragmented," because some ideas are still in the process of becoming; "partial," because they are limited and inevitably partisan; and "potentially oppressive," because we cannot fully know the world of the "other." Such a description acknowledges as well that it is unlikely that there is equal weight and legitimacy among participants, nor that such discourse is free of conscious and

unconscious concealment of interests. To resist dominating tendencies Greene (1988) and Ellsworth (1989) speak of building coalitions to develop conscious and grounded critique and forge commonalities among "shifting, intersecting and sometimes contradictory groups." Such proposals emphasize the difficulty of developing emancipatory knowledge. The challenge is for participants to suspend judgement and belief and seek processes to enable all to be "knowing subjects" whom Freire (1973) describes as participants who "achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-historical reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (p. 70). The interest in emancipation is served by a multiplicity of perspectives—that meet and are changed by that interaction.

There is inherent in this work what Kemmis (1985) describes as the double dialectic, the moving back and forth between thought and action, between self and the values and beliefs that define self within society. Those charged with the responsibility for education need to be able to identify the role they assume within the social structure and within power relationships that influence who can count as knowers and what can count as knowledge. There is a moral responsibility to join with colleagues and students in this double dialectic, increasing knowledge of self and naming the contradictions inherent in society, thereby uncovering its possibilities. I assert this obligation because, according to this critical view of knowledge, educators are in the highly moral business of constructing and distributing knowledge. One has the potential of being the oppressor as well as the oppressed, a role we need to go to all possible and reasonable lengths to guard against.

This oppressor role can intrude in efforts to join together as collaborating practitioners. To be sensitive to the social dynamics of participation and interaction requires limiting the degree of skepticism and challenge each can bring to the analysis in order to increase the depths of our possibilities for understanding what is happening and what it means to make reflective practice happen (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991). A key role for critical knowledge in education is to teach us how to construct circumstances in which differences can thrive and we can learn to support as well as critique one another in the exploration for alternative futures.

The limits of Habermas' view of emancipatory knowledge—and on to postmoderism

It is at this point that the goal of critical theory as represented by Habermas becomes problematic. His emancipatory goal, paradoxically, is to arrive at unitary wholeness, to develop a new consensus that is the result of undistorted communication. He retains a "commitment to the ideal of normative reason as expressing an impartial point of view" (Young, 1987, p. 69). Having advocated the intersubjective and critical processes necessary to understand the interests served by different claims to knowledge, he then seeks new universal claims built on the outcomes of those processes. Oppression has been the outcome of distorted speech; emancipation will be the outcome of communicative competence. In the ideal speech situation in which participants are enabled to both speak and listen, human interest will be served by a negotiation of new universal claims to knowledge. But as he asserts the ultimately unitary nature of subjectivity, the contingent nature of the relationship between knowledge and power is ignored (Travers, 1990, p. 31). Thus, the hierarchy reasserts itself accompanied by new ostensibly liberatory forms of discourse.

To presuppose that the result of Habermas' dialectic is to arrive at claims of universal validity is to assume a convergence among participants which is at odds with the profoundly contextual nature of human interest. Ideology, as Lather (1991) puts it, "is the medium through which consciousness and meaningfulness operate in everyday life...it is the stories a culture tells itself about itself" (p. 2). The individual and personal voice needs to continue to assert itself in the ongoing interest in examining these ideologies. I find myself attempting what Lather describes as a postmodern project, "to explore the generation of meaning that takes us beyond ourselves" (p. 2).

Acknowledging postmoderism as an absence of definitions, I use a description that posits what it is not. Lyotard (1984) had identified modernism with the "grand narratives," overarching philosophies of history such as the Enlightment story. Fraser & Nicholson (1988) describe postmoderism as the absence of the "grand narratives" of legitimation. Lather extends this description of absence to include "the decentering of the former humanist view of the

autonomous individual capable of full consciousness and endowed with a stable self" (p. 5). This humanist, and modernist, view informs Habermas' goal for critical theory. He seeks a universal core among the multiple discourses. Postmodernism, on the other hand, celebrates difference:

> It [postmodernism] is first and foremost an acceptance of the ineradicable plurality of the world—not a temporary state on the road to the not-yet-attained perfection, sooner or later to be left behind, but the constitutive quality of existence. (Bauman, 1988-89, in Burbles & Rice, 1991, p. 396)

I regard the true collaborative project as living in, as justified by, this postmodernist condition. It requires moving sites, developing new norms and behaviours to entertain a discourse that is always partial, never arriving, but being continuously renewed and more fully informed. It is living between the "no longer" and the "not yet" in perpetuity.

Understanding or emancipation?—an illustration from the field

De Castell (1989) illustrates the organization of educational work by way of a discussion of the theory-practice split.

> To the extent that we can talk about theory as distinct from practice, practicing teachers are already committed to a theory or set of theories about their practice,...However, teachers work in institutions dedicated to practice and their work is primarily in speaking. As academics, we work in institutions dedicated to theory and our work is primarily in writing. Our respective forms of labour are thus separated into different kinds, and hierarchically stratified into different levels, and these distinctions are institutionally effected, structured and legitimated. This form of power—otherwise known as the division of labour—drives a wedge between thought and action, between conception and execution, between theory and practice. (p. 47)

This thesis describes an attempt to shift the balance of power de Castell describes. The aim is not to reverse the hierarchy, not to privilege one kind of work or knowledge over another, but to move to sites where new attitudes and norms will be supported in an effort to establish a discourse among equals across institutions.

Richardson, in her paper, *Significant and Worthwhile Change in Teaching Practice* (1990) supports the importance of this discourse between school-based and university-based teachers, but does not address the issue of the balance of power. The knowledge of school-based teachers that drives their classroom action constitutes "a set of empirical, value and situational premises" (p. 14). They must be included, along with empirical premises of

research, in making judgements about what change is worthwhile and significant in teaching practice. That the knowledge necessary to inform education is incomplete without this contribution, embodies a notion of knowledge as socially constructed. It is the combined contributions of school-based teachers and researchers in education who happen, usually, to be university-based teachers, that "could lead to a socially constructed sense of warranted practice that can guide...change..."

Richardson, along with a growing number of academics in the area of teacher education (Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992; McEwan & Bull, 1991) clearly regards the knowledge of teachers as making a necessary contribution to knowledge claims in education. The position from which they put forth their arguments, however, continues to support a hierarchy of knowers with academics holding the privileged position. Collaboration, as I am defining it and trying to live it in terms of the work described in this paper, cannot function where hierarchy is asserted. As Coordinator of the collaborative project described in this thesis, I was continuously challenged to assess my own position as a university-based teacher. Understanding of teaching and learning needed to arise from and be shaped by our collaborative effort. My contributions needed to sit along side of, and be critically examined along with the contributions of all participants.

Richardson posits that the knowledge held by teachers is powerfully informed by beliefs, values and prior experience—knowledge that serves the human interest in understanding. For this knowledge to be most fully understood and educative, therefore, requires reflexivity. Yet, even as it is recognized that the moral and ethical and historical views of the knower affect the claims to knowledge held, there is no suggestion that knowledge developed as a result of research be subject to the same scrutiny. The assumption here would seem to be that the researchers' subjectivities do not permeate the questions they chose to pursue, the methodologies preferred nor the premises offered. Even as the university teachers mentioned above speak in a manner indicating great respect for and valuing of the knowledge of teachers in public education, they remain on their own site looking over at wise and

experienced practitioners at work and searching for theoretical justifications or frameworks to help those teachers make sense of their work. They fall short of proposing new common sites, of entering into a methodological paradigm that would enable the "raising to discourse of that which is given as structure" (Ricoeur, 1981), in short, the disruption of traditional hierarchy.

I am suggesting here that the collaborative endeavour necessary to "a socially constructed sense of warranted practice" requires that the knowledge claims that inform teacher education, traditionally predictive claims arising from academic research in universities, undergo reflective scrutiny within the collaborative community of school-based and university-based teachers in the same manner as Richardson suggests above for school-based teachers alone. This does not mean "simply" the dialogue Richardson suggests public school teachers engage in to determine the theoretical justifications of their practices, but a dialectic carried on between teachers from university and school sites to examine and criticize, on an ongoing basis, the beliefs, values and human interests that inform both their individual and collaborative work. The goal is a more deeply informed understanding of education for all participants.

It is a shift from a focus on the codification of practice that usually entails the separate and isolated development of knowledge claims to the collaborative examination of knowledge informed by emancipatory intent. The project is not simply to provide justifications for claims put forward by school-based and university-based teachers, but to include an examination of the contexts in which these claims arise. Why these claims? Who benefits? What reality do they represent? Who is privileged, and who excluded in support of these claims? The project is the construction of critical knowledge claims that support knowledge as socially constructed and necessarily and "ongoingly" open to critique. This is the critical view of knowledge I took to the field when I began my work in the north.

My intent as a university-based teacher undertaking collaborative work in teacher education with school-based teachers was to experience the possibilities of occupying new sites. All participants in this enterprise would have the opportunity to view the work they do from a "wider surround" not possible within isolated institutional communities. Although

Richardson's (1990) is not a postmodernist position, her call for recognition of researchers as "change agents," describes a role for university-based teachers that I am attempting to develop in this thesis, "to provide not just findings but ways of thinking [that]...heighten teachers' awareness of beliefs, provide content for reflection and help in articulating justifications" (p. 16). And, I would add—to provide an ongoing critique of the conditions of practice.

But, again, the change agent role is necessarily assumed by both groups within this community of educators. School-based teachers are change agents as well. The project is to deepen awareness of one's own and of others' perspectives and understandings. And this awareness enables participants to negotiate agreement from within, and with respect for, this complexity.

The question arises, of course, how coherent can a program be that is developed within this postmodern frame? Is it not inherently contradictory to pursue agreement? The answer acknowledges the necessary ambiguity and tension of the educational enterprise. In the words of Audre Lorde, "Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of *necessary polarities* [emphasis mine] between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening" (p. 319, in Ellsworth,1989). The process is one Ellsworth describes as a "persistent critique of received narratives" rather than a search for the coherent narrative.

Metaphorically speaking the dialectic moves to new sites. The agreed upon starting point at these new sites, the primary norm, is equal opportunity to negotiate meaning, and subsequent courses of action. Implicit in the acceptance of this ground rule is an obligation to examine the means by which our prevailing relationships are maintained and legitimated—to include in the discourse an examination of the structures within which we work as well as the work we do there.

It is the reality, at present, that universities largely determine the shape of teacher education programs, as well as what constitutes students' successful completion of that education. The program I describe in this thesis to illustrate my argument lives under that

hierarchical umbrella. I believe this hierarchy is neither necessary nor the healthiest situation for the education profession. There is no reason I can discern that this responsibility (and, therefore, power) cannot be shared. If the structure, as well as the text, is collaboratively developed by way of an ongoing dialogue between university and school-based teachers, it follows the admission and evaluation of student teachers can be addressed as a joint responsibility as well. The claims about teaching and teacher education that will continue to be developed as a result of this collaboration will represent the best we, as teacher educators, can do.

Narratives as a Reflective Tool in the Inquiry into Knowledge

Narrative is a form of meaning making which expresses itself by drawing together descriptions of states of affairs contained in individual sentences, and creates a higher order of meaning that discloses relationships among the states of affairs. Narrative recognizes the meaningfulness of individual experiences by noting how they function as parts in a whole. It is particularly sensitive to the temporal dimension of human existence, it pays special attention to the sequence in which actions and events occur.

> Narrative comprehension is a kind of acquisition of knowledge which regularly occurs as people understand the written and oral communications produced by others. (Polkinghorne, 1989, pp. 35-36)

Narratives, says Ricoeur (1981), relate human action to the world. They are a response to feelings of discord or fragmentation. They provide form to our experience and a meaningful unity to our existence (in Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 67). Human actions take place in cultural settings that maintain symbolic forms for use in the articulation of action. These forms have a public character, making our actions communally "readable" and significant. They are comprehended and justified from within a moral stance. The interpretation of these actions residing within a particular context, and informed by particular past knowledge and experience, is the work of hermeneutics or interpretive science. Knowledge claims arising from this understanding guide the determination of "right" courses of action within a particular context.

An outcome of narrative reflection is an increased awareness of what Habermas (1979) calls "first level constructs": the values and world views inherited, the institutionalized roles assumed, and the social norms assimilated. Without an understanding of these constructs that guide individual thought and action, it is impossible to "move on" to an examination of the hegemonic relationships that have shaped those primary understandings and perspectives. Joining with colleagues in critical reflection on the narrative accounts of the self as professional is a method for increased self knowledge and for locating one's self within the professional community. This understanding is necessary to an examination of "second level constructs" those ideologically determined societal and institutional structures that define and regulate our work and our relationships. Habermas defines the goal of this expanded awareness as the development of "communicative competence," an awareness of the regulatory force of these structures and texts and an ability to articulate this knowledge, to move among members and negotiate what ought to be done. Whereas Habermas and a postmodernist could both view the narrative as having the potential to promote emancipation, they would part ways in terms of the emancipatory goal. A postmodernist view would be the narrative as an opportunity to promote difference: a Habermasian view would be a way to overcome difference and find consensus.

Narrative inquiry requires dialogue. It requires as well some shared beliefs and values on which the dialogue can be based to access participant meaning and to make possible ongoing sense-making. Paradoxically, one requires being socialized in order to share beliefs and values and make meaning together, and, simultaneously, one needs to develop the ability to recognize and challenge the ideological construction of the meaning we make. Private and public reflection on our narratives provides the opportunity for community members to support one another in this process of critique.

Reflection is paying attention to and searching for understanding of a problem or vexation which is causing feelings of conflict, a temporary "stuckness." It includes retrieving past knowledge and experience in order that the present event and possible solutions have points of reference, a context. The narrative is a vehicle to examine the relationship among the

elements that make up the event. The language used as the narrative is told creates meaning and denotes value.

In the narrative discourse undertaken by school-based and university-based teachers as they negotiate a curriculum for teacher education, the situated dilemmas of practice will be defined by school-based teachers who will also be involved in their solution. So socialized are we, beginning with our own schooling as children and continuing to our more recent socialization as workers in public education, that it is immensely difficult to know what it is we know and what it is we have assimilated uncritically into our repertoire of attitudes and behaviours which "belong" to education. The conflict inherent in reflective activity is often the indicator of such a discrepancy between what we know and what is claimed to be the case. The examination of the conflict is the first step in the development of emancipatory knowledge. However, such open declarations of "stuckness" will be risky and stressful "in a society where intellectual tradition puts a high value on certainty," (Flodin & Clark, 1988). Inquiry into the values and beliefs upon which individual experience and understanding is based proceeds under the assumption of the basic human quality of intelligent self-direction It requires both compromise and courage to continue to question the course determined even as the action is undertaken.

Chapter IV

Researcher as Method

> As we come to see how knowledge production and legitimation are historically situated and structurally located, scholarship that makes its biases part of its argument arises as a new contender for legitimacy. (Lather, 1991, p. 3)

As both a participant and as researcher within this community of teacher educators, I carried with me a vision of what I thought our "best" work would look like. As coordinator of the project I had the opportunity to encourage and support particular discourses in action. As researcher I had the opportunity to select (as I re-count in my thesis what took place there) what I regard as representative samples of that ongoing dialogue. Such intimacy with our work made Lather's (1991) statement particularly salient: "It is imperative that we recognize and proclaim as possible our position, and be cognizant of our language and power" (p. 52). It signals, as well, the need to acknowledge the necessity of "supporting research that is less certain" (Simmons, 1983, p. 302).

Qualitative methodologies address research that, in some form or other, to put it baldly, asks questions regarding persons or groups and publishes the answers. Given such potentially sensitive work, there is a responsibility on the part of the researcher(s) to provide an environment that is felt by participants to provide the time and conditions for them to contribute authentically and to be heard accurately. This mandate raises two important questions central to my work and to work in general in the field of qualitative research: What constitutes an "authentic" contribution? and How does the researcher work most "responsibly" with participants?

The narratives that are set down in this thesis are complicated by the differential power and status traditionally accorded to the participants whose words appear here. Many regulatory conditions stood in the way of the ideal of "institutionally unbound speech" that both Greene (1989) and Habermas (1972) name as a condition of a "true" or "authentic" dialogue. Such authentic speech evolves in environments characterized by opportunities for a variety of

perspectives to be put forward, for reflection on the choices made, and for modification of those choices as a result of reflection.

Our making of meaning, both privately and with others, is constructed from within the subjective experience of being human in a certain time and place in history, necessarily a construction of meaning that includes recollections, perceptions, and expectations. There is implicit in research taking an interest in uncovering this meaning, agreement that human experience is organized and intentional; that the organization and assigned meaning is uniquely configured, but that it also transcends the individual—it can be both spoken of and received within a community with shared beliefs and values (Polkinghorne, 1988; Von Glasersfeld, 1984). Through these dialogues meaning and value are negotiated and the accompanying search for agreement regarding "right" courses of action is part of that ongoing discussion. Whether the dialogue includes social critique, the critical examination of the social structures and relationships within which the search is conducted, depends upon whether the goal is "simply" understanding or the goal is change. Both goals were valued and pursued in our collaborative work and are evident in the data contained in this thesis.

To facilitate the examination of both goals was a responsibility I assumed as both researcher and coordinator. It required that I attempt to understand the regulatory conditions that would interfere with the examinations, and, as possible, to emancipate us from those conditions. One such regulatory condition stands out from the others as omnipresent in all attempts to move through understanding to emancipation. That is the regulatory power accorded to words, rather than individuals, to name reality (Maxwell, 1984). The use of that power is demonstrated in the service of predictive knowledge claims. Such claims substitute categories and codes for particular events and individual interpretations. To begin with these claims would be to put unnecessary constraints on our negotiations. We would eventually arrive at predictive claims but they would be the result of beginning with our narrative accounts of our everyday working lives. In this way the opportunity existed for meanings of words to be accorded their place inside the narratives. They could be acknowledged as socially

constructed and personally interpreted. The particular presented itself as a point of entry into our collaborative work that signalled that the locus of control lay with the experiencing subject.

Researching, too, represents a regulatory condition that can constrain, even as it provides the possibility for, the fullest understanding of collaborative work. As Aisenberg & Harrington (1988) describe, there are prior constraints on research housed in universities. Researchers are expected to "pursue questions defined as important by disciplinary authorities, only questions the answers to which can be established with scientific certainty or accord with a system of theoretical logic" (p. 138). This describes the interest in predictive claims and their powerful hold on what counts as knowledge. But qualitative research has gained increased respectability and voice in academic research in the past decade. It represents the possibility of not belonging to that academic tradition. Qualitative research in the human sciences as I define it and utilize it here, represents an attempt to disrupt this regulatory force, "to operate against a predefinition of matter worth knowing," (Ibid.) with its position of privilege for the researcher. If "power consists of determining what stories will be told," (Heilbrun, 1988, p. 43) then the goal is to invest that power in the participant. The research is the active negotiation of meaning taking place among participants (including the researcher as participant).

It is this membership of the researcher within the community that enables her to participate. The accuracy of the researcher's description and analysis is dependent in part on her relationship to the operating narrative scheme, to her holding in common the values and beliefs necessary to shared reception and development of meaning (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991). The method returns us always to the subject active in remembering, in finding out.

> If telling a story requires giving oneself away, then we are obligated to devise a method that mediates the space between the self that tells, the self that told, and the self that listens: a method that returns a story to the teller that is both hers and not hers, that contains her self in good company. (Grumet, 1987, p. 323)

This method and these processes provide what Lather (1986) calls "face validity," a check by participants that what is being offered as data is, in fact, recognizable as "ours." The goal is the creation of critical knowledge that furthers an emancipatory condition for participants. The opportunity for the development of emanciaptory knowledge is an outcome

of understanding the roles, responsibilities and perspectives of the different group members, and with having the freedom to generate new possibilities of being within that collaborative work.

I am describing here a "heliocentric view" of qualitative research. It is both an admission and an assertion that I am moved and shaped by the activity I research as well as implicated in the shaping and influencing of that activity. The purpose of this positioning is dictated by claims to knowledge that begin with the individual and are negotiated from within the participant group. The researcher "captures" this negotiation: her interpretations "activate" the text. The central tension of this methodology is to retain the individual voice even as those voices are necessarily reduced to "representations" by the researcher's text and, later, the reader's lens. Addressing the "the inescapability of representation," Derrida (1978) shifts my attention "from the responsibility of representing things in themselves to representing the web of structure, sign and play of social relations." In other words, it is the researcher's responsibility to expose the tensions, the debates, to tease out the queries and doubts, the surprises—to go beyond the representation of events to the critical uncovering of *why* these particular events.

Limitations of language

As I began the work and research that are this thesis, I said to participants with whom I worked as participant-researcher:

> *We will, by the time our work is done, have determined courses of action for this curriculum project and ways of thinking about this work that do not yet exist. They will be a unique result of our work together taking place at this time and in this context. [reconstituted from journal notes, oct, 1989]*

In researching the collaborative effort of university and school-based teachers, I was interested in "capturing" the perspectives and understandings of participants as we struggled to develop a common project, and to make visible new constructions of meaning as we "bent" individual knowing to new conjoined purposes. The words that would communicate our processes and outcomes might not yet be available (at least not yet "bent" as Merleau-Ponty

puts it below). I was mindful as well of needing to understand what part our diverse "roles" (as opposed to our personal qualities) played as we sought to redefine positions of power and responsibility. We were "from secondary school," and "from fifteen years in primary education," and "from the university," or "seconded to the university from the school," etcetera. How would this diversity play itself out as we explored the parameters of collaborative work? How could "traditional" relationships be reconfigured? How would I/we know? How were the words I had spoken received by participants? Did the words convey excitement, challenge, new roles, responsibilities, professional growth? (those being the messages I was trying to convey)—did they trigger images of chaos, lack of direction, leadership and structure? (those being messages I worried about conveying). Whatever the reception, the speaking had already altered their meaning and constrained both the way we proceeded together and the meaning we made. In this ongoing struggle at collaborative meaning-making I was (and am) encouraged by Merleau-Ponty's proposal that "it is in the use of spoken language that new meaning is constructed, as the resources of language are bent to fresh and new usage" (in Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 27). It suggests as well that such a project, grounded in values other than those that have defined traditional relationships between universities and schools may need to be carried out in an alternative setting (by which I mean with altered structures that define "how" we are to participate). We need to move sites.

I am laying out the complexities of the collaborative project as part of the explication of method to emphasize the necessary fluidity in choosing qualitative strategies. I require strategies that enable readers to enter into the shifting evolving state of becoming, of being a learner, of understanding the evolution of the researcher as she lives out the work; and of other community members as they speak their lived experience and listen to the experiences of others. "New stories," Heilbrun (1988) tells us, "demand collective speaking and listening." As new stories emerge they provide moments of knowing critically. They can be "the moments of invention in which we are becoming something else than what our history has constructed us to be" (Foucault quoted in Rajchman, 1991, p. 161).

As a result of the processes undertaken in a collaborative attempt at meaning-making, contradictions and dilemmas and doubts can be raised and new understandings of the self and the world born. Our conflicting and cooperating discourse is an opportunity to see what frames our seeing. We make available what Foucault (1980) describes as "spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see which constitute power/knowledge" (quoted in Lather, 1992, p. 3). We open up new sites of contestation.

The methodology seeks not simply to "uncover" but to make of that "constructed visibility" the opportunity to envision and attempt new constructions. This is the complexity of negotiating new meaning, a process that requires disrupting "old systems of knowledge." Aisenberg & Harrington (1988) capture dramatically participants who are historically "receivers" of knowledge, beginning to find voice and authority. They are examining the experience of women finding voice and "authority" as "new" members of the academy. There are obvious parallels to the collaborative work described in this thesis:

> ...in deconstructing old systems of knowledge...they [women in the academy] must name phenomena hitherto unnoticed.... What one frequently hears, therefore, is a good deal of hesitant, fragmented, even agitated speech...the opposite of the clear, fluent, assured articulation of thought [that] models public presentation of ideas.... Yet such exchange is frequently laden with meaning...ideas offered before they are fully formed so that others can add to them...can join with others to define new directions. In short the language of feminist exploration is inevitably probing and tentative, and the participants...have little choice but to abjure precision and fluency if they are to contribute. (p. 81)

Negotiating meaning signals new facilitative and receptive roles and responsibilities for all participants in a collaborative effort—making room for other ways of knowing. Knowledge is partial; there are possibilities of being of which we are not aware; what we will experience may as yet be unnameable; we (any one of us) may have to change our minds. Research in the qualitative tradition provides the opportunity to pay attention to this discourse, not in order to establish new categories and codes but to "foster differences and let the contradictions remain in tension" (Lather, 1991, p, 8). Thus the work of this thesis situates itself in the interstices of the "no longer"—(we have moved out of our isolated institutional settings)—and the "not yet"—(as we reach towards redefining relationships among us).

Ironically it can only ever be "a representation of the failure to represent what we point toward but can never reach" (Ibid., p. 7).

Qualitative research enables me as participant-researcher to situate the subjectivity of both the individual and the joint struggle in such a way that my rendering provides points of entry for readers to join with and challenge this work. The successful establishment of these points of entry is an indication of acceptance of this accounting on the part of the reader. The idea of "acceptance" is one traditionally referred to as "validity." Qualitative research is an area where "validity" is regarded as problematic, which, I will suggest, is the way it should be regarded.

Historically, Scheurich (1991) argues, validity has functioned across paradigms as a boundary to guard against the disintegration of the "Western knowledge project," a project defined as "the repeated effort to overcome plurality and establish unity by reducing the many to the one" (Taylor, 1986, p. 4). The power of validity in this interpretation is offered as another example of the power of regulation to enforce hegemony:

> The proffered justification for a validity boundary is to ensure quality, trustworthiness, and legitimacy. Historically though, boundaries also exclude that which attacks the paradigmatic status quo...validity boundaries are always already ideological power alignments. (Scheurich, 1991, p. 7)

Such analysis gives me pause. Does "acceptance" of this work in the end require multiple voices to become one? I am aware of the seductive pull toward solutions, toward theoretical frames to contain (constrain) this work. It would be antithetical: it would deny the shifting, contesting voices requiring attention. But events, projects, activities exist within the world, they are contingent and can be held up to the light in relation to other ideas, beliefs, standards. Instead of ignoring validity, Foucault (1977) suggests we would be better served by problematizing it. "The subsequent pursuit of this problematic would fragment, dislocate, and undermine our present validity practices with new questions and possibilities, the idea being to multiply differences rather than create new valid orders" (in Scheurich, p. 7). It is a project in line with collaborative attempts to ensure that differences can flourish.

By discussing the central issues of generalizability and sampling in terms of qualitative research, I provide a way of entering into the debate around validity and explaining the procedures I utilize to "validate" this project.

The issue of generalizability

I have defined generalizing as the process of going from the specific to the general. In terms of qualitative research it concerns "the extent to which whatever relationships are uncovered in a particular situation can be expected to hold true for every situation" (Patton, 1980, p. 279). This is a view arising from traditional social science where the interest lies in making empirical generalizations rather than finding intrinsic value in the particular case. A refinement of this process, more sensitive to naturalistic inquiry was offered by Cronbach (1975) among others as "particularization," that is the noting from situation to situation or from one interview to the next of a repeating effect and describing and interpreting that effect anew in each instance. Guba (1978) speaks of generalization as a working hypothesis to be tested again and again: the use of qualitative research to provide perspective rather than truth. Is this another way of subsuming the "other"? It is attractive, seductive, to find unities. I am trying to resist. The worthwhile display of data in my opinion is context-bound information that provides a range of response, rather than generalizations.

Qualitative research facilitates understanding of human experience. By honouring the context, and the recollections and expectations of individuals within that context, as well as their present experiencing, we are privileged to understand more deeply the complexity of being human. If we were to ask what is worthwhile about this kind of knowledge claim that serves interpretation of social life and, under certain conditions, emancipation, in contrast to the claim of predictive knowledge, the following example would illustrate. Whereas the interest in the development of predictive knowledge is to control material conditions, the development of claims for understanding is to address the moral and ethical questions of what we "ought to do" with the technology. But it is deeper and more fundamental than that—it is

emancipatory knowledge to enable the prior question, what kind of "progress" is desirable, what kind of technology we want to develop. It is a different kind of knowing which is situated in the world and seeks avenues to make a qualitative difference within that world. It increases our capacity to understand and respond wisely to a myriad of human concerns while reminding those who act on that knowledge that it is always partial and must continue to be examined.

If this is the mandate for qualitative research, I do not see that generalizing benefits it. Divergent and dissonant we are as a species, and it is the running up against these differing views that both gives us pause to re-examine our own perspectives and provides the possibility of deeper appreciation of others. There is a sense as well that when broad statements (generalizations) are made about a group or an action, for instance, there is an appearance of "truth" or "fact." The reader does not have to "mess around" in the complexity of real sense-making.

The aim of qualitative research is to deepen and enrich our perspectives and understandings, not to reach agreement. Emancipatory qualitative research increases our ability to effect change through increased knowledge of the "other" and of the other within systems that regulate and organize our everyday world.

To generalize is necessarily to reduce, to categorize, to delimit understanding about what has taken place, as well as to limit what can be learned from the outcomes. Generalizing is not an activity commensurate with the realm of meaning, temporality may be lost as is the complexity of human interaction. There is a tendency to appear to have "discovered truth."

The issue of sampling

There is no pretence here, however, that not to generalize is to provide a "true" picture. Selection and interpretation is necessarily active at every stage of this project—selection of activities and of data; interpretation of words and actions. Precisely because of these limitations the recounting of the work of this thesis must be captured through the ordinary

language of the participants. It is the participant as central referent that most vividly captures the meaning of this work. Sampling can preserve the nuance, it can enable the qualitative researcher to paint the mini-portrait that attempts to "faithfully" represent the full range and meaning of events—how each part relates to the whole, not necessarily harmoniously, but with purpose.

There is particularly challenging self-reflexive work to be done on the part of the researcher (what do these choices say about my beliefs, assumptions?). It requires recognizing and documenting the inevitable changes that characterized relationships within the teacher education community as well as the effect of these changes on the researcher. Still, it often "sounds like," to read descriptions of the elements of qualitative methodologies in research texts, that it is "common sense" and will proceed "reasonably" from the beginning to the end.

But it is never straight forward, and the temptations to "balance" the portrait, "harmonize" the colours, to "blend" oneself as researcher into the mix, are pervasive. And more serious in my mind is the potential to cover over a "lumpy" bit, or overwhelm it, or isolate (trivialize) it. A dramatic example from Ellsworth's (1989) work illustrates particularly this last point:

> ...what I write and how I write is done in order to save my own life. And I mean that literally... it is a way of knowing that I am not hallucinating, that whatever I feel/know *is*. (p. 302)

It is what Ellsworth describes as a "reality check for survival" which comes "already validated." When I think about that ,"sampling" takes on a different hue. Kaleidoscopes come to mind. It signals complex and changing patterns as voices conjoin and clash. It signals a need to keep the issues "in the middle" of all the participants as much as possible.

Methodology in action

In the best interests of research with emancipatory intent, the questions would have been generated by the participants and the research carried out by all. This was not the case. But all the participants, as groups and individually, generated the answers. We determined

together the important understandings about teaching and learning that student teachers needed to demonstrate in the first practicum semester—and the best processes to reach towards that vision. I spoke of the need for us to develop collaborative processes to facilitate university-school district work in teacher education. I was not sure exactly what those processes might be, but they would be guided by a belief in equity and the intelligent self-direction of all participants. We would figure it out, and modify it as we went along. I described my researcher role, my interest in recording the manner in which our collaborative work evolved and the outcomes of our combined knowledge and experience. (At the time I did not know if this work would constitute my thesis.) I requested formally, their permission to record and use as data our group processes and evolving curriculum.

If school associates wanted to "study" this teacher education work, there was an opportunity to use these days together as part of an undergraduate course offered by the coordinator in curriculum development and implementation. The classes were the eight days we had together over the two semesters plus two further four hour classes. In addition, the course required keeping a journal of the experience of being a teacher educator in the consortium, an analysis with the student teacher of their joint practicum experience, and a final paper on the subject of teacher education. Copies of their journals were sent to me monthly. I responded with remarks and questions meant to encourage their continued reflection on teacher education, particularly as they viewed its unfolding within the consortia. Nine school associates in the two consortia took the course. All gave me permission to include their writing in my thesis.

To overcome the inevitable biases of a participant-researcher as much as possible, I have referred to the importance of careful documentation, attempting to let the story tell itself (mindful of the impossibility of it being anything but a subjective rendering on my part). The dialogues that I use in Chapter Five to describe our work come from a variety of sources, as shown in Figure 1 below.

As I list these sources of data I am mindful of a limitation they impose that has become clearer to me as I write this thesis (particularly Chapter Five). The audio tapes of dialogues with group members took place in three circumstances: a) when we convened as a large group, usually to discuss or summarize issues that had had first public discussion in small groups, b) three classroom sessions with school associates that took my course (and the same teachers whose journals figure prominently in my re-telling of our collaborative tale, c) a session with faculty associates (and the new coordinator) six months after I had left the coordinator position. I need to state that I do not find the data thin. Indeed, I believe it is rich and worthwhile, but because of the circumstances, it is limited, and does not record the contributions of individual members who, for whatever reasons, did not choose to contribute in larger group settings. Nor did I "know" the participants at work at their individual sites in an intimate sense (although I was in a number of their schools and classrooms and had many informal conversations).

Figure 1. Sources of Data

1. Audio tapes of (a) the full group planning sessions—two days in October and two days in November, and (b) the sessions held during the practicum semester in which we reflected on and modified the program (February and March).
2. Journal entries from the nine school associates enrolled in the undergraduate course.
3. Audio tapes of a session with the faculty associates addressing the worth of the collaborative effort six months after the practicum semester was over.
4. Participants' responses to a letter I sent out one year later asking school and faculty associates if our work together had made (was making) a tangible difference to them professionally over time (54 letters sent out; 16 replies, all positive, received).
5. Notes from journals and research files kept throughout this work by the researcher.

A balance to this, I think, and important to an understanding and assessment of our efforts, are the outcomes of our curriculum building—creating a framework for our

curriculum, filling in that framework a first time and returning to and reworking our program after we and the students had an opportunity to experience and reflect upon it. I am acutely aware as I write this of how far it is from the methodology I espouse. Distance and the expense of travel meant we did not meet as often as I would wish (either individually or in small groups) to check out our agreement about the course of the work and to continue to develop our understanding of ourselves from within it.

Within the time and geographical constraints, however, we built a description of our understandings of teaching and learning.

> *At our sessions together I encouraged us to identify doubts, hesitations, tensions which arose in the course of the everyday world of work—and in our recounting of that work with others—as a way of paying attention to what we think is worthwhile. I shared some examples of my own - I began gently as I felt the trust level to be "right," questioning some statements to clarify their and my understanding. I did so consciously, to model reflection-in-action. I was aware by my own hesitancy that I feel "powerful" in that my being "from the university" at least at the beginning, precluded others "talking back." Or was that my self-fulfilling prophecy? I worked hard at establishing commonalities in language, recollections of being a teacher, aims as teacher educators, at the same time celebrating what was unique. I orchestrated, facilitated, sat in groups, shared stories and questioned. I viewed myself as passionate about my work and confident that we could make meaning together. Our community of educators had had a range of responses to my proposal—from excitement to skepticism to criticism. I found myself more likely to engage "encouragers" in group discussion. [journal entry, nov, 1990]*

Nine of the teachers kept journals of the experience that they shared with me. I kept a journal. I did not share it with them. (Nor, until I wrote that did it occur to me to do so. What was my thinking about our relationship? I am forced to rethink my position as collaborator. I did not approach equity as closely as I had imagined.)

And this is but one illustration of the ongoing challenge to work collaboratively from a position of traditional privilege as both Coordinator of the program, and as instructor of the undergraduate course. The position of coordinator included an evaluative role in terms of faculty associate work: faculty associates were also required to evaluate my work as coordinator. My ability to be collaborative can be examined in terms of the ability of our team of university-based teachers to sustain a critical dialogue among ourselves around our work. (For instance, one of the faculty associates did not choose to discuss with me a difficult situation concerning a school associate became evident during my analysis of the project. We

had discussed many other "problems," why not this one?) An understanding of my ability, or lack thereof, to work in a collaborative manner required I continuously ask myself how I influenced or was influenced by evolving events. It is an uncovering of relationships that implicates me deeply as participant and as researcher. It is central to my analysis of this project.

What were the issues, concerns, that arose for us? Apart from journals, most of the data of our work together is large group discussion and curriculum development documents. How do I capture "the nuance of everyday language" if so many of the situations are "orchestrated"? At least in the tape recording of our large group sessions I hear our questioning. Do I lead people to answers. Do we admit multiple realities, a range of perspectives? Is there time for reflection, clarification? Is there shared meaning-making, decision-making? What gets paid attention to, what ignored? What is the quality of the relationship between us? How is that to be defined? What roles and responsibilities do different participants take on?

Most importantly, in my view, this thesis attempts to describe an attitude towards journeying with others which may be of benefit to some. The journey is undertaken as a learner, committed to an on-going and never-ending process of becoming. It is an alternative pathway to sense-making which begins for each traveller by the use of narratives of other journeys in order that we honour the unique construction of what we know. By describing the manner in which the journey was undertaken this methodology makes available the many kinds of knowing which constituted the accumulated wisdom of the travellers, as well as the processes entered into to travel together.

The journey was undertaken not in search of a "fit" within a predetermined conceptual frame, although, as noted in chapter three, different frameworks were utilized in thinking about this work. The goal was the development of a process to deepen our individual and group knowing, and to determine principled procedures to guide our teacher education work. The methodology choosen needed to honour the subjectivity of all participants. It needed to

support participants in naming those perspectives and understandings that made up their individual world views. If new knowledge was to emerge it would be because the time and environment for trust to build, and the time for thoughtful reflection was provided These contextual variables needed to be included. The methodology in this case is the participant-researcher being informed by and responding to the evolution that was our journey towards new sights/sites.

Two distinct questions guide my selection of data as I recount the project in the next chapter: How did we make meaning together? What was the meaning we made? In both instances I display samples of what we said and did, of the tensions and doubts that surfaced and the actions that were the result. I describe the decisions we came to, the procedures we put in place.

These two questions are under the umbrella of another that guides my analysis: How did our making meaning together make any difference to the kind of meaning we made? In other words, was the collaborative effort worthwhile?

This is qualitative research: there is no separating the knower and the known; there are a variety of perspectives from which to choose; all are value laden. The choices we made were the best we could do, as a community of educators committed to the education of new teachers. And if this "truth" is well laid out it will expand my/your/our possibilities of being and becoming.

Chapter V
The Dance of Collaboration

The vision informing my work in teacher education is to create an environment where possibilities can be explored, where different perspectives on teaching and learning are welcomed, in short to foster among participants an attitude of reciprocity. The goal is not to codify practice but to develop procedures for enriching our understanding of practice, thereby increasing the possibilities for worthwhile and coherent action in teacher education. Such a collaborative effort requires that participants suspend the norms and the assumptions that traditionally sustain both the isolation and the hierarchical relationship between the universities and public schools. It requires a willingness to listen deeply to the narratives that describe other points of view and to entertain the notion of changing your mind.

The intent of this chapter is to describe the processes undertaken by school-based and university-based teachers as they worked collaboratively to develop a teacher education program. The focus is on the first of the three semesters required for certification. During this 14 week semester the students' time is equally divided between experiences in the field and time on campus in seminars and workshops. The collaborative project described here is the shaping of a program to determine what student teachers should observe, understand and do during that 14 week period in order to demonstrate their eligibility to continue in the program. Although we made some modifications to the sequence of program activity (for instance, the long distances some student teachers had to travel to get to the campus meant we planned longer but not as frequent campus sessions), the sequence and balance of this campus-field activity was in line with other SFU teacher education sites. Our work was also guided by the principles of the Professional Development Program which emphasize the development of autonomous, self-evaluating and reflective practitioners. It was an emphasis reinforced by our approach to collaboration that began with reflective attention to the knowledge of teaching and learning we all held.

This chapter attempts to reconstruct the work guided by two questions: How did we make meaning together? and What was the meaning we made? In terms of an analysis of this work, these two questions are under the umbrella of another: How does our making meaning together make any difference? In other words was the collaborative effort in teacher education worthwhile?

In previous chapters the inception of these consortia in teacher education in northern British Columbia, their beginning stages, and the setting for the collaborative work have been described. I have also described the selection process for school associates and faculty associates and some of the particular histories and unique personalities of those colleagues with whom I shared this project.

As both coordinator of the consortia and as a doctoral student researching collaborative work in teacher education, I brought a commitment to this project to try to make the inquiry as inclusive of all participants as possible. I do not mean that my colleagues from the schools and the university became co-researchers. I would have preferred that, but lack of time and money and the fact that this work was carried out a considerable distance from my home made such an effort impossible. In this case, the inclusive nature of the work was our collaborative development of understanding of teacher education, the subsequent shaping of the program and the ongoing and critical examination and modification of our efforts. The examination included an ongoing critique of the processes we used to develop our understandings.

The university-based teachers, the faculty associates and I, involved in this collaborative project were not regular faculty members. Regular faculty were assigned to each consortium and worked with us planning the semester and providing some seminars for the student teachers, but in the day to day operation of the program, and in the collaborative effort with the school-based teachers, we were "the university." Our responsibility was to set up and run the Professional Development Program, SFU's year long teacher certification program. Our intention was to define what the program would "look like" in collaboration with the school associates in the consortia.

In the beginning the faculty associates and I were accorded much of the status and concomitant power traditionally associated with being "from the university." It was to be expected, of course, that as we began together school associates were waiting to find out about the SFU program (most had not had any association with SFU's faculty of education) and to understand what exactly we had in mind when we spoke of collaboration. But there was another kind of distance between us that was based on assumptions about what teachers based in universities and teachers based in schools know and do—universities "do" theory and schools "do" practice. Theory in this familiar dichotomous view is defined as knowledge claims arising from academic study and research that lie outside of the contexts that define the everyday world of practice. Such claims were identified in chapter three as serving the interest in prediction. On the other hand, knowledge arising from practice is viewed as situated and personal, the result of school-based teachers' thought and action in the context of work. These claims were defined in chapter three as knowledge serving the hermeneutic interest in understanding.

It was my assumption that school-based teachers would not accord this situated knowledge of practice equal value in our collaborative project because of the traditional status accorded academic knowledge. In other words, assertion of knowledge claims by university-based teachers could silence school-based teachers' contributions. In order to disrupt this hierarchy and challenge this traditional view, we began our dialogues with the situated knowledge of school-based teachers. We began our discussion of teaching and learning with the situated and personal stories of practice; we developed our understanding of teacher education using the language, the context and the experience of the school associates as our focus.

The knowledge of the school associates has also been emphasized because the knowledge they hold is equally important to the determination of "right" courses of action in teacher education. To right the balance was, in my mind, to emphasize knowledge arising from practice in order that a sense of equity could be served. It did not mean abandoning

knowledge claims that did not arise directly from practice. It meant to me that the onus was on the university-based teacher to use language that would enable knowledge arising from research to lie alongside situated knowledge, and to support/inform inquiry into classroom events as defined by school-based teachers.

I struggle explaining this. Does it sound hierarchical? Was it "talking down" to my school-based colleagues? Obviously, the intent was the opposite. I am reminded of a term used by Maxine Greene—"malefic generosity"—to describe the actions of well-intentioned middle-class professionals who believe that they must be the executors of the transformation. "They are likely," she says, "because of their language, their commitments, even their interest in critique—to exert a new kind of domination, a new mode of control." How do I step outside of my place in the dominant culture as a white middle-class doctoral student to examine these possibilities? For instance, I experienced the ongoing tension of wanting my voice heard, but assuming that, at least in the beginning, it would be accorded more weight, take up more space than one voice deserved. The transcripts perhaps speak most eloquently to these thoughts and questions.

But that is not the whole explanation of why we began with personal narratives. It was the integration of knowledge claims that interested me. I had a clear agenda in terms of addressing the perceived dichotomy and hierarchy of knowledge preserves. I wanted to develop an appreciation among us for the variety of kinds of knowledge we all held. Predictive knowledge was not the exclusive preserve of academic study, but was also a component of the knowledge held by school-based teachers. Knowledge claims having to do with the understanding of practice, those situated claims imbued with a moral or ethical stance were a necessary component to a full understanding of education. The possession of critical knowledge, that which we needed to know in order to question taken-for-granted roles and relationships in education and to effectively critique the claims of prediction and understanding, was a desirable goal for us all.

Collaboration requires reciprocity. What I describe here is an attempt to reach towards that goal (simultaneously acknowledging it as unattainable). I hoped to provide the freedom for us to reconfigure, to resist regulatory forces that have traditionally determined who is legitimated as a knower and how this knowledge is displayed. Such freedom will be evident in "...the degree or quality...of the perspectives available and the [opportunity for] reflectiveness on the choices made" (Greene, 1987, p. 80). I have tried to redefine roles and responsibilities by turning questions about what we ought to do back to the group for negotiated agreement. I have tried to make room for differing perspectives by beginning with the situated and personal experience of participants and by emphasizing the ongoing and evolving nature of collaborative work. I have encouraged participants to be aware of and question assumptions about "the way it is." I assumed that the sheer numbers of the group (over 20 school-based teachers and 3 or 4 university-based teachers) would make it possible for school-based teachers to feel supported in examining—and celebrating—the complex, dilemma-ridden, ongoing challenge that is public education. My intention was to develop an environment in which collaboration in teacher education was viewed not only as a viable manner of proceeding but as a necessary one. This chapter describes in part the struggle to realize that opportunity—the struggle to let go of, and to share power and to establish new coalitions.

Regarding the use of names of the participants in this narrative. I have chosen to describe for the reader a few of the participants who were most outspoken and, therefore, influential in our group discussions. I have chosen not to use individual names in the parts of the transcripts used in this chapter. I would be delighted to be able to provide histories and personalities for all the participants, to draw the reader fully inside our unique relationships and interactions, but that is not possible—in the first instance because I do not know all those histories. Nor is it the point of this particular thesis. That the outcomes are influenced by personal histories has been acknowledged and examples of those are drawn. In the end, however, it is the processes whereby distinct individuals, in distinct roles, can develop new relationships that enable the joint negotiation of meaning and action that is the central focus. At

least that is how I see it today as I expand the descriptions in chapter five. Maybe later I will change my mind.

Eight days over two semesters were set aside to develop, implement, reflect on, and modify our program, as shown in Figure 2 below. This schedule was the same in both consortia.

Figure 2. Program Development Days

The planning semester—October (2 days)
- examining our own practice
- describing the unity and coherence of education

The planning semester—November (2 days)
- personal case studies
- developing domains in education
- developing the understandings that defined the domains

The practicum semester—January (2 days)
- the student teachers join us
- introducing the program

The practicum semester—February (1 day)
- reflections on our beginnings
- reviewing the domains
- supervision and evaluation

The practicum semester—March (1 day)
- reflection and modification
- restructuring the domains

The Planning Semester—October

We gathered the first evening, sitting separately in district groups, and in grade groups—more strangers than acquaintances among the thirty adults. There was wine and cheese and fruit. There were introductions and preliminary remarks. The following is reconstituted from notes I had made for that first gathering. They were my opening remarks to the group:

> *Cood:* *What we will develop will be unique because it will be our particular journey together, taking place here and now with unique individuals. We have different understandings of our work and some differing beliefs and values which inform what we do all day. And we have some common purposes which bind us together in the educating of children.*

> *Together we will know what to do. As a community of teacher educators we can support, clarify and enrich each others' personal knowing. This is a new program needing new interpretations.*
>
> *Our task is to develop a vision of a good professional—to identify what a 'good' teacher understands about teaching and learning, and carries out in successful practice. As we talk about our work we will begin to articulate those understandings and what they look like in our ongoing professional activity. And we will use those understandings to build a curriculum which addresses the following question: What should a student teacher understand and see and do in order to foster his or her development as that 'good' teacher?" [reconstituted from my journal notes, sept, 1989]*

Following the introductions and remarks, we broke into small cross-grade, cross-district, cross-institution groups. The task in the small groups was to discover something everyone in the group had in common (other than work in education)— and a way to pantomime that common interest for the rest of us to guess.

The next morning there were more acquaintances than strangers as we began our discussions about the work we do. To encourage a focus on the common purposes that link our separate work, I asked the group to consider: What is it that young people should be able to do after spending thirteen years with us in the public education system? We wrote privately about our vision, we discussed it with a partner, and then, as we felt comfortable, we offered our thoughts in a large group discussion. The common educational purposes we expressed provided a sense of unity and coherence to the educational enterprise. We were enabled as a group of elementary, secondary and university teachers to envision the possibility of negotiating agreement about a program for the student teachers.

Then we considered what needed to happen in schools to accomplish those educational goals. We entertained questions such as the following: What was a time you felt particularly successful in your work? Why do you think that was? What is a metaphor that would describe your view of yourself as teacher? What do these accounts tell you about what values, beliefs, knowledge inform your work? What do these accounts tell you about what is important in teaching and learning? The unique and individual expressions of our work were married to our common purposes. Reflection on individual experiences, filtered and organized by way of the unique configuration of inherited world views, institutionalized roles and social

norms that make up what Habermas (1979) describes as our "first level constructs," was a necessary first step to a deeper understanding of the knowledge, values and assumptions that informed our educational activity. Without this understanding, an examination of second level constructs: a critique of ideology, a critical re-interpretation of the past, an entertaining of other possibilities of being, in short the development of knowledge claims to serve the interest in emancipation, could not take place (Ibid., p. xi).

During those first two days we spent a lot of our time focussed on our daily professional lives. The energy level was high. Participants were intensely interested in providing and listening to stories of practice—whether the practice took place in university or public school settings.

We began the second day with the metaphors of teaching that had been our homework. Some had physically constructed or drawn their metaphors, others had written about them. Again the feeling of shared values and beliefs, of belonging to a common enterprise was evident—even as the metaphors emphasized the distinctiveness of each contribution to that enterprise. Following this exercise I asked the group to reflect on this collaborative process as it was beginning to emerge. It was a way to check out how we were feeling, and to obtain some guidance about the needs of the group. It was also a way to draw attention to the collaboration that was taking place.

The following are excerpts from the first session I tape recorded. I did not feel I could begin recording until I felt some degree of comfort and trust among participants (although they had all given me permission from the beginning to tape our work).

Cood: *What are you hoping to pick up along the way? What are you hoping that this program is going to help you or have you take away that makes it worth participating in? What do you need to make that happen?*

Flo: *I am a relatively new teacher so what I hope to gain from this is an understanding of myself not as a student anymore but as a teacher. Like I remember looking at myself being a student teacher and now I am still in there and getting to be a teacher. So I think having a student teacher is going to help me look at myself as a teacher. I hope!*

Julie: *On the other hand, I have been teaching forever it seems. It is good to go back and to tear the whole thing apart and see what makes it up and remind me again what's involved.*

Cood: *Having a student makes you look at yourself more thoughtfully maybe than you have time to do otherwise.*

SA: *I have been teaching for quite a while and tend to, you know, well we did this today and tomorrow we'll be doing this. And so I need to keep thinking more than sometimes I do, thinking why am I doing this. And hoping it will help me understand more, to think more. I am not very good at explaining why I do things and I am wanting some help in articulating that to a student teacher.*

Cood: *You want some help in how to articulate how you are thinking about your teaching, with a student. Did that come up for others?* [Much talk and agreement] *Tools for articulating what you are doing? OK. How about some other things that came up in terms of what you are hoping to take away and what you need in order to do that.*

SA: *I think I am hoping that I am going to pick up some ideas, some more things I can add to my knowledge base and to my experience. Again I have not been teaching for very long myself. I am also hoping to come out of here feeling that I have learned something, come out feeling good about myself in the classroom. And hopefully that I can reflect that in working with a student teacher.*

FA: *In the work that I have done in the past with school associates—often if you encounter a student who has a struggle on their journey and maybe they decide that teaching is not for them...It is really hard not to feel responsible for those. So as we are going through this journey one of the needs that I would project based on my own experience is some help in coming to terms with what we have contributed and what we can contribute to a person who may not...We are not responsible for them becoming something just as we are not on our own responsible for our pupils. We cannot make every student the way we want them. And it doesn't mean we have not tried.*

Cood: *So you are saying sometimes you might not feel successful.*

FA: *If you measure your success by the success of your student teacher that may not be the best measuring stick. If they quit you may have done a very good job, you may have done something very good for the profession. For some teaching is the wrong choice and they are really grateful that you have helped direct them out of the profession.*

Flo: *I would be very angry if someone...I know I had worked a long time and someone said well maybe this is not the profession for you. I don't think that's the place of anyone to decide except the student. I don't think they should tell me what they think I should do, it is my decision.*

Julie: *I don't think that was what was being said here. I think that they said that if the student teacher decides on their own that this isn't for me then you shouldn't feel bad about it.*

Flo: *OK. I think I should preface that by saying that's what my first school associate said to me and I really resented her and I love teaching so ...*

Emily: *If this had been the way the SFU program had been before I might have taken a student teacher. The things that I am hoping to pick up on the way aren't so much from the student teacher, but more from the whole experience of being with other teachers now. And I suspect that we are all going to feel a bit stronger when it comes to student teacher time, knowing that there are twenty-seven other people who have suffered with us. Even though this person comes from the university with these wonderful ideas and blows us out of the water.*

Cood: *A real need is for affirmation from one another, from colleagues.*

SA: *We haven't had time to really sit and reflect about what we are doing or expressing things or discussing things. The day is just too busy. I mean you are always planning for the next day or second day. You never sit back and do what we are doing now.*

SA: *We don't get that. That is what we talked about in our group.*

[Much agreement and chatter]

SA: *I think it is good and we need to have pats on the back saying we're doing the right thing too.*

Case: *This is part of the reason I liked the whole project—because I look at it as peer coaching and with peer coaching comes reviving. We can't always ask kids for constructive criticism. They will tell you whether they like it or not. They will give you their reasons. But it is when you talk it over with a peer that is where the real refinement comes because he tries it in a different classroom with a different group of kids. He encounters different problems from what you might encounter. So after school Mark and I get together then we discuss the real guts of the lesson and then we discuss what changes we are going to make or what other things we are going to try and with that we do develop some really good lessons.*

Cood: *It sounds as if what you are saying is that it needs—in terms of this program—there is a need to make time for these kinds of thing to occur with the student teachers.*

Case: *You have to have constant communication after, not just before but after. That's when the real growth takes place.*

We talked about who we were and how we participated in the educational enterprise. We began to identify the tools we would need to introduce to student teachers such complexity and deep knowing. We discussed what we expected to gain from taking on this work. And in our discourse we began to name what we believed to be some of the characteristics that make "good" teachers and "best" practice. As I reread the transcripts of the beginning session there emerges a sense of the personal efficacy portrayed by those who spoke. They wanted to deepen their understanding, to re-examine and to articulate their practice. It was a private process—needing the time to think about what they do, and a public process—talking with colleagues. Particularly, I find expressed in these opening days as we spoke from our own contexts, an excitement in learning from colleagues and contributing to their knowledge. School associates wrote about this in their journals (as students in my course). The first two comments appeared in journals during the planning semester. The third came at the end of the program, looking back:

> *Exchanging thoughts, ideas, questions with other committed and skilled educators gave me a sense of well being for our profession.* [SA journal, oct, 1989]
>
> *The approach you have made in the northern teacher education program seems so much more reasonable. I feel totally involved in trying to analyze my teaching in order to help others. It has to be a more effective way than relying so much on methods courses. I like the idea of close involvement of the school associates.* [SA journal, dec, 1990]

> *The most positive aspect of the program for me, a view also held by others I spoke with, was the opportunity to meet colleagues from other towns and settings within the school system to discuss our common concerns and goals of the process called education.* [SA journal, mar, 1990]

In preparation for the development of our teacher education program, we turned to a consideration of how student teachers could enter into the rich and complex environment we had described.

Emily: *We were wondering what the students would be doing during their observations. There should be some guidelines for them to follow while they observe.*

Cood: *Yes, we will together provide some of those structures as we develop the program. Hopefully, one of the goals next time we are together will be to create instruments that will help the students focus and observe certain areas in the classroom.*

Emily: *In the same vein, people in our group expressed in different ways wanting to have some sort of say as to what the student teachers would be required to do in addition to teaching. I have a strong feeling that in times past student teachers have been asked to do too much, unrelated. And then you are dealing with somebody who is just too tired to do a good job no matter how wonderful they are.*

Cood: *It sounds like you are cautioning, you have a concern that maybe their assignments could take them off track?*

Emily: *I would like to have some say if possible as to the sort of things that are appropriate for a student teacher to be doing—are they relevant or a hoop?*

Cood: *Yes, we are doing this together, making decisions about the shape of the program, about what students do in the classroom and on campus, together, with faculty associates and school associates so we see there is relevance and coherence.*

Mike: *What prompted that concern was remembering being a student teacher. It was our first Friday back on site after four days in the classrooms, bouncing in through the doors, turning cartwheels saying guess what happened! Everybody was really excited. And the expectation was we were going to sit down and create a lesson plan and everybody was just bursting with news—No, no now is not the time for that you have a lesson to plan. And we were saying no no listen to me this is what happened.*

Cood: *So in constructing this program you would make sure to put in time for the students to do what Case was just saying teachers ought to do—take time to reflect on their work?*

Emily: *Yes, it was really like the faculty associates were doing their thing. They had a lesson planned and they were just like dogs worrying a bone. This is what you are going to do.*

Cood: *It is interesting to me, listening now, to make the connection to what we were talking about yesterday...about learning, about how it takes place as a result of tying present knowledge to past experience.*

Our meaning-making was influenced by participants' past experience—as student teacher or school associate. Perceptions of these roles evoked strong memories. It signalled to me the importance of this collaborative venture. If we do not negotiate among all the participants what is "appropriate" for the student teachers, we end up with what Habermas

refers to as pseudo-consensus, the result of distorted communication—thinking we have agreement, but not knowing how each participant translates, from within their own "reality" what teacher education looks like and what needs to be changed. (In the end, we determined that the student teachers needed to be part of these negotiations as well.).

As participants spoke to their past experience, the opportunity was present to suggest some of the conceptual frameworks that were emerging: *"...so in constructing the program you would make sure to put in time for the student...to reflect...?" "It is interesting...to make the connection...to what we were talking about yesterday, about learning..."* It is an example of the integrating of different kinds of knowledge, of different kinds of educational work contributing to the whole—of conceptual frames being offered as mirrors to examine situated events.

The discussion continued. School associates had been affected to varying degrees by the changes taking place in public education in the province. Being in the midst of change themselves, they were uncertain about the introduction of these changes to student teachers.

SA: *What new directions in the curriculum area are you looking for your teachers to develop?*

Cood: *I'm not sure if I understand the question. Are you wondering what the student teachers come with in terms of understanding the programs and necessary tools and what is your role?*

SA: *Well we are in a time of change. We are all in a different area of change. Now you are training your teachers to go into the "Year 2000"* [provincial document outlining the change]. *How can we facilitate that?*

Cood: *That is a critical question. I think we are all going through this change and people in the university are muddling through making meaning out of it at the same time as teachers in the classroom. So perhaps we as a group might discuss what the key fundamentals are that we need to focus on.*

Why wouldn't I or the faculty associates step in at this juncture and offer our perspectives on this question (one of my doctoral committee members asked upon reading a draft of this chapter)? To do so at this point would have been detrimental to the collaborative project as I envision it. We had had no discussion within the group on the subject of curriculum changes taking place in the province at that time. For anyone to begin this important discussion before we all had the opportunity to gather and articulate our thoughts, would have been to pre-empt and, therefore, to silence some voices. In this first session we

needed to build trust that all voices would be heard, as well as identify the important issues that needed attention. In this way the collaborative effort was reinforced. The decisions would be made within the group as we deepened our understanding of education by way of paying attention to the individual and unique contributions of participants to the public dialogue. We were still establishing first level constructs.

There were a number of references to the manner in which school-based teachers' voices had been silenced in both teacher education and other professional situations in the past. These were clearly documented in school associate journals.

> *SA:* *When I had a student teacher under the "traditional" model, I was told exactly what she had to do, how much and how often. I gained little from the experience and suffered the stress of making a judgement on a person without the benefit of discussion or collegiality. In retrospect I find this quite amazing! In contrast, in this program I have been asked to take on more responsibility and in so doing have become committed to my student teacher's success and hence the success of the program.* [SA journal, nov, 1989]

> *SA:* *The past tradition of university reps doing the evaluating has left me feeling quite redundant. The student teacher had been with me six weeks and my evaluation was lightly considered.* [SA journal, dec, 1990]

> *SA:* *Being with other teachers this way, this "interactive professionalism" is the exception rather than the rule in public education. The rule is the "passive professional." Internal politics and change within the system drive teachers behind their doors. Many don't want to cope with change, feel inadequate or afraid and operate on survival mode.* [SA journal, dec, 1990]

> *SA:* *It is a rare occurrence for teachers to have the opportunity to share their knowledge.* [SA journal, mar, 1990]

Reference to our collaborative effort as helping to overcome the feeling of isolation was made again and again.

As a last exercise, we went back into small groups to pull together the activities of the last two days. In these cross grade/district/institution groups we focussed on the importance to our work and to teacher education of the following concepts: communicating across the curriculum; articulating our individual practice; modelling the development of the reflective practitioner; teaching as inquiry. Each group focussed on one of the concepts. The quotes below were among those made when the small groups "reported back" to provide the closing remarks for this first session.

> *SA:* *The whole session developed trust, sincerity, openness and therefore, was conducive to communication. Out of it we could see that we were all student teachers, that no one knew it*

all. We were all learning.... There was tremendous respect for what other people brought....We came to realize that even though we were from other districts, from different grades, there were many similarities as well as common threads and themes and purposes. We could celebrate the differences. We do have different ideas, and we have common goals. We could say we all grew from the exchange.

SA: *We also raised the question what is the future of teacher education in terms of ridding it of its many islands? We have many islands in our profession. This communication is perhaps the best way to get rid of the boundaries, to get rid of the water surrounding a few pieces of land.*

SA: *I think too often as teachers we just look at our practice in isolation. Why not join together as groups or zones, talk about how we are going to implement the changes taking place in education. Why not get three or four schools together and talk about how you are going to do it.*

What made this interactive professionalism possible? Two reasons stand out in terms of the first session. One was time, "*time to really sit and reflect about what we are about and, what is even more unusual, why we are about it.*" And the other was an attitude of reciprocity: we all had knowledge to contribute.

SA: *It is this feeling generated that you are important which is greatly responsible for the success of this program.* [SA journal, nov, 1990]

SA *This program has made a great step in bringing the university and the school district together. By providing training for sponsor teachers and including them in the design of the program, they are providing mutual ownership and ensuring success of the program.*

With a strong foundation from the university and continued communication between the university and the district, the student teachers should be able to find an education community sharing a philosophy based on more than the status quo. [SA journal, mar, 1991]

Time, trust, a sharing of power, these were all important ingredients. Important as well was the recognition that the enterprise we were engaged in required the contribution of teachers from kindergarten through university.

But while this supportive and encouraging dialogue was pervasive, it did not represent all we had to say about education or its institutions. At the beginning of this chapter I noted two general conditions that characterize a collaborative environment. These are the time to reflect on choices made, and the number and quality of perspectives available. Although in relative terms we were experiencing a luxury of reflective time, perspectives were limited. Not unexpectedly, we did not begin with an examination of weaknesses of the education system nor of our practices within it. Some comments could be said to work against the generation of such perspectives.

> *SA: I think everybody here—it is so nice because everybody is positive about their experience in their classrooms, they are raving about their kids.* [transcript, oct, 1990]

Such a comment denies the tensions and conflicts inherent in the daily activity of teaching and gives the message that "successful" teachers are not critical. And yet, the solution is not as simple as replying to this comment, *"Yes but is that realistic? Is it our job to make kids happy? Are 'wonderful' kids necessarily 'learning' kids?"* What has been expressed here, I would suggest, is a need on the part of the speaker for safety. And I respect this, and look elsewhere for the opening that will enable those questions to be put out in front of us all. And, in her own time, this speaker appears to have found the confidence to move beyond "safe" comment. In contrast to her above quote taken from our first taped group discussion, are two of her journal entries, one from the second and one from the last session.

> *At our second session I had a feeling of closeness and openness towards my colleagues. We had discussed many topics frankly and with feeling and we had built up a trust. I felt I was in a situation where I would stretch, grow and question during the next two days.* [SA journal,nov,1990]

> *I realized there are individuals with differing opinions who can enhance and expand my own development. It has made me more accepting and flexible of thoughts and techniques that may be different from my own.* [SA journal, mar,1991]

I have set up these series of participant statements to make a point about collaboration. I cannot begin to imagine the entry points for individuals when they are encouraged in a group situation to articulate that which they have been doing in relative isolation most of their professional life. We need to begin with the positive, with the successes, if participants are to feel (as well as to know) they have anything worth contributing. There is a substantial amount of talk in these transcripts that begins with expressions of feeling or sensing or intuiting. Understandings about what is worthwhile in education are often embedded in those statements. To begin to look critically at what they represent in substantive terms requires trust in the group and confidence in oneself. The collaborative dance is slow and intricate.

Tensions arising in this first session emphasize its intricacy. A school associate remarked, "*We realize we may be uncomfortable in discussing teaching practices where you [the university] may disagree.*" Implicit in this comment was the expectation that judgement on right and wrong practice would be forthcoming from "the university." Traditional views of the

distance between schools and universities continued to influence perspectives about the daily work each of us did. Were there implicit in these views judgements about the "worthwhileness" of the different knowledge we held? I was not sure.

> *SA:* *We are doing things in our classroom but we haven't put a label on them—like critical thinking—and maybe we should try to inquire into this and maybe put a label so that when a student teacher comes in, we can explain that this is an example of...*

I do not imply here that teachers based in schools were awaiting judgements or conceptual frameworks, that they were wanting to "give over" power to the university. I don't think that can be assumed. But at this site where teachers based in universities and in schools were attempting collaborative work, traditional relationships and perspectives continued to influence our dialogue.

If we were to move beyond the current organization of institutional power, if our dialogues were to be truly reflective of a collaborative relationship, perhaps instead of: *"We may be uncomfortable discussing practices..."* we might have managed to state: *"We recognize that there will be times when something a student teacher has learned on campus may differ from something being addressed in the school. What are some ways we can help student teachers sort through the diversity and benefit by it?"* Instead of, *"...maybe we should put a label on things we are doing...," ;* we might have managed: *"Many of the things we do in schools have labels put on them that we don't use (or don't find helpful?) in our daily work. What is important here for student teachers to understand? Are these labels helpful or do they mask the complexity of what is being done?"* To undertake a discussion of these questions requires many kinds of knowledge. Such questions encourage participatory and, ultimately, emancipatory dialogue. The language signals a new relationship where participants suspend judgement and consider a range of perspectives in determining courses of action. These were the kinds of conversations I was trying to support.

My journal writing at this time, during the planning sessions, indicates my own state of awareness of and struggle with this issue of equity.

> *Cood:* *Throughout the sessions I encourage us to identify doubts, hesitations, tensions which arise in the course of our examination of the everyday world of work—and in our recounting of that*

work—as a way of paying attention to what we think is worthwhile. I share examples of my own—I even, very hesitantly, question some statements of others to clarify their and my understanding. I do so consciously, to model reflection-in-action. I am aware by my own hesitancy that I feel "powerful" in that my being "from the university" at least at the beginning precludes others from "talking back." Or is that a self-fulfilling prophecy? I work hard at establishing commonalities in language, in recollections of being a teacher, in finding common purposes as teacher educators, at the same time celebrating what each of us brings that is unique. I orchestrate, facilitate, sit in groups, share stories, and question. I view myself as passionate about my work and confident that we can make meaning together—I know the only way to build coherent, congruent, and, by implication, worthwhile teacher education programs, is by way of our combined knowledge. The focus is on exploring practice through opportunities to recount personal practice.

There has been a range of responses to my initial invitation to be collaborators, from excitement to skepticism to criticism. I find myself more likely to engage "encouragers" in group discussion. [journal entry, nov, 1990]

The contradictions inherent in this work continue to reveal themselves. I read again the words I wrote as I struggled to live out collaboration. I am trying to establish common language, purpose, meaning even as I write about the importance of critique and the resultant tension in determining what is worthwhile. (I am beginning to view collaboration as a dance, a line dance—people come together, awkwardly at first. As they dance they begin to get a sense of one another, then they move apart and move on. When they come back together, further down the line, it is easier, but the tension of moving together exhausts and dancers leave the dance, to reacquaint with their own measure. But that too has changed. And the music beckons...)

The Planning Semester—November

The homework assignment between the first and second sessions was to describe an incident of educational decision-making in which the making of the decision had evoked feelings of tension or conflict. Participants were asked to pay particular attention to what appeared to be causes of the conflict.

At the end of the first session I had given my own written case study to the group as an example. I had described the conflict I had felt around an original decision to have students in an undergraduate course evaluate a particular assignment. I had written that I had changed the evaluation procedure in mid-sentence, even as I introduced the assignment to my students. The group read my description and facilitated, through questioning, my reflection upon what I

believed, valued, and understood about teaching and learning that had led me to change my mind. The questioning had provided me with some new insight into my action. I had explained at that time, by way of rationale for the homework assignment, that as we examined our case studies with the help of colleagues, we would, as had I, understand more clearly what was important to us, what we paid attention to when we made decisions in our work. By identifying these main area or domains to which we paid attention, we would provide for ourselves a framework within which to build our teacher education program. (I don't recall whether I spoke of the value of conflict or tension to signal "worthwhileness" or not—I certainly would now.)

It was with individual "case studies" that we began our second session together a month later. These accounts were explored first with a small group of colleagues. They supported and encouraged one another in an examination of the beliefs, values and assumptions that guided their individual decision-making. It was hard work. Upon reflection, the presented issue often uncovered a deeper purpose for the decision. This, in turn, would encourage further examination.

Developing the domains

After these small group discussions, I reminded us again of the reasons for the development of our program in this manner.

> *Cood:* *Those of you living your professional lives in classrooms with children and making the kinds of decisions you have discussed this morning on a daily basis—hundreds of them—are people who understand deeply what education is. You make those decisions based on what you value in education, what you think education means, what you envision as the outcomes you want children to exhibit.*
>
> *We talked in our first session together about the kinds of things that we all believe drive the educational enterprise—how our children would be when they graduated if we had been successful in our work. We talked about the unique ways that each of us translates those outcomes for children into our daily work. Now we have discussed the decisions we make around education on a day to day basis. We will use the outcomes of those discussions to look again at the unity of concerns that drive our educational decision making, that are most important to us all as influences on our work. And these will determine the domains—the main areas in education—that can be a framework for thinking about the education of new teachers.* [transcript, nov, 1990]

We began as a large group summarizing our case studies. As participants discussed their decisions, I wrote words and phrases on the board that I thought captured the main idea of their summaries, clustering the ideas as they seemed to suggest common domains. Below are five of the educational decision-making stories school associates related in summary to the large group.

Joe—intermediate teacher

SA: *I had a situation almost like others but also different. I dealt with the dignity of the child, with a child who had some break up in the family life. I had had a fairly good rapport for about two months, but then it started to go downhill very quickly. I have tried to put him on a homework book and bring the parents in and have them involved.*

How I have changed in some of my educational decisions and in behaviour decisions about the child is by talking to some of my colleagues right here. He still is working, but he doesn't want to be on task on exactly what I am teaching. Okay, let's say I am doing math, he wants to draw, if I am doing science, he may want to read something else. So what I expect of him is that he will do the work, and he will remain on task, but then at times if he really wants to draw, have him draw up something for a novel study he's doing, use that talent that he has but also keep him working in the classroom. Also there are certain things that he still even though he is angry, there are certain things he cannot do. He cannot hurt others, he cannot take away the dignity of other children. So basically what I am trying to do is work with him to keep a relationship with teacher and student that I am not the bad guy. I still respect him as a student and as a person, and help him start to get back on track.

Cood: *Thank you I know a lot of you have talked about this valuing the relationship between a teacher and a child. Perhaps underneath that there are some assumptions about what that enables the children to do. We believe that unless that kind of a relationship exists with a child that other things won't happen, so we invest a lot of time and energy in that.*

Linda—intermediate teacher

SA: *A lot of what others have said relates to me as well. I had to come to grips with the fact, accept my failure to teach a concept based on my time line. I have to have patience to continue it at the child's individual speed rather than in my tempo. To meet the needs of the child rather than, "this is mine, my goal, and this is the speed I like to teach at—this is what I expect of you children." And sometimes they are just not ready.*

Cood: *I was writing it here, thinking about it as respecting individual children, but it was also talking about instruction and how instruction has to meet the needs of so many different children. There are different developmental sequences, stages for children. You were talking about some content that you had to teach and how just simply teaching the content was unsuccessful that it needed to somehow recognize where different children were at.*

SA: *That's where I had to stop and quit with a certain group of children. I couldn't just keep on trying to force information, they just weren't ready. Like where the majority of the children had it, let those children go and carry on, accept the fact that these kids just don't have it yet, but hopefully, with extra work they might come around. So I had to accept some failure on my part and justify it with the parents.*

Cood: *Children learn at different rates. What do parents think?*

SA: *If you are honest with the parents and explain what you have done, where you are going, what your expectations were, how the child has not failed, but how the child was not ready. I think they understand the process too because the same thing, their baby may not have walked at 6 months. You can't set specific time lines for children. They are going to travel at their own rate, and if you explain that to parents they become your allies. You can provide extra work saying you guys want to try where I left off, fine, but in my professional opinion this child is not ready for it yet, but hopefully before the end of the year they will have this concept rooted, based on different methods of attacking the same problem*

FA: *Is there not a need to indicate that there is some sort of tension between curriculum expectations and that last point about the method being right? We have been drawing lines of tension between the individual child and the group in the classroom. I think there is also tension between the standards and expectations that we have, and that individual development or those individual rates of development.*

Cood: *So the tension between what curriculum tells us to teach and what in fact individual children need to learn? Curriculum must be adapted and it doesn't always lend itself to that.*

The complexities of practice began to be exposed: the diversity of children, the content to be taught, the role of the teacher, of the parent, of the child. *"I have decided to try to keep this student on track,"* said the school associate, *"by encouraging him to use that talent he has but also keep him working in the classroom"; "You can't set specific time lines for children,"* another school associate said. But what happens, then, to all the other relationships—the child's grade in school, curriculum content, the skills—that depend on the child knowing certain concepts at certain times? How do we decide what is most important? What do we teach if there are not specific time lines? How can parents understand how their child is doing? We raised those and other questions about teaching and learning, probing more deeply into what we knew and had experienced. In this manner we began to name the educational domains to which we paid attention: the child, the role of the teacher, the curriculum. We began to name the understandings that would guide our work within those domains: the child has a history that must be taken into account; the relationship between the teacher and the child is complex and tension-filled; curriculum content needs to fit the needs of the child.

John—high school teacher

SA: *My decision was based upon flexibility of instruction. I wanted one hundred percent understanding rate among my students for a particular concept. So I simply have to come up with a new way of teaching. After a try or two, different ways, I finally hit on something. I was trying to teach them what a phalanx was, in grade seven socials. This was a military formation used by ancient Greek warriors. I wanted them to get this idea—how difficult it was. I tried film strips and I tried discussions and I tried just me standing up and telling them what it was and I tried diagrams. Nothing worked. I gave them a quiz on it and they couldn't*

even remember what it was. So finally I thought I need something that they can remember, and I went down to the gym and I got myself some spears—hockey sticks—and I needed shields so I went and got us some snow shoes. Out on to the field in PE groups, groups of two march, groups of 4 march, groups of 8, everybody together, right until the period ends. We keep right on going through the afternoon. Finally we get everybody. A couple of times somebody trips and they all go down like ninepins. So finally we got it all together and we marched across the football field, out to the other side of the school yard, down the road, around the block. And they didn't want to stop !!!! Round we go and back into the building. Quiz the next day. Everybody knows what it is.

[John was a good story teller and had us all laughing by the time he finished. The "phalanx" became a rallying point when we were overwhelmed by the ambiguity of collaborative work.]

Cood: *What's the underlying idea?*

SA: *Hands on.*

SA: *Concrete experience.*

SA: *There are different ways that children need to hear and experience.*

FA: *Isn't there also an underlying assumption that everyone could learn?*

Sue—intermediate teacher

SA: *Mine has to do with evaluation and accountability. Our report cards demand letter grades as well as how is the child doing—grade standing in relation to others. When I test I usually test in smaller chunks so the child gets high marks.*

Anyway, I went to all the trouble, doing the tests and marks and putting them on the "marks manager" to show to the parents. I usually staple all these printouts on the report cards. I decided this year I am not going to do that. Our school has always been one that the student gets the 85.6 even though 86 is an 'A' and you have to give a 'B'—and the father comes in and says you have to account for this, why not an 'A"? I would rather be safe than sorry.

Anyway this year I didn't do it. I decided to scrap it all and I didn't have one person ask.

Cood: *And you scrapped it because evaluation is for what purpose?*

SA: *I would rather it was more how the child is doing against himself or herself. I can say to the parent whether he's low or high or whatever.*

Cood: *How well they are doing ...*

SA: *How well they are doing against themselves—that's my underlying value.*

Cood: *So evaluation is for a child.*

SA: *It is self-reference.*

Ron—intermediate teacher

SA: *Mine is mostly about the individual child, and the needs of that child—but in relationship to the classroom.*

Cood: *Again that tension of what the child needs and the respect for the group. Can you say what you value in making that decision? What was most important in terms of the decision?*

SA: *I am still deciding. It has to do with, it is between setting standards and being fair and being firm. Sometimes it is a time to be firm.*

Cood: *Can you explain why?*

SA: *In this case it was a team and it was a commitment, and we can't make an exception and this is the way it is and you have to have your consent form in like everybody else and it is firm. It is really hard to make that decision.*

Cood: *Given that it is hard. We all experience that in a lot of ways as teachers and parents—what is it that we believe, that underlies that, that makes us able to make those hard decisions?*

SA: *I felt that in this particular case that we were trying to teach responsibility and that each of us, he owns the responsibility and we have to teach them that they have some ownership of consequences. That was a really hard one because we didn't get to play.*

School associates dilemmas were resolved repeatedly in favour of the child, often in conflict with the expectations of parents, principals and curriculum: "*I test in small chunks so the children get high marks.*" Their stories described resilience and tenacity in reaching toward the clear purpose of providing for children the experience of success: "*I couldn't keep on trying to force information that they just weren't ready for.*" Children, they theorized, must experience success or learning will not take place: "*I simply had to come up with a new way of teaching.*" There was no disagreement on this point, although, as the transcripts above illustrate, success was defined in a variety of ways. Further, school-based teachers put the responsibility for providing the environment for children's success squarely upon their own shoulders. So they found ways around obstacles that interfered with what they deemed important. Here was the situated knowledge of practice that would inform the understandings about teaching and learning that student teachers needed to acquire.

As the stories were recounted, I wrote on the board key words or phrases, clustering those that were similar in emphasis. To illustrate this exercise, I am putting down here the type of phrase I would put on the board, using the stories that have been recounted above. These are not all the phrases or words I would have written because I would have been responding to each story as it was told. In Figure 3 I have put the names of the story tellers after the phrase so the reader can connect them to the particular stories.

Figure 3. The Story Tellers

social/emotional development of the child (Joe, Ron, Sue);

evaluation is for self reference (Linda, Sue);

individual child history (Joe, Sue, Linda);

teacher-student relationships: teacher as counsellor/ as parent (Joe, Linda, Ron);

teaching and learning styles, curriculum as content,
curriculum as what the child is ready for (Joe, John, Linda).

The first time I clustered the ideas that arose as we spoke it was "genuinely" an evolving picture of the domains driving educational decision-making as represented by those group members. After that, although I tried to resist it, prior expectation influenced my clustering: I would be "looking for" certain patterns rather than providing room for the new possibilities that I speak of elsewhere as being a desirable outcome of collaboration. A more intimate involvement of all participants in determining the clustering could help overcome this effect. It is obvious that I am controlling the direction of discussion to some extent. As I examine the transcript it appears, again, that presuppositions about where the discussion would go, encouraged me to "lead the way." It was not my conscious intention. Although there are a good number of examples of my line of questioning being challenged/corrected in my transcripts, it is desirable to find ways to have a framework be more clearly the work of all participants. That would overcome, at least partially, the unavoidably narrow and prejudiced view of any single participant. Finally, I realized as I listened again to the tapes of our discussions, that other understandings I didn't focus on were available within the narratives. I don't believe this matters in terms of building the framework for the program. The purpose of our case study exercise was to ensure that the framework was "ours," was rooted in our experience On the other hand, it matters in terms of individuals having the opportunity to deepen their understanding of their own practice.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the stories of educational decision-making that were related, and the educational significance of those decisions as related by the story teller, led to the identification of five predominant areas or domains that appeared to be consistently at the centre of our educational decision-making. These are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4. Five Domains of Education

** the STUDENT—the physical, social, emotional, moral, intellectual dimensions of the child.

** the EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT—the creation of environments where students can trust, take risks, and develop responsibility.

** the CURRICULUM—the processes, skills, content; the lesson; strategies to engage students.

** the ROLE OF THE TEACHER—facilitator, guide, mentor, expert, friend, explorer.

** EVALUATION—the recognition and development of "tools" to promote student growth and self-concept.

Developing the Understandings Within Each Domain

Having erected a conceptual framework for talking about teaching and learning, we needed now to determine the important understandings within each of the domains. We divided into five domain groups, each person choosing a domain that was of particular interest, with the restriction that each group be comprised of teachers from different grades and districts and, as possible, institutions. Each group was to address the following questions: what should a student teacher understand, what should a student teacher observe and what should a student teacher do within that domain to indicate a potential for teaching and a readiness to go on to the next semester. In other words, what was important for a beginning student teacher to demonstrate in the first practicum semester? The emphasis was on the first question of

understanding. The second and third questions were largely completed by the faculty associates after the planning sessions with school associates were over.

> *Cood:* *We begin now to build a curriculum that encourages student teachers to explore the domains, to begin to ask big questions—what is evaluation for? how do you begin to understand the different needs of children? how do you arrange good learning environments? what does being successful mean? They may seem to be very big questions, but if the students don't ask these questions, they won't develop the decision-making tools to resolve the dilemmas of practice such as those you have so eloquently illustrated today.* [transcript, nov, 1990]

By naming the understandings within each domain we developed guidelines for the day to day activity for the semester; the seminars on campus with faculty associates (who had worked alongside the school associates throughout the sessions), and the classroom experiences with the school associates.

We worked in these small groups all afternoon. The next morning we came back to report our progress to the large group and get any additional input before agreeing that the understandings the group had come up with would be the domain guidelines for the first semester. The following is the report from the small group working on the "domain of the child":

> *SA:* *We felt the most important understanding was that children are unique. Everyone is different—and they are coming to us with a history—that there is a family behind this child and that can affect what is happening in the classroom. How a child is learning today may be different than how she functions tomorrow because something different is happening outside of the school.*
>
> *There is a wide range of children in the classroom. For instance, some children have had no exposure to reading before kindergarten, others are reading already and you have to accommodate all those—and how do you do it? It can be pretty scary for the student teacher but they have to understand that they must meet those diverse needs. And not only needs, but interests are different, and so learning has to be encouraged differently just through something interesting to each of them.*
>
> *We talked about different rates—someone might be more advanced academically but socially and emotionally they are at a different rate. Some move quickly through an area and others need more time and practice So you can't think if I do this, they will all know that—you have to realize some will and some won't after many tries and you have to deal with that.*
>
> *So part is respecting their backgrounds, how they learn, respect for them as people. And because of that respect, the need to maintain confidentiality.*

As we listened to these summaries there would sometimes be further discussion or clarification.

> *SA:* *Where we said we have ownership of our own learning—I was just thinking of the curriculum—the whole idea of the child's ownership—I am not sure where to fit it.*

Cood: *Does it come back to curriculum, that it should be structured to empower learners?*

SA: *That is what I am talking about.*

Cood: *So the understanding you would like to add?*

SA: *That students have ownership of their own learning.*

Cood: *Meaning that we structure for them to inquire into things that interest them. Is that part?*

SA: *Also that they show us different ways of representing what they have learned—involving them in determining actual projects*

Statements such as those above provided me with a deeper understanding of what the sharing of power meant, of the possibilities of collaboration, as well as educating me to the collaborative nature of many elementary teachers' engagement in education.

In the end these understandings were listed as statements to guide our thinking about what student teachers should do all day. These statements represented what we, as a group, believed student teachers needed to address—through their actions, and through their reflection on their actions.

An example of the discussion around the "domain of evaluation" is presented below.

SA: *When I mark their books I use that as another way of teaching. I spend a lot of time marking. I make a comment and talk to them about it—hopefully building another lesson.*

Cood: *So evaluation is teaching.*

SA: *I think so—hopefully students look at the comments and learn from them.*

SA: *I agree—as we evaluate in different ways some of the evaluation is going to be ongoing, developmental, some is immediate, basic, right now.*

Cood: *Evaluation is ongoing. What is evaluation for in terms of the child? If we were saying why we evaluate in terms of the children what would be a statement we would want the student teachers to understand?*

SA: *To give the child feedback.*

Cood: *OK, it provides a way for the child to understand his or her own growth. And I think someone extended that—that feedback needs...*

SA: *...to be meaningful.*

Cood: *I felt you also said self-enhancing.*

SA: *Yes, I said sensitive. I think we need to be sensitive to the child's feelings. You want them to try again, you want to encourage and support their learning.*

SA: *The children's evaluation of what they do is just as valuable as the teachers'.*

This last statement was consistent with the statement made by this group on evaluation as it related to the student teacher:

SA: *The most important thing for student teachers to learn is how to self-evaluate.*

Cood: *Why is that so important?*

SA: *So they can show they know what is working, what is not, and can change what they are doing.*

Together we described what we believed student teachers should understand within each domain (Appendix F). It was a deep thinking about the decisions made in classrooms every day. Understandings often held tacitly were articulated and examined. *"I was able to think about ideas and values that I hadn't expressed very often and were sometimes difficult to articulate"* [SA journal, dec, 1990].

This was the work of our two day planning session in November. And when we had finished identifying the domains and the understandings that were to define them, it was time to go home. There was no time for me to witness any reflection on this work on the part of the school associates except through the journal entries of my school associate students. Their written comments described a deeper understanding of themselves both professionally and personally. I don't think this is surprising given the task. One journal piece, written after our planning session by a primary teacher who had recently returned to teaching after a long stretch at home with family, offered a particularly rich reflection on her meaning-making.

SA: *Being a school associate means finding time to give serious attention to my own work. Everyone needs opportunities for self renewal but those of us responsible for developing other human beings need them most of all. Thinking deeply about what we are doing leads to asking better questions, breaking out of unnecessary routines, making unexpected connections and experimenting with fresh ideas. We must consciously create spaces in which to think about the meaning and purpose of our work.*

Teachers' narratives refers to a teacher's own interpretations of the events that occur within their particular contexts in which professional decisions are made. Such narratives can be a powerful force in heightening teachers' awareness of their own professional reasoning.

By experimenting we judge the effectiveness of the response, sometimes we redefine the problem, collect and analyze new data and try another method. We build up a repertoire of examples, images, and understandings. Such a repertoire does not develop automatically from participating in the practicum, but requires the student teacher's active involvement to transform experience into understanding, principles and personal theories.

I am still changing and learning. I am accomplishing different kinds of things. I am clarifying my values and sorting out my beliefs. I am trying to define what it means to live a

worthwhile life and how I should be with others. This personal search has professional ramifications. My values and my aspirations must come with me whether I enter a classroom or my home. It has meant a shift in my thinking. I am challenging myself to see, to hear, and to think and reflect. I am challenging myself to become a better teacher.
[SA journal, jan, 1991]

My own understanding was continually deepened throughout our discussions, as was that of faculty associates:

FA: The faculty associate job is totally enhanced by collaborating. It works! It is absolutely essential. It brings different perspectives together. We need continuously to be shaken up—for new learnings and possibilities—for the opportunity for new knowledge to be generated.
[transcript, nov, 1991]

We contributed jointly to a broadening of perspectives and an increase in depth of knowledge about teaching and learning. For instance, our framework emphasized not only the importance of addressing children in classrooms in a wholistic manner but consistently embraced a similar approach to working with student teachers. Not surprisingly, this consistency influenced the teacher education curriculum we built and represented a major contribution to our collaborative efforts.

The University Role

Comments by school associates offered a perspective on the role and responsibilities of the university-based teachers in these planning sessions.

SA: We talked about how difficult this was coming here, and really just thinking about what we do in our daily practice. It takes time to become a reflective practitioner. It is extremely high risk taking to have someone ask you what you are doing and why you did it. It was hard to articulate how we felt about our own practices, to tell other people why you were doing it. It was easy to do but hard to tell. But reflecting on your decisions and past practice makes you feel good about your teaching. And it is ongoing—we are not already there, it never ends. [transcript, oct, 1990]

SA: Thanks for the facilitating and probing questions to get us down to exactly what we were trying to say. Sometimes ideas are just forming as they are being spoken so might sound a bit hesitant (speaking for myself). [SA journal, dec, 1990]

SA: Your support and the feeling you have conveyed of appreciation for being school associates will aid me in this journey. [SA journal, 1990]

SA: Attitudes must change [regarding the contributions of school-based teachers to educational decision-making] *at the university level in particular. Your group has to be unique in not being burdened by the ivory tower syndrome.* [SA journal, jan, 1991]

The comments point to some success in overcoming traditional roles and relationships. They confirm a positive feeling about our work that was echoed by the majority of participants

during the planning semester. They speak as well to the distance still to be travelled to a place of equity in discourse between university-based and school-based teachers. I am struck by human fragility and the need, as was emphasized time and time again in our sessions, to build an environment where participants can feel successful. To publicly discuss our thoughts and actions is risky, exciting—and highly unusual. (Yet it is exactly what we will require of student teachers in the months ahead!) It is one of my recommendations that student teachers need to be more often included in these exploratory and potentially emancipatory dialogues. But I am being made aware as well of the risk of shutting down the dialogue among teacher educators prematurely. Some of our conversations would not have taken place if student teachers had been present. When is the time to bring other stakeholders into the critical discussion?

Our planning sessions had been worthwhile. But the evolution of the program was far from perfect. School associates left behind the understandings and recommendations for student teacher activity—we had built the framework and the "walls" together. School associates were not involved in the detailed planning of the program—most of this "furnishing" was done by the faculty associates.

The Practicum Semester—January

Faculty associates translated this collaboratively built framework into program activities and assignments. Although I tried to support faculty associates in both consortia as much as possible, the fact that I was responsible for two consortia and that my main base of operation was the main campus, meant faculty associates did the bulk of the programming without my direct involvement. Our main communication was by phone or electronic mail. Faculty associates made a concerted effort to be faithful to the framework established in the sessions together with the school associates.

FA: *At times I feel very supported through this collaboration, that we are not carrying all of this alone, that we are not expected to make all those decisions out of context and then have them fit someone else's context. I actually like this process but it doesn't make it easy. You are*

> *taking into account everyone's point of view. You feel accountable to all the school associates all the time.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

For a variety of reasons the translation of the framework we had developed together into day to day program activity did not seem to fit for some school associates.

The faculty associates introduced the program to the student teachers during their first week on campus in January. In the second practicum week the school associates and coordinator joined the faculty associates and student teachers for a two day session where school associates heard, for the first time, the details of the developed program. (I did not do any recording during this session because I had not sought permission from the student teachers to involve them in my research.) One school associate, evaluating this session later, gave it a low rating for collaborative effort.

> *SA: In January our session included the student teachers. Very little collaboration took place at this meeting. The school associates were given explanations about what the student teachers were required to do. This had already been developed without the collaboration of the school associates!* [SA journal, feb, 1991]

Faculty associates were surprised and defensive when this sentiment was voiced. It did not fit their perceptions of how the program had been developed. I felt frustrated by the geographic distance that separated us and reinforced intellectual and psychological isolation. The focus shifted in this semester from reflection on one's own practices to reflection and critique of the practicum in progress.

Over the month following the January session, student teachers moved through a variety of experiences including observations in different classrooms and grades as well as a two week period in their school associates' classrooms. The faculty associates visited all the classrooms and, along with school associates, observed student teachers in their first interactions with children.

The Practicum Semester—February

At the time of the session recorded below (our seventh of the eight days we had together), student teachers were back on campus again. Their major focus at that time was preparing a series of lessons to be taught during the four week immersion in their school

associates' classrooms that would begin the following week. School associates, faculty associates, and the coordinator had come together to discuss practicum perceptions and experiences, to reaffirm what would take place in the remaining six weeks, and to review ongoing supervision and evaluation methods. The student teachers did not join us in this session.

> *SA:* *It was wonderful to get together again with our "professional friends." We have opened up, sorted out, looked within ourselves, looked at what we do and how we think about certain things. And here we are again—each with new experiences having had a student teacher in our room for two weeks. I am not alone in feeling tired, stretched with questions that have a far away beginning and no ending.* [SA journal, feb, 1991]

As I reread the transcripts from that session, I note that our talk had changed. It was more confident, straightforward, less tentative. I do not mean by that we had become dogmatic, rather that there were feelings of individual power, of individual worth. (We had danced the collaborative dance before. If the rhythm changed, we could probably figure out the new steps.)

We talked of watching the first forays of the student teachers "trying on" the teacher role. I perceived my questions as being more critical and persistent. Participants indicated by their talk that there was an environment of trust and of collegiality: we could risk more. The frequent laughter as stories were told was wonderfully empathic. We appeared to be evolving as a community of learners sharing some common values, beliefs, and purposes.

We reviewed the domains. This time we gathered in primary, intermediate and high school groups, rather than our original cross grade and district domain groups. Now that we knew the student teachers, (the faculty associates and school associates had observed them in classroom interactions), we were able to focus on how the understandings would look in practice.

Reviewing the domains

> *Cood:* *What kinds of things will they have to be doing so we know those understandings are developing. How do we need to see them behaving in classrooms? What things do we need to begin to hear them question or think about, inquire into, that will enable us to have some confidence that they are ready to go on. We are looking for signposts that will enable us to make decisions, to assess the student's potential. This is the heart of the work we do, getting*

an understanding of the profile of what the student teacher should look like in the first practicum. [transcript, feb, 1991]

The following comments took place in our large group discussion that followed the domains review. We described student teacher activity in the practicum and the understandings that activity represented.

SA: *Student teachers need to demonstrate an understanding of the importance of routines, of the necessity of internalizing procedures and anticipating consequences. The example given was the school associate who always has kids put hands up and the student teacher decided she didn't want to bother with that and then half way through a lesson realized she wanted to change, the class was going out of control.*

Cood: *Okay, what is the understanding about our role that underlies that description. What is it you want them to understand about the teacher's role?*

SA: *Learning of management skills?*

Cood: *What about them though? What do student teachers need to understand about managing?*

SA: *They need to understand that it is part of the teacher's responsibility to create an environment in which the children can learn.*

Cood: *And that means that ?*

SA: *You have expectations.*

Cood: *A big responsibility that teachers must provide - but you are saying more than that—you are saying the learning environment is ...*

SA: *Wait a minute. This has gone off a little bit from where we were going. We are saying we want the student teacher to internalize all the little things—that we don't write down every step in every lesson in our day book—it becomes very automatic. They need to know—like saying to the class go get your text books and the entire class goes wingy. They need a routine, a way of managing different events in the classroom and those things have to be internalized by the students so they develop their own techniques for working through their lessons—not just that they are going to teach a math lesson but you know the hidden agenda in every lesson.*

SA: *It is teaching through managing and managing through teaching.*

Cood: *So a student teacher must understand that a learning environment requires certain structures, a certain framework.*

SA: *I think the word "comfort" works for me. They have to find a comfort level where the kids are comfortable, where they are comfortable and everyone that is associated—the parents, the admin—where an admin can walk into the room and see that it is functioning at a level where nobody feels threatened—there is rigorous, active learning going on.*

Cood: *So if there are clear expectations? No hidden agendas—therefore a comfortable classroom. Is that it? Are we moving away from what you were saying?*

SA: *I think that's right.*

SA: *In our group one of the SAs said her student teacher sat and watched for a lot of time at the beginning and thought, "well this looks okay," and then, when he went to do a lesson, he*

realized it wasn't so easy because he hadn't taken account of all those things that go around a lesson. He has this really nice lesson here but without all of this the lesson doesn't work.

Cood: And this is the framework that needs to be there?

SA: Yes, that's the framework and if you are not aware of this you may think you are all set with this nice little lesson and you go to do it but without all that it falls apart.

SA: I think that is partly rapport with the students. Student teachers are finding when you are teaching the students everything is "tickity -boo" but they get up there—and they don't—well they shouldn't have the same rapport [laughter- they better not!]—so they can't do the things you can do, so it is partly rapport with students.

SA: Judith, if a teacher has a picture of what they want a lesson to look like—or what they want a classroom to look like when they engage in some activity, then it is relatively easy afterwards to see how far your vision—what the actual picture was and you have got somewhere to start. But if you walk into it—with just the lesson and have no idea what it is going to look like ...

If you know you can articulate what it was supposed to look like—and why it didn't, and go from there.

I have included this lengthy passage to demonstrate the "sharper" talk—the more confident talk, where the work and the language and the context were familiar. A school associate felt comfortable challenging my questions: "*Wait a minute, this has gone off from where we were going.*" The successfully managed classroom was described: it included a "feel" to the classroom as much as a "look." To create such an environment required interpretive knowledge—"*...to articulate what it is supposed to look like, and why it doesn't,*" as well as predictive knowledge, "*and where to go from there.*"

We went through each of the domains in this manner translating the understandings into what we would see in terms of the development of the student teacher. [As I write this, I can't help thinking about how rich and stimulating an environment this would have been for the student teachers to have shared with us—a thought I will return to shortly.] A school associate writing later of this session stated:

> *The day helped me to focus on what has happened and what I need to think about over the next four weeks. Most [school associates] mentioned some growth themselves, either in reflecting on what they were doing or why or because of a discussion with their student teacher. Everyone, again and again, stated a feeling of being "part of a whole" and felt they had "bought into" the program.*
>
> *The negative comments were not about the process but about the timing of assignments and the time necessary to do a good thorough job. The frustrations seemed to be centered around time constraints, the clarity of direction and the responsibility the school associates were expected to shoulder.* [SA journal, feb, 1990]

Our reconvening was exciting, stimulating—and difficult. The demands of the teacher education role on the school associates were causing stress. There was the new experience of a never-ending dialogue with student teachers who "*are so intent, they dwell on my every word!*" In addition, there was a feeling among some that the promise of our collaborative effort was falling short. This became particularly apparent when we began to discuss student assignments. One of the school associates asked the faculty associate with whom she was working: "*How much do they have in the way of assignments in this four week time with us?*" I suspect, in retrospect, that the school associate already knew the answer, but wanted to make a point before the large group. It would be the expectation of the faculty associates that this information would have been discussed between student teacher and school associate. It was also laid out during the January session.

It may have been one school associate who initiated the dialogue below, but she was quickly joined by others with similar concerns.

SA: *They have their journals—and a child study.*

FA: *That is tied in to their work in your room. And they videotape one of their lessons if possible.*

SA: *That is an extra assignment.*

FA: *Yes, but tied into what we are doing together.*

SA: *When you add it up—the lessons, and the journals and the child study and mid-term—that is a lot of work.*

SA: *Besides all the planning!*

SA: *And depending on the different backgrounds they are coming from—they are all at such different levels.*

SA: *I would rather the student teacher was at the school for some of the planning for their unit. My children do some of the planning. I might say we are going to be working on this topic, what do you know? what do you want to know? And the student teacher should be there when the children are doing that rather than be on campus. Maybe there should be some options here. Whatever way the teacher is doing it. Whatever way is best for the two of them.*

SA: *Are you going to guide them in planning?*

FA: *We are building in flexibility because some of the new themes they are introducing in your classroom don't start till next week. So they are not starting right away. They will have something to bring to you but then they will work with you.*

FA : *And we were doing the same. They started out with you, they choose a topic with you and now they have been to the conference and have heard some more things about planning and some of them can incorporate those. We have said that the theme should come to us but we are not expecting it to be complete. Obviously, they need more time with you.*

FA: *I guess I need to have a sense before they go back to the school of what it is that comprises this sequence—where it will begin and how and what are the anticipated outcomes and why. And what I have asked for is the first lesson done in detail and a good sense of the second...*

We seemed in this exchange to have lost touch with one another—with our common purposes as teacher educators. There were clear statements that the school associates felt the need for more intimate involvement with student teachers' development at this stage. That the student teachers were "elsewhere" was antithetical to a central understanding of our program—to shape practice around the needs of the child.

SA: *I do not see how they are going to do that without time with us. I couldn't do it. If I was trying to plan a lesson for your classroom and show it to somebody else, I couldn't do it without spending time with you.*

SA: *There should be a week where they could drop into their own class and work in the classroom. Come as they need to see you.*

As the discussions continued it became evident that some of the important participants were missing. Here was the time that the student teachers could have joined our learning community.

SA: *When we are out couldn't they be out too? I mean why couldn't they be part of the session today? I know I feel I am out a lot already. I am reluctant to take more time when you guys are here anyways—and we are here—that maybe we could have done it that way. We could have talked about this together.*

I think the school associate was right. As the demands of the practicum semester crowded in, time together to continue the professional talk which had characterized our more collaboratively successful beginnings was rare. Perhaps if at this juncture the critical examination of practice could have included student teachers, it might have sustained our beginnings. In addition, and just as important, it would have provided student teachers with a model of collaborative meaning-making taking place among a group of future colleagues who represented a variety of institutional perspectives and different kinds of knowledge. For instance, they would have heard faculty associates talking about their need to "*...have a sense of how the student teacher conceptualizes the structure of lessons, how they would engage students, what the anticipated outcomes might be.*" They would hear school associates explain

that, "*...my children do some of the planning...*" And they would witness the coordinator asking, "*What are the understandings about teaching and learning that underlie...?*" Perhaps they could then more readily envision the necessity of integrating different kinds of knowledge and envision themselves as critical inquirers into what was worthwhile in education. If teacher educators from schools and universities are to continue such open inquiry into education, even as they facilitate student teachers' introduction to the enterprise, student teachers need to be invited into their learning community. There students could witness and "try on" the norms and behaviours required for reciprocal and emancipatory dialogue.

But the fact that the differing perspectives of the school associates and the faculty associates were spoken, and heard, signalled in itself a shift in the assumptions about the roles and responsibilities each of the participants should have. As one school associate said,"*Maybe there should be some options here. Whatever way the teacher is doing it. Whatever way is best for the two of them.*"; and another school associate, "*I do not see how they are going to do that without some time with us.*" There was no longer a clear hierarchy defining who and what was important. What became clear instead was the need for a procedure to ensure student teachers understood how to develop learning activities to benefit children. The determination of that procedure required input from all the teacher educators—ideally in a collaborative dialogue that included student teachers. There is a significant shift required here from a focus on the question of "Who knows," to the questions,"What do we need to understand," and "What can we all contribute to that understanding?"

The Role of the University-based Teacher

"*Collaboration,*" observed one of the school associates, "*forces people to assume different roles, to take risks that they would not ordinarily take.*"

The faculty associate role within this collaborative structure was not the same as that assumed by faculty associate colleagues at other sites. Although there are a number of collaborative undertakings with school associates as a result of their involvement in the

Professional Development Program, they are not traditionally involved in program development in the SFU program.

> *FA:* *When I look at faculty associates in other programs I see, if you like, their power to determine the direction it will take. I don't...they don't face any of this. They are not accountable to twenty-five school associates in the way that we feel accountable. I am jealous of the freedom and flexibility that I see.*
>
> *I actually like this process but it doesn't make it easy. I mean there are days when I say—I really don't know—I mean I have not got to the point where I couldn't subvert it and get in what I thought was important anyway!* [transcript, nov, 1991]

When envisioning the development of a teacher education program as a collaborative venture, I had not thought through the difficulties such a shift might cause for faculty associates. I wrote in my journal after the planning semester:

> *Cood:* *Interesting, and not considered thoroughly by me, is the impact* [of this collaborative structure] *on the faculty associates. They are constrained as well as informed by this collaborative effort. They are working hard to understand and clarify school associates' thought and determine how it fits into their job.*
>
> *Is it going to make their job more difficult? Certainly they are more judged, do not arrive as authorities from the university. It is going to be a different triad with the school associate looking to see how well the faculty associate does his/her job—a job that the school associate has helped shape.* [journal notes, dec, 1989]

The shift from traditional roles and relationships to being equal participants in a community of learners was challenging and uneven for us all. *"Collaboration,"* wrote a school associate, *"requires time and effort because activities are shared and not simply directed or told."* Faculty associates would agree:

> *There is no doubt in my mind about the value of collaboration. Yes, it is harder. It is incredibly demanding of time. You know I have collaborated with colleagues in a school to do particular things. You did them and they were over. It is the ongoing nature of the collaboration between faculty associates as well as with school associates that I don't think I was prepared for and did not anticipate.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

They were accountable not only for the concrete organization and carrying out of the campus portion of the program, but for the ongoing negotiation of its meaning throughout the semester with all the participants. This was particularly challenging to faculty associates in their first year with the program. As one first year person commented: *"...there are so many people needing you to be fully functioning and I didn't feel capable of that, still struggling to make sense of the framework of PDP and the consortium."* This collaborative effort was a vision I

had brought to our work—and although the faculty associates agreed with the concept of the collaborative effort, we were all struggling to envision it manifest. The same faculty associate commented further:

> *FA: Each time we worked with the school associates it was another step, but to me it was an unknown step. Until I have the framework, I can't be a full participant. I have to listen. I have to find out what is going on.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

I believe the struggle to develop a collaborative relationship was most difficult for the faculty associates. Exactly why this was so raises an interesting point that I will pursue in the following chapters. Most were recently out of school-based teaching themselves, many had been school associates. They had taken on a different role and other responsibilities to children and education by virtue of their affiliation with the university. They were to teach, supervise and evaluate student teachers. But so were the school associates. And school associates and faculty associates were developing the program together. What/where was the power of the university role? Some school associates felt it was shared power and we had assumed new roles: *"I believe your group has to be unique in not being burdened by the ivory tower syndrome."* Others felt the power to be oppressive: *"I will consider very strongly before taking on the role of school associate again if all my hours of conferencing and observing and evaluating are hardly considered. The faculty associate's assessment is what is written on the final paper."* The role for the university-based teachers was being redefined as we went along.

> *FA: Well, you do have a voice, but only to a point. You are only one of the players. And in the final analysis you are having to have responsibility without authority I guess would be a way to put it. But that is false too because in the end you control your own situation.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

> *Cood: And the decisions we make in teacher education need to include many communities—all the voices of people involved in education. If there are not different voices how do we come to grips with our own biases and prejudices? If that is not happening the full debate is not taking place.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

It required a different relationship, the giving over of some of the power and concomitant responsibility to school associates. [One of my doctoral committee members, upon reading the above in draft, commented, *"Anyone who gives power can take it away."]* She is right, of course, and the structures within which we worked meant that "giving over power" was an accurate description of our institutional relationship. Final responsibility for

the student teachers' program, and for the evaluation of the student teachers, was the university's. Perhaps because of this, when tensions arose, participants would move "back" into traditional roles and relationships. As one faculty associate remarked, *"I have not got to the point where I couldn't subvert it* [the collaborative effort] *and get in what I thought was important anyway"*...to which one of the other faculty associates had replied with a chuckle, *"Right on!"*

Of course the same remark could have been made by a school associate in some circumstances. But the method of subversion was different, and highlights the issue of power. The school associate, in the example above, brought her concerns before the group and built a coalition of like-minded school associates. Her power lay in numbers rather than in hierarchy.

And what of the coordinator role? How did I subvert the collaborative effort? I was attempting to create an environment in which participant contributions shaped program development and activity. The very fact that it was my creation caused constraints that I have attempted to recognize throughout the thesis, and that I have attempted to overcome in my work. Like the faculty associates, however, I went away to plan my activities. In my case I worked at the main campus when I was planning for our sessions together. (It was program policy that the coordinator be located at the main campus, primarily to maintain the link with the faculty of education.) I would subsequently work through the ideas for our sessions with the faculty associates, inviting critical comment and modification. The hierarchical nature of this approach was tempered as we built our understanding and confidence as a team, and as participants in a collaborative project. In short, as we began to understand collaboration more fully, we worked with greater equity. Our discussions about collaboration became richer and more challenging (see APPENDIX E) as our experience and understanding informed thought and action. It was these discussions that helped me understand some of the limitations of collaborative work, and the need to more fully honour the need for individual decision-making. I did not work with school associates in their schools and classrooms, and was limited in terms of understanding the outcomes of our collaborative work. I depended on the faculty associates

to help me understand how our initial work translated into teacher educator work in classrooms, and to subsequently identify areas we needed to address.

We approached a semblance of the full and reciprocal debate only on occasion. After all, one cannot debate everything. (The tension would build and we would all find times when we had to move out of the collaborative dance—to find ourselves. But we could not go back to the same places from whence we had come—or was it that from whence we had come did not look like the same place?)

There was another major stress that I find hard to measure in terms of its impact on our work. We lacked, in many cases, the necessary skills to engage in the negotiation of meaning. Besides the need for reflection time, for a safe environment, and for common language to express our thoughts, there was a need for the questioning and listening skills required of collaboration.

The Role of the School-based Teacher

Perhaps that lack of communication skills was part of the reason behind the frustration felt by some school associates:

> *SA:* *I need more concrete expectations of me—guidelines about your expectations.* [SA evaluation, mar, 1990]

> *SA:* *Our work together didn't really prepare me for what we were doing. I needed more closure to sum up our time together.* [SA journal, mar, 1991]

Also it was inevitable that there would be frustrations given the short period of time to understand, develop and implement a teacher education program. Lieberman (1986) states in her study of collaborative work, "Ambiguity and flexibility more aptly describe collaboration than rigidity and certainty." Knowing this did not necessarily make it any easier. For some, the time and effort necessary to consider a variety of perspectives and to arrive at agreement on courses of action that were, in the end, simply guidelines, was frustrating and sometimes led to confusion. From my perspective, whatever we needed to know to determine the activities that would be the expression of our program, was embedded in the process we were undertaking.

We were making explicit major understandings that student teachers should address and providing examples of those understandings in practice. The way in which the program played itself out would vary, just as our own practices varied. And our ongoing dialogues, taking place in two's and three's in formal settings and informal chats, would provide the perception checks and critique that would guard against either indefensible subjectivism or pseudo-consensus.

For the university to provide "concrete expectations" was to undermine the collaborative task and re-establish the hierarchical relationship that had left school associates in the past feeling redundant and isolated. As one of the faculty associates proclaimed even as she struggled with the everyday challenges of working collaboratively: "*Once we start talking of collaboration—and even hinting that by collaborating we will all come to be the same or think the same that is death to collaboration.*" We had to take some responsibility for constructing meaning by ourselves, as well as with others. However, those facilitating this work needed to ensure there was ongoing time for reflection, both interactive and individual. There was never enough time.

For other participants the frustrations took a different form. It was not that the expectations weren't understood, but that they were overwhelming.

> *SA: The frustration wasn't with the program but with the feeling that there isn't enough time to reflect on the relationship between theory and the practice of teaching once back in the classroom setting with the student teacher.*

For some, the solution to this press of time was to re-establish the separate work of universities and schools.

> *SA: While we all need time and should be encouraged to reflect on our teaching practice, we don't have the opportunity to dwell strictly with the abstract. Perhaps that should remain the role and domain of the university side of the triad. The university—the faculty associates and the coordinator—should be concerned mostly with the theoretical while the school associates have to be more concerned with the practical. The student teacher would gain insight from both sides. The role of teachers in this collaborative process would be to give the student teacher the chance/opportunity to see the theory set into motion—the "how" side of the "why."*
>
> *I am very conscious of trying to ask questions of the student teacher that are open-ended, that try to find the underlying values and beliefs. But again I feel the need to be very practical as I am here to observe him on the practice of teaching.* [SA journal, mar, 1991]

Some of the frustration expressed here could be alleviated by including student teachers in some of the professional conversations of our collaborative group. However, the continued perception of a necessary (desirable?) split between theory and practice, as well as a further separation between practice and the values and beliefs that underlie practice, represent a challenge not so easily addressed. To separate the work of university-based and school-based teachers in this way would bring the collaborative process as I define it to a halt. It would destroy our teacher education community; the university-based teachers dealing in the "abstract" realm and the school-based teachers in the "practical" realm—and the moral/ethical realm not being dealt with explicitly at all.

As I have illustrated above, claims serving the interests of prediction and understanding were proffered throughout our time together as we described, defined, justified and questioned the work we did. Emancipatory claims were less frequent but were also part of the discourse. The understandings we determined to frame our teacher education program could have been formally described as predictive claims as defined in this thesis. Empirical evidence of what classroom teachers know, and the opportunity to revisit that evidence is inherent in the daily work of classroom teachers and leads to predictive claims. Why did we continue to view decontextualized knowledge as the province of research taking place in universities?

Predictive knowledge claims developed in the human sciences are always influenced by the subjectivities of those involved in their development. As defined in chapter three, these claims reside within a taken-for-granted context of commonly held beliefs and values. While predictive claims can contribute interesting and valuable ideas or conceptual frameworks that can provide a counterpoint to or support for interpretive claims, at some point this knowledge requires examination in the light of the taken-for-granted normative positions they represent. The next step, the critical work, is to go beyond an understanding of the normative position to a critique of the dominant ideology that supports it. This complex and ongoing discourse, that fosters the development of emancipatory knowledge, requires a collaborative effort between school-based and university-based teachers.

What counts in collaborative work is an ability to appreciate the interconnectedness of different kinds of knowledge and the different human interests that are served. In the light of that broader appreciation decisions can be made regarding the best course of action available. The discussions school associates had with student teachers, with faculty associates, with the coordinator, with colleagues, all, potentially, comprised those decision-making conversations. Our teacher education program and its continued evolution relied on those conversations. The richest of them included many voices and diverse ways of knowing. Our project expected school-based teachers to take themselves seriously as developers of knowledge.

To illustrate, I have recorded below the words of a school associate describing the tension of juggling the demands of the school associate role. I will then use that illustration to suggest the "bound together" nature of different kinds of knowledge informing the thoughts and action of that teacher educator.

> *SA: Time seems to be the constant concern with this system of educating teachers. Here I have this student teacher who is willing and eager to talk, discuss, analyze what a teacher is, does, etcetera, but her mere presence disrupts what I do in a classroom as I spend time talking to her rather than preparing a "model" lesson. I sometimes wonder what it is I am modelling here! It sure isn't well planned lessons and daybooks!* [SA journal, feb, 1990]

Why are "doing" and "talking about" in this case seen to be in conflict rather than complementary? Why does the student teacher need to go away so the lesson can be prepared? Surely "talking about" a lesson with the student teacher, would involve predictive claims arising from experience and from research, claims to understanding arising from values and beliefs about children and education, hopefully involve emancipatory knowledge that encourages questions about "given" structures and relationships between children and curriculum, etcetera. All these contribute to what a lesson "looks like." Creating the knowledge base that informs that lesson in that particular time and place and circumstance was precisely the holistic development of student teacher abilities and understandings that I envisioned as a desirable outcome of our collaborative efforts. (But it is not what we modelled when we separated the student teachers from our sessions.)

Of course having said that I recognized that there was only so much time and that student teacher questions had "*far away beginnings and no endings.*" But to separate the student teacher from the rich modelling of the school associate as her knowledge and experience are brought to bear on composing her teaching and learning relationship with children is a great loss. We cannot afford to lose touch with how we come to know.

The Practicum Semester—March

Our last session together, at the end of the practicum semester, was a celebration of all we had learned and accomplished. It was a chance to review and modify our teacher education program, and a forum to critique the planning sessions we had had in the fall. Although the inevitable tensions associated with redefining roles and relationships among university and school-based teachers resurfaced, they by no means dominated our final meeting. However, to continue the discussion begun above, I will examine those tensions first, and then demonstrate their potential for bringing about transformative understanding. I have chosen to focus again on an issue that had been identified from the beginning as a potential source of conflict between school-based and university-based teachers—student teacher assignments.

The large group discussion below followed a small group focus on recommendations for the program. Participants had been asked to address the questions: What were the positive aspects of the program and of our work together? What needed to change?

SA: *Are you planning on doing the same sort of thing next year—eight days with SAs?—or have we sort of developed something that might work for a couple of years?*

Cood: *Well it is my belief that we become the best teacher educators by having a deep understanding of our own practice and then working with others to understand our professional work together. So when others come in to this work they will reflect on their practice and will contribute and shape and plan. The way the program has meaning is by your being involved in the shaping. It is ongoing.*

For instance, one of the recommendations here, a change you recommend in its shape since we started together, has been to slow down, don't give the student teachers so much stimulation all the time. Give them more breathing space and time with us.

FA: *Excuse me, when you say time with 'us'?*

Cood: *With the school associate.*

FA: *So they don't like the balance of campus and classroom time?*

SA: *It is more free time we are recommending.*

SA: *The students need more bridge time.*

FA: *Could I ask, was it just after the conference and getting ready for the series of lessons that you felt this or were there other times that you would like to have seen bridging as well?*

SA: *They seemed to be under a great deal of stress. It was just balancing the overwhelming stage.*

FA: *Is this a general feeling I mean I am seeing heads that shake and heads that nod. Is this a general perception or is it one perception.*

SA: *I don't think my student teacher was under stress — but he was in a small class and good kids.*

SA: *I think it depends on the individual. Some have families ... that added stress.*

Cood: *You know, as well—we provide planning time, reflection time, bridging time—what do we give up? Exhausting as the conference was, [student teachers had attended a week-long academic conference] it was so rich and nowhere in their PDP year will that chance come again. There is so little time in one year.*

SA: *That is why I think it a good idea that some of that time to work with our student teacher—rather than us going through the process of reinventing the wheel and naming the domains. Although that is important, yes, but we could have spent more time with the student teacher.*

I would like to examine this excerpt in detail. In it are examples of the tensions and interpretations that appeared and resolved themselves and reappeared again as we did our collaborative dance. We listened, struggled, contributed. Our work, in many instances remained separate, our perspectives not understood—*" ...have we sort of developed something that might work for a couple of years?"* I thought I had consistently talked about the program being shaped by our collaborative effort and uniquely the result of that effort taking place with particular individuals in a particular time and place. How then could anyone think we had "arrived?" To be honest, this was not a perspective I felt like entertaining! I wanted to assert, "*Knowledge arises from and serves human interest. It requires persistent examination. Even as we determine how we will proceed, we need to begin the process of critically examining that decision."* The question above suggests a perspective that would view our work as "done": to go through the planning again would be redundant. I remember the tension I felt as I challenged myself to describe my perspective.

> *Well, part of my belief is that you become the best teacher educators by understanding your own practice. That to me is fundamental. The only way I feel I become more skilled in this work is by deeper understanding of my own beliefs about my work in education. The way the*

> *program has meaning is by your being involved in the shaping. It is ongoing. For instance, one of the recommendations here, a change you recommend in its shape since we started together, has been to move back, don't give the student teachers so much stimulation all the time. Give them more breathing space and time with us.* [transcript, mar, 1991]

I don't know how my words were received. The faculty associate, feeling criticized, asked, *"So they don't like the balance of campus and classroom time?"* Tensions between school associates and faculty associates regarding the value of different types of work for the student teachers was an ongoing theme. Some of these tensions were exacerbated by personalities and by lack of skills to communicate the necessary understanding and negotiate a course of action. *"They* [the student teachers] *seemed to be under a great deal of stress,"* remarked a school associate to the large group. Communication between this school associate and the faculty associate with whom she worked was at a standstill. More than once this was the route she took, to put her grievance before the group to find support and alternate ways of proceeding. In this case she had had significant support.

The determination of what was important for student teachers to pay attention to—given the framework we had built—was a contested area where issues of power and control were played out again and again. The assignments developed from the domains had been left to the faculty associates to determine. As I noted earlier, their decisions had not met the expectations of some school associates. The resultant tensions influenced our examination of processes as well as the programmatic decisions we had made.

"Although they [the domains] *were important, we could have spent more time with the student teachers,"* said one school associate. [*"How do you respond to this comment?"* asked one of my doctoral committee members. *"Is it legitimate?"*] I ponder the question. How do I sort through all of my/our/their experiences to provide a context for this? I recall the excitement and feelings of personal power and worthwhileness expressed throughout our planning semester. The salient issue here I think was, again, the feeling expressed by some school associates that they were not as involved in decision-making about what was important student teacher activity as they would have liked. So the important question becomes one of time allocation. How do you apportion limited time to two important activities: the

development of understanding of self within the teaching profession, and the passing on of that understanding to the student teacher. The pressure is most acute in terms of the immediate demands of the latter. And the suggestion is that time for the former be sacrificed. The obvious link between the two activities is not made.

An end-of-semester summary, developed by all the school associates, and spoken to by one of their members, provides some perspective on how, in the end, they viewed the experience.

> *SA:* *What has this journey meant for the school associate? Well, TIME!!—time out of class, with student teachers, in conferencing and so on—a lot of time.*
>
> *It has meant meeting with other teachers from other grades and districts which has been a really neat experience, to be able to sit down and talk to other people—to have that opportunity to talk to people from other areas.*
>
> *It has been mentally and physically draining. The word "stress" came up from several different people. Hard on us in many ways. It's been stressful.*
>
> *It has been a chance to observe our own classes. We have had time and opportunity to sit back and watch the children.*
>
> *It has meant using reflective practices, thinking about what we've been doing, making alterations and changes too.*
>
> *It's been a risk-taking experience. It is always a risk when you invite someone into your room to try out things and take over so there's a risk.*
>
> *It has been a chance to share experiences with the next generation of teachers. We are helping mould the next generation of teachers coming into the system.*
>
> *It has been a chance to acknowledge our assets. We really do do a good job of some of these things. It has been a chance to recognize some of our limitations as well. I am not as good at doing that as someone else—maybe I need to work on this skill a little more.*
>
> *It has been a chance to think about the complexity of the job as well. Students are realizing that—sometimes you forget how many things you do in a day and when you stop to think about them—when you have to teach somebody else about them and you have to stop and think about all the things that go together to make up a whole day.*
>
> *It has been a chance to think about our philosophy, and how our philosophy must be consistent with the students, and with the student teacher. If you are working in a "learner directed" way, you need to be learner-directed with your student teacher, and learner-directed with your students, and learner-directed yourself if you are working with another group.*
>
> *Flexibility, we have had to learn to be flexible in our classrooms, be ready to change. And. well, it has been a very demanding job for us.*

This summary describes the central tensions between time for self—to talk to colleagues, observe the children, reflect on philosophy and its expression in action—and time

for the student teacher—to conference, to supervise, to plan. It was a very demanding extra job requiring great flexibility. Of course there is never enough time. But the solution in terms of work and time in this program was not obvious (to me). *"The best part of the program was time spent with colleagues"; "We need more time with the students."* Both sentiments were strongly voiced. The future challenge, as I see it, is collaboratively to determine what we need to know to do the best job as teacher educators.

It was my assumption that the best job necessarily involved providing transformative opportunities within our collaborative framework. Inquiring together into our knowledge and experience with the express purpose of creating a program to educate new teachers would provide enhanced opportunities for such transformative growth. Like one of the school associates who stated at our first session, *"The things I am hoping to pick up along the way aren't so much from the student teacher, as from the whole experience of being with other teachers now,"* I believed the important process was teachers inquiring together and as freely as possible into educational work. And what would give that inquiry impetus, I assumed, was the purpose of being educators of teachers. It was an emancipatory project that I envisioned influencing participants' sense of professional worth in a positive way beyond the immediate work of our teacher education community.

In February, 1992, I sent a letter to participants asking them, in effect, whether the work we had done together had, in the longer run, been worthwhile. (I sent out 54 letters and received 16 replies. All of them were positive.)

> SA: *I realized that I was a professional and that I can afford to believe in my own abilities while more openly accepting the abilities/expertise of others.*
>
> SA: (high school) *I became aware of more options available to me as a teacher and so experimented more with different strategies. I also focussed less on teaching curriculum and more on teaching kids.*
>
> *FA: I view education more globally, work with colleagues in a more holistic way. Work with colleagues—that too has changed. I am not content to work alone. I have many more questions—and fewer answers.*

This confidence was extended to include the work of colleagues:

> *SA: I am only one piece of the educational puzzle and need to link up with others—to form working groups that include a diversity of personalities and working assignments.*

That the children benefitted from this experience is not something we discussed very often. These reflective comments were made by school associates at the end of the practicum semester:

> *SA: The student teacher is gaining, I too am gaining and as a result I believe the students are or will be gaining. I have had to step back and ask myself why I do things, what I expect from students and how they should accomplish it. All this has to do with me but influences how I teach and what kind of person/teacher I am.* [SA journal, mar, 1990]

> SA: *The winners will be the kids in having better prepared teachers.* [SA journal, mar, 1991]

Throughout our discussion in that last session, recommendations were made that indicated a desire for greater integration of university-based and school-based work—often including the student teacher. More conferencing time with the triad was highly valued. There should be more integration of course work to include campus and field components:

> *SA: We were thinking about having methods courses that began before they began their first practicum and continued after they had finished that practicum. Their assignments could be geared towards things they were going to be teaching. There would be two purposes for their work, one for the course assignment and one for the actual teaching. Part of their mark would be the unit that they had to plan and the other part would be the doing it in the class. [transcript, mar, 1991]*

University course work needed to be integrated with classroom experience: it needed to take place during the practicum semester. The context was important and provided relevance.

Our discussions demonstrated the potential of collaboration. For instance, in the case described below, the collaborative effort enabled the re-negotiation of a procedure to determine student teacher assignments. In our naming of the domains we had consistently stated that practice, and the preparation for practice, began with an understanding of the needs of the child. No less was necessary, the school associates argued, in terms of meeting the needs of the student teacher: our expectations needed to be commensurate with their level of understanding and ability, as well as with the context in which they worked.

> *SA: There is a strong feeling that once the student teacher is in the classroom that they should just be allowed to be in the classroom and not have to do anything else. Or only course work that relates directly to the classroom. There is a lot of stress from expectations outside the classroom. For instance the video: for some it was useful, for others it was an horrendous stress. Maybe assignments need to be done more in consultation with the school associate—that it really is valuable, practical, useful, possible.*

The faculty associates, of course, had come up with the assignments in response to the collaborative framework we had built. They would have assumed the assignments would be viewed as valuable and appropriate.

Cood: *What if we agreed that there are certain understandings that need to be demonstrated in this semester. For instance, the video is produced so students can demonstrate, among other things, reflective analysis of their practice. We agree that is an important ability they must demonstrate. What are some other ways it could be done?*

FA: *That is like the evaluation domain, being responsive to the place that the student teacher is at. They are on a continuum—some are way ahead, others still struggling. That feels...like someone said we need to be consistent with our philosophies and principles all the way through. That feels like a good adjustment.*

SA: *We need to acknowledge that they are at different places and what I like about it is that you don't expect that they all will have reached point A by next week. You recognize that it is a growth for them and that to me is really important.*

Cood: *And you are helping us see that. Sometimes we think we are doing that but we are not doing it as well as we can.*

Student teacher assignments needed to be more responsive to the developmental stage of the individual student. We would come to agreement as a teacher education community about the understandings the student teacher needed to address, and leave to negotiation among the "triad" the appropriate assignment to demonstrate that understanding. In my mind it provided a model of successful collaborative work. It required that power be shared to construct a procedure for assessment of student teacher development. And in the constructing, in the process of negotiation, lay the power and the possibility of constructing new understanding and of broadening perspectives. (Our dancing was awkward. We stumbled and started apart, came back together. We're beginning to get it.)

Revisiting the domains

During our final session we—faculty associates, school associates and coordinator—revisited the educational domains as well as the concomitant understandings, observations and activities that had been developed under each domain. Fresh from the experience of intense weeks of work with student teachers, we revealed a new, or renewed, appreciation of the continuum of teacher development and of the need for continuous observation, reflection and self-evaluation.

As briefly illustrated on the grid that follows, recommended changes (described in the column, "UNDERSTANDINGS REVISITED") focussed on depth as opposed to breadth of experience. Figure 5 lays out initial and "revisited" understandings of the five educational domains:

Figure 5. Educational Domains Revisited

DOMAIN	UNDERSTANDING	UNDERSTANDING REVISITED
STUDENT	– need to address social, emotional and intellectual dimensions of the child	– more emphasis placed on the development over time of child as well as dimensions
EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT	– intentions with which we create environments where child can trust, take risks, develop responsibility	– strong recommendation for variety of guided observations to appreciate the variety of styles, arrangements, grade levels – in recognition of ST* developmental process, these observations were to be extended over time and tied to ST evaluation of their own growth
CURRICULUM	– processes, skills, strategies – the content: lesson, unit, theme	– coherence of education a primary understanding–developmental sequence of content and skills – emphasis on why we teach – focussed journal writing to demonstrate understanding
ROLE OF THE TEACHER	– facilitator, guide mentor, authority explorer, friend	– rehearsal for these roles through role-play and self-evaluation – teacher as professional, able to develop knowledge as well as recommend theoretical base for ST
EVALUATION	– to recognize & develop 'tools' to promote child growth & self concept	– second component added was ST self-evaluation over time, reflecting on developing understanding and demonstration in practice

*ST = Student Teacher

The emphasis was on the developmental nature of learning to teach—student teachers needed time to observe, plan, attempt, reflect, modify—to live in the middle of learning events and demonstrate increased ability to identify, assess and respond to them. It was a slower, more reflective pace, suggesting more allocation of time for student teachers to observe a variety of educational environments as eyes became "wiser." *"They need a place to just get their feet wet. This isn't the final practicum."* It was a more holistic view of education. In terms of the understandings we had drawn up in the beginning, it represented a shift. This shift, I believe, indicated a renewed understanding and valuing, on the part of all learners within our community, of the practitioner as an effective and intentional professional, at the heart of the child's learning.

SA: *Our celebration at the end of the semester was great. It is amazing how people who have only met on five separate occasions, come from different areas of education, have different ideas, values, beliefs, can feel so bonded (for lack of a better word). I am amazed by the strength of the bonds. This in itself has made it worthwhile. Many of the activities we cooperated on made me feel part of a vast group with similar goals and objectives regardless of the level within education we were dealing with.*

The gathering into small groups to re-define the domains was also quite a good experience. Our group found that the basic ideas had not changed but we had some experience to draw on which changed the specific outcomes. We actually felt we knew what we were talking about and for me it was the first time I felt that way. Even in our "sluggish minds" on the "day after" we were able to think and what is better to articulate what we knew to be meaningful experiences. [SA journal, apr, 1991]

But while there was an apparent agreement that all the participants shared and valued the insights we achieved, there was always ambivalence around our collaborative work. For instance, faculty associates agreed that everyone must experience an environment that facilitates equal opportunities to listen and to be heard and then added, *"...but the experience I have had as a faculty associate has made me more knowledgeable about what education is and what the practice of education should be."*

FA: *So your voice should be stronger?*

FA: *Uhmm, I think so. I think I would have to say that because...You know I wonder whether someone who has a Master's degree in some particular area might not have as strong a voice. I am not saying I would have the strongest, but stronger than some.*

Cood: *This is intriguing. It is what I am trying to understand. Decisions in teacher education need to include all the voices of people involved. If there are not different voices how do we*

recognize our own prejudices? Collaboration does not mean "giving in," it means coming to mutual understanding about what is important.

Does the holding of an academic degree confer precedence over experience? Does the experience of a faculty associate who has been in many classrooms and had many professional conversations with a variety of educators count more? Should faculty associate experience be given precedence over school associates' depth of experience in fewer settings (and fewer professional conversations)? Status and power were defined and redefined. The point of the collaborative enterprise—to increase our understanding and mutual ability to act—sometimes went missing. Although perhaps those who took part in this conversation might say I missed the point being made here that faculty associates felt they were being put in a position of having "*responsibility without authority.*"

Another interpretation might be that they had *responsibility without ownership.* By that I mean that there was not the degree of collaborative meaning-making and decision-making between faculty associates and coordinator that would have enabled faculty associates to move more comfortably into a role that was evolving as we worked together. We were attempting, simultaneously, to understand and to fulfill our roles. Meanwhile, we (and, I felt, primarily I) had responsibility to districts, teachers, budgets, student teachers, to ensure the extra time and money allocated for this effort was perceived by participants and by other stakeholders to be worthwhile. I had to come to understand how to reconcile my responsibility and authority with my collaborative goals. Faculty associates had to come to reconcile their responsibility for much of the daily work of the program while accommodating decisions that had been arrived at within the larger group, or by the coordinator, and which might not reflect their own inclinations. These tensions was not unlike those experienced by the school associates when the program framework they had developed with the faculty associates and coordinator was felt to be appropriated by the faculty associates who determined, without further consultation, the student teacher timetable.

These tensions bring to the fore an element in the social organization of the institutions involved that I do not deal with in this thesis, the influence and power of other players in

school districts and universities who set parameters that sustained or constrained our work. Notwithstanding the weight of other institutional structures to impede, however, there was enough latitude within the consortia to support the development of a collaborative effort to develop more integrated and coherent programs for student teachers. Thinking back now I don't believe we/I made as good use of that latitude as was possible.

I found participants attracted by the richness of the collaborative effort and afraid of losing themselves within it. There is a fundamental human tension here which needs to be acknowledged. Collaborative work must take care not to deny individual effort and voice. Collaboration is ongoing work. There needs to be space for retreat into individual work. Action needs to be followed by reflection—both private and public—and a reshaping of action. If it is well done there will be entry points for voices to re-assert perspectives and continually broaden the understandings that inform choices. I hope it includes student teachers next time.

(New dancers appear. They show us new steps, or variations on the old. Others go off to new places to dance. Some decline invitations and decide to sit out a few tunes, but they watch the others with new eyes.)

Chapter VI

Between the "No Longer" and the "Not Yet"

Collecting My Thoughts

As I reflect on just what an analysis of this collaborative dance might look like, I am struck by the layers of interpretation already embedded in the narrative. It is collaboration seen though my eyes—my view of what collaboration should be—and my view of how it was as I selected data and arranged it in certain ways to make particular points. As acknowledged in my examination of methodology in chapter four, to "represent" how it was is not possible (Derrida, 1978). My approach then in this analysis is to focus on the tensions or dilemmas I, and we, faced, on the inter-play of our histories and our expectations, attempting to avoid what Ricoeur (1981) describes as the "text of desire" by enabling critical instances to be in view.

In the beginning I lamented the lack of opportunity for the rich knowledge of education held by classroom teachers to contribute to fundamental decision-making in education. I also described an essential "homelessness" attributed to academic writing that resulted in a perception among school-based teachers that the knowledge claims arising from study and research in universities were not readily accessible to inform the challenges and dilemmas of everyday practice. I have been careful throughout not to lay claim that all that is missing to find the answers to problems in education is the inclusion of classroom teachers in the decision-making process.

To develop a teacher education program collaboratively required that university and school-based teachers take on roles and responsibilities that had not been the experience of teacher education for any of us in the past. I suspect that for all of us, from whatever grade, district or institution, a commitment to collaboration signalled the need to develop new attitudes and skills. For some it was a more familiar approach to their work than for others—the talk of many primary teachers as they described their negotiations with their students demonstrated an

understanding of collaboration. Nevertheless, this present work required new approaches in order to integrate diverse knowledge and experience in the interest of a common purpose. The struggle to work in new ways is a central theme in the analysis of this effort.

The purpose of the collaborative project described in this thesis was to create a curriculum for student teachers for their first practicum semester. In our planning sessions—four days in the semester preceding the practicum semester—we had created a common vision of our work by describing the "successful" graduate of thirteen years in public education. Through a variety of narrative forms, including the development of personal metaphors to describe ourselves as teachers, and the writing of case studies describing decisions made in situations of professional conflict, we had delineated our unique perspectives and actions in carrying out that vision. As a result of reflection on our work both privately and with colleagues, many developed a more critical awareness of the values and assumptions and knowledge that informed that work, as well as the biases that limited our perspectives. This enabled more informed, articulate and inclusive discourse as we named the most important areas or domains in education. Those domains provided us with a framework to begin to think in depth about what student teachers should pay attention to and understand in a first practicum semester.

And as we came to agreement as to how to proceed, some perspectives and understandings were inevitably put aside. In Habermasian terms, some interests that drive the development and legitimation of particular knowledge claims were not served. There is no clearer reason for the dialogue among teachers from both institutions to continue than to provide opportunity for these diverse perspectives and interests to be known and examined, and continue to disrupt and challenge decision-making (Ellsworth, 1986). This will ensure that what has been regarded as tentative agreement in the first instance does not become "the way it is" in the second (Lather, 1991). It is not the goal of collaboration to build new structures, but to provide an environment in which participants have equal opportunity to offer their perspectives, and hear a variety of other perspectives, in reflective and critical dialogue.

As a result of the experience of collaboration, I understand that what we needed to know was embedded in the processes in which we, as a group, engaged. It was not a matter of a final product. We might write down what we were thinking at a given point in time, what we knew under the present circumstances, but the important understandings evolved within, and as a result of, the ongoing process, our evolution temporarily halted when we arrived at agreement and wrote it down. The heart of these processes was an ever expanding knowledge of education from a number of perspectives. It was a deeper and more critical knowledge of the self and the other and a willingness to work through the differences and negotiate agreement on courses of action and articulate probable consequences of those actions. It was my assumption that having come to agreement, through critical and reflective thinking about education, on a framework of understandings to be addressed by student teachers, that we could, and would, chose our own unique manner of accomplishing teacher education. Having looked at what we know, and having built our program based upon it, we would know what to do in particular situations. So when a school associate asked, *"Where do I begin with the student teacher?"* I could respond, *"What is the underlying idea you want the student to understand?"* Those understandings were the curriculum we had stopped and written down.

Only as "insiders," listening to and speaking with one another, can we share reception and development of meaning (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1991) and, thereby, foster the opportunity for transformative action. The researcher within a collaborative effort between university and school lives inside the work with other participants. She is a learner, listening deeply, being shaped by as well as influencing outcomes of the work. The role requires vigorous reflexivity—seeking self-knowledge as well as knowledge of the other and displaying such knowledge publicly. The intent in this thesis is a narrative that resonates with readers across the divisions between schools and universities, and that contributes to the deeper understanding that stimulates transformative action.

A Framework to Guide the Analysis

Having been so thoroughly immersed as coordinator and researcher of the work described in this thesis, it seemed wise to attempt to gain some distance as I began the analysis. Cammann (1985) in his chapter, *Action useable knowledge* (pp. 109-122), provides a framework to examine the kinds of knowledge he believes are required to think about and implement change. He does not write specifically about collaboration, but more generally about the challenge of understanding change. He writes from the perspective of change agent examining the areas needing attention when thinking about organizational change with human beings who bring different perspectives, interests, and power to the change effort, but who bear allegiance to a common organization. This could be said to fit the general interest and context of my work. In terms of this thesis this framework can be useful in the analysis of the development of a collaborative effort that required shifts in perspectives, interests and power to succeed. His integration of different kinds of knowledge is not dissimilar to that which interests me: he seeks models of change to provide him with predictive power; knowledge claims with interpretive power to guide moral and ethical decisions within particular contexts; and claims with emancipatory power to understand the relationships defining a particular organization and enabling him to imagine alternative structures.

Finally, he lays out two assumptions that he applies in his work that I believe are important to an honest rendering, and a patient reading, of change efforts. The first is that change is not a "rational process" but is influenced by "power, politics, personal view points, distrust of rational arguments, and individual interests" (p. 110). In short, change is influenced by past experience, present circumstances and expectations for the future. Secondly, he states that successful work as a facilitator of change requires a clear—and shared—understanding of one's own values and assumptions. A codicil is that the work he takes on accord with his own values and be seen to have potential to improve the quality of work life for the participants (p. 110). We shared some fundamental values and assumptions

that made Cammann's work seem a worthwhile and legitimate lens for me to bring to bear on an analysis of an attempt at changing the way in which teacher educators from universities and schools carry out their common task— the education of new teachers.

There are, however, some significant differences between our contexts and approaches that need stating. Cammann does not claim membership in organizations in which he works. He is an outsider. His interest is in bringing about change for others. Thus his focus is on the knowledge and skills he needs to facilitate that change. I considered us all, together, to be involved in shaping and being shaped by the change. Thus I am interested in the knowledge and skills we all need to work together for change. He speaks of seeking consensus; I, of temporary agreement that is critiqued in an ongoing forum. Like Cammann, I am the initial facilitator, imposing an order on our activity. A fundamental difference is that I am seeking to divest myself of the central change role; he simply works from that role. His goal, however, is what he calls "action useable knowledge," knowledge of the implementation of change that will provide models for doing it better next time. On this point, we agree. I would hope, as a result of this analysis to suggest some tentative frames to "try on" other change efforts in the area of collaboration. Perhaps in choosing Cammann's framework, I am also acknowledging my initiating role as change agent and my isolated role, in the end, as researcher attempting to understand our work.

Influence—The Vision

Cammann is interested in "knowledge about the use of influence, the consequences of its use, and the ethics of being influential" (p. 121). He divides this examination of influence into three areas: developing a vision; influencing of individuals towards the vision; and determining processes to influence implementation.

> Organizations are maintained by a complex set of interdependent forces, and any set of changes will create secondary reactions that will disturb the change process and alter the intended results. Consequently change is unlikely to be created successfully by any planned sequence of activities. Rather, it requires an image of the result that is desired, and people who can invent activities as necessary to bring the result about. (p. 111)

I think back to the vision I described—of educators from schools and universities working together to develop curriculum for new teachers. I am interested in examining how that might have been perceived (received) by school associates and faculty associates, and what values, on the part of the coordinator were explicated or implied. I go back to the data to examine first my words to the group as we began, and then to the perceptions of what we were about that I gathered from our group conversations (the transcripts) and the journals of the school associates taking my undergraduate course in conjunction with our teacher education work.

This is our "unique and particular journey together," I said. Beginning with a private and then public examination of the work we do each day, "we can support, clarify and enrich each others' understanding," and "develop our vision of the 'good' professional" (transcript, oct, 1990). As we discussed who we were as professionals, and what a teacher education program developed together might look like, I would find occasion to enlarge on these general statements: "We are doing this together, making decisions [about what student teachers will do]...so we see there is relevance and coherence" (Ibid.).

> *Those of you living your professional lives in classrooms with children and making the kinds of decisions you have discussed this morning on a daily basis,...understand deeply what education is. You make those decisions based on what you value in education, what you think education means, what you envision as the outcomes you want children to exhibit.* [transcript, nov, 1990]

The knowledge of school-based teachers needed to be included in educational decision-making outside the classroom.

I did not speak about different kinds of knowledge, about Habermas' distinctions between predictive, interpretive and emancipatory claims, nor did I speak of the value of the contribution of academic knowledge. Both were, however, implied in the description of our collaborative effort as the contributions of the knowledge of all participants involved in the education of new teachers. The knowledge and professional experience of school-based teachers was clearly valued, as was their ability to access and contribute that knowledge to the discussion and decision-making of the larger group. The skills and attitudes necessary to come

to agreement were not described. I did not emphasize suspending one's beliefs and judgements and listening deeply to others. I did not suggest "you may need to change your mind." I did, throughout, refer to our reflection on and modification of the program we developed.

We will work together, we will collaborate, I said. But the proposed change did not include talking about the fact that what we all knew was necessarily tentative, that knowledge was constantly in process and dependent upon time and place. But the knowledge school-based teachers developed to understand their work was valued. When case studies were introduced as a tool to examine what we considered as important domains in educational decision-making, participants were asked to "*describe an incident of educational decision-making in which the making of the decision had evoked feelings of tension or conflict*" (Ibid.). This statement implied that diverse and conflicting knowledge claims about what ought to be done were held by us all—that our work demanded flexibility and the possibility that we might need to change our minds. But the personal case studies that participants wrote primarily described internal conflicts—conflicts one resolved privately, (indeed, that had been the basis of my case study that I provided as an example to introduce the process). The importance of recognizing and examining conflict intersubjectively as necessary to a clearer understanding of one's values and prejudices (Ricoeur, 1981) was not emphasized.

Nor did my articulation of the vision driving our work explicitly address the development of critical knowledge to examine the ideological structures within which we worked. Yet it was clear that what we were about required change in inter-institutional structures and relationships.

> *We will, by the time our work is done, have determined courses of action for this curriculum project and ways of thinking about this work that do not yet exist. They will be a unique result of our work together taking place at this time and in this context.* [chapt 4, p. 57]

Collaboration in teacher education, I had said, was us, determining together what the important understandings were that student teachers should address, by first developing together a deeper understanding of what we all knew.

Writing this now I understand that I described the change that was collaboration without elaborating on the values and concepts underlying my understanding of change. I did not, in other words, lay out the conceptual framework regarding knowledge claims and the particular interests they serve that I describe in chapter three. Recognizing my concern for not privileging a voice "from the university," I am not surprised. Further, as we began our collaborative effort, these ideas were living with the tensions I felt around the difficulty of communicating "abstract" ideas in a manner that facilitated communication rather than raised barriers. But my evolving understanding of collaboration, and of the ideas that support it, means I would do it differently next time. As Cammann states, "an image of the result that is desired [enables] people to invent activities as necessary to bring the result about" (p. 111). As I continue this analysis, I will point out places where I perceive that a further elaboration of my understanding of change might have made a positive difference.

As I struggle to analyze the collaborative dance I described in the previous chapter, it is important to recognize a major difficulty in this writing, together with my attempt to overcome it. Sometimes I can hardly believe what I failed to do in facilitating this collaborative effort. It seems essential to be explicit about the value of conflict as a signal of what we believe is "worthwhile" in education. Surely I spoke of it. Well, if I did it was not recorded, nor was any comment on it by group members. I recognize that it is impossible for me to sort out what I knew then and what I have subsequently grown to understand. When we began I suspect I worked harder at developing commonalities than I did at working with the tensions, a stance I have tempered as a result of this experience . Meanwhile, the only guard against this confusion of *when* I knew what I know, is to keep to the transcripts and written records of what unfolded in those collaborative attempts. The rest will appear in the analysis and recommendation.

One other piece of the vision of a collaborative effort between university-based and school-based teachers that I know I brought with me (it was an important part of my personal history that brought me to this work) was a belief that the work we did together would make a

difference over time to school-based teachers sense of confidence and belief in their own professionalism. (And, I realize now, as a result of our work together, that as their personal self-esteem grew, so did their belief in the expertise of their colleagues.) But I did not speak about that to the school associates until a year after our work was over, at which time I wrote a letter to each of them asking them to comment, if they wished, on whether our work had made a long term difference to their professional work. I sent the same letter to the faculty associates. But before that I had talked with them about the long term effects of our work.

> *Cood:* *What about the school associates? How do you think it has been for them? If it is true collaboration the people involved are more able as a result of the work to continue the changing for themselves—and with other people. They are beginning to be questioners and challengers in terms of growth—have an attitude of inquiry.*
>
> *FA:* *Have we asked that it make a difference to them? Has that been an expectation that has been communicated to them?*
>
> *Cood:* *I don't know why, but it didn't seem appropriate to say as a result of this you will be different.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

What then were the understandings about collaboration in teacher education conveyed to school associates and faculty associates as we began our planning semester? The remarks that follow were first impressions and thoughts of our effort by school associates from transcripts of our large group discussions and from journal entries.

> *This program is providing a whole new environment for the student teachers. I am convinced that if we are to train teachers effectively and efficiently, we must see the task as a single piece and not be satisfied to assign separate parts of the process to the different levels. Collaboration is a solution.* [SA journal, nov, 1990]

This "whole new environment" was described variously by other school associates as a place to get rid of the isolation—*"the many islands in our profession"*—and celebrate the differences and the common goals (transcript, oct, 1990). And they perceived the faculty associates and me as modelling that bridging of the islands: *"Your group,"* a school associate writes, *"has to be unique in not being burdened by the ivory tower syndrome"* (SA journal, dec, 1990).

Of course, "unique" we were. We didn't belong in any permanent sense to the "ivory tower." But, as the remark implies, we were referred to, and related to, as "from the university," and representing SFU's teacher education program in that particular time and

place. The pertinent question in my mind is: Was our "uniqueness" a function of the collaborative processes undertaken, or of the prior affiliations of the university-based teachers? The roles we all had in our teacher education group were either school roles or university roles, and the transcripts of our work demonstrated that the distinction was an important reference point throughout the semesters we were together. The degree to which we succeeded in overcoming the "ivory tower syndrome," was a result of the faculty associates and me refusing to assume hierarchical positions. Since collaboration cannot proceed if the "force" of hierarchy is asserted, I would suggest it was the process "succeeding." In other words, although our collaborative work took place within hierarchical arrangements, the university teachers suspended, as possible, the privilege that position was traditionally accorded, and the force of that privilege in terms of asserting expertise. Of course, as has been amply illustrated throughout this thesis, the collaborative dance was, and is, a series of very intricate maneuvers—roles and relationships shifted and redefined themselves throughout.

"It is necessary for all teachers to have an overview of the entire system," said one school associate in a journal entry after our first session in October. *"To not do that limits the view of the student teacher and creates a lack of awareness of the total progress of the children through the system."* We had in that session begun by building a common vision of the purposes of public education in terms of our responsibility to children. It had provided what is, in my experience, a rare feeling of cohesion among teachers from all grades throughout the system who, in the normal course of events, are not in the same meetings, let alone discussing together educational concerns and goals. School-based teachers were viewing education from what Grumet (1981) describes as a "wider surround."

> *Including school associates in the design of the program provides mutual ownership and ensures program success. Student teachers should be able to find an educational community sharing a philosophy based on more than the status quo.* [SA journal, nov, 1990]

For some it would seem that coming together in this way, what this same journal writer referred to as *"interactive professionalism,"* was the exception and already it had disrupted traditional ways of thinking about what we "ought" to do. This was perceived to be the case in

terms of past experience in teacher education roles as well where "*my evaluation had been treated lightly,*" and,"*university reps had made me feel quite redundant*" (SA journal, nov, 1990).

The school associate's remark about change in the status quo, signals one of the entry points where the development of emancipatory knowledge could have been spoken to and demonstrated. Another entry was available as a result of the frequent request of school associates for help in the development of communication skills both to articulate their own practice and to support the efforts of student teachers. The faculty associates and I spent time modelling and demonstrating conferencing skills and questioning techniques. We emphasized the importance of understanding the values and beliefs that informed action in education. We did not emphasize questioning *why* we held those particular values or beliefs, those more risky dialogues Britzman (1991) described as conversations that help us understand "how we came to know."

Despite the importance I have accorded to the development of emancipatory knowledge throughout this thesis—indeed I cite it as a primary goal of the collaborative effort—I am not convinced that the lack of critical conversations at that point in time mattered so much (except that it remain an important goal). As I describe in Chapter Four (p. 59), we were involved in a challenging and difficult discourse: "*Sometimes ideas are just forming as they are being spoken so might sound a little hesitant (speaking for myself).*" (SA journal, dec, 1990). We needed time to examine "first level constructs," the inherited world views, institutionalized roles and social norms that guided our work (Habermas, 1979, p. ix). This examination was a necessary first step to enable our collaborative effort to proceed. A social critique of the institutional structures within which our work took place could not begin until we as a group had an understanding of the work we all did, and of the taken-for-granted structures that we assumed in our descriptions of our work. We needed to understand how our histories had been interpreted within present dominant structures, before we could begin the critical

reinterpretation that provided the opportunity for other stories to be told, for "becoming something else than what our history has constructed us to be" (Foucault, in Rajchman, 1991).

We also needed to build trust in order to be more critical—and that trust waxed and waned with time and the circumstances. I am reminded of the school associates describing the "feel" of a classroom, an understanding, they said, that was central to a student teacher's ability to succeed with a lesson, no matter how well planned that lesson might be. Similarly, with our collaborative work, it was a matter of developing a "feel" for the comfort level in our group—including my own feelings of comfort, balancing the tensions I felt being "inside" and critical—being participant and researcher—at the same time.

The faculty associates described a similar tension as evident throughout the time of our collaborative project. They said it had to do with finding the balance between listening and speaking. *"The university,"* said one of the faculty associates, needs to *"compromise more, more than we have let it do, so we have a level playing field...all partners bringing something, sharing something, compromising somewhere"* (transcript, nov 1991). At the same time there was concern about the university losing its voice: *"Where you have so many players who have similar interest, you need to stir it up or you begin to believe you have got answers."* One could substitute the word "faculty associate" for "university" and get a sense of the personal tension between *"compromising and losing voice."* It was the tension I, too, struggled with as participant/researcher. Being sensitive to the dynamics of interactions "limits the degree of skepticism and challenge each can bring to the analysis," suggest Tabachnick & Zeichner (1991, p. 16).

But for faculty associates as well as school associates there was the sense of viewing a "wider surround" as a result of our collaborative beginnings. The collaborative effort was an opportunity to bring different perspectives together; an opportunity to talk *"in a manner that enables all of us to learn,"* with the result that *"we are not expected to make decisions out of context and then have them fit someone else's context"* (transcript, nov, 1991). But those processes required an environment of trust, they said, that was difficult to develop as one

struggled to understand simultaneously the role of faculty associate within it. The struggle was exacerbated further by the short time they were in their job. *"Just as it begins to make sense,"* said a frustrated faculty associate beginning her second and final year at the time of this discussion, *"you go"* (Ibid.).

I return again to Cammann's point about the influence of a vision. Participants need to be motivated to invent activities that will foster that vision. I had spoken of a unique and enriching journey; both school associates and faculty associates were willing to come on that journey. For school associates it was a journey that affirmed their work and experience. It was the antithesis of the isolation they had felt in former teacher education roles, and often felt in their everyday work. For faculty associates it was, once again, more complex. They were inventing new roles—and new activities—envisioning how the program built on the framework we built together might evolve. I don't think this unique contribution of the faculty associates was accorded the public recognition and valuing that it deserved. It signals a limitation to my vision.

We had all agreed it made good sense to view the education of new teachers as being "one piece." All teacher educators needed to understand the full development of the student teacher—and that required understanding all contexts in which the education of a student teacher took place, and the knowledge, values, beliefs, and assumptions about teaching and learning to which student teachers were exposed. *"It requires,"* I said, *"a change in how university-based and school-based teachers interact." "To the degree that we succeed, student teachers should find an education community that is not reliant on the status quo,"* was a school associate's rejoinder.

Influence—The People

Cammann speaks of understanding how individuals are influenced to engage in constructive change. Most straightforwardly, he says, it is a matter of making connections between the values participants hold and the goals of the change. I will speak here of our

coming to recognize values we held in common, and of the influences we had on one another as we moved through this change. In order to develop a community of knowledgeable teacher educators from schools and the university who could negotiate agreement on a program to educate student teachers, we needed to recognize that we held some common beliefs and values (Polkinghorne, 1989; Kemmis, 1985). To realize this goal required "*using reflective practices, thinking about what we've been doing, making alterations and changes,*" as one school associate described our activity (transcript, oct, 1990), and deepening our awareness of the perspectives and understandings that informed the work of group members.

At our first session as a teacher education community, on the second day, I asked participants their thoughts about our time together so far—how they were feeling, what we could do to make this time worthwhile. Their answers are an indicator of what they valued about our work, and the influence that work had on them. They spoke of "*feeling a lot of support,*" (transcript, oct, 1990), of valuing time with colleagues: "*the whole experience of being with other teachers...makes us stronger.*" They valued examining their work and wanted help in acquiring tools for articulating that knowledge. They valued affirmation, particularly from colleagues, "*we need to have pats on the back saying we're doing the right thing*" : "*when you talk it over with a peer that is when the real growth takes place*" (Ibid.). They spoke of experiencing a "*tremendous respect for what people had brought,*" and a "*celebration of the differences as well as the common threads, themes and purposes*" (Ibid.). The building of stronger bonds among themselves as school-based teachers developed rapidly. "*It is amazing how people who have only met on four separate occasions, come from different areas of education, have different ideas, values, beliefs, can feel so "bonded" (for lack of a better word)*" (SA journal, mar, 1990). They trusted what they had to offer: "*I am relying on my experience of working with kids to carry me through this journey*" (SA journal nov, 1990), and they trusted that the process would enable that knowledge to inform our teacher education program.

But the tension of the collaborative dance was evident as well. It was "*scary*" opening up. It was "*extremely high risk-taking.*" "*It takes time to become a reflective practitioner.*" These school associate statements speak strongly to "limiting skepticism and challenge." But it also feels good, school associates stated, to realize how much you know, how well you handle the complexity, and "*we are not already there, it never ends. We need to do it our whole career*" (transcript, oct, 1990). Acknowledging this, some school associates spoke critically of a school culture that was "too busy to inquire into its own busy-ness" (Ibid.). The positive value they put on this collaborative effort in teacher education, carried on within the busy-ness of their culture, created tremendous tension for school associates and became a critical factor in how school associates viewed collaboration when work with student teachers began.

Their perceptions of what was valuable work with student teachers often echoed the sentiments expressed about our collaborative work together as teachers.

> *I want them to have ownership of their learning and I knew they would have to feel they had come up with solutions on their own. This required the focus of conversation be on themselves rather than what I would have done or me telling them. This was modelled for us at the in-services.* [SA journal, jan, 1991]

> *I wanted to ask him questions about what he sees happening between the students and me. I don't think he is ready. He still wants to impress me and isn't quite comfortable about being my collaborator rather than my student.* [SA journal, feb, 1990]

When improvements to the teacher education program were discussed, closer university-school ties in the work undertaken by student teachers was recommended: "*Student teachers should have courses that begin before their first practicum, and part of the coursework should be in the practicum, and evaluation be by both teachers for the course*" (transcript, mar, 1991).

I cite these remarks and events as indications of individuals, influenced by the collaborative project, to respond to collaborative activity, as well as to initiate it themselves. They would represent what Cammann describes as participants whose values matched the goals of the collaboration—even as the commitment to these goals was stressful and time consuming.

The influence of the collaborative effort on faculty associates was less clearly definable. Although they found it "*worthwhile*" and "*totally enhancing to bring different perspectives together,*" the "*ongoing*" and "*incredibly demanding*" nature of collaboration made it "*very difficult.*" "*But we are breaking ground, attempting to change opinions at so many levels, it is bound to be slow-going*" (transcript, nov, 1991). For instance, they appreciated that what we were doing in actuality included pre-service, induction and in-service work since we were working with new teachers who were hoping to gain from this "*an understanding of myself not as a student anymore but as a teacher*"; "*to pick up some ideas, some more things to add to my knowledge base and to my experience*" (transcript, oct, 1990). They spoke about this at consortium meetings, and still some districts continued to refer to the work simply as "your teacher education program." But in the end faculty associates were in agreement that they wouldn't want to work any other way. The continued ambivalence around this decision is captured by one faculty associate's remark in reference to the faculty associate role in collaboration: "*I'd rather be on this roller coaster than a treadmill.*" The collaborative effort with school associates provided knowledge about the contexts and histories that informed the school associates' work, and the dialogues they shared with them to arrive at the teacher education program were "*excellent, they brought fresh ideas.*" And we, as a university-based team, valued and were nourished by our own ongoing collaborative dialogues throughout our time together.

For myself, as coordinator, how was I influenced and how did I influence the valuing of others? I expected the energy, interest, and commitment that school associates and faculty associates initially displayed. As I reread the transcripts and journals, I was affirmed in my belief in their knowledge of education, characterized by a deep understanding of and attachment to children.

> *A first grade class is a group of 5-to-7-year-olds none of whom looks, acts, thinks, behaves, talks, or grows in the same way. It comes with assorted needs ranging from Kleenex to affection. It has stars in its eyes and loose teeth in its mouth, questions on its mind, Band-aids on its knees, forgiveness in its heart and peanut butter sandwiches in its lunch.* [SA journal, nov, 1990]

I was challenged to broaden my own thinking about collaboration upon hearing the extent to which collaborative activity was going on in schools, particularly in elementary classrooms: "*Children should be involved in determining what they will do to show us what they have learned,*" (transcript, nov, 1990) and by the subsequent influence of those understandings on our teacher education program—student teachers should be involved in determining what constituted evaluation of their work. The continued ambivalence some school associates described about their ability to deal with "*the abstract as well as the practical*" (SA journal, mar, 1990) in teacher education work, I attributed partly to the press of time, but also to the novelty of the idea that what they knew constituted knowledge claims. That was not part of their past experience nor, I suspect, an expectation they would have for the future. As one school associate had remarked in our planning sessions, "*It takes time to become a reflective practitioner.*" And, of course, student teachers wanted answers to practical "what and how" questions and often resisted responding to "why." I was constantly reminded of the enormous time demands of our work, and watched stress and/or frustration cause participants to retreat to their familiar and separate ways, and the collaborative attitude to wane.

I was particularly surprised by the extent of the breakdowns in communication of school-based and university-based teachers between the planning and practicum semesters. I would expect the interest and commitment referred to above to dissipate to some degree when the student teachers appeared—shifting to the student teacher. And since we did not include the students in our collaborative work, we lost some of the finite energy available for the teacher educator role. But I cannot help having the sense that we/I started something that was not properly supported to sustain its momentum (apart from the failure to include student teachers at some sessions). One faculty associate voiced the same thought: "*We have interfered with what we began.*" I will attempt, as I work through this analysis, to come to further understanding of this central point. Perhaps some understanding of this will be forthcoming in an examination of resistance to influence.

Resistance

All of us resisted this collaborative effort at some point. It was not a resistance to the general goals enumerated above. It was, rather, resistance to the experience of collaboration as it played itself out within our project. Cammann describes reasons for resistance as: lack of understanding; perceptions that the change will cause harm; a feeling of being disadvantaged; and a preference for stability rather than change (p. 112). I will examine resistance in terms of those areas.

Lack of understanding

Lack of understanding begins with a look at the facilitator of this change effort. As I have described above, there are a number of ways in which my facilitating would be different in subsequent collaborative work. The conceptual frame was not as finely drawn as it could have been. That cut down on the interpretations available to participants. My lack of articulation about the opportunity for the development of emancipatory knowledge may have discouraged some possibilities or understandings from being offered. My inability to describe adequately the ambiguous nature of collaboration, the necessity to live with uncertainty and make decisions without ever having all the information, may have caused more frustration or anxiety for some participants than would inevitably be the case already with such processes.

There was frustration, too, caused by the tensions that built as a result of the ongoing nature of collaboration. This stress could have been alleviated by supporting participants in moving away from the group from time to time and finding space "*to be me.*" This tension was dramatically illustrated a number of times. For instance, a school associate brought her concern before the group because she could not resolve it outside the group with the faculty associate; a faculty associate declared, "*I have not got to the point where I couldn't subvert it* [the collaborative effort], *and if I ever did, I would have to leave. There has got to be a little bit of room for me, for us*" [transcript, nov, 1991]; the coordinator writes in Chapter Five

when describing a school associate who asked if we were going to develop the program all over again next year: *"The question suggests a perspective that would view our work as 'done.' To be honest that was not a perspective I felt like entertaining!"* (chapt. 5, p. 113). We expressed, in various ways a dissatisfaction with the collaborative dance. We were tired and our need to move away required attention and appreciation—perhaps only within ourselves in some instances, by the group in others. It would have been worthwhile to talk about it openly throughout the semesters.

I recall a discussion around student teachers' mid-semester evaluations that was a particular surprise to me. I would have sworn there was agreement among all of us that what the student teachers were thinking and doing both on campus and in classrooms needed to be understood by all. At the time of this dialogue student teachers had spent more time on campus, and observing in other classrooms, than they had in the school associates' classrooms:

> *SA:* *Is it necessary for the school associate to be in on the mid-term portfolio, because a lot of it has been built up from before they came into the school?*
>
> *Cood:* *Ah...what would be anybody's view on that?*
>
> *SA:* *Well, it helped me see where the student teacher was, the background. And that is what I figured the mid-term was—helping us to understand what they were bringing to the classroom.*
>
> *SA:* *I don't think so, it had little to do with what was happening in the classroom.*
>
> *SA:* *Well maybe the school associate's role could be to present what her involvement with the student is going to be—to tie it together.* [transcript, mar, 1991]

At least if the discussion is ongoing participants do not fall into the trap of imagining there is consensus—on anything.

Perceived as causing harm

The first indication I had that this work might have the potential to cause harm came during the semester when the faculty associates and I were driving across the province to the various districts talking to school-based teachers who had been asked by their districts to

consider school associate positions. As I describe in chapter two (p. 29), listening to the teachers express concern about extra responsibility if they join us, about the lack of qualified substitutes, and the difficulty of travel in the north, I found myself questioning (in my journal), *Is this educationally the best use of busy teachers' time? Will it make a difference? And to whom? And how will we know?* (Cood journal, oct, 1989). As has been recorded in this thesis, lack of time, and the concomitant stress, has had a negative impact on collaboration. It brings me back to a point I made through a letter in *"Teacher ,"* the British Columbia Teachers Federation newsmagazine, when I was a faculty associate: *"Where is the recognition and valuing of the contribution those* [our best] *teachers make to the development of new members of our profession?"* (chapt 2, 24).

Another kind of harm school associates perceived was the lack of access to student teachers when they were planning lessons for the immersion period. This signals a greater harm, one referred to above in this chapter—that the university-based teachers somehow interfere with what they had begun. We invited collaborative program development, but we did not see how we could collaborate in terms of developing the details of the programme—there was no more time available to meet as a group. (Of course, there may have been other ways to do this, but we didn't see them.) Why didn't the school associates perceive greater congruence between what we began together and the outcomes of that work that were completed by the faculty associates? (I say "perceive" because the faculty associates, who had done the bulk of the detailed programming, could demonstrate a congruence, both philosophically and pragmatically.) There were a number of factors interfering with successful collaborative work: lack of understanding, lack of communication skills, lack of time. It was not lack of interest or commitment on the part of any of the participants, not at the point that the curriculum was written at the end of the planning semester.

In the end, I believe school associates felt that power had been shared, and then taken away. It had not been taken away with the intent of serving other interests, but pragmatically, because there was no more time. Empowerment, states Freire (1973, p. 70) consists of the

development of the capacity to understand one's situation and of the capacity to effect change in that situation. Initially, we grew in our understanding together. Then, school associates did not continue to be in a position to effect the concomitant change that was indicated by that understanding. We needed the time to continue the collaborative effort in terms of naming the activities to accompany the understandings we had developed together. Collaboration required the weaving back and forth of interpretive and predictive knowledge that provides coherence, balance—and worthwhileness.

When it came to evaluation of student teacher performance, faculty associates perceived the potential for harm in the fact that they felt they had "responsibility without authority."

> *FA:* *Well, you do have a voice, but only to a point, you are only one of the players. And in the final analysis you are having to have responsibility without authority I guess would be a way to put it. But, uhmm, that is false too because in the end you control your own situation.* [transcript, nov, 1991]

Someone has to take final responsibility and it can't be all of us accepting the responsibility together, they said. But they meant more than that. It was a feeling of knowing more, of having more expertise—of deserving to have more say. *"I do think the experience I have had as a faculty associate has made me more knowledgeable about what education is"* (transcript, nov, 1991). As we debated this issue (chapt 5, pp. 120), I was struck by the shifts in thinking required of the collaborative effort that would preclude the debate we were having, at least in its present form. In the first place, it would not be a matter of who was most expert, but of what each could contribute to a greater, more holistic understanding. In the second place, the agreement about what to do in a given situation would begin with the question; What do we need to understand here in order to reach agreement? And third, but certainly not least, the dialogue and the decisions reached would be guided by a commitment to reciprocity, to a necessary and equal exchange of views, and the search for possibilities.

Having written that, I reread the transcript and find the comment: *"I was thinking, maybe what happens now is we take power away. If it was their responsibility maybe it would be different..."* (Ibid.)—and a possibility is born. And I ask, *Why can't universities*

and school districts decide together how evaluation would take place? What we needed to see?" (Ibid.) Another possibility. These are the kinds of shifts in thinking that collaboration fosters. The work of education is viewed in a more holistic manner, and new potentials come to mind.

But it is not quite fair to leave it there. Having taken on the faculty associate roles that traditionally carried more power and authority within SFU's teacher education program, the disruption of this status caused feelings of discomfort for the faculty associates. As I mentioned in chapter one in my description of the consortia, (pp. 5-6), our work existed under the hierarchical umbrella of the Professional Development Program, in SFU's Faculty of Education. Within that program, faculty associates are charged with being the final decision-makers—in the ordinary course of events—of student teacher progress. So perhaps it was inevitable that we interfered with what we had begun. For instance, when tensions arose around student evaluation, the "force" of hierarchy was, in some cases, reasserted. This "force" I would characterize as the assertion, implicitly or explicitly, of holding the requisite knowledge. Most of the time we attempted to work together as learners, suspending judgement and listening deeply to one another, operating "as if" we were equal—which we were when we were being most collaboratively successful.

Feeling disadvantaged

Faculty associates certainly felt disadvantaged in terms of the issue of student evaluation described above, as did school associates when their authority seemed threatened by decisions being made for the student teachers' work load without their input. I felt disadvantaged working from such a distance. Faculty associates felt disadvantaged working so far from the main campus, in isolation from many university services and events. School associates felt disadvantaged having to travel long distances in difficult conditions, and having to shoulder two jobs, teacher educator and classroom teacher. We didn't dwell on these a lot, but they were there, ever-present in the background.

Preferring stability

As has been illustrated by dialogues from the transcripts of our work, this was challenging, and at times, risky work. We had all committed ourselves to this more challenging way of doing teacher education business that requires *"more time and effort because the activities are shared and not simply directed or told"* (SA journal, feb, 1991). Preferences for stability at this point I would characterize as reactions to the demands of this kind of effort, and a need to reduce the tensions that followed. As the stresses piled up, participants found ways to offset their discomfort. I have illustrated and discussed at length in chapter five two examples of this strategy: a school associate who encourages harmony at the expense of openness (pp. 82-83); a school associate who suggests in her journal that the "doing" of theory and practice with the student teacher is too much and suggests to me, *"you do the abstract, we'll do the practical"* (pp. 108-111). They are dramatic examples of participants running up against the limits of their tolerance for conflict or tension, and the resolutions they seek.

The faculty associates' occasional longing for the *"freedom and flexibility of the faculty associates in other programs, their power to determine the direction of the module"* (transcript, nov, 1991), could be said to be a preference for stability. The coordinator's desire to ignore the critical remark of the school associate who was questioning the need for collaboration, (chapt 5, p. 113) could also, ironically, be characterized as a preference for stability.

Influence—The Process

What were the processes used that influenced participants in the positive and negative ways described above? When I began to analyze these processes and their influence on the implementation of change, the first issue I turned to was that of my membership as participant, facilitator, and researcher, in the group. Understanding the language, the norms and

behaviours, and the conditions of work, deeply for public school teachers, less so for university teachers, I felt myself to be in a strong position to advocate particular processes.

I have spoken throughout about the need to disrupt particular normative patterns in order to achieve the collaborative goal of joint university-school curriculum development in teacher education. I have noted the struggles around issues of power and status, the forming of different coalitions within our larger group to overcome more traditional authority. I have understood the particular need of school-based teachers for affirmation outside the classroom and by other than children. (On that subject, I would add that part of the breakdown of our collaborative community in the practicum semester may have been because the primary affirmant for the school associate had become the student teacher, rather than other members of the collaborative group). I understood the tension between the school-based teachers perception of risk, reflecting on and discussing personal practice—and the university-based teachers' keenness to bring a critical stance to all utterances. I perceived university-based teachers as coming already affirmed as "knowers," we had a plan, an idea, that we invited school-based teachers to share. I believed that for most school-based teachers the idea of being a developer of knowledge was new. But as decision-making became more dependent on the group as a whole, there was a shift in who were knowers and what constituted knowledge. University-based teachers began to experience the riskiness of having their work questioned.

These were structures and relationships I understood and anticipated as a result of membership in both groups. Given these understandings, I will examine our processes under the general headings Cammann describes as naming the reasons why certain processes are used: to share assumptions, to share critical information, to identify sources of conflict, to avoid manipulation, to avoid the conclusion that (collaboration) is not worth it! These have pushed me to look at the work I undertook from a different perspective. I have been surprised by some new insights as a result.

Processes

To share assumptions, believes and values

Collaboration is dependent on shared values and beliefs, both in terms of valuing the collaborative process, believing it to be worthwhile, and in terms of arriving at agreement, albeit tentative and subject to change, about what ought to be done regarding the issue the group is examining. University-based teachers had indicated a valuing of the collaborative process in terms of suspending assertions of "matter worth knowing," and working to integrate different kinds of knowledge. I had assumed we had agreement on that process, and on the concomitant values and beliefs it represented, with school associates. We had a lot of positive feedback from them about the collaborative approach, particularly was it valued for exchange with knowledgeable colleagues. Did that include exchange across institutions? Let me say, first of all, that the suggestion was never made that teacher education could be or should be carried on without the university's contribution, but what that contribution was was not clear. In short, were university-based teachers viewed as colleagues? We were valued for our facilitating skills as understandings of teaching and learning were examined; for our modelling of questions, particularly in terms of conferencing with student teachers; we were seen to be supportive and encouraging. When recommendations were made to improve the program, the value of the triad conference—faculty associates, school associates and student teacher—was high on the list. We all (given our individual stamina for the collaborative dance), valued the collaborative effort, and believed it to be the best way to proceed in teacher education.

But the assumptions would crop up that academic knowledge didn't have much to do with what went on in classrooms (chapt 6, p. 140), or that it was necessary but separate: "*The student teachers have learned a lot of theory which is now fitting into place. There must be a balance of both. Much must be learned by doing, but there must be a base from which to*

operate" (SA journal, mar, 1991). But neither view was voiced very often, most likely because it was not a debate that was introduced or encouraged. (Perhaps it should have been.) For many, as we negotiated the understandings student teachers should address in their first practicum, there was growing appreciation of our group as developers of knowledge (chapt 5, p. 118). How the contribution of the university-based teachers to that curriculum would be characterized I am not sure, but that we were valued members of the group was clear. We came to agreement on beliefs and values that described the mandate of public education, and appeared to agree that to educate student teachers to carry out that mandate required our combined contribution.

Personal narratives about our work put the power in the hands of the school associates to define the context, to determine the language, to spell out the dilemmas, in short to be the central referents in the group. The narrative process was affirming and perceived as valuable.

> *Teachers' narratives refers to teachers' own interpretations of the events that occur within their particular contexts in which professional decisions are made. Such narratives can be a powerful force in heightening the teachers' awareness of their own professional reasoning.* [SA journal, jan, 1991]

Narrative approaches put us more intimately in touch with our own experiencing. For some, it fostered the building of trust and understanding. The opportunity was there to be in touch with perspectives and possibilities not experienced before—to take part in "the generation of meaning that takes us beyond ourselves," as Lather (1991, p. 5) describes the postmodern project of embracing diversity.

Cammann emphasized processes for the sharing of assumptions: I added values and beliefs to the list. While the building of a collaborative community requires coming to agreement on values and beliefs held in common, I think more of an emphasis on assumptions might have provided a more powerful first look at what guided our individual work. If we had examined our assumptions about institutions, teachers, knowledge, kids, etcetera, it might have opened up and explored our "diverse voices" more fully, whereas, there was a tendency to be more passively accepting of declared values and beliefs. The content and form of our

thinking are socially constructed from within the dominant ideological frame and that "reality" is experienced largely as "given" (Von Glasersfeld, 1984). The creation of critical knowledge then proceeds negatively by reconstructing what history and our own development have constructed for us. A sharing of assumptions would have signalled areas or issues needing further exploration to deepen mutual understanding, and would most likely have provided a natural entry for a discussion of emancipatory knowledge.

To share critical information

I view critical information as information participants needed to have to function most effectively. I viewed it as critical that all participants understand their knowledge was necessary and valued in the development of our teacher education program. A reply by one of the school associates to my letter asking if our collaborative work had been "worthwhile" confirms her understanding—and those sentiments were echoed often.

> *I was proud to be included with people who I saw as caring educators both at the SFU level and at other schools in our district. Rarely do we get opportunities to meet and discuss what we do. I felt valued for input I could offer; sometimes I wondered why they'd listen to me! I also realized I was not the only experienced teacher still learning and struggling with new programs.* [SA response to my letter, jan,1992]

It was critical as well to understand that ongoing reflection both alone and with others was required to access that knowledge. I believe prior comments (Chapter Five and Six) by school associates on the difficulty and rewards of intersubjective reflection indicate its value was realized. Insights participants described as being the result of the discussions with colleagues were valued. As Joe said when recounting his case study discussion, "*How I have changed in some of my educational decisions is by talking to some of my colleagues right here*" (transcript, nov, 1990).

I came to realize that knowledge of the past history of participants also played a critical role in helping me understand the dynamics of the groups—as I am sure it did for all of us to varying degrees. For instance, as I reread transcripts of group discussions, I understand more clearly the anxiety behind the question of the school associate who asked if we had to "*do the*

program all over again next year." Throughout her journal entries and discussion comments is a sense of anxiety about time—she was always *"squeezed for time,"* and her student teacher needed to *"pick up the pace."* It gave me some insight into her concern for taking the time to *"do it again."*

To identify sources of conflict

I have described a number of potential conflicts above. The identifying of past experience, the uncovering of values, beliefs, assumptions, were all important processes to increase our individual and group understanding and identify potential sources of conflict. The processes used to keep us personally in touch with one another, to monitor how we were doing, what demands were crowding our lives, what I referred to as a method of intimacy (chapt 2, pp. 36-37), were important, as was time to debrief our mutual experience as teacher educators. I was mindful of trying to provide an environment of trust so that problems could be aired and not fester. But school associates were very hard on themselves. Just as they were critical of their classroom work if a child was having difficulty, they were now critical of themselves if they weren't modelling the "right" thing, or saying the "right" thing for, or to, the student teacher. The following are all excerpts from school associate journals during the practicum semester:

> *The student teacher has so many questions and I am not sure I always have the right answers.*
>
> *I will have to teach everything perfectly because they [student teachers] are really watching me.*
>
> *I must say I am looking forward to the next two weeks [student teachers will be on campus] where I will not be worrying about doing a perfect job.*

However, these same school associates never wrote of expecting that "perfection" from students in their classrooms, or of student teachers. It is a central tension being played out regarding the force of predictive and of interpretive knowledge, a tension I perceived, within our work, as characterized by the tension between the roles of "expert" and "learner." What

processes would have assisted us in articulating these tensions, and a deeper understanding of how we come to know?

The biggest source of conflict—time—has been mentioned in many places in this thesis. This is particularly worrisome to me in terms of my advocacy for collaboration, and the dependency of collaborative efforts on the willingness of members to spend time developing increased knowledge of self and other. It was strikingly evident in our planning semester that the time taken to examine practice and build a framework was valuable.

> *The reflection process and critical thinking was valuable personally and collectively; a good reminder of the positive effects of quality time and the patience for process. I gained insight and awareness of our need to form working groups that include diversity of personality and teaching assignments. We built the trust and respect for one another and moved beyond the structured framework of schooling to actually listen and learn together.* [SA response to my letter, jan, 1992]

But when we debated the use of time within the program—especially the eight days we had had together over the two semesters, no obvious parallels were drawn by the school associates between the opportunity for self-growth and the role of school associate. Thus, despite the personal and professional satisfaction and growth they reported, they would cut it out so they could have more days with the student teacher. It was a luxury they couldn't afford. It is indicative of the enormous pressures they feel that being the best teacher is "doing" not "thinking" about education. As de Castell describes (1989, p. 47), "Our different kinds of work are institutionally effected, structured and legitimated...and drive a wedge between thought and action..." The rewards are for the doing, and for the consequences thereof: there are few tangible rewards for being out of the classroom, thinking. The fallacy of this assumption is obvious.

I observed the complexity of attempting to rearrange these structures that determine our roles and relationships in education. Superintendents and principals in districts where there was stronger support for our work, encouraged time out of the classroom for reflective work. It was valuable working time they said. But I listened on two occasions while school-based teachers told their principal or superintendent that simply encouraging them to take the time

away from the classroom necessary for the teacher education role indicated their lack of understanding of the pressures of the classroom, and the extra stress it caused to be away. It is a complex issue.

The collaborative dialogue to address this issue would begin with negotiating agreement on what it was important to understand. My contribution would be that it was important to understand what empowers teachers, for instance, what fosters their ability to say, as school associates stated after our collaborative effort had finished, *"I am more willing to stand up for my beliefs and defend them"; "I can afford to believe in my own abilities and more openly accept the expertise of others."* (SA responses to my letter, jan, 1992).

To avoid individual manipulation

Most important in terms of processes to avoid manipulation is the development of the communication skills of the group to enable contributions by all members. Given our mandate to build a curriculum, and the short space of time to do so, it was not realistic to address communication skills as an isolated activity, but such skills were integral to working with student teachers, to reflection on our work, and for the discussions about the understandings student teachers should address. So the skills were addressed and utilized. There could have been more emphasis on the connection to our collaborative work. There could have been more opportunity for practice and modelling of communication skills. Again, it would have provided opportunity for a richer exchange with student teachers in attendance.

To avoid manipulation is also to support the growth of group members in building confidence and self-esteem. Because of my experience as a teacher and consultant in the public school system, I was well aware of various status-power divisions. For instance, there is higher status accorded to the teaching of higher grades:

> *Probably the greatest accolade I ever received was being asked to be the grad speaker. This is unusual in that grade seven elementary teachers are soon supplanted by high school teachers.* (SA journal, nov, 1990)

> *If everyone agreed that the primary years are where it is at and that those really are the most important years, then primary teachers should have the most preparation time, the best salaries, the biggest budgets and classes would not only be small but smallest. But this is not so of course.* (SA journal, mar, 1991)

There is a power differential between male and female teachers—particularly at the elementary level. Status is accorded to amount of formal education, as opposed to years of experience (informal education?).

> *Today the student teacher asked what my degree was in. When I responded honestly that I didn't have my degree yet he replied that he knew that. Why then did he ask me? I'm trying not to let this bother me but it does. While he has more university years than I do I still feel confident in my teaching abilities.* (SA journal, feb, 1991)

There are differences in the status accorded to different kinds of work. For instance, a music teacher would have higher status than a shop teacher, but lower status than a science teacher. I would pay more attention to those I perceived to be "marginalized" people, I would ask them for the examples, or use examples from their grade or work, use the vocabulary or situation that highlighted those whose voices were traditionally "less important." I consciously encouraged a shift in perspectives that would possibly provide some freedom from traditional roles and relationships. It was an attempt to offset the abuse of power that is signalled by the absence of voices (Ellsworth, 1989). Did I thereby create other situations of abuse?

We did most of our work in small groups. I tried to reconstitute those groups whenever possible to mix grades, districts, institutions. In a discussion addressing the inclusion of student teachers in our group during the practicum semester, the subject of the constitution of members in small groups came up, and provided another perspective to put along side the one I held at the time:

> *Cood:* *One of the things we are saying is if we are going to be collaborators let's include the student teachers—don't leave them out there somewhere while we sit here and talk about them. And they do learn from being with us and hearing us discuss. We just became such a big group if you remember what we were like in January.*
>
> *SA:* *Someone suggested breaking into grade groups then.*
>
> *Cood:* *Yes. There are so many things. One of my agendas was that we get across districts and across grades and across institutions and hear what is going on beyond our own doors. But maybe it is negating the fact that at that time [during the practicum semester] you want to hear from people who are doing the same things.*

SA: You can't do everything at once and when you are trying to figure it out it is nice to get feedback from others in that same area.

Another process to avoid manipulation included an emphasis on listening in a manner that precluded judgement and focussed on clarifying the speaker's idea or experience. That was sometimes difficult. When I walked round to different groups during discussions, I would often hear people sympathizing and offering solutions rather than asking the speaker to consider what was most important in the narrative, or what alternatives might be available.

To avoid the conclusion that the change effort (collaboration) is not worthwhile

I smiled at this last reason Cammann gave for the processes used. It was obviously a part of the reason for each process. But I had not thought of analyzing our work in those terms. But to begin back at the beginning—when I and the faculty associates first spoke with superintendents about recruiting school associates, we asked that our ideas have a chance to be heard by teachers and their principals before anyone made a commitment to this collaborative approach to teacher education. We wanted school associates who supported this approach and we wanted them to be supported by their administrators. As mentioned in chapter two (p.29), when the principals and/or superintendent attended the subsequent meetings with the prospective school associates (and there were wide discrepancies regarding this factor across districts), it made a positive difference. They listened to their teachers' concerns about taking on this work and did what they could to suggest ways to alleviate those concerns. The valuing of the potential of those school-based teachers to contribute to the education of new teachers was evident. At later meetings, administrators who had worked closely with us in the beginning continued to be most facilitative of solutions when problems arose. I do not pretend to know all the reasons why some districts were more responsive to our work than others. I certainly came to appreciate that collaboration in teacher education was only one of a myriad of items on the agenda of a busy school district. I do know that where the time and will was available to involve key district people in initial decision-making meetings, the sense of "worthwhileness" for our work, and the concomitant feelings of well being engendered among

our teacher educator group contributed to "success" for all of us—including children in classrooms, I would guess.

From the beginning as well I spoke of the "worthwhileness" of our unique and ground-breaking journey. *"We will arrive at ways of carrying on teacher education that have not been tried before"* (transcript, oct, 1990). In each consortium it was the first time the program had been built this way: we called ourselves "the originals." As has been recorded above, there were the rewards of examining and celebrating how well one carried out the complex activities of everyday work, and there was the affirmation of that knowledge when we returned to, reflected on, and modified our original work:

> *The gathering into small groups to re-define the domains was a good experience. Our group found that the basic ideas had not changed, but we had some experience to draw on which changed the specific outcomes. We actually felt we knew what we were talking about and for me it was the first time I felt that way We were able to articulate what we knew to be meaningful experiences.* [SA journal, apr, 1991]

That returning to examine our work was one of the most important processes we experienced. There was a renewed understanding and valuing, on the part of all learners within our community, of the practitioner as an effective and intentional professional, at the heart of the child's learning. When the "domains" were modified, the "role of the teacher" domain was expanded to include a previously neglected descriptor, "teacher as professional, able to develop knowledge as well as recommend theoretical bases for the student teacher" (chapt 5, p. 119). This is particularly significant in terms of a broadening of perspectives for school-based teachers. They perceive themselves as making a contribution that influences education beyond their classroom. It is a role I assume provides satisfaction for all of us who choose to work in the field of education—to leave a legacy that we believe enhances the quality of life for children, for society.

These broadened perspectives contributed to increased personal confidence and a sense of autonomy school associates said in their responses to my letter after our collaborative project was over. This increased sense of self-worth, and the concomitant increase in the valuing of

colleagues have been powerful reasons to regard collaboration as worthwhile (chapt 5, p. 43; chapt 6, p. 25).

But if the increased responsibility and expertise, as well as inclination to be more involved with colleagues in their work were not valued by key persons outside the group, at our individual places of work, it was difficult to sustain a sense of "worthwhileness" about the great amount of extra energy being expended in the name of collaboration. When we addressed program changes, a recommendation was made to help overcome the time pressures everyone was feeling—the hiring of a travelling substitute attached to the program. In this instance, the key persons needing to understand and support the program would include members of the teachers' union as well as the administrative personnel.

SA: *This recommendation is to provide a substitute who could release the school associate and student teacher for joint planning as well as for the mid-term and final evaluation conference with the faculty associate. A substitute who does enrichment projects with kids so the school associate does not have to spend time preparing for the sub to come in.*

SA: *The contracts won't allow it.*

SA: *A sub travelling from school to school teaching for an hour? Is that what you had in mind?*

SA: *That was the suggestion.*

SA: *The contract wouldn't allow it. A contract is a half a day assignment.*

SA: *Well, does it say they have to be in the same school for half a day?*

SA: *Only within a school I believe can they travel from class to class.*

SA: *Well it is certainly worth looking at. It is not as if the sub has to prepare a whole lot of different lessons. Looking at it from the sub's point of view as well as the teachers'.*

SA: *And they wouldn't be teaching the entire day—maybe three times.* (transcript, mar, 1991).

We discussed a number of ways to make more time available. Secondary school associates said the only way to provide time was to reduce their course load. Elementary teachers didn't have that option. They said substitutes often caused more demands in planning time than the "freed-from-teaching-time" they got in return. Some districts had offered the

school associates a number of substitute days that they could choose to take when they needed them—to work with the student teacher, or to recover from working with the student teacher.

Rewards also needed to be perceived as available as a result of having been involved in our collaborative teacher education program. In other words, having taken the time as either school associate or faculty associate, to address the education of new teachers, needed to be seen to have benefits beyond the time spent in that activity. It is discouraging to develop valuable skills and then watch them atrophy. As one faculty associate wrote upon returning to classroom teaching, "*I do not have the energy or time to pursue activities with colleagues—to encourage the reflection and collegiality that I know I am capable of doing" (FA response to letter, jan, 1992).* This speaks clearly, as did my comments about the involvement of district people in initial decision-making meetings, to the need for the critique of practice to include as well a social critique that confronts institutional obstacles to change.

And such sentiments speak as well to the principle that what we are doing in our area of the educational enterprise will have benefit in other areas—that it will benefit children, that it will benefit the teaching profession as a whole, overtime, as the student teachers become teacher educators and pass on the legacy.

> *I spoke to a district staff meeting about our program. I could honestly say that I felt it is as good a program with as much collaboration as I have seen or heard about. I really feel SFU, you and the district and administrators are to be complimented. As I reiterated, "The winners will be the kids in having better prepared teachers. I felt again, as mentioned earlier, a confidence I hadn't felt often before. It certainly leaves me with a good feeling.* [SA journal dec, 1990]

I hope the winners also will be university-based teachers who become more knowledgeable as a result of participation in a university-school collaborative efforts. Study and research informed by the field, and, in some cases, defined by and with participation of the field, is an essential part of the effort to develop worthwhile knowledge for education.

Influence—The Ethics

In part, the descriptions above of the processes used signal the potential inherent in my position to manipulate the activities and outcomes of our work. For instance, as I discuss in

Chapter Five (pp. 90-91), it was quite evident that as facilitator I controlled, to some extent, the manner in which the educational domains were determined. My point in that discussion was to recommend processes that remained more fully in the hands of the participants so outcomes could be controlled by the group rather than by individuals. That, in my mind, is a question of ethical practice as a facilitator and as a researcher. Moreover, the facilitator must be clear about the values informing the work and the reasons for the processes used.

> *Cood:* *Those of you living your professional lives in classrooms with children and making the kinds of decisions you have discussed this morning on a daily basis—hundreds of them —are people who understand deeply what education is. You make those decisions based on what you value in education, what you think education means, what you envision as the outcomes you want children to exhibit.*
>
> *We talked in our first session together about the kinds of things that we all believe drive the educational enterprise—how our children would be when they graduated if we had been successful in our work. We talked about the unique ways that each of us translates those outcomes for children into our daily work. Now we have discussed the decisions we make around education on a day to day basis. We will use the outcomes of those discussions to look again at the unity of concerns that drive our educational decison-making, that are most important to us all as influences on our work. And these will determine the domains—the main areas in education—that can be a framework for thinking about the education of new teachers.* [transcript, nov, 1990]

Given my earlier confession that I already had a domain framework in mind when I said that, it could be argued that I should have put those domains on the board and simply demonstrated how the decisions group members had made in their case studies "fit." After all, the original framework was an "authentic" framework: it had developed as a result of the same process with another group of school associates. However, my goal was for ownership of the program we developed to be in the hands of the group as much as possible. I would prefer to find processes to enable them to come up with the framework themselves. (Recognizing that limits are still being set by the imposition of that particular activity.) The "institutionally unbound speech" Habermas (1972) named as a condition of authentic dialogue is not available unless individual and group "realities" can be uncovered and examined.

The researcher, too, must examine her "realities." As I have mentioned elsewhere, upon rereading the transcripts I was surprised by the extent of the manipulation of group discussion by two of our group members. I think the reason I did not view these people as

manipulative at the time was because they raised issues I had an interest in pursuing, so I took the issues up and did not question their appropriateness. What became apparent to me later was that there were not a lot of different voices involved in these particular conversations, an eloquent illustration of what Ellsworth describes as "the subtle abuse of power manifest by the absence of voices" (1989, p. 312). It is also a clear example of the importance of thick description in qualitative research in order that researcher's biases become apparent to both reader and researcher.

I return to Maxine Greene's caution about the "malefic generosity" of well-intentioned professionals whose "language, commitments, even their interest in critique, can exert a new kind of domination, a new mode of control" (p. 98). Like Cammann (p. 110), I am interested in work that accords with my values and that I believe has the potential to enhance the quality of work life for the people with whom I work, and the quality of life for the children for whom all of us in education work. But as I have found, rereading transcripts and journals, my commitment to my vision of collaboration has at times, prevented me from behaving collaboratively, as Greene warns.

I envisioned collaboration without appreciating the difficulty of dwelling so continuously in the ambiguous and time-consuming process of negotiating meaning. Indeed, because I was not so continuously involved, it was not until we were in the practicum semester and the negotiations between school associate, student teacher and faculty associate, and between coordinator and faculty associates, became more numerous and intense, that I became aware of the extent of the tensions exacerbated by such continuous interaction. What guided and sustained our group continued to be a commitment to a reciprocal dialogue, but I needed to understand that the reciprocal dialogue broke down and became oppressive if there was not the opportunity for individual meaning-making and action. The challenge remained for me to understand how best to demonstrate that tension as the source of new understanding and action for the group and for individuals within the group.

The critical ability to know one's self

In chapter two, I described my professional journey to this place of collaboration. I spoke of the isolation and the accompanying perception of low status for classroom teachers that undermined my confidence. I described, briefly, my work with First Nations' people where I was shocked into new awareness of the potential for oppression inherent in the role of public school teachers, and of the need for multiple voices to inform educational decisions. I recounted the opportunities I had as district consultant and as a teacher educator to witness the deep understanding of children and of learning environments that our best teachers exhibit. All of this made it quite clear to me as a coordinator of teacher education programs that I wished to find a way to include school-based teachers in educational decision-making, and, in this instance, specifically in the development of teacher education curriculum. As a result of my doctoral work, I increasingly envisioned this conjoining of educational knowledge in terms of conceptual frameworks that now inform this thesis.

Given the intimacy of my involvement as coordinator and researcher, and given my already filtered and organized views of the world, my method of research and analysis had to be "openly value-based inquiry," Lather (1991, p. 2). The reader needed to be able to reconstruct and judge the collaborative project with some knowledge of the initiator, facilitator and researcher—simultaneously, in this case.

This critical look at one's self as the initiator of change, then, is also a look at the ethics of being influential. Cammann suggests that critical self-knowledge is fostered by looking at who you pay attention to and where you get your information (pp. 119-121) as a first step in identifying personal prejudices and biases. The question is asked in an interesting way: What do participants need to know in order to succeed? I mentioned in my descriptions of our work (chapt 5, p. 85), that I was more likely to pay attention to encouragers than skeptics as we began—a direct contradiction to my declared valuing of tension as the source of growth. Who were considered encouragers? First of all they radiated positive energy, they nourished me in

my facilitator role. They were ready to contribute and seemed inclusive in manner. But with some, as I have recounted above, it was the fact that they were including me that I was mistaking for inclusiveness!

I paid more attention to what I would call philosophical and to tentative comment than to confident assertions of what should be done. Collaborative work is necessarily "hesitant, fragmented, even agitated speech...ideas offered before they are fully formed" (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988, p. 81), offered as "language bent to fresh new purposes" (Merleau-Ponty, in Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 27). I wonder now if I discouraged practical talk during our sessions: I usually could not refrain from asking some form of "but-what-about-the-beliefs-that-inform-that-action" question. On the other hand, I wanted all views to be heard (most of the time) and sometimes I was told that that was not appropriate, "*Sometimes your desire (need?) for consensus is counterproductive to group cohesion*" (SA journal, mar, 1991). In line with my sensitivity for the "right balance" between university and school talk, I tended to pay more attention, in subtle, and probably not so subtle, ways to school associate rather than to faculty associate comment in the large group. For instance, I would focus more, be more inclined to extend an idea with a school associate: I would not spend as much time clarifying faculty associate comment. (Of course we had long hours of conversation outside these sessions.) School associate talk dominated these sessions. (And, I suppose, but cannot confirm, female elementary teachers were paid more attention than secondary or male teachers—in the interest of "righting the balance.") Most of the time I encouraged different perspectives and, particularly, comment that questioned "the way it is." Dichotomous thinking was discouraged. I was attempting to provide the opportunity to envision and attempt new constructions by interrupting traditional relationships (chapt 4, p. 59).

But all this self confession may leave the impression that I was centre stage. In fact, I tried not to talk too much. I did not facilitate everything. The faculty associates and I shared the beginning and the orchestrating of different processes. Most processes were teacher-centred, and a majority of the time in large group work, it was school associates reporting back

and expanding on discussion that had begun in small cross grade/district/institution groups. We returned always "to the subject active in remembering and in finding out" (chapt 4, p. 56). I facilitated those large group debrief sessions, perceiving my particular skills to be those of clarifying and extending individual and group thinking.

This description points to a limitation on my knowing imposed by data made up in part by the transcripts of these large group discussions that were a feature of every session. Particular people and, therefore, viewpoints were more likely to be represented. But the viewpoints expressed were diverse: they were not a chorus.

Cammann suggests other questions that are of value in the development of critical self-knowledge: How do you deal with failure? With stress and pain of participants? How do you keep grounded in the vision? Considering these questions puts me in touch with the enormous value I attach to the opportunity to study this collaborative effort. I have, as it were, observed myself dealing with these questions as I review the transcripts, the journals and the letters, and develop the thick description of this work. Keeping critically in touch with my own experiencing has required ongoing personal and intersubjective reflection. It has required the "heliocentric view" that I describe in Chapter Four (p. 57), recognizing that "I am moved and shaped by the activity I research as well as implicated in the shaping and influencing of that activity." To describe that view puts me in touch again with the inevitable tension of facilitating and researching collaborative work. The goal was to "multiply differences rather than create new valid orders," (Foucault, in Scheurich, p. 7). I struggled to keep issues "in the middle," not to cover over the "lumpy" bits—I think of the hours I have spent describing some of the complexities of time, place, personalities, and history that are inextricably woven into the unfolding of any event. Most importantly, I have attempted, as both facilitator and researcher, to undertake this work as a learner "committed to an on-going and never-ending process of becoming" (chapt 4, p. 67).

Summary

In his summary Cammann makes three points about "action useable knowledge." First, the knowledge needs to cover the whole sequence of change events. This is the thick description I have provided, particularly in chapters two, five and six, that enable readers to have (using Cammann's list) an understanding of the context, the personalities, the skills, feelings, roles, behaviours and influences on the event. If there is one of these areas that is not as thoroughly covered as the rest, it is the outside influences on this event. Although I briefly described initial contact with districts in Chapter Two, and included some of the influences of district activity on our work in the analysis in this chapter, I have certainly not provided a thick description of the activity or the personalities of consortium partners. Nor have I mentioned the university, in terms of those in the faculty with responsibility for teacher education, beyond the fact that they handed me a mandate to develop teacher education programs in specific geographic areas with particular district and college partners. Although that was not the last word on the subject with regular faculty—I was, in fact, in constant touch with, and answerable to, the director of the Professional Development Program, and spoke regularly with faculty assigned to each consortium, the day to day coordination of the programs was left in my hands.

My particular interest in this thesis is the study of collaboration as a process that must be understood and put to use, to put it simply, for the survival of the planet earth. Secondly, it is an interest in collaboration in teacher education because this is a field I know well and value highly. In both cases I am interested in studying the processes and evolving relationships that define collaborative efforts and the "action useable knowledge" that enables the next collaborative effort to be better. I do not suppose the effort can be successful without an understanding of the whole field or structure within which it takes place. A critique of practice necessarily includes a social critique of the institutions that can support or constrain practice

(Liston & Zeichner, 1990). That aspect requires more study in terms of the collaborative effort in teacher education.

Secondly, Cammann states, action useable knowledge includes complementary simple models that together provide holistic views. In this way both parts and wholes can be understood and manipulated. What "parts" have I provided? I have provided a view of a model that I recommend discarding, that of isolated and disjointed components to programs in teacher education that, in the end, discredit both university and school knowledge. I have provided conceptual frameworks, examining different kinds of knowledge and their necessary contributions to teacher education, and processes to enable the integration of those contributions. I have described a model where roles and relationships are redefined by paying attention to personal narratives and by embedding the collaborative work in the language of those narratives. I have provided models that support the development of emancipatory knowledge, beginning with an understanding and articulation of what we know in order to move from an explanation of being to other possibilities of becoming. These models are all built on the foundation of another—that of the social construction of knowledge and the concomitant necessity for ongoing examination of the interests that knowledge serves.

And having provided predictive models, I have then provided the holistic view of the change effort by describing the collaborative dance. Chapter five is the models in action. Then there is the readjusting of those models informed by knowledge claims developed in the interest of interpretation and emancipation, as the participants dance and the researcher "activates" the text. This is the heart of my work and is contained (as much as human thought and action can ever be "contained") in chapters five and six. In the final chapter I will make some recommendations about further changes to these models that could result in some different dance steps, but I do not claim to write the final score—for the collaboration dance is always changing and never finished.

Lastly, Cammann emphasizes that the link must be made to the skills necessary to the change effort. And I add attitudes—also necessary to the change effort, and necessary for the

appropriate utilization of the skills. Collaboration depends on the development of communication skills to facilitate, clarify, extend ideas—skills required as well by successful teacher educators. Both roles are dependent, as well, on the commitment of participants to the cultivation of attitudes of reciprocity and of respect for the intelligent self-direction of the persons with whom one works. In this regard, the purposiveness and ongoing stimulation of teacher educator work complements the development of attitudes and skills that can enhance other collaborative endeavours. But such acquisition requires ongoing monitoring, practice, and encouragement that needs to be included in planning for change.

Claims Regarding Collaboration in Teacher Education

As a result of the experience and study of collaboration in teacher education, I am proposing five claims that I believe describe a standard for a reasonable collaborative effort. As well I am describing research conditions that I believe best serve the goals of understanding collaboration and supporting transformative thought and action. I conclude this chapter with a brief comment on each of these claims linking them to the analysis contained in this chapter.

Claim #1 A collaborative effort between school-based teachers and university-based teachers is necessary to the development of worthwhile teacher education programs.

The knowledge and understandings of school-based teachers largely defined the context and the issues that guided our discussions about education. Predictive knowledge provided a variety of conceptual frames, and generated processes, that guided our examination of education. We deepened our individual and collective understanding of teaching and learning. Then we stepped back from this richly complex work and named the understandings about teaching and learning that guided work within this complexity. We developed predictive knowledge claims that we had confidence in given their development in relation to the everyday activity of the field. This movement back and forth between different kinds of knowledge was

the weaving of knowledge claims that can provide coherence, balance and worthwhileness to teacher education.

Claim #2 Collaboration means redefining roles and relationships among participants guided by an attitude of being a learner —suspending judgement and listening deeply.

When we succeeded in approaching our work together as learners, other constraints—normative patterns defining and legitimating traditional relationships and work—fell away. To a large degree, at such times, we overcame the status quo and entertained the possibility of freedom from what our history constructed us to be. When we felt threatened, when our contribution was discredited somehow, we retreated to a didactic role and began to insist on "the way it ought to be." Then, for me, a different kind of growth took place: I was forced to view my limitations and ask myself why.

Claim #3 Collaboration requires a critical self-knowledge as well as knowledge of the other.

This is a postmodern view that challenges the assumption of the possibility of "an autonomous individual capable of full consciousness and endowed with a stable 'self'"(Lather, 1991, p. 5). The comments of school-based teachers in the transcripts, and, particularly, in their journals, provide dramatic evidence of the importance attached to the opportunity to develop a more articulate and intentional understanding of themselves and their practice. Valued equally was the opportunity for intersubjective reflection, the opportunity to deepen their understanding of the practice and concomitant values and beliefs of their colleagues. The activity was described as rich, exciting, risky, and necessary (transcripts, oct, nov, 1990). The collaborative effort required such processes to "restore the tension between the self and the 'other' and bring our prejudices to light" (Ricoeur, 1981, p. 59). They were necessary as well to articulate the beliefs and values that we shared and that enabled us to engage in discourse and to reach agreement (Polkinghorne, 1988; Kemmis, 1985). A further outcome was the

increased knowledge and confidence that has empowered individuals in the long term (chapt 5, p. 116; chapt 6, p. 150).

The processes facilitating this increased knowledge challenged the participant/researcher on a number of occasions to examine assumptions about the extent to which she was collaborative. My understanding of the possibilities of collaboration was extended.

Claim #4 Collaboration requires ongoing and critical dialogue to ensure knowledge continues to be viewed as socially constructed and historically situated.

If we had simply come together, determined a framework, much in the manner that we did, and left it there, it is not likely that the exercise would have been empowering to any of us in the long run. But having put forward our first best effort, having had the opportunity to begin to experience the consequences of that effort, and then to reflect on and modify our work, provided us with powerful evidence of the constructed nature of knowledge. We were together long enough to experience the resultant tensions and conflicts of negotiating among competing knowledge claims to determine what we ought to do. And we were involved in the reconstruction of what we knew—at a new site, metaphorically speaking—because the time, the event, the knowledge we held had changed.

Claim #5 The outcomes of the collaborative effort are contained within the processes and can be characterized as a deepening awareness by individuals within the group, of the perspectives and understandings held by group members, and an ever developing capacity to work within difference, to negotiate agreement, and to predict the consequences of that agreement.

If we are committed to the collaborative effort, we have come away from our work together with new eyes. We see with a wider surround and cannot take action without considering the effect of that action within a richer and more complex variety of contexts. In our work together we wove back and forth between different understandings and perspectives,

between interpretive, predictive, and, less frequently, emancipatory knowledge claims, guarding against the appropriation of meaning. We stopped and wrote down what we knew at the end of the planning semester about what student teachers should understand about teaching and learning. When we stopped to write them down again after the practicum semester, we learned new things about ourselves and our colleagues. We have all been change agents, providing for one another new ways of thinking.

Claim #6 Because the outcomes of collaboration are characterized by enhanced understanding and capacity to act, research into collaboration is most richly served by assuming the role of participant/researcher in order that the social conditions and reflexive processes of participants can be described, including those of researcher as she shapes, and is shaped, by the events recorded.

The obligation as researcher is to avoid determining ahead of time what knowledge is worth attending to by recording the interplay of history and expectation, open to having events shape and challenge the self and recording the resultant tensions. Such research requires thick description of collaboration in action. In this way "moments of constructed visibility" are offered that provide for the reader a glimpse of the challenges and possibilities of collaborative meaning-making.

Chapter VII
Toward a Reasonable Standard

I was listening to a program on CBC radio a few weeks ago reporting on a conference addressing women and the law. The conference was examining the ways in which the law discriminated against women, and the Law Society discriminated against women lawyers. The conference was presided over by former Supreme Court Justice, Bertha Wilson. It appeared to be an important conference: recommendations were being developed that, if approved, could result in some fundamental changes to the way in which Canadian common law was interpreted. Since judgements in common law proceed by way of interpretation of a general body of law in light of specific cases, the changes required were largely attitudinal—to make available a wider range of interpretations. Conference speakers were emphasizing that those charged with making the interpretations needed a deeper understanding of and appreciation for events as they affected women, and as they were viewed by women. The speaker on the radio suggested the conference could represent a breakthrough. If accepted, the recommendations would initiate the process of refocussing a profession and body of law in a manner that would legitimate other perspectives than those that had dominated British courts for centuries and, since 1867, informed Canadian courts. The standard that had prevailed as the lens through which cases and persons were traditionally viewed in respect to common law, the speaker referred to as "the standard of the reasonable man."

What was being recommended at the conference was another standard, one that proclaimed there were other perspectives, other histories to be read and written. The recommendation was that "the standard of the reasonable woman" needed also to be applied in law and to the law. In citing this case I am not suggesting that "men" and "women" are stable entities that represent all the perspectives that need to be considered in law, nor that the law has been, in fact, so narrowly applied in all cases. The important point here, however, is the

assertion of reasonable points of view other than those that have been dominant over many centuries.

I introduce that story, and describe the dramatic (but surely "reasonable") attitude shift required as a paradigm case that illustrates knowledge viewed as socially constructed, historically situated, and legitimated in the service of particular interests. It is the attitude shift and the view of knowledge required to reach towards the "reasonable standard for a collaborative effort" I am proposing in this thesis, delineated by the claims first laid out in chapter six, and further developed in this chapter. In both law and in education these standards are being proposed in response to the diverse groups and individuals who are proclaiming that there is a lack of "fit" between what the law, or the university, says ought to be the case, and the experience of those affected by the decisions.

It is the perceived lack of "fit" between universities as the sites of coursework and seminars in teacher education programs, and schools as sites of the practicum, that the collaborative work described here has attempted to overcome. Teacher education carried on at isolated sites has resulted in the discrediting of knowledge held by university-based and school-based teachers. For instance, some of the stories told by school-based teachers in our collaborative group referred to the alienation and isolation they had experienced in previous teacher education work: they had felt "redundant" and "lightly regarded." That was surely not the intent of the university that sought their involvement. A recurring theme among university-based teachers is a concern for the lack of "fit" of some school-based teachers as models of critical and reflective practitioners. But when do school-based teachers have time or support to develop these processes for themselves and, thereby, to articulate and organize the knowledge they hold? Judgement must be suspended: educators from schools and universities need to listen to one another and understand the role each assumes in complementing or negating the educational work of the other if we are to reverse the fragmented and often contradictory experiences of teacher education reported by student teachers.

A collaborative effort does not concern itself with who is most expert. Such a question is not helpful because no matter how much expertise a group member may have, their knowledge exists in relation to the knowledge of the rest of the group, and is necessarily changed by the contribution of the other. This is in contrast to the humanist view of the "stable self":

> Humanism posits the subject as an autonomous individual capable of full consciousness and endowed with a stable "self" constituted by a set of static characterisitics such as sex, class, race, sexual orientation. (Lather, 1991, p. 5)

A view of knowledge as socially constructed and serving particular interests, and a view of collaboration as inviting the contribution of multiple and contestatory voices, precludes the humanist notion. Collaborative processes facilitate a deeper appreciation of individual limitations as the tension of the dialogue reveals other perspectives. Within this tension is the potential for transformative action, action taken with a wider appreciation of its possibilities and consequences.

Using the Claims to Delineate a "Reasonable Standard of Collaborative Effort"

Claim #1 A collaborative effort between school-based teachers and university-based teachers is necessary to the development of worthwhile teacher education programs.

A collaborative effort between educators from schools and universities includes a public examination of the knowledge and assumptions that they hold and that underlie and guide their thought and action in their educational work. Such a dialogue fosters: a) coherence regarding the ideas and activities that constitute the formal education of young people—and of student teachers—and b) an ongoing and reflexive dialogue about what is worthwhile in education. Such a process provides some assurance of responsiveness to changing circumstance, to new perspectives and ideas arising from universities, from schools, and, to some extent, from society at large as children and their adult caregivers impact on the public school system.

It is necessary to carry on this dialogue over time to sustain worthwhile change in education. One requires a sense of belonging within the educational enterprise, a sense of place and purpose, otherwise there is no foundation from which to envision change (Ricoeur, 1981). Nor is there the possibility of experiencing oneself as an agent of change. To collaborate is to support the development of Freire's (1973) "knowing subject" who both understands the need for change, and has the capacity to effect change. These two conditions require inter-institutional dialogue characterized by negotiation among educators with a diversity of mandates and interests.

The curriculum for teacher education developed by school associates, faculty associates and the coordinator in both consortia (NWTEC and New Caltec) achieved, to a degree, a sense of coherence, balance, and worthwhileness. And that sense of "rightness" was not limited to the substantive outcome of a curriculum framework for student teachers, but included a psychological outcome of pride in our shared ownership of the responsibility for educating new teachers. The commitment to this collaborative manner of conducting teacher education was very strong. It made sense to all of us that we develop together that which would guide our work with student teachers. In our unique situation with teachers from Kindergarten to grade 12 and from four school districts, the fact that we built a common program, reinforced a sense of a shared commitment to and purpose in education that was particularly rich. Having worked together, we agreed that we needed to get rid of the isolation, of the "islands" that separate one group of educators from another. This program seemed to model a way of beginning to do that.

Claim #2 Collaboration means redefining roles and relationships among participants guided by an attitude of being a learner —suspending judgement and listening deeply.

This is a position that begins with a belief in the intelligent self-direction of human beings, and a commitment to foster equal and inclusive exchange of ideas and perspectives. To experience the possibility of change, requires that one enter the discourse open to these

other perspectives and willing publicly to offer one's own views for examination : colleagues can offer new findings and new ways of thinking. For the necessary environment of intimacy and trust to evolve, the degree of skepticism and challenge present in the discourse must be limited. Given these attitudes and conditions, a disruption of roles and relationships that privilege particular knowledge or knowers is encouraged. This commitment to collaborative processes needs to be joined to skill competence that enables a dialogue across tensions and conflicting views, and a conjoining of contestatory voices in order to act.

The act of critical reflection, both privately and with others, is at the heart of the collaborative effort. The opportunity for and valuing of this intense and focussed effort is rare in the lives of school-based teachers. In our collaborative work it was a valued and legitimated activity and that, in itself, was a transformative act. Our narratives, and reflection on those narratives describing our relationships with children, with curriculum, with research, provided intimate portraits of ourselves within the structure of education. At the same time there were opportunities to hear other perspectives, and comprehend education from a "wider surround."

We witnessed, at our most collaborative moments, different kinds of knowledge enriching our understanding and providing the opportunity for new knowledge. We constructed a framework for student teacher curriculum. Power, as defined in terms of institutional structures that legitimated university-based teachers as the conveyors of knowledge, and school-based teachers as the receivers, slowly shifted as we worked together. It took on an alternate definition, at least within the confines of the recorded large group discussions that constitute part of my data, as power to articulate that which we needed to know at a given point in time. This meant the power could shift a number of times within an hour or two of talk. The resultant ambiguity about roles and relationships meant new roles evolved, and as tensions about what we ought to do arose, the ambiguity of collaborative work provided spaces for the tensions to erupt into new knowledge.

One of the interesting shifts in status came about because elementary and secondary teachers were listening deeply to one another's narratives of work. At this time in British

Columbia there are fundamental changes taking place in curriculum and in school organization. These changes have been addressed in primary grades for the past two years and many of the school associates who were primary teachers were eloquent spokespersons for the new curriculum. Their understanding and experience in this area gave them a status, particularly with secondary teachers who were not yet engaged in the change, that is not the norm in terms of public school hierarchies. It is an instance of the more comprehensive appreciation for and the building of the connections between and among educators that enhances the opportunities for change to be sustained.

In contrast to the abstract reading and writing about education that preoccupied me as a doctoral student, were the particularized contexts and practices described by school-based teachers. They defined richly complex starting points. Our discussions centred around concern for the relationships of children with teachers, with curriculum, with school environments. I experienced myself thinking about education from the middle of the dilemmas school-based teachers described.

Claim #3 Collaboration requires a critical self-knowledge as well as knowledge of the other.

I came to this journey with a particular history, and with values, beliefs and expectations that were part of the argument I built for the worth of a collaborative effort. This self knowledge continues to be challenged as writing about the effort sharpens my understanding. I am changed and need to keep recording the evolving because, as researcher, as well as facilitator, my evolving influences the interpretation of other changing events. This shaping and being shaped, the tension of the interplay between self and other, is the development of critical knowledge. The creation of critical knowledge then, proceeds negatively by way of challenging previous interpretations.

To examine our present interpretations, we began with our individual and personal narratives, those ordered, structured, and goal-related sequences of events that represented our

understanding of who we were and what was worthwhile for us to do (Polkinghorne, 1989). These narratives revealed the interpretations of social life we adhered to, and their manifestation in our work. Within the collaborative processes supporting this examination, we experienced the tensions of both belonging to the larger educational enterprise, and of not belonging, as we ran up against perspectives that didn't "fit" our own. These interstices provided the moments of doubt that signalled the limits of our own world views, and the possibility of viewing differently.

For most participants this examination and these dialogues were, first of all, a re-discovery of what we knew. In the main, we became more aware of the beliefs, values, assumptions that influenced the work we do. And our work was also viewed as more complex and rich with both consequence and possibility than we had had time to know. We realized our stories belonged to a history and tradition that had more coherence than we had had time to discuss. And coalitions were built within our group that enabled individuals to feel a sense of shared values and experiences. Where there was the time and interest, these coalitions became sites of power and supported social critique. An instance of this was the critique provided by a number of the school associates regarding the approach to lesson and unit planning the university-based teachers had come up with for the student teachers. Their criticism of this approach included a criticism of the structures that had led to that decision in the first place—and suggestions/demands for change.

Claim #4 Collaboration requires ongoing and critical dialogue to ensure knowledge continues to be viewed as socially constructed and historically situated.

The tension of the critical dialogue signals there is more than one way to view, to think about, to act upon an event. At the same time it validates as worthwhile what each contributes to a deeper understanding for all members of the group. An understanding of this view of knowledge is key to an understanding of collaboration. I describe the outcomes of collaboration, in part, as a deepening awareness of different perspectives and an ability to

negotiate courses of action among them. This awareness and ability are dependent on dialogue and negotiation being ongoing, a recognition that knowledge is not fixed.

The outcomes we stopped and wrote down in terms of the curriculum for student teachers were representative of what we knew at that point in time. And as we experienced the program underway, and as we thought about it when it was over, we had different knowledge, and the program changed.

But, of course, it was not that straightforward. Our different understandings and perspectives enriched, but they also caused tension and conflict and sometimes we needed to sit out the collaborative dance and regain our sense of self. These different movements of enrichment, tension and retreat signal the difficulty of the collaborative effort and are an important reason for keeping the view of knowledge as socially constructed in front of the group. The coherence and worthwhileness of our teacher education program depended upon participants being willing to return to the dance.

The shift in thinking that characterizes the movement from hierarchical to collaborative arrangements is the shift from a search for who knows, for the expert, to a focus on what it is we need to understand at this particular place and time, and on what it is we can all contribute. We are all responsible then for examining, and reflecting privately and publicly, on our work. Assuming this responsibility, we place ourselves somewhere on the continuum between the "no longer," as we gain more freedom *within* our world as a result of greater knowledge, and the "not yet," as we imagine the possibilities of freedom *from* our inherited world views. This is the creative step of reinterpreting our constructed histories and developing new stories. The stories recounted by school associates a year later (chapt 5, pp. 115-116), are examples of personal histories reconstructed.

<u>Claim #5</u> The outcomes of the collaborative effort are contained within the processes and can be characterized as a deepening awareness by individuals within the group, of the perspectives and understandings held by group members, and an everdeveloping capacity to work within difference, to negotiate agreement, and to predict the consequences of that agreement.

In the end, after seven months of meeting and working together, we had begun to understand what it meant to be teacher educators in collaboration, in new roles and relationships. I believe the majority of us went about our work differently as a result of our dialogues with colleagues and with student teachers. And if we had committed ourselves to being learners, we saw what we and our colleagues did with different eyes. The greater ability to articulate what we knew, and what we came to know, fostered pride and confidence in our work and, was transferred to greater confidence and interest in the work of colleagues. The deeper awareness of what collaboration entails facilitated the ability to transfer the process to other sites. This capacity was illustrated by school-based teachers who reported building collaborative groups in their school or district as a result of their positive experience within our group.

This greater confidence in the self included, among some school-based teachers, a role as a developer of knowledge, appreciating the contribution they had to make to decision-making outside the individual classroom. For example, the teacher education curriculum we developed was predicated on the necessity of attending to the moral, emotional, intellectual and social development of the student teacher. In other words, the emphasis school associates had placed on their relationships with children was extended to describe the relationship with student teachers. Thus the appropriate curriculum and the appropriate evaluation outcomes for a student teacher were contingent on that unique and particular individual. This perspective heavily influenced the modifications made at the end of the program—a time when we knew most intimately the experience and possibilities of teacher education. These processes and outcomes emphasized a basic tenet of collaborative work—that consensus is neither expected or sought. As one of the faculty associates remarked, "*Once we start talking of collaboration and even hinting that by collaborating we all come to be the same or think the same that is death to collaboration*" (transcript, nov, 1991).

Limitations of Collaboration

Collaboration is ongoing, time-consuming and breaks down from time to time as a result of the tensions of ongoing negotiation among participants. The participants referred to in this thesis were attracted by the opportunity of an expanded and diverse group of educators informing decision-making in teacher education. It made good sense to all of us that both institutions were represented: the collaborative effort promised richer fare. But the intensity of the work took its toll. The effort required suspending one's own beliefs, as is possible, to listen to and support and consider those of others. It required the integration of a number of different claims—and the concomitant setting aside of others. It meant compromise and negotiation, with no expectation of "arrival." What we did achieve was a deeper understanding of education that enabled us to come to tentative agreement about what we ought to do in the first practicum semester. And we questioned and modified that agreement as we worked together.

And this description does not begin to address the diverse histories, interests and power that individuals brought with them into the group. The intense and multi-layered dialogue and development of meaning was very rewarding and very rich. But I believe many of us sometimes felt we were losing ourselves within it. The fundamental human tension of negotiating between the needs and interests of the individual and the needs and interests of the group required acknowledgment and legitimation. Opportunities for participants to remove themselves from the collaborative dance were required. Clearly the challenges of collaborative work, and of developing the communication skills required, needed to be acknowledged and supported.

Collaboration also requires the cultivation of attitudes and activities that are antithetical to many of the regulatory forces in place in the educational enterprise in both universities and schools. School-based teachers have, traditionally, been described as a "receiving" culture, a culture that carries out ideas developed by outside experts. There is today more attention paid

and respect given to the knowledge held by practitioners, but in the main, as I have argued in chapter three, the power differential between school-based teachers and other educators—administrators, district personnel, university teachers—has not changed. The implications for school-based teachers as developers of knowledge are profound. Given their place in the hierarchy, they can have little confidence that what they have to contribute will, in the end, make a long term difference, will it contribute to educational policy?

School-based teachers who become faculty associates, on the other hand, appear to move up in the hierarchy. It seems somewhat paradoxical that most faculty associates so quickly assume an "expert" role that sets them apart from their school-based colleagues. The hierarchy remains in tact with faculty associates "changing sides." Why does this happen? When faculty associates first begin their affiliation with Simon Fraser University, there is concerted attention paid to their expertise, they are lauded as "outstanding practitioners" who have been selected to educate new teachers. It is an exhilarating time. The work one has been doing in isolation in classrooms is publicly appreciated. Membership in the faculty is (temporarily) proffered. I would suggest the celebrations could emphasize the opportunity their temporary appointment at the university affords for them to strengthen the voice of their school-based colleagues in teacher education. Such an emphasis would also acknowledge teacher education as a rich opportunity for education across the continuum of pre-service, induction, and in-service. Both these instances—school associates as developers of knowledge; faculty associates as collaborators—signal the importance of including within the collaborative effort participants representing the diverse interests and institutional structures that are implicated in teacher education programs.

Implications of This Approach

As I have stated above, one of the implications of collaborative work is more time devoted to thinking about as opposed to doing education. As I believe is evident in the body of this thesis, it is time that can provide abundant personal and professional rewards in both the

short and the long term. And, I assume, and a number of school associates stated as well, that children in classrooms benefit by having teachers that are feeling a renewed sense of personal efficacy and a heightened regard for their colleagues. How is the financial cost of these outcomes weighed against other demands for limited educational dollars? Or, put another, more interesting way—how could collaborative work make a contribution to meeting those other demands?

Not only financial considerations complicate the ability for successful collaboration, but attitudes towards the value of teacher educator work must be examined as well. In chapter six I described the reaction of two school associates to encouragement by their administrators to take the time off they needed for teacher education work (in addition to our sessions). The school associates spoke of the stress and inordinate amounts of extra time (above that devoted to the collaborative work) that being out of their classroom entailed. Obviously, given finite energy and time, the children came first. How can classrooms and schedules be arranged so that school-based teachers are not penalized for taking the time to engage in thinking about education in critical and reflective ways with colleagues?

And why is the role of teacher educator not accorded the value and higher profile it deserves? This question is at the heart of my advocacy for collaboration between universities and schools. The area of pre-service teacher education provides a particularly promising opportunity to address the continuum in teacher education. Throughout our work together in developing curriculum for the student teachers, it was clear we were engaged in professional development for ourselves. We were providing support for new teachers who were struggling to realize their images of practice, and renaissance for experienced teachers who openly declared the value of going back and unpacking and examining what it was they did all day. University-based teachers had rich and diverse opportunities to develop an understanding of and respect for practice and its relationship to children, to curriculum and to educational environments. And because the work was sustained, supported and collegial (Little, 1981), the momentum grew and we changed—first ourselves and, secondly the program. In the end,

many of us had developed a more reflective and critical approach to our work that approximated the primary attitude we wished to instill in student teachers. As both a legacy, and as an attitude with which to address ongoing work, the collaborative role of teacher educator deserves higher status and recognition from schools and universities—and concomitant material rewards and conditions that make it possible to sustain energy and commitment.

Many of the processes and practices undertaken by the collaborative group of teacher educators in this thesis could have been in joint session with student teachers. Such joint sessions, framed around an examination of the dilemmas and tensions inherent in education, would provide student teachers with the model of an active and responsible profession engaged in the examination and development of knowledge. But as I discuss in chapter five, (p. 96; 103-104), there is a time for the reflective and critical processes to include student teachers and a time for the work undertaken in preparation for that event. The opportunity needs first to be afforded to school-based and university-based teachers to understand their roles and relationships to knowledge as a group of teacher educators with common goals and purposes. The intent is to provide time for trust to build between traditionally distant colleagues, and for critical understanding and valuing of the contributions of each to become part of what group members know.

I appreciate that this way of framing the work means some of the dialogue about practice goes unremarked by student teachers, and some opportunities are lost, but most school-based teachers described the processes of public and intersubjective reflection on practice to be challenging and often risky. To begin as a full contingent, including student teachers, might cause the dialogue to shut down. As so many school associates remarked in the course of our time together, they worried a lot about getting it "right" for the student teacher. The pressure to be right in front of colleagues and student teachers might be overwhelming.

The paragraph above points to a central tension and paradox within which we resided throughout our collaborative work—the tension engendered by attempting to sustain the contradictory roles of both learner and expert, the one role requiring the suspension of beliefs, the other observed as the assertion of beliefs. So school associates would both assert what student teachers should do, and worry about constraining their unique vision and individual meaning-making. Faculty associates agonized over providing space for all voices to be heard, and then asserted their right to make the final decision about a student teacher's evaluation. It caused the flux and ambiguity that were changing roles and relationships and tensions. As I have attempted to demonstrate in this thesis, collaborative efforts require shifting the question from "Who knows?"—"Who is the expert?" to "What do we all need to understand?"—"What do we all have to learn and contribute?"

Researching a Collaborative Effort

Claim #6 Because the outcomes of collaboration are characterized by enhanced understanding and capacity to act, research into collaboration is most richly served by assuming the role of participant/researcher in order that the social conditions and reflexive processes of participants can be described, including those of researcher as she shapes, and is shaped, by the events recorded.

The role of researcher within a collaborative effort can be significant in increasing the capacity of the participants to answer the latter question: "What do we all need to understand?" As I describe in chapter four, the researcher participates in the struggle to develop meaning, experiencing along with other participants the tensions, conflicts, moments of doubt, that are often the fertile moments of disruption into new knowledge. It is writing at the site, and about the site at which relationships with one another intersect. Individual histories, present perceptions and future expectations are made visible. The goal of both the discourse, and of the research as thick description of discourse events, is emancipatory—to provide knowledge

of the human condition that can enhance our capacity for transformative action (Heron, in Lather, 1991).

As a researcher within and examining such a discourse, I am "freed" to look at difficult issues "truthfully," and with as much opportunity to gain self-knowledge and knowledge of others as our situation allowed. But one runs the risk as well of shutting off other views existing outside the researcher's inevitably limited ability to understand, and outside the inevitable limits of the group to generate meaning. Therefore, besides the representation of the collaborative work, there is necessarily the description of the researcher's reflexive work as she writes herself influencing and being influenced by the evolution of the collaborative work.

That is the researcher/participants' ongoing negotiation and construction of meaning, and it is also the development of new knowledge. I have stopped at this point in time to write down what I know and to offer a standard for a reasonable collaborative effort. Throughout my description and analysis of our collaborative dance, I have attempted to be open to contestatory voices, and to represent those competing perspectives and claims. Now I have developed knowledge claims that are written down, generalized claims that define a standard. As predictive claims, they take for granted the context and its normative structure and do not attempt to incorporate value statements into the claims themselves. But they are supported by interpretive claims, and purport to foster the opportunity for emancipatory knowledge.

Given a view of knowledge as socially constructed, it is appropriate to put down what my construction is at the end of this work. I have retreated from collaboration to isolation to serve my interest in personal meaning-making, in understanding our work and bringing closure to this thesis. The claims are offered tentatively with an invitation to return to the collaborative dialogue and examine their appropriateness in other contexts. It will be a dialogue that includes an articulation and support of value positions. Like Lather (1991, p. 3), I am suggesting that "scholarship that makes its biases part of its argument [is] a contender for legitimacy." Perhaps I am suggesting more than that—that scholarship has for too long kept silent about its biases, and needs to enter the dialogue, offering new ideas and knowledge,

with a recognition that they are necessarily value-laden, developed to serve particular interests. In other words, university-based teachers need to enter the collaborative effort with school-based teachers as learners, prepared to negotiate agreement about what is worthwhile to pursue in teacher education.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are in two categories: (a) processes, and (b) participants. All the points have been made within the body of the thesis. This is by way of summary.

The collaborative processes

1. The conceptual frameworks informing collaboration, and the concomitant vision of what that will look like in action, need to be offered clearly and in a manner inviting discussion with and contribution from participants. As Cannamm (1985) described in his paper on change, the unpredictability of the forces set in motion by change efforts makes it impossible to fully plan a sequence of events to bring about change. What is necessary is a shared vision of the desired result that frees individual initiative to invent activities that support that vision.

2. The ongoing tension of a collaborative effort needs to be recognized. The necessary communication skills need to be identified, modelled and supported. To ensure participants will return to collaborative efforts, "time out" needs to be valued and legitimated.

3. If the initial rewards of collegial exchange are to be sustained, social critique as well as critique of practice needs to be emphasized. If attention is not paid to this, participants, in the end, lose the sense of possibility, of "generating meaning beyond themselves," and the work will be seen to be "done."

4. Following from #4 is the idea of the tension and conflict such critique engenders. Such conflict requires recognition as the spark that can ignite creativity and growth.

1. If this approach to teacher education is worthwhile, and I believe it is, then the attitude towards the role of teacher educator needs to change. It seems paradoxical to me that the work of educating new teachers has such low status within our profession (Lanier & Little, 1986). If we value our own work, this is one of the most important roles to take on. School-based teachers, at present, are expected to assume this role in addition to their regular work. Immediately the emphasis on critical and reflective processes for educators and their student teachers is sabotaged. We require our best teachers in teacher educator roles, and they require material and public rewards that distinguish them as models towards which their colleagues can aspire. These school-based teachers need to be present to negotiate the time and conditions that represent the best "rewards" for them. Their skills and abilities as teacher educators need to be recognized as contributing over time to work with colleagues within their schools and districts.

Similarly, university-based teachers' rewards at present are largely based on the communication of their research, through reviewed journals and conferences. The time and rewards for work with school-based colleagues, and for critical and intersubjective reflection on their own practice, needs to be legitimated and valued. Their skills and abilities as collaborators and researchers need material recognition.

2. What is the faculty associate role within collaborative effort? Like other participants, faculty associates need to acquire the attitudes and skills to value and negotiate among difference. Their opportunity to practice these skills during their orientation to faculty associate work puts them in a strong position to model and support collaborative work with school associates. Because their entire focus is teacher education, they can provide the structure and the text to begin with their school-based colleagues. But there are two main forces standing in the way of successfully engaging as a collaborative faculty associate. The first, as I have already discussed in this chapter, is the lack of preparation for such a role.

3. The second is a function of the hierarchical structure within which they work. At present faculty associates are responsible for the final evaluation of the student teacher. I fail to

see why there should not be equal partnership between school districts and universities in terms of negotiating both who gets into teacher education programs, and how they go out. Such equality in decision-making would go a long way to ensuring support for collaborative efforts among university and school-based teachers. As it was succinctly stated by one of the faculty associates, "*Maybe what happens now is that the school associates do their best but they do know that someone else will take over. Maybe if it was left to them they would take it more seriously.*" A situation in which power is given over (and, therefore, can be taken back) makes collaborative work uneven, even counter productive at times.

4. Recommendation #3 signals the need to consider who needs to participate in collaborative work in teacher education. Collaboration is time consuming. It is not a suitable venue for all decision-making. Nor are all people suitable participants—some probably should not attempt, or would not want to attempt this type of work. Given those constraints, there needs to be a commitment—at least an understanding and support of the process—on the part of those within the university and school district who necessarily are affected by the work.

5. Who should attempt this work? It would be an interesting line of inquiry to identify characteristics of the "collaborative personality,"—and the approach to interviewing that would highlight such characteristics. Such personalities are desirable to build the necessary bridges between our existing "*islands of isolation*" within the educational enterprise. There needs to be a valuing of those suited by nature and interest in this kind of work within both institutions.

6. One bridge that was not built during the practicum semester was between the teacher educators as a collaborating group, and the student teachers. It was, I believe, a missed opportunity to reinforce our critical and reflective examination of practice. It would have provided student teachers with a model of collaborative meaning-making among a group of future colleagues who represented a variety of institutional perspectives, and who held different kinds of knowledge. Perhaps they could then more readily envision themselves as critical and life long inquirers into what is worthwhile in education.

Bibliography

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: outsiders in the sacred grove.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Aiken, J.M. (1989). Can educational research keep pace with education reform? *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 71, No. 3.

Barth, R.S. (1991). *Improving schools from within.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Berg, D.N., & Smith, K.K. (1985). *Exploring clinical methods for social research.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Berger, P., Berger, B. & Kellner, M. (1973). *The homeless mind: modernization and consciousness.* New York: Random House.

Britzman, D.P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: a critical study of learning to teach.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Burbules, N.C., & Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences: continuing the conversation. *Harvard Educational Review.* Vol. 61, No. 4.

Cammann, C. (1985). Action useable knowledge. In D.N. Berg, & K.K. Smith (Eds.) *Exploring clinical methods for social research..* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Carr, D. (1986). *Time, Narrative, and History.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Castell, S. de (1989). On writing of theory and practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 23, No. 1.

Castell, S. de & Freeman, H. (1978). Education as a socio-practical field: the theory-practice problem reformulated. *Journal of Philosophy of Education.* Vol. 12.

Cinnamond, J.H., & Zimpher, N.L. (1990). Reflectivity as a function of community. In R.T. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M.C. Pugach, (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education: an analysis of issues and programs.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Code, L. (1989). Experience, knowledge, and responsibility. In A. Garry, & M. Pearsall (Eds.), *Women, knowledge and reality.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher.* Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 2-14.

Cooper, M. (1988). Whose culture is it, anyway? In A. Lieberman (Ed.). *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Derrida, J. (1978). Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences. In *Writing and difference,* trans. Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp. 297-324.

Erickson, G.L., & MacKinnon, A.M. (1991). Seeing classrooms in new ways: On becoming a science teacher. In D.A. Schön (Ed.). *The reflective turn: case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Glasersfeld, E. von. (1984). An introduction to radical constructivism. In P. Watzlawick (Ed.), *The invented reality*. pp. 17-40. New York: Norton.

Goodson, I. F. (1991). Sponsoring the teacher's voice: teachers' lives and teacher development. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 21, No. 1.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York:Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1986). Philosophy and teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Grimmett, P.P., & MacKinnon, A.M. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. In G.Grant (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education 18 (pp. 385-456)*. Washington D.C.: The American Educational Research Association.

Grimmett, P.P., Erickson, G.L., MacKinnon, A.M., & Riecken, T.J. (1990). Reflective practice in teacher education. In R.T. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M.C. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education: an analysis of issues and programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grumet, M. R. (1987). The politics of personal knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17:3*.

Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Heilbrun, C.G. (1988). *Writing a woman's life*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Heron, J. (1985). The role of reflection in a co-operative inquiry. In D. Boud, R.Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Reflection: turning experience into learning*. New York: Kogan Page.

Howard, J. (1989). Teachers and teaching: on teaching, knowledge and "middle ground". *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 59, No. 2.

Kemmis, S. (1985). Action research and the politics of reflection. In D. Boud, R.Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Reflection: turning experience into learning*. London: Croom Helm.

Lanier, J.E., & Little, J.W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 56, No. 3.

Lather, P. (1991). *Being smart: feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern.* New York: Routledge.

Lieberman, A. (1992). The meaning of scholarly activity and the building of community. *Educational Researcher*. August-September.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Liston, D.P., & Zeichner, K.M. (1990). Reflective teaching and action research in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, Vol.16, No. 3.

Little, J.W. (1981). *School success and staff development: The role of staff development in urban desegregated schools.* Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 60, No.2.

MacKinnon, A., & Grunau, H. (1991). *Teacher development through reflection, community, and discourse.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

McEwan, H., & Bull, B. (1991). The pedagogic nature of subject matter knowledge. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 316-334.

McPhie, J.L. (1989). Attitude change through cultural immersion. *Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 19. No. 3.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 56,
No. 4.

Peshkin, A. (1985). Virtuous subjectivity: in the participant-observer's I's. In D.N. Berg & K.K. Smith (Eds.), *Exploring clinical methods for social research.* Beverly Hill: Sage Publications.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1989). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rajchman, J. (1985). *Michel Foucault: The freedom of philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reinharz, S. (1985). Feminist distrust: problems of context and content in sociological work. In D. Boud, R.Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.),*Exploring clinical methods for social research.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Report to the college of teachers on teacher education in British Columbia (1991). July.

Rich, A. (1975). *The burning of paper instead of children. Poems: selected and new, 1950-1974*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. *Educational Researcher*, October.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and human science: essays on language, action and interpretation.* Thompson, J.B. (Ed), Cambridge University Press.

Russell, T. (1991, April). *Critical attributes of a reflective teacher.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Scheurich, J.J. (1991). *A postmodernist politics of methodology: the paradigmatic transgressions of validity.* Unpublished manuscript.

Shils, E. (1983). *The academic ethic: the report of a study group of the international council on the future of the university.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press..

Simmons, V.M. (1985). Reconstructing an organization's history: systematic distortion in retrospective data. In D. Boud, R.Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Exploring clinical methods for social research..* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tabachnick, R.B., & Zeichner, K.M. (1991, April). *The reflective practitioner in teaching and teacher education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Tabachnick, R.B., & Zeichner, K.M. (1991). Reflections on reflective teaching. In Tabachnich, R.B. & Zeichner, K.M. (Eds), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education.* London: Falmer Press.

Travers, A. (1990). *The invisible woman: a feminist critique of Habermas's theory of communicative action.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of British Columbia.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience.* University of Western Ontario: The Althouse Press.

Young, I. (1987). In Travers, A. (1990). *The invisible woman: a feminist critique of Habermas's theory of communicative action.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of British Columbia.

Appendices

Transcription Rules

Transcriptions have been prepared for this thesis in the following manner:

1. Transcripts were made directly from the tapes of the group discussions.

2. Nothing was changed or omitted in the original transcriptions.

3. The transcripts appear in the thesis with the following changes from the original:
   a) Breaks have been made to indicate sentences as those natural breaks seemed to appear upon rereading the transcripts.
   b) The following expressions were removed except where their retention seemed apprpopriate to preserve the intent of the utterance: "ummm," "er," "ah," "okay."

4. Although these changes were made in order that the transcripts be more accessible to the reader, it is,in my mind, still a question whether this "sanitizing" is a good idea. To a degree the necessarily hesitant and fragmented speech that characterizes meaning-making is sacrificed.

Guidelines for use of appendices

The following appendices contain complete transcripts of the discussions of the participants in this study. They are available for the reader who is interested in gaining a more complete understanding of these discussions as they proceeded from beginning to end. The interpretations of these data that the author has presented in the argument of the thesis have been reviewed by some of the participants. It is possible that some readers will render other interpretations of the events of this study—this opportunity is well and good in the pursuit of verisimilitude and evidential support and justification for the claims made in the thesis. At the same time, however, it should be clear that the appendices are provided to complement the text, and that under no circumstances would another writer be permitted to make public interpretations of the data without acknowledging their contexts. To do so without the written consent of the author and participants in this study would breech an ethical contract with the participants.

Appendix A

School Associate Orientation, October, 1990

C = Coordinator
FA = Faculty Associates
SA = School Associates

New Caltec 401/2 SA Orientation

C: So, it is very important that you bring questions and concerns so we can pull it into the program and think about it, let it help shape the next in-service and even deal with some of it this afternoon. So we will record to make sure that we don't miss anything. We are also going to add any new needs, concerns and questions that have come out of your small group discussions or your individual writing on to the list that we started yesterday to make sure that we don't miss anything. I'd just like to start. I am not going to ask you to talk about why you decided to take part so much as I have a feeling now that you are fairly into it. Here we are, we are going to be together for some time. What does it feel like at this time? Mixed feelings?

SA: Still interesting!

SA: I am not sure we knew what was expected.

C: How does that affect you in terms of your feelings? Is it a little bit of anxiety producing?

SA: No, I don't know what is expected! [laughter] I am not anxious about it just curious.

C: Are there words that you would put to this?

SA: I am feeling bonded to a lot of people here, feeling a lot of support. I am finding it is nice to know that other people feel the same things I am.

SA: I am feeling comfortable.

SA: I think everybody here—it is so nice because everybody is positive about their experience in their classrooms, they are raving about their kids.

C: It is a sense of commitment, not just to this program but to teaching? Anybody else want to add to that?

SA: This morning there was an interesting point made at the breakfast table. The adjective in the name was kind of corny but it sure worked. I would like to use it too.

C: I am going to kind of skip around a bit with the questions that we were using as a starting point for reflections to ask a little bit about the last 3 questions. "What are you hoping to pick up along the way?" "What are you hoping that this program is going to help you or have you take away that makes it worth participating in?" "What do you need to make that happen?" And perhaps we can just throw ideas in a pot, get a sense of those and then start to record the questions.

SA: I am a relatively new teacher so what I hope to gain from this is an understanding of myself not as a student anymore but as a teacher. Like I remember looking at myself being a student teacher and now I am still in there and getting to be a teacher. So I think having a student teacher is going to help me look at myself as a teacher. I hope!

SA: On the other hand, I have been teaching forever it seems. It is good to go back and to tear the whole thing apart and see what makes it up and remind me again what's involved.

C: Having a student makes you look at yourself more thoughtfully maybe than you have time to do otherwise.

SA: I have been teaching for quite a while and tend to, you know, well we did this today and tomorrow we'll be doing this. And so I need to keep thinking more than sometimes I do, thinking why am I doing this. And hoping it will help me understand more, to think more. I am not very good at explaining why I do things and I am wanting some help in articulating that to a student teacher.

C: You want some help in some ways, in how to articulate how you are thinking about your teaching, with a student. Did that come up for others?

[Much chatter and agreement]

C: Tools for articulating what you are doing? OK. How about some other things that came up in terms of what you are hoping to take away and what you need in order to do that.

SA: I think I am hoping that I am going to pick up some ideas, some more things I can add to my knowledge base and to my experience. Again I have not been teaching for very long myself. I am also hoping to come out of here feeling that I have learned something, come out feeling good about myself in the classroom. And hopefully that I can reflect that in working with a student teacher.

FA: In the work that I have done in the past with SAs often if you encounter a student who has a struggle on their journey and maybe they decide that teaching is not for them—that is really hard not to feel responsible for those. So as we are going through this journey one of the needs that I would project based on my own experience is some help in coming to terms with—what we have contributed and what we can contribute to a person who may not—we are not responsible for them becoming something just as we are not on our own responsible for our own students. We cannot make every student the way we want them. And it doesn't mean we have not tried.

C: So you are saying sometimes you might not feel successful?

FA: If you measure your success by the success of your student teacher that may not be the best measuring stick. If they quit you may have done a very good job, you may have done something very good for the profession.

C: And for those who sometimes it is the wrong choice and they are really grateful that you have helped direct them out of the profession.

SA: I would be very angry if someone—I know I had worked a long time and someone said well maybe this is not the profession for you, I don't think that's the place of anyone to decide except the student. I don't think they should tell me what they think I should do, it is my decision.

SA: I don't think that was what was being said here. I think that they said that if the student teacher decides on their own that this isn't for me then you shouldn't feel bad about it.

SA: OK. I think I should preface that by saying that's what my first school associate said to me and I really resented her and I love teaching so...

C: Some food for thought and probably something to come back to.

SA: If this had been the way the SFU program had been before, I might have taken a student teacher. The things that I am hoping to pick up on the way aren't so much from the student teacher, but more from the whole experience of being with other teachers now. And I suspect that we are all going to feel a bit stronger when it comes to student teacher time, knowing that there are 29 other people who have suffered with us. Even though this person comes from the university with these wonderful ideas and blows us out of the water.

C: A real need is for affirmation from one another, from colleagues.

SA: We haven't had time to really sit and reflect about what we are doing or expressing things or discussing things. The day is just too busy, I mean you are always planning for the next day or second day you never sit back and do what we are doing now.

SA: We don't get that. That is what we talked about in our group.
[Much agreement and chatter]

SA: I think it is good and we need to have pats on the back saying we're doing the right thing too.

SA: This is part of the reason I liked the whole project—because I look at it as peer coaching and with peer coaching comes reviving. We can't always ask kids for constructive criticism. They will tell you whether they like it or not. They will give you their reasons. But it is when you talk it over with a peer that is where the real refinement comes because he tries it in a different classroom with a different group of kids. He encounters different problems from what you might encounter. So after school Mark and I get together then we discuss the real guts of the lesson and then we discuss what changes we are going to make or what other things we are going to try and with that we do develop some really good lessons.

C: It sounds as if what you are saying is that it needs—in terms of this program—there is a need to make time for these kinds of thing to occur with the student teachers.

SA: You have to have constant communication after, not just before but after. That's when the real growth takes place.

C: I am going to ask you, focussing in on the needs and the questions, the concerns that you discussed in your group, just purely on the basis of the time constraints and make sure that we collect either specific or general questions that you have that came up in this.

FA: One of the things I was hearing was that a wish people had is something they wanted to pick up along the way if you like is the opportunity to share ideas, to share things that they did.. People were excited about what happened yesterday afternoon and they shared some successes. And want to include that in some way. I think that is related to that time calendar again of building in some time when people can talk to each other.

SA: We were wondering what the students would be doing during their observations and if there are going to be some guidelines for them to follow while they observe?

C: We will together provide some of the structures as we develop the program, and hopefully one of the goals of the next time together, one of the outcomes will be within the group that you are working with create an instrument which will help the students focus and observe on certain areas in the classroom.

SA In the same vein, people in our group expressed in different ways, of wanting to have some sort of say as to what the student teachers would be required to do in addition to teaching. I have a strong feeling that in times past student teachers have been asked to do too much, too silly, unrelated, and they are dealing with somebody who is just too tired to do a good job no matter how wonderful they are.

C: It sounds like you are cautioning, you have a concern that maybe that their assignments are going to take them off track.

SA: I would like to have some say if possible as to the sort of things that are appropriate for a student teacher to be doing—are they relevant or a hoop.

C: The answer is absolutely, yes—we are doing this together, making decisions about the shape of the program, about what students do in the classroom and on campus, together with FAs and SAs so we see there is coherence.

SA: Yes, they get so overloaded.

SA: (School associate recalling his student teacher days) What prompted that concern was when we had our first friday back on site after four days in classrooms, bouncing in through the doors, turning cartwheels, saying guess what happened in my class this week!!! Everybody was really excited. And the expectation was we were going to sit down and create a lesson plan and everybody was just bursting with news that they had to share. Then—"No, no now is not the time for that you have a lesson to plan." And we were saying no. no listen to me, this is what happened. There was no opportunity for that sort of thing.

C: So if you were constructing this program you would make sure to put in time for the students to do what Case was just saying teachers ought to do.

SA: Yes, it was really like the FAs were doing their thing, they had a lesson planned and they were just like dogs worrying a bone. This is what you are going to do.

C: What is interesting to me listening to you is the connection to what we were talking about yesterday—the way we regard learning, how development takes place.

SA: Actually one of the things that happened in our group was concern about is there anything for us to do between now and November?

C: That is next on the agenda after this discussion.

SA: The one about help in language to articulate in depth discussion with the student teacher. Somebody expressed a concern about what are some things we can do to make it a positive experience for the student teacher and also for the school associates.

C: What can we do to facilitate that positive experience—yes, and a discussion of evaluation and supervision.

SA: We need to know what the student teacher expectations are.

C: From you? From the program? OK?

SA: In the intermediate areas what new direction in curriculum are you looking for your teachers to develop?

C: I am not sure if I understand that question. Are you wondering what the student teachers come with in terms of understanding the programs and tools for working with the programs, and what is your role in that as well?

SA: Well, yes, but we are in a time of change. We are all in a different area of change. Now you are training your teachers to go into the year 2000 , how can we facilitate that?

C: That is a critical question. I think we are all going through this change and people in the university are muddling through making meaning out of it at the same time as teachers in the classrooms are. So perhaps something that we as a group might talk about—is what are the key fundamentals that we need to focus on.

SA: We answered that a little bit yesterday too that the students that will come and see that we are in the learning process and that times are changing.

SA: I think they need, we need, to make haste slowly, ensuring we are comfortable and them being. And we are saying to ourselves start with a little thing and they will need to say the same.

C: Sort of a kind of a collaborative learning process for all of us. Any other questions or concerns?

FA: I think there was coming from someone in the group—we need some recognition and appreciation that what we do is hard work. That it is true of what we do here as well. This is not some sort of couple days of rest, but that it is equally hard work, and we need to be recognized and appreciated. Both within the group and outside it.

C: What could be some of the thoughts about outside the group?

SA: My Class!—I am away a fair bit and I am always careful to tell them what I have done.

SA: They need to know this is not frivolous.

C: So perhaps another need I hear you are saying is that there is a need to communicate about this program on a broader level for our sakes and your sakes. Perhaps you would have some suggestions about how the university can take a role and how you can do it yourselves as well.

SA: Districts are major stakeholders so they need to be reassured. There is the perception of my class, my own kids, parents need to know.

C: I think it is a very practical application when you think about the student teacher coming into your classroom, how will you frame the experience for your kids so that they understand what's going to happen, how things are going to proceed?

SA: I have a very positive staff and they will help me lots but they are asking why do you need all this time off—and only partly kidding—we need to beat it down.

C: Do you have an idea of the way that's best done?

SA: In our district I don't think it would hurt at all to have something in the bulletin let people know what is going on.

SA: The information we were given was really useful. Why not get it out to the rest—this is what these teachers are doing.

SA: There are also some very positive political views as well and it shows that the government is supporting teachers—good PR.

C: What about the administrators or board people or...

SA: Have you talked to them?

C: We are scheduled to be at the next Administration Meeting in Prince George on November 8th, and there is the Steering Committee, it represents the districts in the Consortium, all the superintendents, college representatives and FAs and myself, that's another layer of information. The other group we found in NWTEC that SAs wanted to somehow talk with were district people, the helping people in their districts and there is one suggestion here of FAs going to zone meetings and talking to principals. So it varies but more intimate discussion instead of in a great big...

FA: It seems to me what would be really valuable to have some of the participating teachers do some of that too, giving the perception that this is a collaborative effort.

C: So SAs representing New Caltec—yes.

SA: And so it is not perceived to be the same old program with the FAs doing it all.

C: I guess there are some other nitty gritty questions?

SA: The selection of student teachers—I know some people have concerns about that.

C: OK Others.

SA: How to work as a team with your student teachers.

C: So you are thinking about having a number in your school?

SA: It seems that there are two coming into our classroom and how do we...

C: Yes, there are some tricks and pitfalls—OK.

SA: One of the things I did is videotaped sessions and afterwards we sat down and looked at ourselves at our own performance. We judged for example how we dealt with kids, how we dealt with certain situations, how much talking we did as opposed to how much they did. And the kinds of behaviours and how they fell into the patterns, how there were exceptions and how there were neat things going on. When you videotape it is a great way of looking at some of your own strengths as well as some of the other sides.

C: So that might be a topic that might be fitted in along the way. What are some strategies for improving your supervision and interactions.

SA: Of course not everybody wants to videotape.

C: Have to be careful.

FA: Related to selection was another question. Who are these people, how old, what experience do they bring, what are they doing in the classroom, how they will find out that , when am I going to know.

C: I am going to suggest that we take a break, 10 min—if there are other questions, please feel free to add them to the sheets.

October 1990
Day 2—p.m.

REPORTS FROM SMALL GROUPS EACH ADDRESSING A CONCEPT ABOUT TEACHER EDUCATION

GROUP #1— CONCEPT—"COLLABORATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION"

SA: We liked the idea that the problems we were given were generally appropriate, this whole session developed trust, sincerity, openness and therefore, was conducive to communication. We thought that maybe out of this we could see that we were all student teachers that no one knew it all. That we were all learning. And we also enjoy the flexibility of the groups that kept changing sizes, people, tasks and so on. There was tremendous respect for what other people brought to this workshop. Again communication was very open, and there was a positive attitude throughout, enthusiasm was continually there. We also came to realize that maybe because even though we were from other districts, from different grades, but there were many similarities as well as common threads and themes and purposes. We could celebrate the differences, we do have different ideas, and we have common goals, so we learned that through communication. We could say that we all grew from this exchange.

We do have some questions. Communication makes us create a happy medium between the student-centred and the teacher-centred efforts. It was a joint effort rather than one that we can single out and say we are it. The questions that we arrived at regarding administration knowing our work.. We do hope that you will address that when you send out communications from here—include them. It is neat stuff!! They need to know what we are doing here and to hear it—and maybe be part of it—that is a possibility although we know it is expensive but maybe a few AOs.

We also raised the question what is the future of teacher education in terms of ridding it of its many islands. We have many islands in our profession, the communication is perhaps the best way to perhaps to get rid of the boundaries, to get rid of the water surrounding a few pieces of land. We need to connect and even though we didn't come up with a common cheer, 2 4 6 8—let's communicate!

GROUP #2—CONCEPT—"ARTICULATING OUR INDIVIDUAL PRACTICE"

SA: Articulating our individual practices and I assume this refers to the student teacher. We would expect a student teacher to set the parameters entering a classroom, stating what exactly they want the class to do and what the expectations from the class are, and to be clear on those expectations and then follow through with them. We realize that we feel strongly about our own ideas, and we respect the student teachers' ideas about teaching. We are not inflexible. If they want their own ideas and they want to try some new things that's fine, go right ahead. To be flexible and accepting of other teaching styles and techniques. We should be that way—and expect the same of the student teacher. We should articulate to the student that they can be experimental, that's fine they can come in and try something new. This is a learning experience, we've all been there and we know that things can fall apart and they still do today—after many years of teaching so I think we can be flexible and understanding of that. Don't expect everything to work out as nicely as it does on paper, it looks great on paper, we can make it look great—but presenting it to a classroom of intermediates or primaries sometimes doesn't work. They can't be quite as cooperative as the paper can be at times—or grade 8 or 9 kids. We realize we may be uncomfortable in discussing teaching practices where you may disagree. I guess we could be uncomfortable with our students teacher and maybe they are uncomfortable with us as well. So that is definitely a thing that could happen there.

As teachers we often worry about the student teacher coming in and maybe bombing, literally and no discipline, the lesson not working and so on. I bet we have just as much fear that they are going to do a wonderful job and the students are all going to be—I don't know if you feel that way, but that has often occurred to me. If they come in and they are just absolutely number one, the kids love them to death and when they leave, the kids will say—Oh god, you are back! I often think that's like this person might be better than me. [much laughter]

C: Thank you. What you pointed out—the real diversity we have in our individual practices.

GROUP #3—CONCEPT—"MODELLING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFLECTIVE PRACTITIONER"

SA: Modelling the development of the reflective practitioner. First of all we struggled trying to figure out what it is really we are addressing, was it us, was it you, what was the question, we didn't know. But anyway we decided it was us, how are we going to model it for our student teachers, and also we talked about how difficult this was even for us coming here, now that we started to learn about this and really just think about what we do in our daily practices. It takes time to become a reflective practitioner. It has some ongoing, I think as Marg was saying that she is at the end of her teaching career now, she is still going on and she is reflecting still today. So it takes a long time. You should do it as you feel comfortable with it, maybe in groups, maybe with your partner or someone on staff, or just individually after your daily teaching or after a lesson. We also decided that it was hard to articulate how we felt about our own practices. What we did in our classroom, it was hard to tell other people why you were doing it, it was so easy to do but it is so hard to tell. Also it would be helpful if the student teacher had a framework, something to work from, some place to start.

We become a reflective practitioner, we continue to improve at it. I think that is what we are saying here, it takes a long time. We should always be reflective, give others opportunity to ask questions about your practice. Give the people, the student teacher, the people on your staff, the opportunity to come into the classroom, ask you what you are doing and why did it but then with that we said that it is extremely high risk taking, that it could be really scary to a lot of people and it's going to be difficult when the student teacher comes in to answer these questions, and not to become defensive. Student teachers will see changes as a result of reflection by experienced teachers like that's something that connects all of us right now is that the whole movement in education is changing. So we are really, we decided our group that we are actually doing that, we are reflecting, not me personally because I have just begun teaching but the people that are changing and looking at how they taught 10 years ago and actually reflecting back to all of that. That they are still wonderful like they were 10 years ago. Reflecting on decisions and past practices makes you feel good about your teaching if you sit and think about it, why did you do that. And development, we are not all ready there, it never ends. So I think the basic thing of all of this that it is ongoing and we need to do it our whole careers. So it is important to give that message to the student teacher.

C: The thing I appreciate about that list is that the variety of ways that you showed that we do reflect not just sitting back and thinking or writing necessarily, but that the people come in to observe, etc. So there are all kinds of ways that it is happening. Thank you.

GROUP #3—CONCEPT—"TEACHING AS INQUIRY"

SA: Looking at our practice, the changes that are taking place in education, inquiring into them, into the Year 2000 and inquiring into that. How are we going to implement this in our classroom, and I think as I am talking, joining together as groups and zones and talking about it, I think too often as teachers we may just be in isolation, just one school and why not get three or four schools together and talk about how you are doing it. How can we continue doing this inquiry? And often we are doing things in our classroom, but we haven't put a label on it, critical thinking, and we should try to inquire into this and maybe put a label so that when a student teacher comes in, we can explain this is an example of...And then analyze what we are doing. Going back maybe the steps in lesson planning, whatever, and analyzing how we are going through different curriculum. Number three was just an re-affirmation of the two days of a child-centred curriculum. I think this is always, well it is something that is so important that the curriculum is there to fit the child, not the other way around, that is very important. But I think a new student teacher maybe will take a look at it and see that child must do such and such by the end of this grade. Review of theory in process. Teacher autonomy—kind of came up in this inquiry that sharing with the student teacher. Standing up for what you feel is right for your self and for the student. At times you are going to have to go to administration, you are going to have to say 'no this is wrong,' maybe go higher up at times, and this is, you don't want to put this right on to a student teacher, saying that there are politics involved, and, I don't know, it is saying have a hard outer shell but a heart of gold. Be able to protect yourselves because we all know people that have left the profession maybe early, maybe not even starting out in it. They would have been darned good teachers but they ran into the situation that was intolerable. I don't know if we are still doing this in some classes, but the new teacher got the roughest classes in high school. You know. Um, the ability to say no even to Pro-D—the person is working all sorts of hours and someone says will you take this on. You should be able to say I just can't do that. Be realistic as to what you can do or can't do.

And than there is nothing new under the sun. Things go round and come round. We talked about always inquiring which we saw as a problem with the busy-ness of our culture, with the business of our profession, unfortunately. Maybe not staying up to date—but trying to make that extra 15 minutes to read something new.

GROUP #4—CONCEPT—"MENTORING A STUDENT TEACHER"

SA: Our group got off to a quick start and we decided right away that we could probably fill ten of these charts with things that we have learned already. Rather than creating an exhaustive list we sort of slowed down and had a round about discussion on a couple we listed right away. We also realized right away what some of the things that we've learned led right into the needs and questions that we came up with and then Jim joined our group and started talking about hockey. Actually Jim posed probably the most significant question we will have to deal with and it is something that is bound to happen and has happened I guess. "How are you going to support teachers in failure?" And I don't necessarily mean that in a negative sense. When somebody's first lesson bombs or when their 45 minute lesson finishes in six minutes. Failure to accept the constructive advice, those kinds of things, that is probably one of the more difficult tasks to deal with. And briefly with our chant 2, 4, 6, 8—it is time for lunch we are already late.

C: When we sat down to plan we of course have an idea of what we want people to come out with and the beauty of something like this is something totally different emerges. Some of the results are the same and some wonderful new outcomes are there that are so rich There was incredible direction, a deeper direction I think, than if just the three of us worked. Just looking at what we have done with the themes in providing direction for

the next workshops. So your input into the next sessions are all these papers which I think we will take away because we are sure we could use them in our next planning session.

There is one other task to do for next time. One of the things that we want to start doing next time is what are the most important things that we need to be working on with student teachers? What are the most important things to put into our curriculum for teacher education? And by way of helping to prepare for that we would like you to read this article which is called "The futility of trying to teach everything of importance." Read it and think about that we've only got a little time with the students,what are the most important things to focus on?

Appendix B

School Associate Orientation, November, 1990

C = Coordinator
FA = Faculty Associate
SA = School Associate

New Caltec 401/2 SA Orientation 'Determining Domains'

(Opening remarks beginning the work of building a framework to hold our teacher education program. The subject is teacher knowledge. It is an afternoon session following upon discussion of case studies with a small group of colleagues. In the case studies teachers had tried to understand the values and assumptions and beliefs that had informed the particular educational action [decision] they had taken.)

C: It seems to me that those of us who live our professional lives in classrooms with children and make the kinds of decisions you have discussed this morning, on a daily basis, hundreds of them, are the people who understand what education is. You make those decisions based on what you value in education, what you think education means, what you envision as the outcomes you want children to exhibit. We talked in our first session together about the kinds of things that we all believe drive the educational enterprise—how our children would be when they graduated, if we had been successful in our work. We talked about the wonderful, unique ways that each of us translates those different outcomes for children into our daily practices. Now we have looked at the decisions we make around education on a day to day basis, and we will use the outcomes of that discussion to look again at the unity of concerns that drive our educational decision-making, that are most important to us as influences on our work. And these will determine the domains, the main areas in education that we think about in all our variability when we make decisions. So I would like to ask you as you feel comfortable—I don't want to go round, but I do want to hear from everybody, as to the kinds of influences, the values, beliefs, assumptions, you found drove your decision-making in the particular case study that you provided for us. And out of our looking at those, and me perhaps asking some questions about it when you talk about it, we will begin to see what are the common areas in education that influence how we behave as professionals. So if I could ask somebody to volunteer to begin this discussion.

SA: Preserving the dignity of the disruptive child while preserving the reasonable climate of the room.

C: OK, the tension that exists between that individual child and what you want to see happening in terms of what goes on in the classroom. And that then has to do with the way in which you as the teacher manage those tensions and make your decision around that. What did you find influenced you the most in terms of making the decision?

SA: A very disruptive child, but had been extremely well behaved up to this point. So anything I did, I didn't want it to be major, but I wanted him to understand that that was not the thing to do at that time.

C: So in some ways socializing this child to the group, and at the same time preserving the child's dignity. OK, thank you.

C: Just the number of strategies that I have at my disposal, I might want to change the decision or make a decision that I need to have a bucket full of tools from which to choose.

C: So the choices that as a teacher you need to make.

SA: The question of what's most important, what helps me make my decisions is based on what strategies do I have at my disposal because I realize something is not working and I am thinking now of the student teacher who might only have one strategy and if that's not working then.

C: Having a number of strategies...Can you talk a little bit about what it is you value about having all these strategies. Why is that important?

SA: The ability to change my mind—flexibility.

C: If you are flexible than you think there is a whole bunch of different ways to respond to the children and the situation It is not just one thing that you need to be able to do.

SA: If I am flexible then I am able to recognize that perhaps my way in fact is not the best way.

C: OK so you have choices, it also means that you are open to a variety of ways. In order to be effective, what is it that you think—to push that a little further—what is being effective, what is it that you are valuing that manifest itself as being effective?

SA: Well obviously for the students, to meet the goal of the lesson.

C: Is it fair then to say that you are effective if you're intentional, and you know how to get from A to B. This is what you know you want to accomplish.

SA: Not necessarily because you...

C: What is effective then?

SA: Well, you might change your goal during the lesson because the children need something else.

C: OK so then you are coming back to the point, to be effective is to be able to respond to individual needs of children or classroom ethos—whatever is happening within the classroom?

SA: Judith, I would like to come back to this openness to a variety of actions. I think that is the result of maturity and humbleness. I have been known to make wrong and rash decisions, but on the other hand I have not been afraid to tell those people involved as part of the decision that I have been wrong, and I have come right back and said that. I think in a sense then humility is part of the outcome of the decision and right or wrong it is not so much a key to this as coming back to flexibility. You certainly need to be humble also. If you make the wrong—like you don't have to stick to it.

C: OK are you talking now about your, what you found influenced your decision?

SA: No, the decision I made I thought was the best one for the student. Also it allowed for her to retain dignity. It made her part of the decision-making process. She felt good about the whole thing and certainly I grew too because she does come back now for an

exchange of values. She is much more willing to come for help, she trusts me. And I think that came out of the way I approached the problem with her.

SA: Mine kind of goes with that because I was humbled by my experience as a risk-taker.

C: Risk-taking on the part of you and the children? So you as a teacher took a risk doing something that you were doing and it was based on valuing...?

SA: Childrens' experiences, having the learning come from them.

C: So it is taking a child-centred—and they also had to risk do you think in terms of what they did? So there was a belief in the growth or development that could come out of that, although it was a scary kind of a situation for you and for them?

SA: Accountability...

C: Can you enlarge?

SA: I need to be able to explain what I am doing. Be accountable.

C: And what would be the underlying belief?

[silence—another SA jumps in]

SA: Perhaps insecurity—fear of being uncomfortable with the program as it was, of what she was doing—she is insecure. She wasn't familiar with it—wasn't comfortable.

C: I am still not sure about the importance of accountability.

SA: I need something to base things on to report to the parents.
I needed to feel more secure about where the kids were at so when I make a difficult decision I can talk more honestly to the parents.

C: Are you talking about evaluation or are you talking about the teacher?

SA: Evaluation I guess. In my own mind I need to understand and be able to tell parents what we have been doing.

C: So evaluation to be accountable to parent and school.

SA: I think evaluation ties into flexibility because the teacher had to change the strategies according to what you evaluate. That is another reason for evaluating changes.

C: Given your evaluation of the child—what you see or what you do to evaluate then has to change with the strategies you use—through your experience.

SA: [speaking back to Sharon] Did it have anything to do with the fact that you taught a number of children whose parents were administrators and you felt pressure to know what you are talking about?

SA: They were very concerned parents.

C: So there is accountability to community and parents as part of community. So our evaluation gives us something to tell about the child, but it also allows us to justify, describe what we do. I would like to stay with people's cases.

SA: Mine goes with flexible but we called it adaptability because we had made a decision at the beginning of the year and then our numbers grew and our support system fell apart and so we had to be adaptable. We want the student teacher to see that. So we changed a lot of what we thought. And even though we believed in some things we changed because of circumstances.

C: And the circumstances, can I ask you what within those circumstances do you value that is more important than doing?

SA: We gave up some things that we really believed in. We haven't completely changed it yet, we are still talking about it. We are giving up some things we believe in.

C: In order to?

SA: Because of class size and manageability and sanity, really.

C: So there are some things within that environment of teaching that needed to be in place in order for anything else to happen?

SA: Before we could carry out what we really wanted to do. It was hard to without a lot of support and we felt that wasn't there.

C: So you had to make a pretty major decision, it sounds to me, around what came first, and what came first here was it the environment or was it harmony within personnel.

SA: Both.

SA: I hear her talk about the value of compromise.

SA: And we will, it is not finished yet.

C: So ability to compromise with a lot of different demands.

SA: Mine involved the dignity of the child and of the classroom. The child had to realize—at least I wanted the child to realize—that there were expectations of how we behave and how we act in a class. It means to respect all those people in the classroom, the teacher and all the other children in the classroom as well as belongings and the things in the class. I wanted the child to still, at the end, be part of that classroom, a contributing member. I wanted to make sure the action on his part wasn't going to leave him outside of the group.

C: I am using the word "citizenship" when I write.

SA: Interest in the child being able to work with others.

C: And to respect that child?

SA: Understanding that child.

C: So always this—the value of the group and the value of the individual child. An interesting tension...

SA: Mine is being consistent with all the children.

C: That there is a fairness? And part of that is again valuing individual children in a way that allows each of them to be able to trust in your, to know you will act in a certain way. To be safe in your class.

SA: I was concerned to get some tutoring for a couple of boys in science. I think perhaps I may have gone off track or something because it seems that when we started talking about our case studies we were looking for us to study where we were having doubts about our decisions. I don't have any doubts.

C: Did you come to a realization of what it was that you valued the most. What was the most important beliefs that influenced you in making that decision?

SA: Particularly with one of them that perhaps I could help him maintain the positiveness that he has at this particular time, and he was quite negative at the beginning of the year. And the other one is being able to help this kid become successful, actually both of them become more successful and perhaps become more self-motivated. If they are able to experience that success.

C: It sounds to me that you see the teacher, or you value or have a belief that one of the ways in which teachers make a difference is to be able to provide an emotional or social climate that can enable the students to feel that they can succeed. It isn't just that, when you said that the content that they needed to master or work on, the word you used were prizing the child's emotional makeup. So I hear you talking about the teacher as a supporter and encourager of children in a way which is different than simply or only being the content teacher.

SA: Mine was changing the physical arrangement in the classroom. One day I just went in there and hauled out all kinds of things in the room and scrounged other things, and I did if for my and the kids benefit —for ease of movement around the classroom, places we wanted to be.

C: Could you give a description of what that environment might feel like for you?

SA: It was more open.

C: And that facilitated?

SA: More space to move around.

C: Open and spaceful, what does that facilitate for you in terms of childrens' learning?

SA: Just movement, kids and I moving and not bumping into things or over chairs. Less obstacles.

C: What happens when that kind of opportunity is constructed?

SA: I am much more pleased with the arrangement and the kids too, cause we set up an area where we can make things that we didn't have before. It was all over the place. Now I just have it in one area and everything is there. I don't know, it just seems to me it was a good decision and the kids seemed to like it too. Just, you're getting around all day all these little kids, all the stuff around, falling over the things, it is just one less hassle-accessibility.

C: And what is the outcome of that, what happens to the learning environment?

SA: The kids know where everything is—easy access. Things get put away.

C: Thank you.

SA: I am still not sure why I made my decisions. People in my group asked good questions. They certainly made me think but I am still not sure. It had to do with deciding, suddenly, all the children were going to work on an assignment by themselves. One suggestion was so that each is more comfortable with themselves or the ones that are weak don't necessarily feel labelled because I put them with someone else, but I still am not sure why I did this.

C: Was there a certain kind of outcome? What would be the outcome of that assignment? What would you get?

SA: It was a research report.

C: So each child would be handing in to you, something which you would evaluate as an example of their work in that area? And in this particular instance you wanted to do that with children as individuals rather than as group members.

SA: I gradually was going to have some work in partners. And then I decided just about on that day that no, you are all going to work by yourselves.

C: Does anybody have questions that they would like to ask, what do you hear?

SA: As she went into it, she said these kids were listing animals and they were enthusiastic and had a lot of knowledge and I thought perhaps she had done it because she was saying I know you can do this—was saying I know you can do this on your own.

C: And part of the evaluation maybe gives us an indication of the potential of each child and sometimes the only way to find that out is to have them do something on their own.

SA: She said they knew a lot. It was something they were really interested in so I kind of think she thought they could do it on their own.

C: Thank you for helping. Recognizing the abilities of individual children. What do they know?

SA: There are a number of things on the board already that contributed to the decision that I made—having the flexibility in terms of choices available to me and making that decision. There was risk-taking, hoping that the decision wasn't going to come back and haunt me the following year. I had faith in the student that I know he is capable of achieving what we are after here, the two of us. This was, just to back up, the student was registered in a secondary English course, and based on his work and two exams, was sitting in the high 40's very close to the magical 50. Keeping in mind what happened the year before, he had been given the nod being in roughly the same situation. I thought, well, you know, maybe it is time the buck stops here. I thought that I wanted to first of all sit down with him and indicate what the situation was—we are very close to a pass, that there are some areas that I would have a difficult time promoting him on to the next grade. I pointed out his weaknesses and his strengths. You are able to articulate yourself well in class, and I have seen a lot of contribution in group work, and cooperation, etcetera, but when it comes to that, the final product, that paper or whatever it may be, there have been a number of times during the year that does not happen.

C: I am going to interrupt you in terms of giving the whole case and ask you just to look at-what would be the...

SA: The risk-taking here was, I said, look we have a new program coming into this district. It was offered this year—correspondence. I will give you the opportunity to pass this course if you are willing to work and produce a number of papers and write up a number of papers etc.

C: What do you value? I really do want to ask you that—this is important. You go to a lot for this student. We all do, we make decision, I am going to do something for this person. What is it that we're valuing what do you believe in that drives you to put that extra time and energy in to different children? Do you believe something about your role as a teacher or about education.

SA: Perhaps I thought I could do more in my role as a facilitator. Although I did have a number of conferences with parents—the students during the year, get really close—you know—you do have the ability to cover this material. What led me to that? I think my inclination at first was no, we're going to have to repeat the course, that was my inclination at first. Because I did not see enough evidence in one of the major components of the course—written work. And I really felt that for me to pass you on to the next group—to put you in the next grade wouldn't be fair and have the same thing happen all over again. I guess jumping through this extra hoop—another way of putting it—in order to move into the next grade in this particular course, hopefully you will internalize something, learn to take responsibility.

C: There are a number of things I hear there about valuing the uniqueness of each child. What you told us is the history of one child and because this child is this way then I make the decision which may not hold for the other child. For another one it may not be repeated, but for this child, knowing what you know, the individual history of the child, and you can make a decision to provide them with a certain opportunity. So you are valuing them as individual children, not as a mass of people that we make decisions about all the time.

SA: As it turns out I am happy with the decision. He appeared in my next, the following year September class, and in conversation here and there, and concerning the fact that this paper was handed in...

END OF TAPE

SA: I guess mine was that I learned that it is not anyone's fault, children or teacher to have a lesson that bombed, and be humble enough to say that I didn't do my homework, or it is not, I mean the children don't go out of their way to defeat you. In my situation it was above their heads and they just didn't have experience to relate to it. So I have to be humble, no matter what I had done I don't think I could have put the concept across.

C: For some reason the word "authentic" comes to mind too and that you are being absolutely who you are. You are a human being and you have made a mistake and let's recognize that. That we all do that. And what a relief to our students to know that we too fall on our faces once in a while and make mistakes. To me that's a lovely model.

SA: It would have been nice if the primary supervisor hadn't walked in! [much laughter]

SA: I think in my situation I was trying to somehow make this person do what I felt he was capable of doing—start to take some responsibility. One of the ways I did do it was through a little bit of peer pressure, putting him with kids a little bit higher than he was performing, the way that I wanted him to do, rather than have him following some of the other not so cooperative groups. Another reason probably was my own peace of mind,

because I guess it was my expectations of the classroom too. There were some things that I expected, want in there and I expect everybody to be working. Plus being that he wasn't my major behaviour problem. In the classroom there is one that is taking away from the time that is available to everyone else, but he sort of contributed to the situation. So I sort of wanted to get him away from the centre of attention, to see it from a different point of view.

C: So again this dichotomy between a classroom environment and respect for the individual child or how that child must work in relation to the environment, is coming up. But it seems to me that one of the things you were talking about, if this is fair, was setting standards or having certain expectations of the way in which your classroom was to be, and you modelled that. But you also showed a belief in the child, in that you could give him certain consequences and he could look up to those.

SA: Yeah, he was the type of child, he wasn't doing any homework. Also a behaviour problem, he was hitting other children. Behaving pretty much as a pain. But it worked in that he is coming to me and saying, "I had a good week, I haven't been in trouble for this or that"—and his homework is being done. Plus the girls intimidate him somewhat!

C: One of the interesting things that comes up as a sort of fundamental question is whether you think children are innately good. You make decisions based on a belief that—given whatever it is you need to do—children will respond well or children have to be sat on or have to be fenced in all the time because if not, they will behave badly. And that is a clearly fundamental belief or assumption that drives a lot of other things we do. We think children are good or bad in their very nature.

SA: I had a situation almost like others but also different. I dealt with the dignity of the child, and a child has had some break up in the family life and that I had had a fairly good rapport for about 2 months, but then it started to go downhill very quickly and I have tried to put him on a homework book and bring the parents in and have them involved. How I have changed in some of my educational decisions and behaviour decisions of the child is by talking to some of my colleagues right here. He still is working, but he doesn't want to be on task on exactly what he is doing. Okay let's say I am doing math, he wants to draw, if I am doing science, he may want to read something else. So what I expect of him is that he will do the work, and he will remain on task, but then at times if he really wants to draw, have him draw up something for a novel study he's doing, use that talent that he has but also keep him working in the classroom. Also there are certain things that he still even though he is angry, there are certain things he cannot do. He cannot hurt others. He cannot take away the dignity of other children. So basically what I am trying to do is work with him to keep a relationship with teacher and student that I am not the bad guy, but yet I still respect him as a student and as a person, but that he can start to get back on track.

C: Thank you I know a lot of you have talked about this valuing the relationship between a teacher and a child and perhaps even underneath that there are some assumptions about what that enables the children to do that we believe that unless that kind of a relationship exists with a child that other things won't happen, so we invest a lot of time and energy in that.

SA: A lot of what has been said relates to me as well. I had to come to grips with the fact, accept my failure to teach a concept based on my time line. I have to have patience to continue it at the child's individual speed rather than in my tempo. To meet the needs of the child rather than—this is mine, my goal, and this is the speed I like to teach at, this is what I expect of you children—and sometimes they are just not ready.

C: I was writing it here, thinking about it as respecting individual children, but it was also talking about instruction and how instruction has to meet the needs of so many different children. There are different developmental sequences, stages for children. Because you were talking about some content that you had to teach and how just simply teaching the content was unsuccessful that it needed to somehow recognize where different children were at.

C: That's where I had to stop and quit with a certain group of children. I couldn't just keep on trying to force information, they just weren't ready. Like where the majority of the children had it, let those children go and carry on, accept the fact that these kids just don't have it yet, but hopefully, with extra work they might come around. So I had to accept some failure on my part and justify it with the parents.

C: Children learn at different rates. What do parents think?

SA: If you are honest with the parents and explain what you have done, where you are going, what your expectations were, how the child has not failed, but how the child was not ready. I think they understand the process too because the same thing, their baby may not have walked at six months. You can't set specific time lines for children. they are going to travel at their own rate, and if you explain that to parents they become your allies. You can provide extra work saying you guys want to try where I left off, fine, but in my professional opinion this child is not ready for it yet, but hopefully before the end of the year they will have this concept rooted, based on different methods of attacking the same problem.

C: So there is communication with a lot of people.

FA: Is there not a need to indicate that there is some sort of tension between curriculum or expectations and that last point that the method is right? We have been drawing parallels between the individual child and the classroom. I think there is also arrows, tensions drawn between the standards and expectations that we have, and that individual development or those individual rates of development.

C: So the tension between what curriculum tells us to teach and what in fact individual children need to learn. Curriculum must be adapted and it doesn't always lend itself to that.

SA: My decision was based upon flexibility of instruction. I wanted a 100% understanding rate among my students for a particular concept. So I simply have to come up with a new way of teaching. After a try or two, different ways, I finally hit on something. I was trying to teach them what a phalanx was, in grade seven socials. This was a military formation required by ancient Greek warriors. I wanted them to get this idea—how difficult it was. I tried film strips and I tried discussions and I tried just me standing up and telling them what it was and I tried diagrams. Nothing worked. I gave them a quiz on it and they couldn't even remember what it was. So finally I thought I need something that they can remember, and I went down to the gym and I got myself some spears—hockey sticks—and I needed shields so I went and got us some snow shoes. Out on to the field in PE groups , groups of two march, groups of four march, groups of eight, everybody together, right until the period ends. We keep right on going through the afternoon. Finally we get everybody. A couple of times somebody trips and they all go down like nine pins. So finally we got it all together and we marched across the football field, out to the other side of the school yard, down the road, around the block. And they didn't want to stop !!!! [Falling off the chairs laughter is accompanying this story!!} Round we go and back into the building. Quiz the next day. Everybody knows what it is.

C: What's the underlying idea?

SA: Hands on.

SA: Concrete experience. There are different ways that children need to hear and experience.

FA: Isn't there also an underlying assumption that everyone could learn?

SA: Mine has to do with evaluation and accountability. Our report cards demand letter grades as well as how is the child doing—grade standing in relation to others. When I test I usually test in smaller chunks so the child gets high marks. Anyway, I went to all the trouble, doing the tests and marks and putting them on the "marks manager" to show to the parents. I usually staple all these printouts on the report cards. I decided this year I am not going to do that. Our school always been one that the student gets the 85.6 even though 86 is an 'A' and you give a 'B'—and the father comes in and says you have to account for this, why not an 'A"? I would rather be safe than sorry. Anyway this year I didn't do it. I decided to scrap it all and I didn't have one person ask.

C: And you scrapped it because evaluation is for what purpose?

SA: I would rather it was more how the child is doing against themselves. I can say to the parent whether he's low or high or whatever.

C: How well they are doing...

SA: How well they are doing against themselves—that's my underlying value.

C: So evaluation is for a child to know as well how they are doing.

SA: It is self-reference.

SA: Mine is mostly about the individual child, and the needs of that child—but in relationship to their classroom.

C: Again that tension of what the child needs to do and the respect for the group . Can you say in a word what you value in making that decision? What came out on top in terms of the decision?

SA: I am still deciding—it is to do with, it is between setting standards and being fair and being firm. Sometimes it is a time to be firm.

C: Why?

SA: In this case it was a team and it was a commitment, and we can't make an exception and this is the way it is and you have to have your consent form in like everybody else and it is firm. It is really hard to make that decision.

C: Given that it is hard. We all experience that in a lot of ways as teachers and parents—what is it that we believe, that underlies that, that makes us able to make those hard decisions?

SA: I felt that in this particular case that we were trying to teach responsibility and that each of us, he owns the responsibility and we have to teach them that they have some ownership of consequences. and that was a really hard one because we didn't get to play.

C: Thank you very much. And thanks to all of you for sharing these things. They are hard things to share. Obviously we are still grappling with what might be underneath some of the things you have said. There might be another area—another value, belief.

SA: The report cards that come out now are always positive and there is a comment to go out from the teacher to the parents. I had written and I got back from the parents—thank you for the nice report you wrote on our son, but can this be the boy that we know who jumps off from the table onto the couch, tries to drink his water without using his hands and never flushes the toilet unless he knows we are listening for him?

C: The parents' evaluation!

The strategy from here is to look at what seem to be the main domains around which we make our decisions and to ask you to take this wealth of thought and information and begin to think how do we get an understanding of what these things are as an introduction for our student teachers. Obviously one of the domains will be the child. Some of you will form a curriculum group to begin to discuss what it is you want student teachers to begin to observe, and begin to understand to be cognizant of the needs of children, of what constitutes successful work in education with children? What does that mean?

There is another whole interesting area or domain here around—Who is the teacher? How does the student teacher begin to understand who we are as professionals? All these different roles we take on and all these decisions we make around our beliefs, who we are, what we represent, what we need to do.

There is another one here on evaluation and what needs to be thought about in terms of assessment or evaluation. Who is it for? What is it for? Who needs to be involved? What does it mean?

Then there are two others—one has to do with the classroom, with the group, with the way in which we set up the environment within the classroom.

Then there is one here which wasn't as much talked about and perhaps we leave it—that is curriculum—perhaps curriculum could be looked at as part of all the rest?

SA: Student teachers are going to have a better understanding of the new curriculum than we are.

C: I was thinking of it in terms of what the student needed to understand about curriculum to begin.

C: I am wondering if curriculum isn't part of all the others? It is part of children and evaluation and environment. All of them are influencing all of the others. You could draw tension lines among all those areas.

FA: Maybe it is beginning to have a secondary role but it is a bit early to slough it off.

C: I wasn't thinking of sloughing it but—in terms of what student teachers need to understand about curriculum in order to begin...

FA: It is part of all those things but I still think they need to unpack it.

C: Curriculum is part of all, but it seems to me all of them are influencing all of the others. You could draw tension lines among all of them.

SA: When a beginning teacher starts out, it is nice to know exactly what to do and if you throw at them something like what we have just gone through that would baffle them. I am wondering how do you address curriculum to beginning teachers when we are changing, when we are right in the middle of change?

C: I am not avoiding your question, I am just trying to think about how to start talking about it. What we want student teachers to begin to do. If we were to think up a series of good questions around each one of these areas—for instance—What are the roles that the teacher takes on? How is curriculum determined? What are the developmental strands that run through curriculum? What is evaluation for? How do you begin to understand the different needs of the child? How do you arrange classroom environments successfully? What does successful mean and what are you wanting to .etc . ? What I am trying to illustrate is beginning to have them—setting up a curriculum that begins to let them explore and, hopefully, in the end, begin to ask, those questions. You are right—if they were to listen to all we have been talking about—But we don't want to tell them, all this. You are quite right, we would drown them—I mean there are hundreds of years of educational experience here talking between us—possibly thousands!

FA: I am thinking that there are levels of questions, the kind that Judith was talking about, that student teachers can address, and there are levels of knowledge and understanding. One can know something about the Greeks and the Romans and a body of content in the curriculum, what a phalanx is—and then there are things to know and understand about what is the function of curriculum. How do we use the documents that we have to help us in making classroom decisions. So I think when we are talking about enabling student teachers to come to understanding, we are not just talking about appointing them with what we know to be curriculum. We are talking about these bigger questions about what does that stuff do for us in our decision-making as teachers. That perhaps seems very big—but if the student don't ask themselves these questions, they won't have the tools for decision-making.

C: It is really beginning to generate questions they need to ask. It is certainly not imparting a whole lot of information. I don't want to know what everybody knows about all these things. I couldn't accommodate it!!

FA: We need a break!

END OF TAPE

Appendix C

School Associate Orientation, February, 1991

C = Coordinator
FA = Faculty Associate
SA = School Associate

New Caltec 401/2 SA Orientation "Understandings Underlying the Domains"

C: As I said before, we are looking at these understandings to help you when you are trying to articulate these open-ended questions to help the student teachers look at why they are doing what they are doing. As Mary described when we were doing planning, we know what we want the students to grapple with—what the big ideas are. Those understandings are what we came up with when we looked at what we want to see as successful graduates from our public education system. Those were the deeper understandings of why we do what we do in the classroom all day. And what you have come up with now in your small group are those deeper understandings, divided up our job for convenience, so we could talk about them within the domains. We want to be able to ask the student teacher about these areas, in all their complexity, as they go through the semester. When we finish putting these domains up, I am going to ask you to get in small groups again according to grade groupings—to say, ok we understand these are the things that need to be addressed by students—how is that going to look in terms of what the student teachers do in the classroom during the month they are back with us. What kinds of things will they have to be doing so we know those understandings are developing—what things do we need to see them do, how do we need to see them behave in classrooms, what things do we need to begin to hear them question or think about, inquire into, that will enable us to have some confidence that they should go on—that they should not withdraw now from this profession. So we are looking for the signposts that will enable us to make decisions, to assess the student teachers. And this is the heart of the work we do, getting a handle on this understanding of the profile of what the student teacher looks like—what they should look like.

So I will ask each group to give us their understandings from each of the domains.

GROUP 1—<u>Domain of the Classroom Environment</u>.

SA: There is a great deal of work involved and it is always changing.

C: When you say it is always changing Julie, what are some of things you are thinking about?

SA: Centres, bulletin boards, arrangements in the room.

C: Let me push that a little bit in terms of why are they always changing—what is it the student teacher should understand about making decisions about what to do when they change things—what is the underlying question.

SA: —some of the strategies involved of different types.

C: Yes but...

SA: Needs of the children.

C: OK, but in order to meet the needs of the children we need to have changing ways of children learning, different kinds of experiences for them to understand—that to me is a deeper understanding that drives the decisions that the student teacher has to make—so out of all this changing—and lots of work, the concept that we are talking about is that children have different needs at different times—does that fit.

SA: OK.

C: Different ways of learning—which means we must provide changing environments which means that—when we say lots of work are we saying that student teacher need to know this is time consuming.

SA: Yes, and ongoing.

SA: I think there needs to be some realism here—in terms of how important is this in terms of the time they do have—to keep it constantly going—like spending every weekend changing your bulletin boards may not be good time management or way to meet that goal.

C: We will do that in the next process after looking at what we need to *see* in order to know that the student teacher is beginning to apply these understandings. You do not need to see the bulletin board changed every week, but you do need to see something that allows you to know the student teacher is aware of its importance—and that is where things get tempered—there is only a month, and they are still babies in terms of figuring it out. Anything else?

SA: There is a safety factor in terms of knowing fire drills, routes.

C: So the understanding being...

SA: Responsible for safety of children.

C: So again when you are questioning—you are asking why are you putting material out in that way—whatever and one of the things you are wanting the student teacher to realize is that responsibility to children for safety. Anything else.

SA: Ours was the backpack [speaking here of a first week activity they had developed for the student teacher]—came from the domain of the classroom environment—we used that as a way to introduce you, the student teacher, to the students and vica versa. We felt that had a validity in September—to have the kids get to know the student teacher—things that expressed their interests and personalites.

C: But you see here is the ongoing challenge—what is it you value about education and teaching that makes the backpack a worthwhile activity—what is the understanding we want student teacher to have?

SA: Understanding the children?

C: What about the children.

SA: That they are different—have different needs.

C: OK so that observation instrument enabled student teacher to enrich that understanding—thank you—any comment?

SA: You can change or influence the classroom environment in order to influence the type or rate of learning that takes place—the teacher has control over that to some extent.

C: The way in which we construct classroom environments influences?

SA: The kind of learning or the rate of learning.

C: What are some of the things that you would put under "kind"?

SA: There are some unconscious lessons that may be taught.

C: So overt and covert learning taking place?

SA: That's right—and "rate"—you can organize your environment so students' attention, students' time on task can be maximized.

C: OK. So this means amount of learning. Then one of the challenges for the student teacher is what does learning look like. For instance, someone was describing to me something a student teacher was doing in the classroom and saying but that is not teaching—having decided what teaching was and wasn't. It is one of the challenges.

GROUP 2—Domain of the Teacher.

SA: What we did is take a list of "do's" that we had made up last time and talked about what we wanted to see them understand as a result of their experiences.

#1—They should understand there are many different learning and teaching styles—all relevant in different situations and they must develop their own teaching style to fit different situations—which will change as situations change.

C: Is there another assumption or understanding underneath that about how they make decisions? You say they need to know there are a whole bunch of different learning and teaching styles—and they need different ones in different situations—that understanding.

SA: —the understanding that children are different.

C: And perhaps what else comes in in making the decision.

SA: What sort of day you are having!

C: So part of it is your own personality and style—what else might be important—for any of you.

SA: It is also what's happening for the kids—what is getting them excited. You have to adjust your style.

C: What else might influence.

SA: The children's understanding.

C: The knowledge level of the children.

SA: well their level of understanding—some get it and some don't.

SA: I think administration and parents—they affect how you teach.

C: So a sensitivity to community.

[Much murmuring and chatter hear, some uneasy laughs].

SA: Any notes in your mailbox lately.

C: It also influences how we present things, how we talk about them in classrooms—that's a big one —ok next.

SA: #2—understanding importance of routines and of the necessity of internalizing and anticipating consequences—of the procedures or lack thereof. The example given was—she has kids put their hands up and student teacher decided she didn't want to bother with that, and half way through a lesson realized she wanted to change [wonderful empathic laughter NOTE: realizing this is very continuous in our work together and is a good indicator of face validity!!].

C: OK—again, what is the understanding about our role that underlies Rosemary's description—what is it you want them to understand about the profession and what we do that gives us—that we agree—that allows us to agree.....

SA: Learning of management skills?

C: What about them though? What do student teacher need to understand about the role of the teacher?

SA: Understand that it is part of the teacher's responsibility to create an environment in which the children can learn.

C: Ok and that means that...

SA: You have expectations.

C: A big and grave responsibility that teachers must provide —but you are saying more that—you are saying the learning environment is one that.

SA: Has to be conducive to learning—also focusing—

SA: Also focusing on—this has gone off a little bit from where we were going—we are saying we want the student teacher to internalize all the little things we do, that we don't write down every step in every lesson in our day book. It becomes very automatic. And a lot

of those things they are going to have to internalize themselves -and they need to know—like saying to the class go get your text books and the entire class goes wingy—they need a routine , a way of managing different events in the classroom and those things have to be internalized by the student teacher so they develop their own techniques for working through their lessons—not just that they are going to teach a lesson math but—you know, the hidden agenda in every lesson.

SA: It is teaching through managing and managing through teaching.

C: Ok so a student teacher must understand that a learning environment requires certain structures, certain framework.

SA: I think the word "comfort" strikes for me—they have to find a comfort level—where the kids are comfortable, where they are comfortable and everyone that is associated—the parents, the admin—where an admin can walk into the room and see that it is functioning at a level where nobody feels threatened—there is rigorous, active learning going on.

C: So if there is clear expectations?

SA: That's right—the door is open.

C: Hidden agendas, therefore, a comfortable classroom—is that ...are we moving away from what you were saying?

SA: I think that's right.

SA: In our group one of the SAs said her student teacher sat and watched for a Lot of time at the beginning and thought well this looks ok and then when he went to do a lesson he realized it wasn't so easy because he hadn't taken account of all those things that go around a lesson—he has this really nice lesson here but without all of this the lesson doesn't work.

C: And this is the framework that needs to be there.

SA: Yes, that's the framework and if you are not aware of this you may think you are all set with this nice little lesson and you go to do it but without all that it falls apart.

SA: I think that is partly rapport with the students.

C: It is rapport?

SA: Yes, with the students—because student teachers are finding when you are teaching the students everything is tickity boo but they get up there—and they don't—well they shouldn't have the same rapport. Well, they better not. [laughter] So they can't do the things you can do. So it is definitely rapport with students.

S: Judith, if a teacher has a picture of what they want a lesson to look like—or what they want a classroom to look like when they engage in some activity then it is really easy afterwards to see how far your vision—what the actual picture was and you have got somewhere to start. But if you walk into it—with just the lesson and have no idea what it is going to look like.

C: Yes, and how the children might react to different things you are going to do.

SA: If you know you can articulate what it was supposed to look like—and why it didn't and go from there.

SA: That fits in with our next one—#3—Understand when to stick to the lesson plan and when to be flexible. We want them to understand the reason for planning it ahead of time but if things are not going in a particular way that they need to understand it is OK not to continue in that direction.

C: Ok so they need to understand the structuring of learning experiences is tentative, subject to change—needs to be flexible and responsive to...what...changing needs?

S: #4—Understand the necessity for different steps to be taken with students in terms of discipline—that you may let a student get away with different things—simply because of that particular student. But behaviour by one student may be the best they can do—while you wouldn't accept that kind of behaviour from another. Also when a student gets out of line a first time you don't necessarily come down on them like a ton of bricks that there are steps to be followed.

C: I put consistency with students according to their needs—is that ok?

SA: OK—then #4—We are not a factory. Our finished products will have many differences from each other, and...

#5—Be fair and flexible.

C: Anything else?

SA: #6—Understanding the necessity to evaluate individuals according to his or her differences or abilities.

#7—Understand the necessity of reconciling the philosophy of the year 2000 with what is actually still happening in the classroom.

#8—Understand teaching is not a 9:00 to 5:00 job and often involves extracurricular activities. They should understand their own limitations in terms of time management and avoid excess stress.

C: I am going to leave evaluation until we come to that group—but the need for a healthful and balanced lifestyle—that is so important—ok thank you.

GROUP 3—<u>The Domain of Curriculum</u>.

SA: First of all that it is changing.

C: Yes and reconciling the year 2000—the new and the old.

SA: Curriculum is content, knowledge attitude, skills.

C: So what does that mean? When you are working with the student teachers are you asking them to include all these different areas when they make up a lesson plan? When they structure experience?

SA: What they bring with them—what background knowledge.

SA: To be accountable—that we are still accountable even though it is changing.

C: Can you give an example? When we say to student teachers you are accountable for the curriculum we are saying—what—that you must teach something? test everything? what?

SA: Right now we are experimenting and a parent might say—I don't want my child in a class where there is this experimenting. But we need to be able to come out of this and be able to say we are teaching the child to read. For instance, be able to explain that to them.

SA: We need to have a reason. There has been a tendency to say the curriculum is changing therefore anything goes. We need to be able to say why.

C: OK articulate your intentions—how activities are educationally valuable.

SA: Our principal just told our parents on Tuesday that the curriculum is not changing it is the methods that are changing. It is still there. We need to remember that, it is just the way we are approaching.

C: Was he talking about attitude, skills, content or just content?

SA: Probably content.

C: And now it is being defined more broadly.

SA: And some principals in this district would disagree with Mary's principal.

SA: I'm not sure there is more to put down. We sure talked about it a lot—We were revolting—worrying about the fact that we seem to have thrown a lot out without keeping anything concrete and it is hard to know—st ask how do you know what to teach. And there is nothing in grade five science that anyone has to teach any more so what do you do?

C: So how do you begin? What are the questions you ask in order to make those decisions on a day to day basis?

SA: Well—what is relevant, what is valuable to learn, I suppose.

SA: How do you narrow a concept science lesson down when there is nothing specific to do in say grade five or six.

C: There are certain concepts they are to understand as opposed to something concrete they are supposed to do?

SA: Why say that that doesn't matter—the concrete.

C: Is that what they are saying? that it doesn't matter?

SA: I have just picked this up from talking to a lot of people over this past year. I really have a fear that, I don't know, they're not coming out with some basic knowledge.

C: They might get shortchanged in all this?

SA: Yes.

C: Yes, I hear student teachers struggling with this. Where is the balance between the knowledge base you want them to have and the processes that we want to use?

SA: Because that knowledge is still important.

C: There are more and more demands being put on us to make those decisions.

SA: Judith we are just going through the intermediate document here in the district and there are two first year teachers and they say they can't take anything really concrete out of this document. So with curriculum, my thinking is that you still need to stay with the curriculum, but you might present it differently—bring in added resources. But student teachers need to have the guide. We say you can change it but you have this to guide you.

C: Then maybe one of the most important things we need to know is what do student teachers need to understand about the change. If the content has not changed, what is it that we want for kids that student teachers should understand that drives this change?

SA: They need to know they don't have to cover all content and guides are just guides, but they need some direction. In some districts there are units they can use.

C: And the way things are changed is in order to do what for children?

SA: To reflect the environment they are going to be in when they come out of school because they want the learning to enable them to function in society when they come out of school.

C: OK, so is that an understanding here?—that the way we make decisions about curriculum is in order to provide more effectively functioning citizens.

SA: That is an underlying principle.

SA: I think it has just gotten more crooked these days, that is what we are questioning. It has got to have more meaning. It has to be purposeful—just not giving them facts for no reason. We are trying to enable the learner—that they have some control over the learning.

C: Then that is an important understanding that the student teachers know they need to structure learning experiences that empower learners.

SA: When you say that to a student teacher that is really a nebulous concept. They want to know what are we going to do today, tomorrow—and I know something that drives me crazy is not having enough resources.

C: That is what we get into next. How do we ensure our student teacher are beginning to implement this in some way? Not that they have it "down pat" but that this is the way they are beginning to think. We need to see that begin to happen in terms of their work.

GROUP 4—Domain of the Child.

SA: We felt we named most of the understandings when we did the domains—and the most important was that children are unique. Everyone is different. They are coming to us with a history—that there is a family behind this child and that can effect what is happening in the classroom. How a child is learning today may be different than how she functions tomorrow because something different is happening outside of school.

And there is a wide range of children in the classroom. Some children have had no exposure to reading in Kindergarten, and others are reading already and you have to accommodator all those. And how do you do it? It can be pretty scary for student teachers, but they have to understand that they must meet those diverse needs. Not only needs but interests are different, and so learning has to be encouraged differently.

C: So you must see in your student teacher that she understands individual kids. They have done a lesson and you might ask them to talk to you about one child they think they have been very successful with, and one child they think they didn't reach. That will provide interesting data. Do they even see those individual children, and what is happening to them? Ways for you to feel they understand those children.

SA: Ok then we talked about the different rates. Someone might be more advanced academically, but socially and emotionally they are at a different rate. And some move quickly through an area and others need more time and practice—have to incorporate that. So you can't think if I do this they will all know that. You have to realize some will and some won't after many tries, and you have to deal with that.

SA: BOY! THIS IS A DIFFICULT JOB!!

SA: Knowing some finish in five minutes—what do you do.

C: I am awed when I listen. How do you do it? And again you are asking student teachers to talk to you about some kids they think will have difficulty—how are they going to engage them? How are they going to assess them?

SA: So part is respecting their backgrounds, how they learn, respect them as people, and because of that, respect the need to maintain confidentiality—what say to parents, to others.

C: Yes, and one of the program objectives being to demonstrate the maintenance of ethical and professional relationships, needing to see that.

Other comment?

SA: Where we said we have ownership of our own learning. I was just thinking of the curriculum—the whole idea—the child has. .
I don't see where to fit.

C: Does it come back to curriculum should be structured to empower learners?

SA: That is what I am talking about.

C: Ok so the understanding you would like to add.

SA: That students have ownership of their own learning.

C: Meaning that we structure for them to inquiry into things that interest them—is that part?

SA: Also that they show us different ways of representing what they have learned—involving them in actual projects.

C: OK different products outcomes and different questions they have.

SA: I think this also comes under child, that we can be the way children learn things, that we can give them all the tools, all the info, but in the final analysis children have to take responsibility for their own learning. And if they don't, it is not our fault. We can do everything we can, but they are responsible for what they get out of it.

C: So our responsibilities in creating and structuring environment and the child...

S: Takes what they can take.

C: So we don't browbeat ourselves. Remember that it is the same for our student teachers. We create structures, but if they don't succeed, don't beat yourselves. As one SA told me, if you are more exhausted than your student teacher, things have gotten out of balance. It is the student teacher that is supposed to be falling apart!

GROUP 5 —Domain of Evaluation

SA: The most important thing was for them to learn how to self-evaluate.

C: Why is that so important?

SA: So they can show they know what is working, what is not and can change what they are doing.

C: So self-evaluation includes what they are doing?

SA: They need to question the results of their activity.

C: So when they ask you was what I did good or bad and you say, "What do you think?", you are helping this process. And the same with supervision, when you ask what to focus on and they say you decide, and you say no, if you know what you are doing, you know what you should be questioning at this time. You decide. It is your responsibility. Talk to me about the lesson, and your concerns, and don't ask me to do it for you.

You have done a beautiful job of illustrating the understandings and as Colleen said, "It is not that they get it all figured out, but that they need to show us developing understanding.

FA: What I noticed is that if the student teacher understood these things they would have such a good understanding of what is in the new Year 2000 document. Those binders are so intimidating, they are so full. But I think we have caught what is the basis of the new program in a much more precise way. For instance, what we have said about curriculum here is exactly what is in the primary binders. And what we have said about kids, how they learn, we've said it.

SA: We have been dealing with the student teacher just now—not when they are practicing or even next practicum—just now.

C: Is there something you want to add?

SA: I was just wondering how much evaluation should student teachers be doing of student work?

C: What do you want them to understand evaluation is all about in terms of their judging children?

SA: Being able to set up objectives and evaluate from that and then make decisions as to where to go next.

C: Ok evaluation is a way to plan—others?

SA: I was going through the student teacher's notebook and she had done some work with a student, but had done no evaluation of it.

SA: I have a little guide, I call it a thinking guide. It's to think in a more sensitive way—and it is not just a little comment like 'good'—it has to mean something. And when I mark the books I use that as another way of teaching. I spend a lot of time marking—and I give them another lesson, something I've noticed on what they have handed in. I make a comment and talk to them about it. And the student learns much more than with putting "X's" all over the page.

C: So evaluation is teaching?

SA: I think so—hopefully students look at the comments and learn from it.

SA: I agree. As we assess in different ways some of the assessment is going to be ongoing. Not all of it is immediate, tangible, right now. In my writing program at the beginning of the year I collect stories and I make a book, and we do another book half way through the year—another at the end of the year and it is not something that happens right away but it happens through the year.

C: So evaluation is ongoing. What is evaluation for in terms of the child? If we were saying why we evaluate in terms of the children what would be a statement we would want the student teachers to understand?

SA: To give the child feedback.

C: OK evaluation is to provide a way for the child to get an indication of their own growth. Evaluation is feedback for children.

And I think what Donna said—feedback is ah...

SA: Meaningful.

C: Well I think you also said more than that, you also said self-enhancing—like it isn't destructive.

SA: Yes, I said sensitive, I think we need to be sensitive to the child's feelings—How would you feel if you got this piece of work with "X's" all over it? You want them to try again, you want to encourage and support their learning.

C: OK anything else—does that feel OK now?

SA: The children's evaluation of what they are doing is just as valuable as the teachers.

C: So child's evaluation of self and of peers too? do they?

SA: Umm sometimes.

C: So is it an understanding that children should be encouraged to be able to understand their own...

SA: Growth and learning.

C: So Mary—have we just rewritten the document (Year 2000) in much clearer language?

FA: It is definitely multi-faceted. They need to be aware of the process—product observation techniques because it is not just the worksheets or the test or whatever.

C: So the understanding is that the evaluation is of the whole child?

SA: The whole child and—I guess that would incorporate such things as the process as well as the product.

SA: Do you have variety in there?

C: You mean a variety of evaluation?

SA: Yes there must be a variety of evidence gathering.

C: There must be a variety of evaluation methods —anything else?

Thank you. That is hard work. I know it is hard to keep concentrating on that for so long. But to revisit that which we are trying to do, that is at the heart of what we are trying to convey to the students can help you sort out the questions people are asking about how do you answer questions, where do you begin with the student. My guiding question to you is "What is the underlying idea you want the student to understand?" If you can look at that concept you want them to understand—then you don't need to go way back because that involves a whole bunch of other concepts and there is one thing, right here, that you want them to concentrate on and understand—and it flows from this work we have been doing here together.

WAITING LUNCH

C: After lunch, and maybe we can organize this while we are waiting. I'd like you to work in groups of three or four and look at what you need to see the student DO, or what kinds of experiences they need to have in order to begin to allow us to know that they are beginning to understand these concepts. I am not going to have us come back into large group after that. That will just be in your small group. Then we will begin to help each other articulate where particular students are in their development. We will review mid-

term conferencing based on your thinking about your own student. So if you could organize your small groups.

SA: I would rather the student teacher was at the school for some of the planning for a half day or a day in the middle of their planning week. My children do some of the planning. I might say we are going to be working on this topic, what do you know, what do you want to know. And the student teacher should be there when the children are doing that, rather than having a day here. Maybe there should be some options there. Whatever way the teacher is doing it. Whatever is best for the two of them.

C: So given some time during that week to be with you in whatever way you see as best? It might be both of you coming out of the class, or whatever suits.

SA: Would it be possible between each of these major things for there to be a breathing time, because I think they are so harried and hurried that there is no time for them to sit back and reflect on what they have finished doing. They start the next thing, so maybe start a little later, give them some breathing time. They were away all last week at the conference, now here they are back in again Monday—busy, busy busy.

FA: They have today off. It is a planning day, but some of them are going skiing.

SA: Yes, we want them to be healthy human beings.

SA: They are awfully stressed right now.

SA: What about last week at the conference? Do you think that was a stressful time for them? Was it a time out.

FA: It was very intense. They were challenged with new concepts—they were challenged in ways they haven't been challenged before.

SA: Comments I heard—it was valuable but—the hour here and there when they could have been planning, they were so burnt out from listening that they couldn't—like us planning after a full workshop.

C: Yes, I think it is fair to say there could not be quality planning time in the past week. An interesting thing that comes out of that—the people who presented were so good—you almost get the feeling that you were supposed to be able to do that, be like that all the time. What the presenters give is so well done and student teachers I am sure go away feeling they should be able...

SA: I didn't feel that way at my conference as a student teacher. These people were fabulous, but I knew they were university instructors and I certainly didn't place myself in that same category of performance. But I certainly enjoyed it. I didn't take away a lot of strategies, but I wasn't intimidated.

C: I am glad to hear you say that. I was worried about that.

SA: I was going to agree with you. I think they are overwhelmed. When they see all that and think they should be able to do that by tomorrow. I think as teachers we sometimes say I don't want to go to another workshop. I don't want to find out about another thing I am not doing. [Much laughter!].

C: Given that, what is it that student teachers should have? What is it that is most important for them to know in this first semester? Given that we don't want to over stress them, and give them reflection time... What do they need to know?

SA: Well I think—we talked about that last time. They need a place to just get their feet wet. This isn't the final practicum.

C: So the reflection on practice in itself is a valuable thing. trying things and talking about them.

SA: How much do they have in the way of assignments in this four week time? Are there a lot of other things they are expected to do?

SA: They have journals—and a child study.

FA: Which is tied in to their work in your room. And they videotape one of their lessons if possible.

SA: They are extra assignments.

FA: Yes, but tied into what we're doing together.

SA: Even preparing for their conference must be fairly stressful, to get all that material ready, including lesson preparation to put into those bins.

SA: Yes, the mid-term conference, I hadn't appreciated what time it would take. I am really glad you are talking about that. I know I hadn't given it a lot of thought about how much time we were asking them to take, and seeing it as educationally valuable but realizing you can't keep piling it on.

SA: And when you add it all up—the lessons, and journals and child study and mid-term—that is a lot of work.

SA: Besides all the planning!!

SA: And depending on the different backgrounds they are coming from, they are all at such different levels.

[Much talk began here among SAs comparing notes. An obvious negative for university planning!! and, I would guess, a feeling of having been left out. Although the planning by university folk had been done in careful parallel to recommendations from our days to together, because SAs had not seen the transition, they did not feel it was theirs].

C: So a recommendation would be the amount of information and expectations that are being asked of the students, in addition to them just getting in there and trying things out and then coming back and reflecting on them is too heavy.

SA: This could be looked on as resources for the future.

C: What is it you are calling resources?

SA: All this exposure they have had could be considered as resources for later—put in a file for the future—not having to do it now.

FA: When would the later be June?

SA: When they are comfortable. When they are ready.

SA: I go to workshops—put the stuff away and two years down the road pull it out and can use it.

SA: It is just too much—even for us.

SA: And the second day of a conference I am just exhausted with all the input—all these great ideas but you are overloaded. If they spend four days with all these people with their ideas, that is totally exhausting of itself.

SA: This next week is also heavily planned. It sounds like they are not going to have very much time for the unit planning which is going to be very difficult for them to do, not having had much experience.

SA: Are you guiding them in unit planning?

FA: I was talking about this with my group. We are doing this slightly differently. We are building in flexibility because some of our new themes are only going to be introduced later in the week. So they are not starting the unit Monday. We have built flexibility into ours. They will have something to bring, but then will work with SAs.

FA: And we were doing the same thing—that they started out with you. They chose a topic with you and now they have been to the conference and have heard some more things about planning and some of them can incorporate those. We have said that the theme should come to us, but we are not expecting it to be complete. Obviously, they need more time with you.

FA: I guess I need to have a sense before they go back to the school of what it is that comprises this sequence—where it will begin, and how, and what are the anticipated outcomes, and why. And what I have asked for is the first lesson done in detail and a good sense of the second. I need to have a sense that they have found the resources they need, that they have given thought to the kinds of activities they are going to include. That they are giving thought to how they might connect it to other goals. Not that they are going to say, I have to include social and emotional development, but I need to know does it connect with anything? If it does great. If it doesn't I am not going to force it.

C: So when they bring these to you it is an opportunity for you to guide, help, question?

FA: Yes.

C: You give them some input. It is not a finished product, just a way to begin.

SA: I don't see how they are going to do that without time with us. I couldn't do it. If I was trying to plan a lesson for your classroom and show it to somebody else, I couldn't do it without spending time with you.

SA: There should be a week where they could drop into their own class and work in the classroom. Come as they need to see you.

FA: They do have today—oh but that's right you are here!!

C: Well then maybe we need to back up right now in terms of when these need to be in. That they need to get back to you before they come in to the FA?

FA: Do they have to . . . I mean I never imagined that they were starting next Monday morning. I mean they need to reconnect with you and with the students. I didn't even think they were going to begin, but what I had was an idea in their minds that was going to fit in there.

SA: But once Monday comes, they are back in the schools and we no longer have this time. They want to spend this time, these two free weekends getting as much of it done as they can. That's what smart teachers do—planning in August. They have to do it when they have free time.

[Much discussion again among all].

SA: Because the SA, the teacher is so instrumentally involved in the theme that is being worked on with the student —and most themes are big ideas that need to be narrowed down once the student teacher ideas have been collected, I thing the SA and the student teacher need at least a half day, if not a whole day of looking at those ideas and resources. From my point of view I would like to have a good idea of where that big idea is going in March and I would like to know before my student teacher comes on March 4.

FA: Would it be any use to you if they came in to you on Monday?

SA: It is our Pro-D day.

SA: It would have to be after school anyway. You are busy and can't talk to them.

SA: It is not built into the present plan so I think we might as well forget it. I will be glad to talk to her if I am around. But I think what we are saying to you is you need to build in more time for us together. I think we are planning on doing that with our student teachers on the weekend, we will find time to do it.

C: I would also say though if it is your recommendation—and I would be interested in hearing your thoughts on this—is requesting of your districts . . I feel I am skating on thin ice because I do not know your union requirements. Do you think that your districts should look at giving you release time during your 401/2 work? Maybe a half day every two weeks or something when you working with your student teachers/ Would you like that flexibility or are you already out so much ? I would like to hear your ideas because we work with the Steering Committee and can represent the needs of the program because they are part of this collaboration too.

SA: Well when we are out couldn't they be out too? I mean why couldn't they be part of the session today? I know I feel I am out a lot already. I am reluctant to take more time away from those kids. Maybe we can work it into the time when you guys are here anyways, and we are here. Maybe we could have done it that way.

SA: I think we could have done without one or two of the days in September and used them now instead. Because although it was valuable and we learned a lot about ourselves, we didn't invent anything. It showed up in the Student Handbook two weeks after we were talking about those things. So it is not like we invented anything.

C: Except that Handbook has been around there for 20 years and is just a guide for us to use as we wish it.

SA: Yeah, but maybe that would be a way of stealing some days. Instead of eight days take six days and the other two are used for planning with the student teacher.

C: Well that is what you have to decide, what is most valuable for you as learners. I mean you need to decide what is most valuable for you as well—for your professional development—not just some kind of martyred hard work. So how is the time best utilized for you to be teachers educators.

SA: A couple of questions—are you planning on doing the same sort of thing again. Are you planning on eight days with your SAs next year? or have we sort of developed something that might work for a couple of years?

C: Well.

SA: And also—when you say are our districts willing to release us are you talking about them paying for the subs?—because I doubt very much—I can't see it happening.

C: Well it depends how they value your work in teacher education—how they view this work.

SA: They are having trouble with their budgets right now.

SA: What about the first question?

C: The first question—well part of my belief is that you become the best teacher educators by understanding your own practice—that to me is fundamental. The only way I feel I become more skilled in this work is by deeper understanding of my own beliefs about my work in education. So to say that we have developed something permanent would be antithetical to the way I see education evolve. Each person who becomes involved for the first time—at least in my vision—and I can only um—if you can't be persuaded than I can go elsewhere.

[I laugh as I say this and it doesn't sound put down but I am very embarrassed—partly I know because I was feeling tired and discouraged at this point—and looking back at the preceding conversation I realize there has been a tension building—SAs feeling left out—and I feeling this is an impossible effort from long distance where I am not available to support and consult with FAs. We are all doing our best [but meaning is not checked out often enough—and there the trust comes and goes].

C: So we can't say we have a program that is finished, that we have decided the program because somebody else will come in and they will look at their practice and they will contribute and shape and plan, and the way that it has meaning is by you being involved in the shaping. If you all stayed together to do 405 in the fall it would be quite a different kind of work than if people were new. But that deeper understanding of what teacher education is all about and how we develop that understanding for student teachers, is ongoing and I don't think it is anything that is ever finished, that is ever "done." So I don't see it as something that we do and go away. For instance, the way you change your lessons as you go along. I change what I do all the time. As I understand things differently. So it goes back to how you see what we have done so far in New Caltec—the

SA work and what is happening for the student teachers. And I hear you saying move back, don't give the student teachers so many stimuli all at the same time. Give them more breathing space and time with us.

FA: Excuse me—when you say time with us?

C: With the SA.

FA: So they don't like the balance of campus and classroom time?

SA: It is more free time.

C: Yes, time that is not structured as teaching or as seminar instruction so there is more time to reflect on what they are doing.

SA: Bridge time.

FA: Could I ask—is it just now after the conference and getting ready for the units that you are feeling this or are there other times that you would like to see bridging as well?

SA: I had a student teacher last year and I felt then they could have had more time for planning. They seemed to be under a great deal of stress. It is just balancing the overwhelming stage.

FA: Is this a general feeling I mean I really think perhaps small groups would have shown this more. I am seeing heads that shake and heads that nod. I really don't know if that is a general feeling or if it is one perception.

SA: I don't feel my student teacher is under the stress—but he is just beginning.

SA: I think it depends on the individual. Some have families which is an added stress.

C: You know, as well, if you give planning time and reflection time and bridging time, what do you give up? It is always a big question. Because exhausting as the conference was, it is so rich and nowhere in their whole PDP program will they get that again. There is so little time in the one year to give the bases and the foundations for becoming a teacher.

SA: That is why I think the idea of looking at the eight days and giving some of that time to working with the student teachers is good, rather than us going through the process of reinventing the wheel and naming the domains. That is important, yes, but could we have spent some of that time with the student teachers

C: And maybe some of those days could have been half a day working on that and half a day with the student teachers—integrating what you are learning with their learning.

SA: Yes certainly the January and this one—some more time with students.

SA: I find we didn't have time in the last week to plan. We both got involved in activities in the school and it was every recess and every noon hour and we would reach the point where we would have to say let's close it down. So yeah, if we could have had half of this day with student teachers to get together. I didn't fell my student teacher was stressed but we just didn't have the time to do all we wanted to do.

SA: It would have been nice in the first time we met—to have had a half day—a sub already in my class—just to take them around the school.

C: In January? Ha! that would be neat! So just go away together?

SA: And see what awful things happen when a sub is there.

FA: But we have to recognize that's nice when we are in Prince George and relatively accessible but Quesnel and Vanderhoof people can't.

FA: Could we ask the Prince George people—would they like the students to be with them Monday afternoon?

SA: The afternoon wouldn't do me any good. I don't have any free time.

SA: Morning would be better.

[much discussion]

FA: What about Nechako?

SA: Are we talking access to material resources or to the SA?

SA: I was wondering—those of you who have seen your students since the conference—the student teachers haven't been mentioned at all in this. I am just wondering are they feeling the need? Did they mention it to you?

SA: I spoke to mine last night. The reason we were talking is that we were going to meet this Sunday. It is a week later and they called in a panic and said we haven't had a minute to ourselves we haven't done anything.

SA: I spoke to mine as well. We had planned to meet this afternoon, but he also said he had not time to do planning.

[Much chatter again—everyone going at it]

C: If we weren't making mistakes we wouldn't be trying! One of the things we are saying is if we are going to be collaborators let's include the student teachers and don't leave them out there somewhere while we sit here and talk about them. And they do learn from being with us and hearing us discuss. We just become such a big group if you remember what we were like in January.

SA: Someone suggested breaking into grade groups.

C: Yes, there are so many things. One of my agendas was that we get across districts and across grades and hear what is going on beyond our own doors. But maybe it is negating the fact that in teacher education you want to hear from people who are doing the same things.

SA: You can't do everything at once and when you are trying to figure it out it is nice to get feedback from others in that same area.

C: And that would be most valuable right now?

SA: Yes, I mean it is overload if we try and give them everything.

SA: Can I mention one more valuable—we are kind of short on valuables right now. [laughter]. I feel that the whole New Caltec program is a good idea. We are working with people from our own community—and giving them the option to be teachers.

C: Keep the New Caltec program going?

SA: Yes. And I like all the classroom time they get.

SA: And they get all those observations. I think that is wonderful—getting into all those schools.

SA: Keep those observations.

SA: Is the SA orientation new?

C: Yes.

SA: Because it has just given the SA so much more understanding of the students.

C: No we haven't done this before. And that is what I meant, I don't think we can do this without your input. And I think that is being proven. We are trying to figure out here how we meet the student teachers' needs both in the classroom and on campus and we need to come together to figure out how to do that. You need to tell me what is the best way to come together. And some of you are saying bring the student teachers in more, not so much by ourselves. And you are missing your students right now.

SA: Another valuable outcome is the kind of students you are giving us. They are more aware, mature, together.

SA: They have a lot more background than you led us to believe.

FA: And some of you did not get babies, you got moms.

SA: What happens next year if you get a number of the same SAs? Do you do these eight days again and reinvent the wheeel?

C: No, I don't know about this reinvent the wheel.

SA: Maybe that is a negative way of putting it.

C: Well it isn't whether it is negative or positive. I just don't know any other way of working in and learning about teacher education except by doing it. Unless I figure it out—no one can give it to me. It is like what we have been talking about with the children taking ownership and being involved in determining the questions. I don't think you can know the questions. Maybe I am wrong, but I can't see how you can proceed in teacher education unless you get down and muck around in it.

SA: Every year? Suppose you have a half dozen of us here doing it again next year are they going to meet again for these eight days?

C: If they are doing 401/2? No. But if they are doing 405...

FA: I was just thinking of another possibility. Say there were six who wanted to go on again. They might help design the eight days with the Fa and Cood—and be mentors for the new ones. And it might just get that much richer. They would go through the same experience with a different role—

FA: Or at least help shape what the days should be like. But if you are going into 405 there would be some days out.

C: You know I would guess that even if folks here went through 401/2 again and did this same program they would learn an incredible amount. It is like myself as an FA—in my second year it was a very different and rich experience. I was looking at things differently.

FA: They might come to different understandings that they thought student teachers should address. But we would probably not diminish the amount we think they should do.

C: So if I could say in summary—it sounds like you value an experience that as much as possible brings SAs and student teachers together. That there is some question about whether the way you were invited in to help shape things in fact took place—that it was already there—and to ask you to help shape it was—not dishonest, but not everything it was cracked up to be. And I guess I would always think of it as all of us building a program—so that you understood the program in your own way and shaped it in your own way. But I need to look at that if you don't feel you were paid enough attention.

SA: I asked to see some modelling because my experience as a student teacher—I don't think my SA had learned to do conferencing very well. And you modelled that and I really appreciate that.

C: I am just trying to figure it out. And when we come back together in March—maybe you can think about it or write about it , whatever is best for you. We will look at recommendations for next year—at least as far as you know for the 401/2 SAs—what they should do, be involved with, and the way the program should unfold and—seriously—what you have to say will help shape it, despite what has happened with the Handbook.

SA: I am sorry about that I did not mean to make a big deal out of it.

C: Well the Handbook is an impediment in my estimation—because the objectives are very behaviourally oriented—very different from the holistic look at the student that we have described. So they are in conflict, and I think that is part of the tension you feel.

SA: The conflict was that the Handbook wasn't even mentioned until after our first two days with the students.

C: Oh well—yes you should have had it when you first started.

Thank you. Safe trip home. We will meet for dinner March 21 and finish up March 22.

Appendix D

School Associate Orientation, March, 1991

C = Coordinator
FA = Faculty Associate
SA = School Associate

New Caltec 401/2 SA Orientation
"What Has This Journey Meant?"

This is our last session together. We have had dinner together the night before and are sporting our "New Caltec Originals" T-shirts.

These tapes are an attempt to reflect on our journey—to talk about growth/development/the profession/collaboration—whatever these questions bring to the surface.

C: If we could begin with those for whom we have come together—*What has this journey meant for the students?*—then ourselves—then the program.

SA: The question is what do our students come away with from this 401-402 journey. They come away with the idea that teaching is a multi-faceted profession. Teaching is flexibility—you have to be able to change—with assemblies, with everything else that happens during the day. They come away with the idea of putting theory into practice. And sometimes the theories fall flat on their face and sometimes they don't. They have to learn to decide for themselves what applies and what doesn't. They come away with insight into the magnitude of the job—this is not a 9:00 to 3:00 job. It is huge, massive—and no one realizes until they actually do it. They come away with an appreciation of individual differences. We are not producing Fords here. We are working with individuals who are going to be in the world one day and every single one is different in many many different ways. They come away with realistic ideas about teaching. It is not all flowery and wonderful, nor is it hell. It is flowery and wonderful some days and hell other days and it is routine—we hope. They come away with many ways of doing things. Try one way, if it doesn't work, throw that away and try another. They come away with a set of routines and classroom mechanics that make the classroom work. I honestly believe that 95% of what we do is routine. We deliberately go in there and set things up, it is a routine. We want them to come in and sit down. We follow through with our morning procedures and set things up in certain ways. And the student teachers come away with those routines—how to make the classroom work. If we didn't have routines it just wouldn't go. And they come away, hopefully, with a sense of humour—the ability to laugh at themselves as well as with the students and at the way things go—if something doesn't work, well, laugh it off and carry on.

FA: Can I ask do they have to bring that with them in the first place?

SA: They have it.

SA: That, or they better develop it in a hurry.

SA: They know when to use it, when to call on it.

S:A: Like Jim said last week—some kid had been put out in the hall because he was being rotten—and while he was out there he pulled the pins out of the door [great burst of laughter]. And when the teacher came out and pushed the door the whole thing went wham—[more laughter]. Well, I laughed like hell. It was one of the funniest things I have ever heard. I wish one of mine would do that. That would make my day. Anyway, hopefully they have come away with strategies in planning, discipline and classroom management perhaps they didn't know before. They have come away with confidence in their own abilities, their accomplishments and their achievements. They have learned to pace themselves, relax, laugh, and they have come out of this realizing a beer on Friday always helps. That's it.

SA: Sometimes they come away with copies of units—really useful things that we went out to buy. We discussed that in one of our groups—stuff that will help them get started.

SA: Yeah, I have still got stuff I gathered as a student.

FA: There needs to be opportunities for tenured teachers to go out on raiding parties too.

SA: That's right. Yes.

C: Anything else. Mike is saying they come away with horrendous photocopy bills .

SA: I have enthusiasm—enthusiasm for working in their own classroom. Can't wait to get their own classrooms. That is something I really felt from my student.

SA: And that there is no definitive way of doing something—there is a multitude of ways —no reaching an end.

C: That is a relieving one to get in a way isn't it. That there is not a "right" answer.

SA: Yeah! It isn't a "yes" and a "no."

SA: I think some of them came in waiting for the answer—that they would get this answer. And now they realize there is no one way, that it is something that evolves from them and takes time and will continue to be an ongoing process of evolution and you don't all of a sudden know everything on Tuesday.

SA: That is like our interview with a student yesterday. She kept trying to figure out what it was we wanted her to tell us—what was the "right" answer. It was an open-ended question—there was no right answer. !!!!

C: OK—Someone going to look at the SA Journey? [Kidding about big print and so many chart papers—and kids working on the floor—a cross-grade kidding.]

SA: What has this journey meant for you? Well, TIME!!—time out of class, with the student teacher, in conferencing and so on—a lot of time. It has meant meeting with other teachers—from other grades and districts—which has been a really neat experience to be able to sit down and talk to other people—to have that opportunity to talk to people from other areas. It has been mentally and physically draining—the word "stress" came up from several different people. Hard on us in many ways. It's been stressful. It has been a chance to observe our own classes. We have had a little time and chance to sit back and watch the children. Not always involved, right in the centre of things, we've been able to take the time in that class. It has meant using reflective practices, thinking about what we've been doing, making alterations and changes too. It's been a risk-taking experience. It is always a risk when you invite

someone into your room to try out things and take over so there's a risk. It has been a chance to share experiences with the next generation of teachers—we are helping mould the next generation of teachers coming into the system. It has been a chance to acknowledge our assets. We really do do a good job of some of these things. It has been a chance to recognize some of our limitations as well. I am not as good at doing that as someone else—maybe I need to work on this skill a little more. It has been a chance to think about the complexity of the job as well. Students are realizing that—sometimes you forget how many things you do in a day and when you stop to think about them—when you have to teach somebody else about them and you have to stop and think about all the things that go together to make up a whole day. It has been a chance—we thought about our philosophy, and how our philosophy must be consistent with the students, with the student teacher. If you are working in a "learner directed" way, you need to be learner-directed with your student teacher, and learner-directed with your students, and learner-directed yourself if you are working with another group. Flexibility, we have had to learn to be flexible in our classrooms, be ready to change—ah—yesterday there was a delay and the three of us had to change things around, figure out another way to make things work. And. well, it has just been quite demanding with report cards and everything else that has been going on right now. It has been a very demanding job for us.

C: Thank you—anything else to add.

FA: Can anyone answer—are there ways that it can be less demanding? Or that there can be support that can it less demanding?

SA: We're going to get to that!! [laughter].

C: Is there anything else in the journey for the SA?

SA: I recognize just how wonderful my students are. And, ah, how flexible kids can be. I hadn't even considered that it would be so demanding on them but it has been. I think they deserve a day off.

SA: Have to keep in mind that the students have totally adopted them, they walk around together.

SA: The kids say, well we are doing this because of so and so—and you know, they have totally adopted them, you know, they are theirs.

C: That is one of things that is going to happen for you in the next two weeks is that leave-taking. It is hard on the student teacher and the students. That they have bonded and now won't see each other—at least for awhile.

OK thank you, let's save the program one for after lunch. Please give your SA attributes to one of the volunteers for them to look at over lunch.

New Caltec Journey

SA: I am not sure how well I am going to do this. I was all hyped up to do it before lunch but not sure if I can remember everything that was said between the lines. One thing that we wanted, that we agreed upon, and we only put down those things that we all agreed upon. We talked about a lot of things but didn't put them down if there wasn't agreement. More support from the FAs for the SAs and the student teacher. The feeling was that the FA should be in the school more often, at least in certain instances.

And, you know, just dropping into the classroom, even for a visit, not to make a formal observation but just to say hello and see how things were going. This could also desensitize the situation so the student teacher doesn't go into a panic when the FA comes in for a formal visit. Ah, there was a feeling that although our student teacher had formal observations maybe two times, that it should have been happening on a much more regular basis. Um, for the student teacher—that between now and when they go into 405 that there are going to be methods courses. There was a feeling that there should have been some methods courses before they went into 401/2.

C: Is there any thought about which ones should happen before?

SA: We agreed that the one they should NOT have was classroom management. We felt that would not be very useful in isolation and that one should be placed after 401.

C: When there is a context. So which before?

SA: Well we were wondering. They can take any four courses?

C: Yes, they can chose their own four.

SA: So they could go into 405 without any reading, say?

C: Yes.

SA: And be expected to take over all the reading in a class.

C: That's right so that's why we need to guide and recommend and counsel. That is something that has been going around at the university for a long time—whether to mandate courses or leave it open.

SA: Is the College of Teachers . . Is that where they are going to recommend one more semester for PDP? Is everyone going to have to have a degree before they begin teaching?

C: That was the recommendation of the Sullivan Commission, that everyone have a degree.

SA: When we wrote this we were thinking about student teachers having methods courses that began before they began their first practicum and continued after they had finished that practicum. And maybe their assignments could be geared towards things they were going to be teaching anyways. That the actual collection of materials could happen before. That there would be two purposes for their work, one for the course assignment and one for the actual teaching.

C: Before 401/2? I mean that does happen in 404 that they get a lot of unit planning done.

SA: Sort of ongoing—like our students were doing a unit on Peru, integrating a lot of subject areas, and it would have been nice if they had had the time before, had a methods course maybe in that area and part of their mark would be this unit that they had to plan and do in the class.

SA: Am I hearing that maybe a student would take a methods course during the year and go into class maybe 1 or 2 days a week and then back on campus.

SA: We did that in our teacher ed program—six weeks in courses, then six weeks in schools, then again.

SA: How was that beneficial?

SA: Ah, it felt a better grasp of what I was looking for out of those courses. I took art, music and PE in my second year of university and I really felt quite conflicted in teaching art or music and the reason behind that is that when I was taking them I really didn't have any idea how I was going to use them. So the academic course I took in my professional year, I knew how I was going to use it and that worked out really well.

S: OK #3 is provide a sub for release time for the student teacher and the SA to do joint planning—and also some release time at the end for evaluations. For mid-term as well. One of the ways to do this—this was an excellent idea, Mike's idea,—have a sub who is hired to travel with the FAs who would have some sort of enrichment project to do with the kids in that hour, and provide time for the SA and student teacher to conference with the FA. And that way the SA would not have to be putting in a bunch of time preparing for the sub to come in if you had a travelling sub who was doing the lesson with all classes.

SA: The contracts wouldn't allow it.

SA: A sub travelling from school to school teaching for an hour. Is that what you had in mind?

SA: That was the suggestion.

SA: The contract wouldn't allow it. A contract is a half a day assignment.

SA: Well, does it say they have to be in the same school for half a day?

C: Could be a full day assignment?

SA: Only within a school I believe can they travel from a class to a class.

SA: Well it is certainly worth looking at. It is not as if the sub has to prepare a whole lot of different lessons. Looking at it from the sub's point of view as well as teachers.

SA: And they wouldn't be teaching the entire day—maybe three times.

SA: When we were talking here about the SA and the student teacher sitting down with the FA, the idea is not that we need to get more time but maybe that some of the eight days that we have could be cut down and more of that conferencing could occur. When the FA came over to be with me and the student teacher for mid-term, we took the entire lunch hour, the kids were beating on the door wanting to come in, and then I had to go and the student teacher and FA had to move into the prep room because we weren't really finished. It would be much better if we were to have a half day, a sub come in, and the SA has time to do the evaluation sheet—like this great big thing that we've got here now—do that—and then the rest of the half day have the FA come in and do the process with us. Comments on that?

SA: I like your suggestion of a half day—and I would like a half day at the beginning—a bridging between what happens when they are here at New Caltec, and what happens when they come to our school. As an SA I would have that half day, even just to take

them round the school, and sit down and agree to some mutual expectations, what the general plant is like so it isn't like dropping in by parachute, so the adjustment is a little more gradual. And that also gives you a chance to set up conferencing with the student teacher rather than just arriving, here's my room, and here's the staff, see you at lunch hour and by the way you're in here now to observe. You know that is quite a sudden adjustment for the student teacher to make—that half day might help ease that.

SA: We're talking here about a half day for a planning session, plus another half day for mid-term plus another half day for final evaluation.

SA: Yes, and maybe that could come out of this—maybe instead of 3 two day sessions here in Prince George have three one and a half day sessions and allow those other half days for those sessions with the student teachers.

C: Yes, it certainly felt last time that it would have been more valuable to have a half day with the students than us here without them all day.

SA: Yes, and for example after their two weeks in conference and seminars, right away they had to dive back into the classroom and I found that quite tedious.

SA: OK another suggestions- this had to do with the kind of course they should take before they come. They should have some knowledge of the skill level of students at each age level. Not necessarily just at the level they expect to teach, but the skill level they should expect at a given age level whether that kid is at that age level or not. In other words the statement was made that possibly an student teacher goes into a grade six class and there is a student in there functioning at a grade three level and they should be able to have some sort of knowledge of what they should expect of each age and developmental level. Any feedback?

C: So it might be a profile of the norm of any particular age level, of what they might expect?

SA: It is not just to cover that age level but to have them get an idea of what is the whole continuum because they may get a class of say eight-year-olds and one of the children is not up to what we might consider to be 8 year old development and they need to have some idea of how to adjust to that child in the class who is operating at a 6 year old, not operating at the developmental level of the rest of the class. Or a child who has moved ahead. Some of us have taken development psychology and it helps.

C: So you are recommending that that might be a course in the academic semester? Or in 401/2—it might be one of the courses taught on campus.

SA: There was a feeling among our group that unit planning may be unrealistic at this level. They are coming into this last four weeks and they really don't know what they are getting into. It might be more realistic if they were to plan an outline for the unit and then in detail just the first lesson so after they taught that first lesson, if there are major errors or problems, then they haven't put in enormous hours planning details of all the lessons. I had to put in the word "maybe" because I found it worked fairly well with my student teacher—we actually planned together on the weekend before he came in. But there was the feeling that it might not be appropriate for some to do so much planning before.

SA: A comment on that . I think it might depend on the different areas the student teacher might be in. In a grade ten science class there may be some reasonable expectations of what the kids are able to do because they have hopefully passed a grade nine class. We

don't have that at the elementary level and that is where this is coming from. My students felt themselves under a fair bit of pressure having to have a unit planned and ready to go and I vetoed that. Asked only for a very very detailed first lesson—and in both cases if they had gone on to plan it would have been useless planning. The second lesson would have made no sense whatsoever. They would have had to throw it out.

C: Especially as we realize that their pacing is something they are still trying to figure out.

SA: We felt that the expectations for student teachers should be clearly outlined to SAs because there was some feeling that the student teacher and SAs went into the mid-term evaluation not really knowing what to expect or thinking they were expecting one thing and it didn't really happen. That things weren't really looked at in the fashion they thought they were really going to be.

C: How was portfolio for mid-terms?

SA: I was one of the persons who commented on that. I felt that the eight goals that the student needed to comment on were valuable but they didn't really reflect what my student had been doing in the classroom. They were 8 behavioural goals with certain objectives in them that students had to prove they had covered those or parts of them—and it was really hard, given what they were doing in the classroom, things that verified and proved those goals.

C: Yes, that language gets in the way.

SA: Yes, and as a SA if I had even had a look, a closer look earlier at those goals, then perhaps I could have helped the student teacher to see what she was doing in the classroom, and what I observed on my sheet would help them to clearly tell the FA how they had achieved that in that time.

SA: It is interesting there seems to be a real difference between primary and intermediate now. When we were in the last session here in February, I left with a strong impression that the three people would come together and share their impressions of what had happened and it would be summarized and we would all agree on it. That third step did not happen. We all came and did our thing and that was the end of it. And I was left thinking what was the purpose. There was this huge gap between practice and theory. The portfolio reflected what had gone on in the classroom and it was a lot of work for them to do it and it really wasn't evaluated.

C: Wait a minute there is a difference between evaluation and summary. You are talking about it not being summarized? as opposed to evaluated? Or do you mean evaluate the presentation?

SA: Their understanding and mine was that they would be very much accountable for what they brought to that mid-term. That it was a big deal and they spent a lot of time thinking about what they would say about themselves. I was very surprised that there wasn't a summary at the end. And I know that is a difference between what happened in primary and in intermediate. So I don't know, whatever happens it needs to be better explained.

C: I would just say two things. This is the first time we have used portfolio so the fact that the expectations weren't terribly clear is not surprising since we are all trying to figure it out. I would say that one of the most important purposes of it is that the student has to stop and do a reflective summary of how they are doing. And that that is

mostly for them. It is not necessarily for us to evaluate. This is in my mind anyway. Unless they have left things out, there is a glaring lack of reflection, of ability to evaluate themselves well, strengths or weaknesses, then I think that is the responsibility of the SA or FA to point out. Otherwise if we see them talking about who they are in a way that is true to our picture, then what we are really all doing is confirming where the student teachers are on their journey. There was an expectation in my mind that there would be a summary out of that of the strengths and the concerns so that that is the final piece that goes into the persons' file with us.

SA: You see the advantage of that is that then you have one piece of paper that all three people have agreed on. Otherwise down the road a student teacher might say well yeah that is what the SA said about me but I didn't agree.

C: Yes, it should be summarized and signed by everyone. Otherwise there is no agreement of a common perception that you have all come away with. And that needs to be in the students' file.

SA: I recognize that the students' journals were a lot of work for them but I found that with our student teachers, the two pieces they brought forward from their journals showed the growth that they had made—being very egocentric when they came in, how do I do this, how do I do that, I I I I I. And the later ones were: are the kids really understanding what is going on? How can I show the kids...So it really showed that growth that they were making. And I think that they found it very beneficial.

SA: Were they sharing their journals with you?

SA: They brought in two entries for the mid-term, and summarized them. That was all that was shared. It wasn't anything else—what they shared was the personal growth that they had seen and that they reflected on. And that was their contribution.

SA: What I liked about the portfolio was getting to see another side of the student teacher because there were some things that I didn't realize. I didn't realize that one of them felt so strong about play. That was neat to see. The first month we are so involved with what is in the classroom, not so much what is in their minds, I guess.

SA: Yes, I heard that from a number of people—the opportunity to hear about their student teacher in a more whole way provided insights that you hadn't had up to that point in time.

SA: The last item here: The FAs need to be aware of the student teacher overload and also the SA overload. Suggestions: They really do have an overload. They really do get stressed out. Even this Tuesday I guess it was they got a bunch of homework again, and I think sometimes they feel they are just sort of scrambling, just keeping up on the treadmill.

SA: And when you do this calendar [NOTE: the calendar they are going to fill out with suggested activity and sequence for the semester] you could indicate a sequence of activity that suggest or reflects that. Anything else?

SA: Is there any way that the math course that they have to do could be made more relevant?

C: That is a faculty decision but I can certainly take that back. Are you saying the math course has nothing to do with what student teachers need for mathematics teaching in schools?

SA: It is so theoretical and yet, particularly in grade seven, some of the student teachers do not have good grade seven math skills and they need to know those things. They need a much more practical approach so they can do it and not just talk about it.

SA: I know quite a few people who have taken it by correspondence. It is just an horrendous thing to take by correspondence.

SA: I would like to see all the student teachers take the two courses you offered in the fall.

C: At the moment that is not legally possible but they are looking at changes in the Bachelor of Ed program—that would be the place where it would be recommended. But right now if they have the credits...

SA: Can't you just make it a prerequisite for PDP?

SA: Well, it could be if that is what the faculty decided they wanted. That is the recommendation that we would make—that there should be some introduction to teaching before they enter 401/2.

SA: They should have that. I mean otherwise they come in in January and they have had nothing.

SA: One thing—I am not sure it came out there. There was a very strong feeling that once the student teachers are in the classroom that they should just be allowed to be in the classroom and not have to do anything else. Or only coursework that related directly to the classroom. And that came through really really strongly that that is where a lot of the stress is coming from, from expectations outside the classroom. For some, doing the video, while it is useful for some, for others it is a horrendous stress. And the child study—while useful for some is a horrendous stress for others. And maybe that (assignments) needs to be done more in consultation with the SA—to make sure that it really is valuable, practical, useful, possible.

C: What if we agreed that there were certain understandings that need to be achieved in this semester and then there was a variety of ways that those things could be done so that there could be negotiations between the SA and student teacher as to how that would be done. For instance, a video is so that they can do a reflective analysis of their own practice. What are some other ways that you can work together to make sure that happened?

SA: It might be more realistic then. Because I think at this point the SA know what is going on in the school. I don't think the FAs have that kind of picture because they are not able to see them as much.

C: Not the same intimacy.

SA: It sounds like you feel the SA is not really sure what the expectations for the student teacher are? Is that right?

C: Or the expectations of the program?

SA: Yeah, it should be gone over.

FA: That is like the evaluation domain we had up here—being responsive to the place that the student teacher is at. That in consultation we want to reach this goal, what are

some different ways to reach it given the differences in the student teachers? Like Mary was talking about the fact that they are on a continuum, that some are way ahead and others are still struggling. That feels —like someone said we have to be consistent with our philosophies and principles all the way through—that feels like a good adjustment.

SA: There are a couple of things in the question: that we address things we would like to see continue as well—things that I see that are going well. One is that the education is being provided in this part of the country for them. That should continue. Two, that we need to acknowledge that they are at different places and what I like about it is that you don't expect that they all will have reached point A or point B by next week. That you recognize that it is a growth for them and that to me is really important. I don't recall that when we were st. We all had to magically reach this point at the same time.

C: And you are helping us see that. Sometimes we think we are doing that but we are not doing it as well as we can. Like this suggestion of adjusting the assignment to meet individual needs. The four of us were talking, while you were doing the group work, about the fact that some of the students may need longer, may need two semesters, that you could almost have two programs—student teachers on different journeys so some of the student teacher would not have immersion happen so fast. You might program people for failure if they are not ready. Again trying to respond to the developmental stages of the student teacher.

SA: So if you are asking us to let them teach for a whole day and it doesn't seem like a good idea can we just leave it? Because I just don't see how mine could.

C: No. don't. This is not a prerequisite. This is if you are ready and everybody wants to do it. Go for it. If you are not don't put everybody through agony.

One thing I want to say about the FA being in the classroom, having been a FA myself I know the time in the classroom is never enough and you are always fighting to find more time. One of the reasons we have worked so intensely together is to have you be more expert and knowledgeable in teacher education so if the FA can't be there as often, there is not the same hole left in the student teachers' guidance because you people also have some of those skills. The other thing is, we have found with portfolio, something I didn't know, not having experienced this, the FAs saying that portfolio has taken horrendous amounts of time, that it has actually probably cut one visit from each student teacher. And so we have to view portfolio as one of the visits. In the past we have talked about number of visits plus mid-term Now, finding mid-term such a great big production...

SA: Is it necessary for the SA to be in on that portfolio? Because a lot of it has been built up from before they came into the school.

C: Ah, what would be anybody's view on that?

SA: Yes, I think it is necessary for the SA to be in the mid-term presentation.

SA: Well, not the presentation but I meant going through the nitty gritty details of the portfolio.

SA: Is that not being evaluated separately?

SA: I didn't even know we were supposed to be involved in that.

C: You didn't need to hear all that?

SA: I don't think so—again because it had very little to do with what was happening in the classroom. And I didn't see anything being done with it anyway. It didn't lead anywhere, not for me. Perhaps it did for the student.

SA: Well it helped me see where the student was, the background. And that's what I figured the mid-term was because they had only been in the classroom a couple of days. It was a mid-term helping us understand what they were bringing into the classroom.

C: So maybe it is refining what goes on in the mid-term and it doesn't become a tedious detailing of everything they have done and thought.

SA: It was too big a process I think.

C: Yes, it sounds like it got too big. But you need to be in on the mid-term because there needs to be agreement—a tripartite agreement—summaries of where the student teacher is, in his or her development.

SA: And perhaps the SAs role can be to go over what the SA is presenting, is going to be involved with with the student.

C: Well it does sound like portfolio can do with some revision.

[general agreement]

Anything else about program?

SA: I found the student teachers were much more knowledgeable after having the education semester before 401/2—much more knowledgeable than I was when I was a student teacher with just 60 credit hours. They were familiar with educational terminology and the documents, and I was just amazed at how much they did know.

C: So you see it as an advantage for the student teachers to have started that dialogue before the stress of being in the schools?

SA: Yes, particularly primary.

SA: That is why I am recommending it—one of my students had taken the semester and one hadn't and there was a big difference. One often had no idea what we were talking about when we referred to the year 2000 documents.

SA: Mine was the opposite. The one who didn't take it was very strong.

C: OK, so it is a readiness level on the part of the student as well.

SA: Although I am sure it would help to have, all that information. But what you are saying doesn't apply in my situation.

SA: She would have been even better if she had had that semester!!

SA: I have a question about next year—I know the reason those courses were offered here was because students needed 75 hours instead of 60. Now, does the prerequisite include that 15 of those 75 hours must be education courses?

C: No. but we will continue to offer them as an alternative along with two SFU academic courses which we negotiate with CNC to teach.

SA: So a student could wait until they have finished all 75 credits before getting in touch with PDP?

C: The recommendation is that student teachers have some introduction to education before 401/2.

[At this time SAs went into small groups with semester calendars to re-write the shape and activity of 401/2 as they would like to see it.]

C: Any general comments about determining the shape of the semester in your calendars?

SA: Just a comment about the mid-term—realizing it was awkward in that week but not being able to think of another solution that was practical.

SA: Yes, we were going to put it a week before, when the student teachers weren't in school, but then we realized well that won't work because the people that need to be with us will be teaching classes at that time. And even if they brought in guest speakers, then the student teachers would be missing that so we threw our hands up in despair.

C: Welcome to planning.

SA: We changed your whole program.

C: It is not my program. It is our program.

SA: It is our program. We decided that big block of time, six weeks should be from the beginning of February and have the other breaks at the beginning and the end so you could schedule your seminars anytime in there. Then they do all their planning with the teacher, visit the school weekly.

SA: The university schedules don't matter.

C: So you think it would be better to have the school experience all together in the middle and have some introduction?

SA: We didn't like the break—having them in and then back out again.

C: It was disruptive?

SA: It well, my students came back and had to start all over again because in those two weeks I had changed a lot of schedules and they had to figure it out again.

C: Yes, well maybe it is thinking about what 401/2 is all about. Maybe it is learning different ways that classrooms can work, different schedules.

SA: Yes, but if they had been with me they would have seen the process I went through, why it was happening. And seen the flexibility needed in the classroom. [Nice Rebuttal!!]

C: That's true. Any other general comment?

SA: It is tough. There are so many things you want to do.

C: I know. When we have just all gone through this, had our eyes opened we can be more creative in thinking about different ways of doing these things.

[Brief discussion about "School Associate Attributes" sheet being created by participants.]

SA: The order that list is in—"flexibility" is at the top because 17 people mentioned it. We didn't reword. If it was obvious two people were talking about the same thing, we put them together. If it wasn't entirely obvious, we left them separate. So "honest" and "ethical" were left separate, for instance. When people went up to the list to pick their three, it came out differently than the original sheet you handed in to us.

Our understanding is this will now go to principals to indicate to them what is really important when recommending people as school associates.

C: Any other comment about the fact that this is going to be used to help us educate people in the schools to the work that you do. It will go out with a description of the program and of the work we do together and will enable them to be more in tune with us, work with us in a more collaborative mode themselves. Is there anything else? You are the first to work this through. You will be talking to others.

SA: What is the time for this for SAs doing 405?

C: Well the first time this went right through the cycle, in NWTEC, 405 SAs had 5 days.

We are finished . This is the end of our eighth day. I remember saying to you that in these last days, the knowledge and the vocabulary and the wealth of ways in which you understand educating new people into our profession would make it quite neat to be talking about all this. And that has certainly been my experience. We are talking about something we have come to share and to understand and we are beginning to talk about who we are and what has enabled us to do this. I know some people have felt more successful than others. I really encourage you to look at the fact that success is not measured by how far your students got—or whether they make it. Some people come in who shouldn't stay in our profession and that is the toughest part, to be with people that you eventually counsel out, or as you work with them you realize that they don't have what it takes to be in this profession. And it is not a failure, it is a success to do that. But is sometimes hard to be able to explain it that way to yourself.

So, it is hard to say. This is the end of my Co-ordinatorship. I will not be back next year. I have had the opportunity over the past two years to do some things that you don't always get a chance to do and that is to develop my vision, to work with teachers this way. I am going to take a year now to try to finish my doctoral work and to write about this—write about the way we need to work together like this in partnerships. I am going to send all of you a paper I am writing about this work. I invite your comments, criticisms, gentle feedback. You are all in there. We are all in there. Our hard work is all in there in different ways. It would be wonderful to get any comment from you.

I thank you for this journey we have been on together and I wish you luck.

Appendix E
A Discussion About Collaboration with Faculty Associates

C = Coordinator
FA = Faculty Associate

A Discussion about collaboration with Faculty Associates

C: What are the pros and cons of collaboration? I think I speak of collaboration as radically as I can in order to ask—"Why can't we, in teacher education, in terms of work with universities and school districts have equity. Why could we not work towards conditions which would enable all the participants to be part of the decision-making. And so what I saw happening in New Caltec was us trying to begin that process. I don't pretend we got very far yet. I think we got a ways in terms of beginning to think that way but I think there is a long way to go. I wrote that paper in terms of describing the vision I had and what I thought we had accomplished. But it is only one perspective and there are many of you here who were and are players in that so what I am asking for *is* your thoughts and responses either to the paper or to the idea of this collaborative approach.

FA1: I think my first feelings on reading it were how unfortunate that I didn't have a share in that vision when I came in to work within it. It would have helped to make so much more sense of what was going on and I didn't have that understanding at all of what was going on in 401/2.

C1: So there was a confusion about what in the world was going on?

FA1: Totally!! The making sense each time we came up to work with school associates it was another step, but to me it was an unknown step and I was unable to make sense of it. I didn't have that framework. Reading it in retrospect I am very sad that I didn't have that framework so not be as involved as I could have been in that process.

C1: So the other paper I gave you that I had written about this work didn't give you what you needed.

FA1: It didn't for whatever reason. Maybe because in looking at this ("In the Beginning") it was talking about what we had done. Your other paper ("Inside Out") was talking about it before, this was, for me, making sense of the experience that I had undertaken.

C1: And I guess you are saying if people are going to do this successfully it has to be more of a shared vision.

FA1: There had—and with that—from my perspective there comes that sadness that faculty associates are coming and going and have such a brief opportunity to be a part of this. It seems you just begin to make sense of it and you go. How sad for the students, and the program that what they are getting is us at our worst for so much of it. That is how I feel about it. When you come in you think you have strengths, you think you have something you can contribute, and for me it was a horrendous feeling to think wow—how do I contribute? How do I make sense of this? And, to me, until I have a framework I can't be a full participant. I have to listen, I have to find out what is going on. It seems to me very inappropriate to speak when I don't understand the framework. That is my own background. I know working with Native people has really enhanced

that Before that I would have just jumped in, trodden with big boots on, had things to say. But after those six years with Native people, you only speak when you have something valuable to say, you do a lot of listening. It changes you. Possibly I almost regretted that I have that because I think I would have functioned better in this program.

C1: Does that mean that—and I realize this is a broad generalization from what you have said but do you think—collaboration can't work because it needs people that are engaged for a longer period of time? Trying to do it with people that come and go a lot is counter productive? Or do you do it anyway?

FA1: I think you do it anyway, but it's more difficult. It is perhaps not as rich as it would otherwise be. There has to be trust and understanding.

C1: Yes, and that takes time.

FA1: But there is a place. I know there is a place for people coming in. I mean if we didn't know that we wouldn't be in this job would we. We know there is a place, but you are not coming in at that place when you come in as an faculty associate because there are so many people needing you to be fully functioning and I didn't feel I was capable of that without that framework to make sense of it.

FA2: I really do think about that—about wanting to have a framework and work within that. It is difficult to begin but I think changing the faculty associates the way we do that brings a freshness —you might be discussing the same questions but you get a totally new set of answers and different comments—it just brings a renewal and freshness into the whole program. Perhaps two years is too short. I don't know. Certainly it is confusing and difficult when you are starting out, but I think collaboration is excellent. New people coming in brings just a great freshness to it.

FA1: I think perhaps something we have to keep in mind is that there is that continuity—that overlapping continuity that we did not have.

C1: Well FA2 had done this before—he was not new to this.

FA1: Yes, but there were many unknowns. Both of us new to Prince George. There were many extenuating circumstances.

C1: Yes, there were. And New Caltec started with you two. Before there were not the collaborative efforts with the school associates—the extended orientation.

FA1: There were too many new things happening to make sense of.

C1: Yeah. What do you think then are the strengths of trying to do it? Why would you try to do it anyway despite the difficulties?

FA1: Try to collaborate? It is absolutely essential! It works! It is wonderful! It brings different perspectives together , it is just totally enhanced by collaborating.

C1: It makes your job better?

FA1: Oh, absolutely.

C1: Because I think it makes the faculty associate job a lot harder. That has been my sense of it.

FA1: Well harder is very different than better. I mean I still think it makes it a whole lot better. Don't you?

FA3: Well you know I did not spend six years with Native people so it has never stopped me. Ah, I am constantly amazed at the fact that FA1 and I are where we are now. Ummm—a year ago I was not sure we would ever be there. It has been a very- an interesting experience, a wonderful experience. It has convinced me that it is possible for people to collaborate if they suffer me long enough. It is very difficult. And last year one of the most difficult things, as I told FA1, was that in being the one who had some experience, and being the one who was almost expected to represent the program to someone who did not have the experience and being exceptionally uncomfortable in that role because I didn't feel I could—there is no doubt in my mind about the value of collaboration. And yes it is harder. It is incredibly demanding of time.

You know I have collaborated with colleagues in a school to do particular things. You did them and they were over. And it is the ongoing nature of the collaboration between faculty associates, particularly ones working out of the same site that is something that I don't think I was prepared for and did not anticipate. Plus it was collaboration on a teaching load that neither of us had had any experience with. That was a lot harder than I had thought it would be—collaborating on an ongoing basis. You know we want collaboration on a lot of things in schools. But day to day—and you don't accomplish something and then say now I can go away and do it on my own because it is constantly coming back. 405 doesn't do that to you. Now we end up missing each other.

One of the good things this year has been taking time to get together—that faculty associates must get together. Collaboration requires meeting. And that is the upside in a way—there is a process you work through. There is a downside to all of this as I see it. In terms of—I don't think it is in terms of Judith's vision because I don't think Judith's vision or anybody else's has been realized—I think collaboration requires a relatively even playing field in that both partners come—all partners come—bringing something, sharing something and compromising somewhere. And I don't think our Consortium has yet got to that stage by any means. Partly because the players have different agendas, different anticipated outcomes. But the big thing that to me has really screwed up the process is—what we have begun to do is work with teachers , practicing teachers, to determine what it is student teachers should know and should be in order to enter into the profession. And despite all of what they give us, all of the input, and the way in which you try to reflect that, the university then comes in and, in a sense says—and by the way meet these 8 objectives— it is almost an afterthought and an intrusion. I think if we really want to have a collaborative program the university is going to have to compromise and back away more than it has done in a sense—more than we have let it do—because we have been representing it as well when we have put those objectives out. I got a sense we have interfered with what we began to do —and I don't know how we get around that or what we do.

C1: That was very evident in the last orientation days with the "originals."

FA3: I am not sure what we do. There are some things the university needs to feel certain of as well.

C1: Yes, I don't think there has been much discussion at the university about what collaboration is because I don' really think that a lot of programs down there (on the main campus) are collaborative. To me what I see as collaboration is faculty associates working together—that is collaborative—but not with school associates—they are "inserviced." It is not creating curriculum together. It is inservicing them as to how they will do their job for us. It is starting, in some cases, in the projects they are

bringing teachers in and they have more time together. And it is those conditions for collaboration that I think we need to—if we want collaboration—if we agree that it is good—and here I think we are in consensus as to that—then we need to think about how we can make it work. It is going to be a long long process. The thing I noticed today (meeting with district administration, principals, and some teachers to discuss teacher education) was we speak such different languages. How do we talk to each other when we have totally different discourse? And somehow we have to come to a common language and that takes a lot of time—a lot of sitting around and dialoguing. Two different parties with two different agendas is not going to create collaboration I don't think. It is frustrating me a bit to hear the district keep saying, 'we have our agenda' which feels like it excludes talk with us.

FA3: Then there is the reverse of that when you say "well, the Dean really slashed the New Caltec budget." Now what part did the Consortium have in that decision. The university has not entered this in the sense of being equal partners. They control the budget. Budget has never become an issue in this Consortium. It certainly was in NWTEC. And that, to the districts at least gives a perception of power.

C2: Yes, well the Superintendent said—when I asked him to chair the steering committee meeting—well no it really is your program and the college's and we just support it.

C1: You know that is interesting in an historical perspective. In NWTEC it has always been perceived as shared. Chairing was shared around—and the budget owned by all. I was thinking, NWTEC began from scratch, there was no program before so the rules are emerging. Where as here there is a long history to overcome. The Superintendent is speaking from that history.

FA2: It seems though that we are breaking ground with this collaboration and I think that we are doing it in a very practical and useful way in that we are beginning with collaboration with the faculty associates, we are starting with that—including Vanderhoof and now Quesnel—we are getting a little further afield. And we are trying to bring in the school associates on the same level—and it takes work and it takes time to change people's opinions. So you start with a nucleus and I think we have a very good beginning but we haven't arrived yet, we've just started.

C1: And it sounds like there is that need too for the level field—the levels that have historically been in charge in school districts or universities—that you can only get so far in the grassroots work unless those people that hold the reins are willing to renegotiate power structures. We get stymied. None of us are in power positions. All of us are temporary.

FA2: But we are just starting out. It takes time.

FA3: Yes, thank you FA3. I think that it is a very necessary. We get so close to things—just like our student teachers—we want it all and we want it now. It doesn't work that way. We are on a continuum too. And I would rather be on the roller coaster than a treadmill!

C2: A meeting like this points out just how far we do have to go yet which is good for me to hear. Because if you just do work with school associates, with the grassroots, I can tend to feel we have come a fairly long way but when I hear principals, and teachers that haven't been involved in this...I become quite aware of how far we still have to go. If I just hear it from the university's perspective, if I just hear it from up there, then I really don't get a true picture of what it all really means in the field.

FA3: Well, okay but something that needs to be added to that because it is a somewhat different view. This year, because we knew we had a number of students seeking secondary placements, more than ever before, we put a "PS" on the letter that went to secondary schools saying that this time we had a number of students needing secondary placements. We had 33 teachers who offered to be school associates. It took something that personalized it for them. For the first time something in that letter caught their eye and instead of dismissing it. Now we have to find the hook for the others.

C1: What do you think we have done for the school associates in the end? If it is true collaboration, the people involved are more able as a result of the work to carry on with something on their own. There is a spin off. They are empowered to continue the changing for themselves and with other people. They are beginning to be questioners and challengers in terms of growth. How do you measure whether in fact they have become—I use in the paper the term 'emancipatory'—less slaves to the kinds of culture and messages that we most often accept unthinkingly as representing the cultures of schools and I don't mean anyone going out to burn buildings, I simply mean questioning why we do what we do. And maybe accepting it and maybe not but having that inquiry attitude. Do we find that? Is all this time and energy in the end making a difference?

FA3: Have we asked that it make a difference to them? Has that been an expectation that has been communicated to them?

C1: I don't know why, but it doesn't seem like an appropriate thing to say—"As a result of this you will be different."

FA3: In a sense I wonder how we communicate to them a) that we value what they do, and b) that we want to know if this has an impact on them. It is a bit like faculty's saying they don't like one shot workshops because they can't have any impact. We have to go back to them a year from now—or three years—and ask "Did your role have an impact?" I am not sure if at the end of the semester you can tell—it may be too close.

FA4: Well I know talking to Rick- he has had quite a difficult experience—a student teacher who has sometimes been challenging—there has been a lot of professional growth for himself and that he is going to be, that he is becoming a better teacher because of the work with his student teacher and reflecting on his own practice. He is convinced it is going to make a difference in terms of his own career.

C1: And is it just because he has had a student teacher. Does it have anything to do with working with a group of school associates? Having had an opportunity to think about the program before hand? Or is it that having a student teacher means you have to learn to think on your feet?

FA4: No, I think it is the orientations too, the bent, having the time to reflect on what it is they are doing, and why. Teachers don't generally have the time to do that—or take the time to do that.

C2: And again I would wonder what happens after it is gone. You have a student teacher and then it is over. I don't know how, or if people continue to do those things in isolation. Do they continue to reflect on their practice? While you are involved you have the student teacher , and the school associates at the orientations. Then you are all alone again. I wonder if it gets lost.

C1: And maybe that is part of the collaboration that needs to continue to have attention—that there is ongoing support for those school associates. It has been jump-started—now...

C2: Yes, I was thinking that our last day together we could look at what people think have been the gains and what they think could continue to support those gains. That information could go back to districts—to administrators or whoever. This is what is starting for these people. This is what they say they need for it to continue.

C1: Again, we come back to collaboration meaning the communication is going on at so many different levels—and that it is understood.

C2: Yes, at many levels—it is a long process but if we can just start thinking of these things together. I think of the continuum—the Superintendent was talking today about the fact that student teachers are learning about education and teachers are learning about education. How can we talk together in a manner that enables all of us to learn together? A lot of dialogue that has to go on between universities and districts to look at teacher development together. Pre-service, induction and inservice are not three separate activities.

FA3: Part of the problem with collaboration is we are leaving out critical players in all of this. Other interested players—administrators—they are critical players and I don't know how we bring them in.

C1: Like today's conversation—a principal saying ' these people need to learn something about supervision'. Well school associates are getting lots of pro-d about supervision. Rick saying he doesn't know how to talk to his teachers about evaluation because he doesn't know what evaluation is in this program.

FA3: The other one I have—if we are talking about forming Consortia with districts and colleges , what is their ongoing role in this. Who represents their ongoing ideals or vision for teacher education? When we work with school associates who represents their ongoing ideal of what student teachers should know and learn and be.

C1: Necessarily it is the teachers themselves.

FA3: Yes, but is that the only one who should?

FA2: Although from the district perspective I think it includes the people brought in to talk with the students—and admin have been instrumental in choosing the school associates.

FA3: But if you are talking of developing a curriculum for student teachers, what is the perspective of the district, how does it get included? Is that the same as the SA views?

C1: Well, in the same way the faculty associates are given the job in the university and in doing the job may or may not represent what the faculty might think. And yet it is delegated. What are you thinking FA1?

FA1: Just that there is this balance to be achieved all the time between what the individual brings and what the program expectations are. I think that's part of the reaction there was today to the talk of "standarized" . Once we start talking of collaboration—and even hinting that by collaborating we will all come to be the same or think the same that is death to collaboration.

C2: That reminds me of a quote in Judith's paper—here—"The test of human character is to live with the thought that there is no convergence. We are many participants in the creation of community actively involved in creating circumstances in which differences can thrive and we can learn to support one another." And of the things that we keep

saying down at the university right now, one of the catch words is "we hear the differences and we are moved by them," that something within us changes as a result.

C1: So maybe the question FA3 is asking is not so urgent because we are not looking for solutions. It is not so important who represents it today because tomorrow it will be different players?

FA3: But what I am trying to say is that it is a question of voice and people have to feel that they have a voice. The district may feel they need to have a voice, not so it overwhelms or necessarily points the direction but, so they are heard.

C2: Yes, that is important and what people do when they hear that voice will probably differ according to the community they belong to.

C1: How do you think voice is accommodated in New Caltec?

FA3: Well I certainly think that we—there are the voices of the faculty associates and the discussions they are involved with to create the program.. There are certainly the voices of the school associates, and we try and take what they say, the understandings they say student teachers should have and look at the ways they think they could get them and try to incorporate those in the program.

C1: What about—like you were saying do the teachers represent the district...

FA3: District is the wrong word—I don't think they can.

C1: How does the district then feel about those teachers being involved in making decisions for teacher education?

FA3: Yes, I think that is the question.

FA2: In Nechako they [principals] were involved [with the faculty associate] in selecting their school associates and they trust their teachers, have faith in them.

C1: And you people [FA1 & FA2] went to the principals. Asked them for their voice. And they said?

FA1: They definitely want to be involved and to be part of that process.

C1: And you have honoured that haven't you?

FA3: Yes, we have tried to.

FA1: As closely as we possibly could.

FA3: You find some who don't want to be bothered.

C1: And that is OK too?

FA3: No, it isn't because, I am not sure if that is just the immediacy of perspective—that it is too important to me, for them to ignore.

C1: Right! How dare they ignore this important work!

One thing...someone who read my paper challenged me saying, you keep talking in here about consensus, what makes you think you really had consensus among the group.

We might here agree to do something together. That really doesn't mean we have all agreed, that we all feel equally good about doing it. But we allow agreement to get on with it.

C2: It doesn't mean we have interpreted how we are going to do it the same way either.

C1: Or that we feel the same amount of okness about it.

C2: Or passion.

C1: Which is that important point that we don't always give everyone voice and some would say well that is impossible, if you gave everyone voice you would be paralyzed. So collaboration is agreement to agree at some point and get going with it, knowing that it is never finished, that it always needs revisiting. That you need to provide opportunity for those voices that weren't heard the first time. So to call it "consensus" is not honest.

FA3: A philosopher's perspective!

C1: Well, I guess it is important to remember that we haven't all arrived at agreement.

C2: I will give the example of this afternoon. If the facilitator takes those categories, I would not be in agreement that those are the most important categories from that discussion. Our group hadn't come to descriptors. We didn't put ours up because we didn't have adjectives to go with them. We had nouns that were important—partnerships, placements. But I am afraid he thinks he has consensus about the important elements of a good teacher education program and will continue to build the pro-d on those elements.

It is like the domains—oh my—look at that—they have just fallen into place!!

FA3: What a cheap shot!

C2: I didn't mean that. They make total sense. I did the same with my Heart students and they came up with the same kinds of things.

C1: The only time it came out "truly" was the first time with NWTEC.
I had no idea what it would be. Then it is difficult because you have expectations.
Then you might as well be up front and have them put their stories under the domains.

C2: Well having to cut 2 days out of inservice we have had to give them the domains.

FA3: To hell with discovery learning!

C1: What powers do you think that we, as university people, have to give up in order for collaboration to happen?

FA3: I am prepared to give away those I have no control over like budget.

C1: We could have a program that gets developed by everybody and we didn't go away and...

FA3: Subvert it to fit our preconceived objectives. Yes, I would like to try that. I really would.

FA1: I have some real uneasy feelings. Everybody having a voice and not necessarily having guidance or wisdom behind the voice. I feel very much in our program the absence of university.

C1: In what way?. What do you want to see?

FA1: I need, I want those people that are studying , who are spending their lives in thinking and researching and gathering to share with us those wisdoms because all the members that we are associated with are tied up with the practice and whilst we are reflective about that we need the theory to come in and keep opening us up and I don't, for me that is a missing element, or might be enhanced in our program. I know we are at a distance that doesn't help.

For instance there is pro-d for faculty associates on campus next week and we are not going down for it.

C2: Yeah, it is a full day on equity—and the externs don't get it.

C1: So you were talking about for you as well as for students.

FA1: Yes, it acts as a catalyst. And it is that that is missing.

C2: We certainly can work towards that being better.

C1: So how can you see collaboration...You started off by saying I don't feel comfortable with everybody having a voice. Is that accurate?...And then you said what is missing is more academic and scholarly input to balance practice.

FA1: Yes, but added to that is that balance of the establishment of practice. We have the administration in our areas which are , by and large, not changing. So in terms of power that is very powerful. We are changing all the time, the school associates are changing, the sts are coming in new. And we haven't got that balance on the theoretical side.

C1: And what would it be doing? Would it be talking to the school associates? Would it be challenging practice?

FA1: Yes, I would like to see it be part of that. It would be ongoing so that —like today, workshops but the university involved as well.

C1: And the school associates?

FA1: And the school associates and the administration as well.

C1: In the end do we need all those voices in order to make good decisions, to develop program?

FA1: Well I think they add. Where you have so many players who have similar interest, you need someone to stir it up or you begin to believe you have got answers. Or you are getting answers.

C1: Where do the faculty associates fit in all of this? They are not school associates.

FA1: Well, I get the sense they are so tied to the system the school system, that they are more like school associates than university.

C1: Would that be others perceptions?

FA3: You may be correct but mine is, that among all of the players the faculty associates are the ones who compromise most in the Consortium. When I look at faculty associates in other programs, in the Lower Mainland, and I see, if you like, their power in the Module to determine the direction it will take, I don't ...they don't face any of this. They are not accountable to 28 school associates in the way that we feel accountable. FA3 should speak to this though since she has experienced both.

FA2: Yes, that's right. We started out with doing it without inservicing school associates, without taking into account too much input from them. Two half days I think. So how much do you get during that time? And so we worked in that setting the first year I was here. And then we worked in this setting and it was like day and night. But it certainly was a lot less stressful when you and your partner sat down and said this is how the program is going to go. We know that they must have this and this. Certainly there was collaboration between us as faculty associates and also with Coordinator. And we would say we will do this on this day etc and that is what we did. And it is different when you take into account the voices of the school associates as well. And then you have to make adjustments and if you look at the difference in the calendar from one year to the next year—It was different ! It was wonderful!

C1: So this compromise is OK? I am not sure if you are saying it is too much, inappropriate, it should be different? It certainly is hard for faculty associates.

FA2: It is hard. And I agree with what FA2 said that the people that compromise the most are the faculty associates because you are taking into account everyone's point of view.

C1: Is compromise a good thing?

FA2: Yes. I also think though that you don't diminish the role of the faculty associate. Suddenly compromising to a point where um ...I don't think it is powerless...

FA4: You don't have a voice? Is that what you mean?

FA2: Well, you do have a voice, but only to a point, you are only one of the players. And in the final analysis you are having to have responsibility without authority I guess would be a way to put it. But, uhmm , that is false too because in the end you control your own situation.

But I do think, in the final analysis, who is on the front line when the program is not working? When some student is not making it? It is the faculty associate.

C1: Well, I guess that could change. Real collaboration would mean that was not the case. That it would be districts and universities deciding together how evaluation took place, what we needed to see. It may never happen but that would be true collaboration. Yes, you would only be one voice among equals. In some ways for you to say that is to say that collaboration was working. If that is what you wanted.

FA2: But I do think, in the end someone is responsible. You can't say it is all of us accepting responsibility. You will always find there is someone who has to make the final

decision no matter how high up you go. Eventually someone has to make the decision. And at this point it stops with the faculty associate.

C1: Well maybe you are talking about a limit to collaboration. That is certainly one of the issues in terms of power. I guess I am not sure, FA2, what you meant by compromise.

FA3: Well there are times when I am jealous of the freedom and flexibility that I see.

C1: You mean the power?

FA3: No, I am going to stay with freedom and flexibility that we perceive , from the outside, that Lower Mainland colleagues have. And some of them have responded that way, saying, How can you stand that? You know? There are times when I feel very supported through this collaboration, that we are not carrying all of this alone, that we are expected to make all those decisions out of a context and then have them fit someone else's context. I actually like this process but it doesn't make it easy. I mean there are days when I say, I really don't know, I mean I have not got to the point where I couldn't subvert it and get in what I thought was important anyway!!

FA2: Right on!!

FA3: And if I ever did, I would have to leave it.

C1: As long as we leave the structure loose enough...

FA3: There has got to be a little bit of room for me or for us.

C1: For individual interpretation.

FA3: Well, I figure, they have them for 6 weeks. They can have their voice there right then. When they get into the schools my voice is fairly quiet and fairly distance and quite intermittent. Too intermittent they tell us! So I figure they get their kick at what they think is important and I should get my kick too.

C2: And the district thinks that, and the administrators think that and...

FA3: Yeah, they do and that is back to where I was earlier I guess. Somewhere, and I am not sure the point that district representation comes . Maybe at the Steering Committee level. I mean I would like sometime to sit and talk about what they think are the important issues, what do they think counts. It would be nice to have that perspective from them, or from the people they delegate to do that. We sort of got a little sense of that today. I think that is a very important thing that happened today no matter how much they might have missed in terms of consensus.

C1: What would you say were the issues that they signalled as being important?

FA3: Somebody gave expression to the particular characteristics in the personnel involved. Someone gave characteristics to practicum that involved a number of qualities. I don't think that was all of the qualities by any means. Some of them began to speak of the currency of theory and knowledge as providing a base for practice. Somebody spoke—god this one really hurt—of throwing out the archaic models—the phrasing of that sort of bothered me because it implied throwing out the models of ways that people had been doing things for a long time—and were perceived that way by some in the audience. Those were some. We certainly didn't get all, the process continues. But I think the district needs to have a voice in saying what they expect from a teacher education

program and the qualities they expect to see in the graduates of those programs. Just as teachers need to have a voice in the qualities they perceive as desirable in the colleagues that they anticipate in the classroom next door—their future collaborators.

C1: Maybe part of this—FA1 what you just said, and FA3 what you said about evaluation, is a recognition that in collaboration those of us who represent different areas in education bring different knowledge and that it is not that we are all trying to know all of it, so that any of us can make the decisions, but that we recognize for instance, maybe evaluation is shared in that there are different parts of what a student does that are evaluated or assessed by different players. Or are given different weight by different players. That is what I think about when I hear you talk about that practicing teachers know needs and conditions of the field. They talk about it in a certain way. And they have more input in to how things work there. And what a university person brings, perhaps, is conceptual knowledge frameworks to try on their work in the field. Not trying to say we all have to come to the same knowledge but that we need to marry the knowledge we all have.

C2: I have some difficulty leaving it with school associates having some knowledge that they evaluated. I am thinking about the situation we were in this morning. You know I would not want to leave practical knowledge to that person—nor would they be supported by the administrator for the kind of things the Year 2000 document says that students should understand when they are going out teaching.

C1: You probably can't separate it out that way. I didn't like it very much myself.

C2: As soon as FA3 began talking about evaluation, and maybe we could all collaborate on evaluation for some reason my back went up. I don't know if I can't let go of being that final evaluator or what. I just think that as faculty associates with the experience we get being in a lot of classrooms, with the experience we get talking to a lot of faculty. We get a depth of understanding about teaching that I never got in the classroom. I think that has given me a lot for looking into classrooms where student teachers practice. I don't want to sound like a puffed up sense of self or anything like that [Much laughter] I incredibly value the knowledge of classroom teachers but I do think the experience I have had as a faculty associate has made me more knowledgeable about what education is and what the practice of it is and the theory of it is.

FA3: What it is or what it should be?

FA4: So your voice should be stronger then?

C2: Ummm...I think so. I think I would have to say that because...You know I wonder whether someone who has taken a Master's degree in some particular area might not have as strong a voice as I have. I am not saying that I have the strongest voice, but I think that I might have a stronger voice than some people who have worked with student teachers.

FA3: But then maybe we should just sit back and say "Good teachers see the future in the eyes of their students." Maybe we should let school associates carry that responsibility when they are dealing with their student teachers. They see the future in the eyes of those student teachers. Maybe they should be the ones speaking out, judging...

C1: And what would be the advantages to that?

FA3: Tie the can on someone else's tail!

C2: No, but I was thinking, If it was left to them, maybe, do you think they would take it more seriously. I mean maybe what happens now is that school associates do their very darn best but they do know that...

FA3: Someone else will take it over.

C1: Well they are the one who is with the student day in and day out, day after day. They see much more than faculty associates do.

C2: But they have nothing to compare it to. Except perhaps having had another student teacher.

C1: Well, maybe.

FA3: Well they compare it to themselves.

FA4: And their kids. They see how there kids respond.

FA3: They also go through all this orientation where they are asked to look at their own practice, to become more reflective and articulate about their practice.

C2: But I I don't think it hits everybody. I don't think it goes through and resonates. So I don't think we can count on the inservice as being that reliable.

FA4: The key is get the best school associates then—the ones who will develop through these inservices. Then it is going to hit them.

C2: I think as well what we begin in those inservices needs to be continued in some way for those people. So that even when they take a student teacher a year from now it is that much more a part of them and they will try to bring that out in a student teacher.

C1: And maybe school associates work in two's and three's so they can support each other.

C2: I think of what FA4 said a few minutes ago about how they see it in their kids, how the student is doing. I go back to the one today. She saw kids being active in sort of a "cub-scout" way as being really good.

FA3: So over the two practica they accumulate Merit badge.

Hey, this isn't so bad—they go to a whole number of people to show competence.

C1: Well in some ways this is intriguing—it is what I am trying to write about —that decisions in teacher education need to include many communities—all the voices of people involved in education, which includes university. And if there is not different voices to challenge and facilitate what is being said —so we recognize how subjective our knowledge is. If that is not happening then the full debate is not taking place.

FA1: And possibly an unequal debate. Possibly one way gets perpetuated and...

C1: Yes, and we fool ourselves if we think what we are doing is emancipatory because we are really doing is reinforcing the same kinds of hierarchies and structures with their own abstract way of looking at the world which has been a paternalistic way of looking at the world which is...

FA1: Still there. And so many teachers in the north have such limited access to new ideas, new ways of thinking, Many of our teachers are very aware of that...

C1: Aware that?

FA1: That they haven't been able to participate in learning. That they have not been able to take the courses. They could take whatever was offered which may not be what they wanted. They know themselves that they want this information, this challenge, the opening. And I guess my fear is that it might be closing rather than opening—saying oh yes this is what we are doing, this is how we are doing it . This is working, you know, and perhaps without somebody coming in with other thoughts to be considered .

C1: And what are the conditions for school associates to question what we have to say?

FA1: Actually one of the things I really like about the triad is the discussion time with the school associates. I think there is a lot of challenging and opening there. But my concern there is that we don't always have a common knowledge base that we are talking about. If we had someone coming in to our SA inservice to throw out a few ideas, let them play with those, then that dialogue can continue.

C1: But then I go back to Jean's question, "Who questions those ideas that are being thrown out for consideration?" Who challenges the thinking or values or assumptions of the person with those ideas? Which, if it truly is an open discussion taking place that too needs to happen. What are the values that inform that person's approach? And if we don't know that we don't have a context for those ideas either.

FA1: Right. And that is exactly my concern in terms of limited access. If you have not been exposed to several ways of looking. You can begin to feel very happy with the one you have got. And many of our school associates...

C1: You know I find that very challenging—I think that is something I have really wanted to do, and, I think, began to do a little bit with our school associates at the end of last year. I remember Jean saying to me after one of our last few sessions, "the questions you have been asking today are not one's you would have been asking at the beginning of the year." There was enough trust that had built up that you could begin to challenge what someone said . But to be able to challenge people's thinking, or to facilitate new ways of thinking about things takes enormous amounts of time—and for people to be feeling enormous amounts of confidence in their own experience. It means as well we are talking about universities having ways of talking and knowing that traditionally teachers haven't challenged. It is very tough. To provide conditions where teachers feel they have the right and the ability to challenge what is being said by "the university." But I do think what you have said is so important.

FA1: One way that I think about the difference between 401 and 405—it seems like we were focussing so much in 401/2 on vision, possibility, take a chance, take a risk,...and I don't feel that the same in 405. I feel much influence of the school associate who is saying, "this is what works for me—try this." It is almost like their wings are cut. I am just wondering if we had get togethers where somebody could come in and shake us up—and then the dialogue between faculty associates and school associates—on an equal partnership in 405—we would part of that as well—that could be ongoing for all of us. Including the students. I see so many of our students in 405 who are on a wonderfully equal basis with their school associate—real sharing. I feel it is ripe for somebody dropping some bombs in that sharing. To really look again.

C1: I guess that is where I see the potential for a Professional Development School.

FA3: To add to that—to take the trio and have them refocus on something together.

C2: We were talking about that yesterday. I don't think that has happened at the Professional Development School, not a lot has happened among each other, most have pursued their own individual plans. And I think maybe some of that is —moving through the first month getting into the classroom and then October, wanting to do their own thing, and November, maybe now is the time that school associates are ready for pro-d—the administrator might be thinking what kind of pro-d can we do together—that could be dynamite. If that happened in early November and then they passed those kinds of conversations on to the students.

FA3: Give the last part of November to work together.

C1: Those SA are just hungry for something now—but they couldn't have known that before now.

FA3: Yes, the things they couldn't know—the students telling us—and the school associates and us listening. If you want an example of compromise, this is the prime one. Don't take them out of immersion! Don't interfere with their practice here. And we listened, because we had to listen. But boy was it a mistake! Those students were desperate for contact with each other. If I were to do this again—I would say once every three weeks. Get them back on campus let them talk with people they more fully trust. Relax, pick up from colleagues what they are doing. We would have done that if we had made our own decisions but we listened to others.

C1: But you know collaboration doesn't mean "giving in" it means coming to mutual understanding about what is important.

FA3: Yes but remember none of us had been through 405 before and none of us knew what to expect. And so we accepted someone else's view of what was important—and we could see what they were saying. In hindsight we have a different view of it now.

FA1: I think it reflects too what we were saying about equal players. If you don't know there is always that sense that others might know.

C1: Well, I guess that's fair. One of the frustrations of this job is our rapid turnover of faculty associates. You just get something figured out and it is over.

C2: I am on a bandwagon for 3 year contracts.

FA1: And the Coordinator—it needs that faculty status—that total involvement with the university—that other dimension that is looking out for that other aspect of the work — for new learnings and possibilities, for the shakeup, for the presence of new knowledge that might be generated.

C1: That can be a faculty person or coordinator—their jobs have changed , becoming more educational leadership, not only administrative. But the ongoingness of a faculty person with the scholarly presence—

C2: I wonder, particularly up here—and if we value the field so much I wonder if we can always find a faculty person who is able...well there are some...

FA3: Well, assignment of faculty to modules is another whole area. (end of tape)

Appendix F

Understandings Supporting the Educational Domains

UNDERSTANDINGS THAT SUPPORT EACH OF THE EDUCATIONAL DOMAINS AND THAT STUDENT TEACHERS SHOULD SHOW SOME GROWTH IN RECOGNIZING AND DEMONSTRATING

DETERMINED BY NEW CALTEC SCHOOL ASSOCIATES
FEBRUARY 1991

DOMAIN OF THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

— creating a classroom environment is ongoing, time consuming and always changing

— children have different needs at different times and different ways of learning

— a learning environment requires a structure or framework and clear expectations (no hidden agendas) in order for children to learn

— we are responsible for the safety of the child

— the classroom environment influences the kind (overt and covert) and rate (amount) of learning

DOMAIN OF THE TEACHER

— it is important for teachers to establish routines and consequences

— there are many different learning and teaching styles and strategies and different ones are required at different times

— teachers need to be flexible and responsive to changing needs (the structure of learning experiences is tentative)

— there is a need to be consistent with students according to their individual needs

— it is important to have balance in your life, to create a healthy lifestyle

DOMAIN OF THE CHILD

— each child is unique, developing different attributes at different rates

— each comes with a unique history

— children have a variety of learning styles

— classrooms hold a wide range of individuals all of whom must be addressed

— need to engage the individual interests of children

— must respect individual differences and respect children as people

— must maintain confidentiality of each child

— the child is responsible for his/her own learning

DOMAIN OF EVALUATION

— it is most important in this practicum that student teachers exhibit the ability to evaluate themselves and to modify activity as a result of that evaluation

— evaluation is in order to plan

— evaluation is to monitor the progress of students

— evaluation is teaching

— evaluation is ongoing

— children have different potential, and therefore, experience different outcomes

— evaluation is ongoing feedback that is sensitive and encouraging and meaningful to children (self—enhancing)

— evaluation is an indicator of the effectiveness of the teaching

— the child's evaluation of his/her self is valuable and necessary in order for change to occur

— evaluation is of the whole child —process as well as product

— evaluation needs to take place in a variety of ways

DOMAIN OF THE CURRICULUM

— curriculum consists of content, skills, attitudes and background knowledge

— curriculum is changing and reconciling the new with the old

— curriculum requires accountability, the ability to articulate intentionality./the 'whys' of our decisions

— curriculum processes are to develop thoughtful and inquiring citizens

— curriculum is structuring learning experiences to empower learners

— students have ownership over their own learning
—they have different ways of learning
—they have different questions

— curriculum is purposeful and meaningful and relevant