

MARILYN COCHRAN-SMITH

23 Duggan Drive

Phone: 617-552-0674

Framingham, MA 01702

Fax: 617-552-1840



CURRICULUM VITAE

Marilyn Cochran-Smith is the Cawthorne Professor of Teacher Education for Urban Schools and Director of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College, USA. Cochran-Smith was Chair of BC's Evidence Team from 2005-2009, which was part of the Teachers for a New Era national initiative, supported by the Carnegie Corporation. She is currently Principal Investigator for a related study of teacher development and retention, supported by the Ford Foundation.

Dr. Cochran-Smith is an elected member of the National Academy of Education and the Laureate chapter of Kappa Delta Pi. She is a member of the National Research Council's Committee on Teacher Education, which was charged by the U.S. Congress to study the state of teacher education in that country. Cochran-Smith was President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in 2004-2005. She was also co-chair of AERA's National Panel on Research and Teacher Education and co-editor of their report, *Studying Teacher Education* (2005).

Dr. Cochran-Smith has written nine books, four of which have won national awards, and more than 150 articles, chapters, and editorials on social justice, practitioner research, and teacher education research, practice and policy. From 2000-2006, she was the chief editor of the *Journal of Teacher Education*. Cochran-Smith also co-edited the *Third Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts*, which was published in 2008. Since its inception more than a decade ago, Dr. Cochran-Smith has been co-editor of the Teachers College Press series on Practitioner Inquiry. This series, which is the only one of its kind in the world, includes 40 books by practitioners and/or about practitioner research, including *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*, which was co-authored by Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle in 2009.

In 2007, Dr. Cochran-Smith received AERA's Research to Practice Award for her book, *Policy, Practice and Politics in Teacher Education*. She has also received a number of awards from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), including the Pomeroy Award for Outstanding Contributions to Teacher Education, the Margaret Lindsey Award for Distinguished Research in Teacher Education, and the Research and Writing Award in both 1995 and 2005. Dr. Cochran-Smith has also received distinguished research and scholarship awards from the National Association of Multicultural Education, the Association of Teacher Educators, Division K of AERA, the New York State Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and Boston College.

Dr. Cochran-Smith is a frequent keynote speaker nationally and internationally. Recent keynotes and invited lectures include the University of Auckland in New Zealand; the British Educational Research Association; the Education Policy Forum at the University of Utah; the Catholic University of Chile, Santiago, Chile; and the New England Research Association. In 2006, Dr. Cochran-Smith served as the inaugural C.J. Koh Endowed Professor at the National Institute of Education in Singapore.

PUBLICATIONS

Books

- 2009
Research Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner for the Next Generation. New York: Teachers College Press.
- 2009
Politics Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M. & Brennan, M. (Eds.) Policy and in Teacher Education: International Perspectives. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman Nemser, S., McIntyre, J., & Demers, K. (Eds.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis, Publishers.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . Policy, Practice and Politics in Teacher Education: Editorials from the Journal of Teacher Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
(Winner of AERA 2007 Research to Practice Award.)
- 2005
Research Cochran-Smith, M. and Zeichner, Ken (Editors). Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on and Teacher Education. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
(Winner of 2005 AACTE Best Publication Award.)
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. Walking the Road: Race, Diversity and Social Justice in Teacher Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

- 1993 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press, 303 pages.
(Winner of 1995 AACTE Award for Excellence in Professional Writing.)
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. , Paris, Cynthia L., and Kahn, Jessica L. Learning to Write Differently: Beginning Writers and Word Processing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 327 pages.
(Winner of 1992 NCTE Richard C. Meade Award for Distinguished Research in English Education)
- 1984 Cochran-Smith, M. The Making of a Reader. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 276 pages.

Book Series and Special Issues of Journals

- 1995-present Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. (Series Editors). Practitioner Inquiry. A series of books written by teachers, teacher educators, administrators, and researchers about their own practice, published by Teachers College Press, New York. Books published: L. Beyer, *Democratic Schools*, S. Noffke & R. Stevenson, *Becoming Practically Critical*; R. Schulz, *Interpreting Teacher Practice: Two Continuing Stories*; D. Meier, *Learning in Small Moments: Life in an Urban Classroom.*, C. Ballenger, *Teaching Other People's Children*, M. Lampert & D. Ball, *Teaching Multimedia*, S. Fishman & McCarthy *John Dewey and the Challenge of Classroom Practice.*, L. McCarthy & S. Fishman, *Unplayed Tapes*, , Ruth Heaton, *Teaching Mathematics to the New Standards*, , Joy Ritchie and David Wilson, *Teacher Narrative as Critical Inquiry*, Margaret Himley, *From Another Angle*, Gordon Wells, *Talk and Text*, Pat Carini, *Starting Strong*, Jennifer Obidah and Karen Teel *Because of the Kids*, Jane Zenni, *Ethical Issues in Practitioner Research*
- 2008 Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (Eds.) "Teacher Education: An International Perspective on Policy and Politics." Special issue of Teachers and Teaching. 14 (4 & 5), August-October.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). "Effectiveness, Evidence, and Efficacy in Teacher Education." Special double issue of Journal of Teacher Education. 57 (1 and 2), (January/February, 2006), (March/April, 2006).
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.) "The Politics of Teacher Education." Special issue of Journal of Teacher Education. 56 (3), (May/June, 2005).

- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). "Evidence and Inquiry in Teacher Education." Special issue of Journal of Teacher Education 53(2), (March/April, 2002).
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). "Teacher Education at the Turn of the Century." Special issue of Journal of Teacher Education 51(3), (May/June, 2000).
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). "Educational Leadership and Social Justice." Special issue of Journal of Leadership in Education. 2 (3), (Summer, 1999).

Journal Articles and Chapters in Handbooks/Edited Books

- In press Cochran-Smith, M. Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In M. Fullan, A. Hargreaves, D. Hopkins, & A. Lieberman (Eds.), The International Handbook of Educational Change (2nd ed.).
- In press Cochran-Smith, M. & the Boston College Evidence Team. Reculturing Teacher Education: Inquiry, Evidence and Action. Journal of Teacher Education. (to appear in November/December, 2009 issue).
- In press Cochran-Smith, M. & Demers, K. "Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century: Research and Teacher Learning." In O. Kwo (Ed.), Teachers as Learners: Critical Discourse on Challenges and Opportunities. Hong Kong: CERC/Springer.
- In press Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman, A., Pine, G. Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and students' learning. Action in Teacher Education.
- 2009 Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Barnatt, J., Terrell, D., & justice McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social in teacher education. American Journal of Education, 115 (3): 3347-377.
- 2009 Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Lahann, R., Shakman, K., & Terrell, D. "Teacher Education for Social Justice: Critiquing the Critiques." In Ayres, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (Eds.) The Handbook of Social Justice in Education. Taylor and Francis, Publishers, 625-639.
- 2008 Ludlow, L., Pedulla, P., Enterline, S., Cochran-Smith, M., Loftus, F.,

- Using Salomon-Fernandez, Y., & Mitescu, E. From students to teachers: surveys to build a culture of evidence and inquiry. European Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 319-337.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. (2008). "The New Teacher Education in the United States: Directions Forward." Teachers and Teaching. Taylor and Francis, 14(Nos. 4 & 5): August-October: 270-292.
- 2008 Enterline, S., Cochran-Smith, M., Ludlow, L., & Mitescu, E. Learning to teach for social justice: Measuring changes in the beliefs of teacher candidates. The New Educator, 4, 1-24.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. "Teacher Research as Stance." In Somekh, B. and Noffke, S. (Eds.) Handbook of Educational Action Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- 2008 Ludlow, L., Enterline, S., & Cochran-Smith, M. "Learning to Teach for Social Justice-Beliefs: An Application of Rasch Measurement Principles." Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development. 194-214.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. & Demers, K. (Eds.) "How Do We Know What We Know? Research and Teacher Education," major section in Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman Nemser, S., McIntyre, J., & Demers, K. (Eds.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis, Publishers. (ms., 190 pp.)
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, K. "Research on Teacher Education: Changing Times, Changing Paradigms." In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, J. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.) Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts: The Third Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. London: Taylor and Francis, Publishers. (ms., 54 pp.)
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Demers, K. "Teacher Education as Bridge? Unpacking Curriculum Controversies in Teacher Education. In M. Connelly (Ed/.), Handbook of Curriculum Research, (2nd edition). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. "Everything's Ethics: Practitioner Inquiry and University Culture." In Campbell, A. & Groundwater-Smith, S. An Ethical Approach to Practitioner Research. London: Routledge, 24-41.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. "Troubling Images of Teaching in

- NCLB.” Harvard Educational Review. Winter 2007, 76(4): 668-697.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. , Zeichner, Kenneth, and Fries, Kim. “Estudio sobre la formacion del profesorado en los Estados Unidos: descripcion del informe del comite de la AERA sobre investigacion y formacion del profesorado,” Revista de Educacion. 340, (Mayo-agosto): pp. 87-116. (Madrid, Spain).
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. “The Future of Teacher Education: Ten Promising Trends (and Three Big Worries).” Educational Leadership 63(6): 20-25.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. “Teacher Education and the Need for Public Intellectuals,” The New Educator 2: 1-26.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. and Donnell, Kelly. “Practitioner Inquiry: Blurring the Boundaries of Research and Practice.” In Gregory Camilli, Patricia Elmore, & Judith Green (Eds.). Complementary Methods for Research in Education (2nd edition). Washington: AERA.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. “Series Foreword.” In D. Mewborn (Ed.) Teachers Engaged in Research: Inquiry into Mathematics Classrooms. (4 volumes). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing (for NCTM), 2006.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. “The New Teacher Education: For Better or For Worse?” Educational Researcher. 34(7): 3-17.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. and Fries, Kim. “Context and Goals: Introduction to the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education.” In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Eds.) Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press, pp, 37-68.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. and Fries, Kim. “Researching Teacher Education in Changing Times: Paradigms and Politics,” In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Eds.) Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press, pp. 69-110.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Educators as Researchers: Multiple Perspectives.” Teaching and Teacher Education. 21(2): 219-225.
- 2005 Fries, Kim and Cochran-smith, M. . “Teacher Research and Classroom Management: What Questions Do Teachers Ask?” In C. Evertson and C. Weinstein (Eds.). The Handbook of Research on

Classroom Management. New York: Erlbaum Publishing Company, PP. 945-981.

- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Promises and Politics: Images of Research in the Discourse of Teacher Education.” In Fairbanks, C., Worthy, J., Baloché, B., Hoffman, J., & Schallert, D.F. (EDS.) Proceedings of the National Reading Conference. Oak, Creek, Wisconsin: National Reading Conference, pp. 28-44.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. "Defining the Outcomes of Teacher Education: What's Social Justice Got To Do With It?" Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, Volume 32, Number 3, November 2004, pp. 193-212.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. . “Practitioner Inquiry, Knowledge, and University Culture. In J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), International Handbook of Research of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. , Davis, Danne, and Fries, Mary Kim. “Multicultural Teacher Education: Research, Practice and Policy.” In J. Banks (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey Bass: pp. 931-975.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Multicultural Teacher Education: Understanding the Context at the Beginning of the 21st Century.” Multicultural Perspectives. 5(3): 3-11.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Multiple Meanings of Multicultural Teacher Education.” Teacher Education Quarterly. 30(2): 7-26.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Inquiry and Outcomes: Learning to Teach in an Age of Accountability.” Teacher Education and Practice. 15(4): 12-34.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning and Unlearning: The Education of Teacher Educators.” Teaching and Teacher Education International Journal of Scholarship and Studies. 19: 5-28
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. . “Teacher Learning Communities.” In James Guthrie (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. and Fries, Mary Kim. “The Discourse of Reform in Teacher Education: Extending the Dialogue.” Educational Researcher. 31(6): 26-28.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. and Dudley-Marling, Curt. “‘Idiots’ and the Massachusetts Teacher Test,” English Education. 34 (2): 104

- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. and Fries, Mary Kim. "Sticks, Stones and Ideology: The Discourse of Reform in Teacher Education." Educational Researcher. 30(8): 3-15.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. and Dudley-Marling, Curt. "The Flunk Heard Round the World." Teaching Education. 12(1): 49-64.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Outcomes Question in Teacher Education." Teaching and Teacher Education International Journal of Scholarship and Studies. 17(5): 527-546.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Constructing Outcomes in Teacher Education: Policy, Practice, and Pitfalls." Educational Policy Analysis Archives. Vol. 9 (11). <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/vol9.html/>
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Beyond Certainty: Taking An Inquiry Stance on Practice." In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), Teachers Caught in the Action: Professional Development in Practice. New York: Teachers College Press, 45-60.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Future of Teacher Education: Framing the Questions that Matter." Teaching Education. 11(1): 13-24.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Blind Vision: Unlearning Racism in Teacher Education." Harvard Educational Review 70(2): 157-190.
- 2000 Zollers, Nancy, Albert, Lillie, and Cochran-Smith, M. . "In Pursuit of Social Justice: Collaborative Research and Practice in Teacher Education." Action in Teacher Education.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Learning to Teach for Social Justice." In Gary Griffin (Ed.), 98th Yearbook of NSSE: Teacher Education for a New Century: Emerging Perspectives, Promising Practices, and Future Possibilities. (pp. 114-144). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. . "Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad and C.D. Pearson (Eds.), Review of Research in Education (Vol. 24, pp. 251-307). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "The Teacher Research Movement: A Decade Later." Educational Researcher 28(7), 15-25.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . "*The Indian in the Cupboard* and the Politics Of Children's Books." In J. Savage. For the Love of Literature. New York: McGraw Hill.

- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. , Albert, Lillie, Dimattia, Phillip, Freedman, Sara, Jackson, Richard, Mooney, Jean, Neisler, Otherine Peck, Alec, and Zollers, Nancy. "Seeking Social Justice: A Teacher Education Faculty's Self Study." Journal of Leadership in Education. Vol. 2 (3): 229-254
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teacher Research: The Question That Persists." International Journal of Leadership in Education. 1 (1).
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teaching for Social Change: Toward a Grounded Theory of Teacher Education." In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.). The International Handbook of Educational Change. Netherlands; Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Knowledge, Skills, and Experiences for Teaching Culturally Diverse Learners: A Perspective for Practicing Teachers." In J. J. Irvine (Ed.) Critical Knowledge for Diverse Learners and Teachers. Washington: AACTE.
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Uncertain Allies: Understanding the Boundaries of Race and Teaching." Harvard Educational Review. 63 (4): 541-570.
- [Reprinted in Facing Racism in Education. (2nd edition). T. Beauboef-LaFontant & D. Smith Augustine (Eds.), Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series, 1996: 369-402.]
(Winner of 1997 ATE Award for Outstanding Research in Teacher Education. Winner of 1997 AERA/Division K Award for Outstanding Research in Teaching and Teacher Education.)
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. and Paris, Cynthia L. "Mentor and Mentoring: Did Homer Have It Right?" In J. Smyth (Ed.) Critical Discourses on Teacher Development. London: Cassells.
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Color Blindness and Basket Making Are Not the Answers." American Educational Research Journal. 32 (3): 493-522.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Power of Teacher Research in Teacher Education." In S. Hollingsworth and H. Sockett (Eds.) Teacher Research Education Reform. 94th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Learning from Teachers' Perspectives." In A. Ornstein (Eds.) Teaching: Theory and Practice. Allyn and Bacon.

- 1994 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Inquiry, Knowledge, and Practice.” In S. Hollingsworth and H. Sockett (Eds.) Teacher Research and Education Reform. 94th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1994 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research.” In A. Purves (Ed.) Encyclopedia of English Studies and Language Arts. Urbana: NCTE.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Communities for Teacher Research: Fringe or Forefront?” American Journal of Education, 100 (3): 298-324. University of Chicago Press.
- [Reprinted in Teacher Learning. New Policies, New Practices. M. McLaughlin & I. Oberman (Eds.) New York: Teachers College Press, 1996.]
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Interrogating Cultural Diversity: Inquiry and Action.” Journal of Teacher Education, 43 (2): 104-115. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Creating Communities for Teacher Research.” In K. Dahl (Ed.) Teacher as Writer: Entering the Professional Conversation. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE: 280-292.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. , Garfield, Elizabeth, and Greenberger, Rachel. “Student Teachers and their Teacher: Talking Our Way into New Understandings.” In N.A. Branscombe, D. Goswami, & J. Schwartz (Eds.) Student Teaching, Teachers Learning. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook. Heinemann: 274-292.
- 1992 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research as a Way of Knowing.” Harvard Educational Review 62 (4), Harvard University. [Reprinted in Class Acts: Teachers Reflect on Their Own Classroom Practice, Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series, 1996.]
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Teach Against the Grain.” Harvard Educational Review, 51 (3): 279-310, Harvard University.
- [Reprinted in Teaching for Change. Addressing Issues of Difference in the College Classroom. K. Geismar & G. Nicoleau (Eds.), Harvard Educational Review, 1993: 191-224]
- [Reprinted in Making School Reform Work. Lessons from Educators. Harvard Educational Review, 1992: 17-48.]
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reinventing Student Teaching.” Journal of Teacher Education, 42 (2): 104-118. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Beginning Writers and Word Processing: A Critical Review of Related Literature.” Review of Educational Research, 61 (1): 107-155. American Educational Research Association.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Research on Teaching and Teacher Research: The Issues that Divide.” Educational Researcher, 19(2): 2-11, American Educational Research Association.
- [Reprinted in Annual Editions Education 91/92 F. Schultz (Ed.), Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1991, 203-212.]
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. , Kahn, Jessica L., and Paris, Cynthia L. “Writing with a Felicitous Tool.” Theory Into Practice, XXXIX(4): 235-245, Ohio State University.
- 1990 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning from Teacher Research: A Working Typology.” Teachers College Record. 92 (1): 83-102, Teachers College Press.
- 1989 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research: Toward Clarifying the Concept.” National Writing Project Quarterly, 11(2): 1-3, 22-27.
- 1988 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Mediating: An Important Role for the Reading Teacher.” In C. Hedley (Ed.), Reading and the Special Learner. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation: 109-140.
- 1988 Cochran-Smith, M. , Kahn, Jessica L., and Paris, Cynthia L. “When Word Processors Come into the Classroom.” In J. Hoot and S. Silvern (Eds.), Writing with Computers in the Early Grades. New York: Teachers College Press: 43-74.
- 1987 Cochran-Smith, M. and Larkin, James M. “Anthropology and Education: What’s the ‘and’ Mean?” Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18 (1): 38-42.
- 1986 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reading to Children: A Model for Understanding Texts.” In B. Schieffelin and P. Gilmore (Eds.), The Acquisition of Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation: 35-55.
- 1985 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Looking Like Readers, Talking Like Readers.” Theory Into Practice, XXIV (2): 22-31, Ohio State University.
- 1985 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reading Stories to Young Children.” Children’s Literature Association Quarterly. Summer: 83-86.

- 1984 Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Read Culturally.” In H. Goelman, A. Oberg, and F. Smith (Eds.), Awakening to Literacy. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books: 3-24.
- 1983 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Art of Nancy Ekholm Burkert.” In Jill P. May (Ed.), Children and Their Literature, A Readings Book. West Lafayette, IN: ChLA Publications: 117-121.
- 1983 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reading Stories to Children: A Review Critique.” In Barbara A. Hutson (Ed.), Advances in Reading/Language Research: A Research Annual, (2) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press:197-229.

EDITORIALS for JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION

- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials). “Evidence, Evidence Everywhere,” Vol. 57 (1); “30 Editorials Later: Signing Off as Editor,” Vol. 57 (2).
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials). “Taking Stock in 2005: Getting Beyond the Horse Race,” Vol. 56 (1); “No Child Left Behind: Three Years and Counting,” Vol. 56 (2); “The Politics of Teacher Education and the Curse of Complexity,” Vol. 56 (3); “Studying Teacher Education: What We Know and Need to Know,” Vol. 56(4); “Teacher Education and the Outcomes Trap,” Vol. 56 (5).
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials). “Taking Stock in 2004:Teacher Education in Dangerous Times,” Vol. 55 (1); “Ask a Different Question, Get a Different Answer: The Research Base for Teacher Education,” Vol. 55 (2), “The Report of the Teaching Commission: What’s Really at Risk?” Vol. 55 (3), “The Problem of Teacher Education,” Vol. 55 (4), “Stayers, Leavers, Lovers and Dreamers: Understanding Teacher Retention,” Vol. 55 (5), The Journal of Teacher Education.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials). “The Unforgiving Complexity of Teaching: Avoiding Simplicity in the Age of Accountability,” Vol. 54 (1); “Teaching Quality Matters,” Vol. 54 (2); “Assessing Assessment in Teacher Education,” Vol 54 (3); “Teacher Education’s Bermuda Triangle: Dichotomy, Mythology, and Amnesia,” Vol. 54(4); “Sometimes It’s *Not* About the Money,” Vol. 54(5). The Journal of Teacher Education.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials). “Teacher Education, Ideology, and Napoleon,” Vol. 53 (1); “What’s Preparation Got To Do With It?” Vol. 53 (2). “What a Difference a Definition Makes.” Vol 53 (3); “The Research Base for Teacher Education: Metaphors We Live (and die) By.” Vol. 53 (4). “Reporting on Teacher Quality: The Politics of Politics ” Vol. 53 (5). The Journal of Teacher Education.

- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials.). "Learning to Teach Against the (New) Grain," Vol. 52 (1), "Multicultural Education: Solution or Problem for American Schools?" Vol. 52 (2), "Higher Standards for Prospective Teachers: What's Missing from the Discourse?" Vol. 52 (3), "Reforming Teacher Education: Competing Agendas," Vol. 52 (4), "Desperately Seeking Solutions," Vol. 52 (5). The Journal of Teacher Education.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. (Editorials.). "Teacher Education at the Turn of the Century," Vol. 51 (4); ; "Gambling on the Future," Vol. 51(5), The Journal of Teacher Education.

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES AND FEATURED PRESENTATIONS

- 2008 Cochran-smith, M. & Ludlow, Larry. "Creating a Culture of Inquiry, Evidence, and Action in Teacher Education." Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile and Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research, Professional Development, and Inquiry." Invited Address for Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Valparaiso, Chile.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Improving Educational Research." Keynote Address for the New England Research Association, Rocky Hill, Connecticut.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teaching for Social Justice: What's Accountability Got To Do With It?" Keynote address for the Education Policy Forum, University of Utah.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Issues Facing Teacher Education." Keynote Address for Johnson Wales University Faculty Retreat, Providence, RI, July 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The National Scene in Teacher Education." Keynote panel for New England Education Research Organization. April 10, 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teachers for Urban Schools." 2008 Cluff Lecture for Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, March 20, 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Holding Teacher Education Accountable for Students' Learning." Invited address for the University of Auckland College of Education. Auckland, New Zealand, March 13, 2008

- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Toward a Theory of Social Justice for Teacher Education.” Invited address for the University of Auckland College of Education. Auckland, New Zealand, March 11, 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Teach in an Era of Accountability: What’s Social Justice Got to Do With It?” Keynote address for Pace University’s 2008 Distinguished Lecture Series, New York City, February 21, 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Enduring Questions in Teacher Education Research.” Keynote address for the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, February 25, 2008.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Future of Teacher Education.” Keynote address for the Associated Colleges of Illinois Annual Meeting, Chicago, September 27, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education: Where Are We and Where Are We Going?” Keynote address for the Annual Conference of the Society for Music Teacher Education, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, September 13, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Darling-Hammond, Linda. “Teacher Education and Alternate Entry Routes.” Invited Presentation for Faculty of the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, July 20, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education and Public Intellectuals.” Keynote Address for the Fifth International Conference on Teacher Education, Kaye College and the Mofet Institute of Teacher Education, Ber Sheva and Tel Aviv, Israel, June 25, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Essence of Teacher Education,” Invited Presentation for Faculty of the Church of Ireland College of Education and Froebel College of Education, Dublin, Ireland, June 18, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Ludlow, Larry. “Transforming Teacher Education: Teachers for a New Era (TNE) at Boston College,” Invited Presentation for Faculty of the Church of Ireland College of Education and Froebel College of Education, Dublin, Ireland, June 18, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research and Evidence in Teacher Education.” Keynote Address for the Inaugural Conference of the Joint Research Group on Teacher Education of the Universities of Glasgow and Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland, June 15, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Ludlow, Larry. “Transforming a Teacher Education Program: Teachers for a New Era (TNE) at Boston College,” Invited Presentation for University of Glasgow Education faculty, Glasgow, Scotland, June 14, 2007.

- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. & Ludlow, Larry. "Rethinking Teacher Education; From Teacher Learning to Student Learning." Presentation for Teacher Education faculty, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland, June 13, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Going About Intensively: Lessons Learned about Quality Research in Education." Keynote Address for University of North Carolina-Greensboro College of Education Research Symposium, April 21, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Learning to Teach for Social Justice: What's That Mean for New Teachers?" Invited Address for University of Oklahoma's "Dream Course" Lecture Series. Norman, Oklahoma, April 19, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Politics of Teacher Education." Keynote Address for the IX Congreso Puertorriqueno de Investigacion, University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, March 8, 2006.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teacher Research in Trying Times." Keynote Address for the University of Pennsylvania Annual Ethnography and Education Forum, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February, 24, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teaching for Social Justice in an Era of Accountability." Keynote Address for the Centennial Conference on Closing the Achievement Gap through Partnerships, College of Education, University of Florida, St. Petersburg, Florida, November 2, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Strengthening Research on Teacher Education." Invited Lecture for College of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, November 1, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teachers for the 21st Century." Keynote Address for the Inaugural Symposium of the Ruth S. Ammon School of Education, Adelphi University, New York, October 16, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "No Child Left Behind: Teachers, Teaching and Teacher Education." Keynote Address for the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) National Congress on Teacher Education, Washington, DC., October 13, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teaching for Social Justice." Keynote Address for the Rhode Island College Annual Education Alumni Day, Providence, Rhode Island, September 29, 2006.

- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education and the Need for Public Intellectual.” Keynote Address for the British Education Research Association (BERA). Warwick, England, September 8, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Studying Teacher Education: Local Knowledge, Public Knowledge,” Lecture #1 for the CJ. Koh Distinguished Endowed Professorship, Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, July 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Trends in the Preparation of Teachers: Possibilities and Pitfalls,” Lecture #2 for the CJ. Koh Distinguished Endowed Professorship, Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, July 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Role of Research and Evidence in Improving Teaching, Teacher Education, and Teacher Learning,”
Lecture # 3 for the CJ. Koh Distinguished Endowed Professorship, Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, July 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Professional Development, Teacher Research, and Inquiry,” Lecture #4 for the CJ. Koh Distinguished Endowed Professorship, centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore,
July 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Studying Teacher Education: Lessons from the AERA Panel Project,” Invited Presentation to the Colleges of Education Research Consortium, St. Patrick’s College, Dublin, Ireland, June 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Key to Improving Teacher Education.” Invited Presentation for the Faculty of Teacher Education, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland, June, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. , “The Essence of Teacher Education,” Invited Address for the Faculty of the School of Education, University of Ulster, Belfast, Northern Ireland, June, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “What It Means to Teach for Social Justice,” Distinguished Lecture, Education Department, University of New Hampshire, May 2006.

- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teaching for Social Justice,” Keynote Address, Teacher Research Conference, University of New Hampshire, Manchester, May 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “What It Means to Teach for Social Justice,” Distinguished Lecture, Education Department, University of New Hampshire, May 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research and Social Justice” Keynote Address for Inquiry Conference, School of Education, University of New Hampshire, April 21, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Why Teacher Education Must Be About Social Justice.” Tommy Thompson Distinguished Lecture, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, March 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teaching for Social Justice in the U.S. and Canada.” Keynote Address for the Teacher Development Conference: The Key to Education in the 21st Century. Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, CA, March, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Improving Teacher Education: Research, Evidence and Politics.” The Robert Nicely Distinguished Lecture in Educational Leadership. Penn State University, State College, PA, February, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Studying Teacher Education.” Keynote Address for the Higher Education Summit: Educating Teachers of Literacy for the 21st Century. Columbus, Ohio, February, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Politics of Professionalism in Teacher Education.” Keynote Address for the PEPE Conference (Practical Experience in Professional Education), Auckland, New Zealand, February, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research as a Tool for Improving Teacher Education. Invited Address at the University of Auckland, College of Education. Auckland, New Zealand, February, 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teaching and Teacher Education for Social Justice.” Keynote Address for the Hawaii International Conference on Education. Honolulu, January, 2006.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education.” Invited presentation for the Education Forum, Washington, December, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education for Social Justice.” Keynote address for the NAME Annual Conference, Atlanta, November, 2005.

- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education.” Invited presentation for the National Science Foundation, Washington, December, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teaching for Social Justice.” John E. Cawthorne Millennium Chair in Urban Teacher Education Inaugural Lecture. Boston College, October, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-smith, M. and S. L. Lytle, “Everything’s Ethics: Teacher Inquiry and Ethics.” Invited conference on Ethics and Practitioner Inquiry. Hope College, Liverpool, UK, October, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research on Urban Teacher Education: Are We Getting What We Need?” Keynote Address for the LASER Urban Education Research Conference. Tampa, September, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The AERA Panel Report on Teacher Education and Research.” Invited Address to the Organization of Institutional Affiliates, AERA, Washington, September, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reforming Teacher Education: Research, Evidence and Politics “ Keynote Address for the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Program’s Project Directors’ Conference, Washington, July 2005
- 2005 Cochran-smith, M. . “Teacher Education and the Standards Debate,” Keynote Address for the Conference of the North-South Standing Committee on Teacher Education, Dublin, June, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reforming Teacher Education: Research, Policy and Politics “ Keynote Address for the OISE/UT International Conference on Teacher Education for the Schools We Need, Toronto, May, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research, Evidence and Outcomes in Teacher Education, “ Keynote Address for the Illinois Teacher Education Division of CEC Annual Institute, May, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The New Teacher Education: For Better or For Worse?” The 2005 AERA Presidential Address, Montreal, April 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research, Evidence and Outcomes in Teacher Education,” Research Keynote for the Association of Teacher Educators Annual Meeting, Chicago, February 2005
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Research, Evidence and Outcomes How Did We Get Here? Where Are We Going?" AACTE Winter Institute, Cancun, Mexico, January 2005.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education for Social Justice.” Invited

- lecture for the College of Education, Rutgers University, October, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Stayers, Leavers, Lovers and Dreamers: Why People Teach,” Invited address for Opening Convocation, Bank Street College, New York City, September, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century: Research and Teacher Learning,” Opening keynote for the International Conference on the Education of Teachers, University of Hong Kong, July, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Professional Development and School Reform.” Invited address for the Regional Training Unit, Belfast, Northern Ireland, June, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Teach across the Professional Lifespan: Inquiry, Community and Critique.”** Invited address for the National Council for Curriculum & Assessment and the Department of Education, Dublin, Ireland, May, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research on Teaching and Teacher Education: Reflections and Directions.” Keynote address for the Five Colleges Conference on Studying Teachers’ Lives. St. Patrick’s College, Dublin, Ireland, May, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Improving Teaching and Learning: Never Underestimate the Power of Local Knowledge,” The Billie Grace Goodrich Distinguished Lecture, College of Education, University of Tennessee, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “What’s Driving Teacher Education: The National Scene,” Invited address for the Faculty of Education, University of Illinois-Chicago, February, 2004.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Politics and Promises: Images of Research in the Discourse of Teacher Education,” Plenary Address for the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ, December, 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Reforming Teacher Education: The State of the Field in 2003. The Bowen Lecture, George Mason University, November 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Consensus and Debate in Teacher Education: Where We Are in 2003?” Keynote Address for the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children Annual Conference, Biloxi, Mississippi, November, 2003.

- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education in 2003. Where Are We Now? Where Are We Going?” Keynote Address for Massachusetts Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Auburn, Mississippi, November, 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Pest or Delicacy: the Power of Local Knowledge in Teacher Education.” Invited Address for the Stanford University Colloquium Series on Teaching and Teacher Education, Palo Alto, CA, May, 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Swords into Plowshares: Research in the Service of Learning.” Judith Taack-Lanier Keynote Lecture, Holmes Partnership Annual Meeting, Washington, February, 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Teach for Social Justice.” Invited Lecture for Center for Urban Educators of the School of Education, Brooklyn Campus, Long Island University, New York, February, 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education: Debating the Future.” Panel Speaker, Opening Night Plenary Session, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, January, 2003.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Research and Teacher Education: A Perspective from the U.S.” Plenary panel presentation and symposium for the United Council on the Education of Teachers, Market Bosworth, England, November, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education for the 21st Century: What’s Research Got To Do With It?” Invited Lecture for the Michigan State University Center for the Scholarship of Teaching, Lansing, MI, October, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Preparing the highly Qualified Teacher: Consensus and Debate.” Fairfield National Bank/Ohio College of Education Lecture. Athens, OH., October, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Rethinking Teacher Preparation: Urban Schools, Diversity, and Teaching.” Invited presentations for Annual Faculty Retreat for the Department of Early Childhood Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, August, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Future of Teacher Education.” Keynote Address for the Australian Teacher Education Association. Brisbane, Australia (via simulcast from Los Angeles), July 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Education, Research, and Social Justice.” Keynote Address for the New England Educational Research Organization, North Hampton, Massachusetts, April, 2002.

- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Making Connections: The Research Base for Teacher Education." Keynote Address for the Annual Conference of the National Association for Research on Science Teaching, New Orleans, April, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Determining Outcomes in Teacher Education: What's Research Got To Do With It? Keynote Address for the Challenging Futures of Teacher Education Worldwide Conference at the University of New England, New South Wales, Australia, February, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . ""The Power of Teacher Research for Students' and Teachers' Learning." Invited Address at the School of Education, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia, February, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Learning and Unlearning: The Education of Teacher Educators." Invited Address at the School of Education, University of South Australia, South Australia, Australia, February, 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Learning to Teach for Social Justice." Featured Presentation for the Annual Conference of the New Teacher Center, San Jose, California, January 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Education: What's Research Got To Do With It?" AACTE Winter Deans' Institute, San Juan, Puerto Rico, January, 2002.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Evidence, Evaluation and Assessment in Teacher Education." Plenary Address for the American Association of Universities Invitational Forum on Teacher Education, Cambridge, MA, October, 2001.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Answering the Outcomes Question in Early Childhood Education." Keynote Address for the National Association of Early Childhood Education Annual conference on Professional Development, Washington, DC, June 2001.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Outcomes, outputs, and results: The New Orthodoxy in Teacher Education?" The James P. Curtis Distinguished Lecture. College of Education, University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, March 2001.
- 2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Determining Outcomes in Teacher Education: Possibilities and Pitfalls." Keynote Address for Massachusetts Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Fall Conference, Boxboro, MA, November 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Inquiry and Whole-School Change." Keynote Address for Action Research Conference, Cosponsored by Jefferson County Schools Research Council and the University of Colorado-Denver, May 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Outcomes Question in Teacher Education." Vice Presidential Address for AERA (Division K), New Orleans, April 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research and School-University Partnerships." Keynote Address for University of North Carolina School-University Partnership Conference, Raleigh-Durham, April 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Future of Teacher Education." Invited Address for University of Rochester School of Education Speaker Series. Rochester, March 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Inquiry, Teacher Learning, and University Partnerships." Keynote Address for Dedication Ceremony for new space at University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada, February 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "The Power of Teacher Research for Teacher Learning." Scholar in Residence Lecture for Mofet institute for Teacher Development, Tel Aviv, Israel, January 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "What It Means to be a Teacher of Teachers." Scholar in Residence Lecture for Mofet institute for Teacher Development, Tel Aviv, Israel, January 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Perspectives on Professional Development and the Future of Teacher Education." Scholar in Residence Lecture for Mofet institute for Teacher Development, Tel Aviv, Israel, January 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Education at the Turn of the Century: Quo Vadis?" Keynote Address for Tel Aviv University, School of Education Alumni Association, January 2000.

2000 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Inquiry and Learning." Invited lecture for Mandel Institute for Educational Leadership, Jerusalem, Israel, January 2000.

1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Questions that Guide Action." Invited presentation for University of Colorado-Denver, Leadership Academy. November, 1999.

- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Blind Vision: Diversity and Teacher Education.” Tenth Lecture for the Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington, Seattle, November 1999.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Collaborative Inquiry for Action.” Invited presentation for University of Colorado-Denver, Leadership Academy. September, 1999.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Finding the Questions that Matter.” Invited presentation for University of Colorado-Denver, Leadership Academy. December, 1999.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Building an Inquiry Stance.” Keynote presentation for University of Colorado-Denver, Colorado Partnership Conference on practitioner inquiry. April 1999.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Learning More, Teaching Better.”_ Keynote Address for Ethnography and Education Research Forum. March 1999.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Beyond Multiculturalism.” Keynote for Montclair State University School of Education Faculty Advance. January 1999.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Knowledge and Skills for Teaching Culturally Diverse Learners.” Invited address for University of California-Los Angeles, CA. July 1998.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Inquiry, Professional Development, and Teaching Diverse Learners.” Invited address for AACTE/MetLife Scholars Program, AACTE, Washington, DC, May 1998.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teaching for Social Change: A Theory for Teacher Education.” Invited address to Education Faculty at Syracuse University, School of Education, Syracuse, NY, March 1998.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Teach for Social Justice.” Keynote for Professional Development Schools Conference, Syracuse University / Syracuse Public Schools, Syracuse, NY, March 1998.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Literacy, Language, and Social Change.” Invited Address for Harvard University, Language & Literacy Faculty / Doctoral Students Seminar Series, Cambridge, MA, April 1998.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Teacher Research and Its Critics.” Keynote address for Teacher Research at the Ethnography and Education Research Forum, University of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA, March 1998.

- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teachers' Voices." Keynote presentation Teachers College Institute on Teaching, Learning Communities, and School Change. July 1997.
- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Literacy, Diversity, and Teacher Education." Lecture for Ohio State University School of Education Lecture Series on Research in Language, Literacy, and Learning.
- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teacher Inquiry, Knowledge, and Practice. Keynote Address for Ethnography and Education Research Forum.
- 1996 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research as Method." Lecture for Fordham University Graduate School of Education Lecture Series for Doctoral Residency Seminar. November 1996.
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Blind Vision: Preservice Curriculum as Racial Text." Keynote address for the Ethnographic and Qualitative Research in Education Conference. University of Massachusetts-Amherst.
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teacher Research and the Constructive Disruption of University Culture." Keynote address at the Ethnography in Education Forum, Philadelphia, PA.
- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Inside Outside: Understanding Teacher Research." Keynote address for The Holmes Group Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Uncertain Allies: Confronting the Dilemmas of Race, Language, and Cultural Diversity." Invited lecture in President's Special Projects Colloquia Series on Educational Reform in a Diverse Society, University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research as a Feminist Activity." Invited presentation for ATRAN (Alaska Teacher Research Network), University Park Elementary School, Fairbanks, AK.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research as Personal and Professional Stance." Invited lecture in SITE Lecture Series at (Summer Institute in Teacher Education), Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "School-University Collaboration: Restitution or Radical Change? Symposiast presentation for JET (Journal of Education for Teaching) Invited International Symposium on Teacher Education, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Ways of Talking About Teacher Research: The Questions That Persist." Keynote address at the Ethnography in Education Forum, Philadelphia, PA.

- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. and Ongtooguk, Paul. "Beyond Color Blindness and Basket Making." Invited symposium for California State Conference on Mentoring and Diversity, "Teaching for a Global Society," Irvine, CA.
- 1994 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Inquiry and Literacy Research." Invited lecture for George Mason University faculty and students, Fairfax County, VA.
- 1993 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Creating Contexts for Inquiry." Invited address for the faculty of Graduate Studies, York University, Toronto.
- 1993 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . "Inside/Outside: Voices of the Philadelphia Community." Keynote address at the Ethnography in Education Forum, Philadelphia.
- 1993 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Restructuring Teacher Education." Invited address for the faculty of Teacher Education, University of Colorado-Boulder.
- 1993 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Color Blindness and Basket Making Are Not the Answers." Commissioned presentation for the Southwest Regional Laboratory invited conference on "Preparing Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond," Los Alamitos, CA.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Chord and Discord" Ideologies of Teacher Research." Keynote address at the Ethnography in Education Forum, Philadelphia, PA.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Against the Grain and Giving Reason." Invited lecture for students and faculty at Harvard University, Cambridge.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Rethinking Student Teaching." Keynote address at the Maryland Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Ocean City, MD.
- 1992 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . "Rethinking Teacher Research." Keynote address for the NCTE Research Foundation Session, Spring Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, Washington, D.C.
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Voices of the Classroom." Keynote address at the Conference on Teacher Research, Lake Tahoe, CA.
- 1991 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Research as a Way of Knowing." Keynote address at Ethnography and Education Forum, Philadelphia.

- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher as Researcher.” Invited Colloquium for faculty and students at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Issues in Creating Communities for Teacher Research,” and “Teacher Research in Inservice and Preservice Teacher Education.” Presentations at the University of California-Davis.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. . “New Directions in Teacher Education: Reform and Inquiry.” University of Rochester/Rochester Public Schools, NY.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Fringe or Forefront?: Communities for Teacher Research.” Keynote address at the Ethnography and Education Forum, Philadelphia.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Rethinking Teacher Research.” Keynote address at the Ethnography and Education Forum, Philadelphia.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Student Teachers as Researchers.” Invited lecture for research and clinical faculty at SUNY-Oneonta.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. , “Toward a Theory of Teacher Education for Social Justice.” Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. , “Practitioner Inquiry: Versions and Variance.” Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (Co-chairs and co-organizers). “Teachers Voices.” Symposium presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April 2008.
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. (Chair and moderator). “A Conversation with Maxine Greene.” Symposium presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April 2008
- 2008 Cochran-Smith, M. and Demers, Kelly. “Research and Teacher Education.” Paper presented for the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, February 25, 2008.
- 2007 Shakman, Karen, Cochran-Smith, M. , Jong, Cindy, Terrell, Diana, and Barnatt, Joan. “Reclaiming Teacher Quality: The Case for Social Justice.” Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2007.

- 2007 Barnatt, Joan, Cochran-Smith, M. , Friedman, Audrey, Pine, Gerald, and Baroz, Robert. "Inquiry on Inquiry: Practitioner Research and Pupils' Learning." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2007.
- 2007 Ludlow, Larry, Pedulla, Joseph, Enterline, Sarah, Cochran-Smith, M. , Mitescu, Emilie, Loftus, Fran, and Gilligan, Jeff. "From Students to Teachers: Surveying Teacher Education." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. , Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, McIntyre, John and Demers, Kelly. "Enduring Questions in Teacher Education: The Third Handbook of Research on Teacher Education." Symposium presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. , Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, McIntyre, John and Demers, Kelly. "Enduring Questions in Teacher Education: The Third Handbook of Research on Teacher Education." Symposium presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, February, 2007.
- 2007 Cochran-Smith, M. . Chair and presenter for symposium, "Rethinking Teacher Education: From Teacher Learning to Student Learning," at annual NEERO Conference, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, April 2007. With BC faculty and doctoral students as co-presenters: Larry Ludlow, Pat McQuillan, Karen Shakman, Joan Barnatt, Sarah Enterline, Emilie Mitescu, Yves Solomon Fernandez.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. ; Sleeter, Christine; Villegas, Ana Maria; and Zeichner, Ken. "Strengthening Teacher Education Research: An Interactive Workshop." Workshop directed at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Teacher Education and the Need for Public Intellectuals." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. ; Shakman, Karen; and Barnatt, Joan. "Complex Matters, Complex Measures: Constructing Social Justice as a Teacher Education Outcome." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 2006.
- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. and Demers, Kelly. Teacher Education as a Bridge: Policy, Practice and Curriculum. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 2006.

- 2006 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Evidence and Effectiveness in Teacher Education.” Chair and organizer for the Major Forum. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Meeting, San Diego, January, 2006.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. and Zeichner, Ken. “The AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education: Final Report” Symposium presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Framing Teacher Education: The Teachers for a New Era Project.” Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Controversies in Curriculum: Enduring Issues.” Chair and discussant for symposium at American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 2005 with BC doctoral students Kelly Demers, Kevin Koziol, Andrea Stairs, Corrie Stone, Tom Higginbotham, and Karen Saxon. (Vivian Gadsden was discussant.)
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Politics of Teacher Education.” Chair and organizer for the Major Forum. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting, Washington, February, 2005.
- 2005 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Studying Teacher Education: Multiple Perspectives on the AERA Panel’s Report.” Chair and organizer for the Major Forum. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting, Washington, February, 2005.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. and Zeichner, Ken. “The AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education!” Paper presented in at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning, Training and Testing: Rethinking Teacher Education-Again!” Paper presented in at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Improving Teacher Preparation: What’s Theory Got to Do with It?” Fireside chat for Division C graduate students at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Understanding and Challenging Educational Inequities.” Chair and discussant for doctoral student panel at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. and Donnell, Kelly. “Practitioner Inquiry: Blurring the Boundaries of Research and Practice,” Roundtable discussion

- at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Assessing Assessment in Teacher Education.” Chair and organizer for symposium. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting, Chicago, February, 2004.
- 2004 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Different Questions, Different Answers.” Presentation for symposium on the National Academy of Education Committee on Teacher Education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting, Chicago, February, 2004.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Multicultural Teacher Education Research, Practice and Policy.” Paper presented in Symposium on “Accountability and Multicultural Education” at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2003, organized and chaired by James Banks.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Overview: AERA Consensus Panel on Teacher Education.” Symposium co-chaired with Ken Zeichner at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “A Closer Look: AERA Consensus Panel on Teacher Education.” Roundtable session co-chaired with Ken Zeichner at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2003.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Voices from the Margins: Qualitative Studies of Teaching, Teachers, and Learning.” Chair of symposium at the American Educational Research Association, April 2003, Chicago. BC students Alan Amtzis, Danne Davis, Janna Jackson, and Ellen Nelson were presenters.
- 2003 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Assessment and Outcomes in Teacher Education.” Chair and organizer of Major Forum at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting in New Orleans , January 2003.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Value and Validity in Multicultural Teacher Education.” Paper presented in Symposium on “Value and Validity in Multicultural Education” at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2002, organized and chaired by James Banks.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “AERA Consensus Panel on Teacher Education.” Symposium co-chaired with Ken Zeichner at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2002.

- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Looking Closely at Practice.” Chair of symposium at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2002, organized by Judy Shulman and Lee Shulman.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Qualitative Studies of Teaching, Learning, and Schooling: So What’s Your Point?” Chair of symposium at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2002. BC students, Kim Fries, Amy Seldin, Midge Connolly, and S. O’Brien, were presenters.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Evidence and Inquiry in Teacher Education.” Chair and organizer of Major Forum at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting in New York, January 2002.
- 2002 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Consensus Panel on Teacher Education: A Progress Report,” Co-chair and organizer of Major Forum at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting in New York, January 2002.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Ethics of Practitioner Inquiry.” Discussant for AERA President’s symposium at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.” Discussant for Carnegie Foundation symposium at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, Mary Kim. “Sticks, Stones and Ideology.” Symposium paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.
- 2001 Cochran –Smith, M. . “Learning and Unlearning: Teacher Educator Learning from an Inquiry Stance.” Symposium paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . “"Accountability-Based Teacher Education: Challenges, Questions, and Critique." Chair and Organizer for JTE Major Forum, AACTE Annual Meeting, February 2001, Washington.
- 2001 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Ethics of Practitioner Inquiry.” Discussant for AERA President’s symposium at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.

- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Diversity and Social Justice." Paper presented at the AERA Annual Conference, Montreal.
- 1999 Cochran-Smith, M., Dimattia, P., Dudley-Marling, C., Freedman, S., Friedman, A., Jackson, J., Jackson, R., Loftus, F., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Peck, A., Pelletier, C., Pine, G., Scanlon, D., Zollers, N. "Seeking Justice: A Teacher Education Faculty's Self-Study, Year III." Paper presented at the AERA Annual Conference, Montreal.
- 1998 Albert, L., Cochran-Smith, M., Dimattia, P., Freedman, S., Jackson, R., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Peck, A., and Zollers, N. "Seeking Social Justice: A Teacher Education Faculty's Self Study, Year II." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. . "Inquiry as a Stance on Teaching: The Preservice Case." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- 1998 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. . "Knowledge for Teaching: Where it Came From." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. "Teacher Inquiry and the Epistemology of Teaching." Paper presented for AERA Annual Conference, Division K. March 1997.
- 1997 Cochran-Smith, M., Atwater, M., Zeichner, K., Rodriguez, A. "Managing Teachers' Resistance to Learning to Teacher for Diversity: Successful Strategies for Transformative Action." Symposium for AERA Annual Conference, Division K. March 1997.
- 1997 Albert, L., Cochran-Smith, M., Dimattia, P., Freedman, S., Jackson, R., Ladd, G., McGee, L., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Peck, A., Schiro, M., Zollers, N. "Seeking Social Justice: A Teacher Education Faculty's Self Study." Symposium for AERA Annual Conference, Division K. March 1997.
- 1997 Brabeck, M., Cawthorne, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Sparks, E., Walsh, M., Zollers, N. "Interprofessional Collaboration: Changing the Culture of the Education School and the University." Symposium for AERA Annual Conference, Division I. March 1997.
- 1996 Agre, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Delcollo, C., Ebby, C., Feinberg, P., Klausner, E., Massey, A., Mitchell, W., Perloff, L., Schatz, L., Stone, P., and Williams, E. "Supervision as Inquiry." Paper presented at the Ethnography and Education Research Forum, Philadelphia, PA.

- 1995 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Blind Vision. Preservice Curriculum as Racial Text.” Paper for American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- 1995 Lytle, S. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research and the Constructive Disruption of University Culture.” Paper presented at the Ethnography and Education Forum, Philadelphia, PA.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Uncertain Allies: Making Sense of the Boundaries of Race and Teaching.” Paper for American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- 1994 Lytle, S. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research: Some Questions That Persist.” Paper presented at the Ethnography in Education Forum, Philadelphia, PA.
- 1993 Cochran-Smith, M. . Interrogating Evaluation: Student Teacher Portfolios.” Paper for American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Building Teacher Inquiry Communities: Preservice Perspectives.” Research Roundtables sponsored by the Standing Committee on Research and the Research Foundation, National Council of Teachers of English Annual Meeting, Louisville, KY.
- 1992 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Toward a Theoretical Framework for Teacher Inquiry and the Epistemology of Teaching.” International Conference on Teacher Research, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research and Preservice Education.” International Conference on Teacher Research, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Knowledge, Inquiry, and Reform.” Paper for the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. and Paris, Cynthia L. “Mentor and Mentoring: Did Home Have It Right?” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- 1992 Cochran-Smith, M. , Eastman, Jennifer, Gultekin, Mary Lu, Gutkin, Robin, and Turner, Delia. “Is There Inquiry After Student Teaching?” Paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Atlanta.

- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Linking Preservice and Inservice Education Through Inquiry.” Paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Atlanta.
- 1991 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Telling a Different Story: Teacher Research as Research on Teaching.” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- 1991 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Collaborative School-Based Research: Confronting the Dilemmas.” Presentation at Invisible College on Research on Teaching, American Educational Research Association.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. “Communities for Teacher Research.” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Student Teachers and Teacher Research: Learning to Think Like a Teacher.” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.
- 1990 Cochran-Smith, M., Larkin, J., and Lytle, S. “Network of New and Experienced Urban Teachers. Washington, DC: First Annual Report to Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. , Garfield, Elizabeth, and Greenberger, Rachel. “Talking Their Way into New Understanding: Student Teachers and their Teacher.” Paper presented at National Council of Teachers of English, Charleston, SC, April 1989.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Discourse of Student Teachers and their School and University Mentors.” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 1989.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Rethinking Student Teaching.” Paper presented at American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, March 1989.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. , Kahn, Jessica L., and Paris, Cynthia L. “Working with a Felicitous Tool: Teachers, Children, and Word Processing.” Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 1989.
- 1989 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research.” Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English, Baltimore.
- 1989 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Of Questions, Not Answers: The Discourse of Student Teachers and Their School and University Mentors.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

- 1988 Lytle, S. L. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning from Teacher Research: Analysis of Texts and Contexts.” Paper presented at Boston Child Language Conference, Boston University, October 1988.
- 1987 Cochran-Smith, M. . “Introducing Word Processing in the Classroom: What Teachers Learn from Each Other.” Paper presented at the Ethnography in Education Research Forum, University of Pennsylvania, March 1987.
- 1987 Lytle, S. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Teacher Research and Research on Teaching.” Paper presented at the Ethnography Forum on Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- 1987 Cochran-Smith, M. , Deborah; and Kingma, Janeen. “First Questions, Last Chapters: Student Teachers Learning to be Teacher Learners.” Paper presented at the Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Philadelphia.
- 1986 Cochran-Smith, M. and Larkin, James M. “Some Contributions of Anthropology to Teacher Education.” American Anthropological Association Meetings, December 1986.
- 1986 Cochran-Smith, M. . “The Road to Early Literacy.” Fordham University Institute on Reading and the Special Learner. Fordham University at Lincoln Center, Graduate School of Education. July 1986.
- 1986 Cochran-Smith, M. ; Kahn, Jessica L; and Paris, Cynthia L. “Play with It; I’ll Help You with It; Figure It Out: Three Teachers Introduce Word Processing.” 7th annual Ethnography and Education Research Forum, University of Pennsylvania, April 1986.
- 1982 Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Cochran-Smith, M. . “Learning to Read Culturally: Literacy Before Schooling.” Paper presented at Victoria Symposium on Children’s Responses to a Literate Environment. University of Victoria, British, Canada.
- 1982 Cochran-Smith, M. . “What Is Given Is No More than a Way of Taking.” Paper presented for World Congress of Sociology X, Mexico City, August 1982.

HANDBOOK OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 2nd edition

Michael Connelly, Editor

Chapter 15.

Teacher Education as Bridge?

Unpacking Curriculum Controversies

Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Kelly Demers

This is the first chapter on teacher education per se to appear in the *Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. It comes at a momentous point in time. Today there is unprecedented attention in many parts of the world to how teachers are recruited, prepared and retained for the schools. In fact policy makers and professional organizations at all levels—local, regional, national, and international—have zeroed in on the education and performance of teachers. At the same time as heightened attention to the preparation of teachers, however, there has also been intense criticism by those inside and outside the profession. Both proponents and detractors have called for major changes, and competing agendas for reform—highly politicized and publicized—have been advocated.

How teachers are educated in the U.S.—and in particular the curriculum to which prospective teachers are or are not exposed—is regarded by most of its critics as well as its advocates as an essential bridge to K-12 schooling and a major determinant of teacher quality, which, in turn, is perceived as the key to students' school success. As we point out in this chapter, however, not everybody has the same kind of teacher education “bridge” in mind, and a few do not see the teacher education curriculum as a bridge at all. Our purpose in this chapter is to provide a theoretical framework—reading the curriculum as political text—and an extended metaphor—teacher education curriculum as bridge—for illuminating the seemingly endless controversies that emerge about the teacher education curriculum in the U.S. where, for better or for worse, curriculum variation is the rule.

This chapter, which focuses on preservice teacher education in the U.S., has four parts. The first includes the chapter's broad definition of curriculum and the theoretical perspective in which the discussion is grounded. The second describes the U.S. teacher education context, where, given the scale of teacher education and the loosely coupled regulatory system, curriculum variation is the norm. Next we review three analytic frameworks developed during the 1980s and 1990s to make sense of the variation in the U.S. teacher education. We suggest that because the contemporary curriculum context differs substantially from earlier contexts, previous frameworks for distinguishing curriculum variations and unraveling curriculum controversies are no longer adequate. In the final section, we take up three major contemporary controversies, “reading” each as a political text by identifying underlying assumptions, connecting the controversies to larger professional and political agendas, and locating these in relation to larger educational trends. We conclude with brief comments about one of teacher education's latest curriculum controversies, which illustrates the importance of a framework that links curriculum, politics, and policy.

Reading the Curriculum

In keeping with the editorial perspective of this handbook as a whole, our chapter takes a broad view of “curriculum” in teacher education that goes beyond simply what is taught to teacher candidates. We also include the premises—whether explicit and implicit—that underlie and shape what is taught, including assumptions about: (a) who should teach in K-12 schools, including who should be recruited and retained in the profession and what knowledge, skills and experiences they should bring with them; (b) what entry-level teachers should know and be able to do, including assumptions about what knowledge is most important in order to teach well, whose perspectives and voices are represented (or not) in a knowledge base for teaching, who generates and/or certifies that knowledge, and how knowledge is assumed to be translated into practice and/or shaped by practice; (c) how and where teachers should be taught, including who should be responsible for educating teachers, how courses, programs, and entry routes should be organized, the pedagogies and procedures used for instruction, and the kind and extent of interactions between teacher candidates and those providing their education that are allowed or encouraged; (d) how the curriculum should

be assessed, including how teacher preparation effectiveness is defined, what counts as evidence of effectiveness, what measures of teaching and learning are considered valid, who is considered a reliable evaluator, and what the consequences of assessment are for various stakeholders; and (e) finally and perhaps most importantly, who decides all of these things, including who has the authority to determine which issues about the teacher education curriculum are negotiable (or not) and who has jurisdiction over the profession.

All of these questions are driven by fundamental—and often unspoken—larger premises about the nature and value of knowledge, the purposes of schools, the role teachers and teacher educators play in those larger purposes, and the point of schooling in a democratic society. Part of what we try to show in this chapter is that when we recognize that many of the most enduring issues in public education are at the heart of questions about the teacher education curriculum, it is easy to see why controversies are so intense and, at times, so seemingly intractable.

Our analytic perspective in this chapter is what we refer to as “reading the teacher education curriculum as political text.” This is based three assumptions: that curriculum can be regarded and read as text; that any curriculum, teacher education or otherwise, can and—given the highly politicized society in which we live—ought to be, read not simply as text, but as political text; and that the teacher education curriculum is made up of explicit texts as well as sub-texts.

The synoptic analysis of the field of curriculum theory first published by Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2002) in 1995, made the argument that the task of the contemporary curriculum field was understanding rather than developing curriculum for K-12 schools. To *understand* curriculum, it had to be treated and analyzed as text:

To understand the contemporary field it is necessary to understand the curriculum field as discourse, as text, and most simply but profoundly, as words and ideas. By discourse we mean a particular discursive practice, or a form of articulation that follows certain rules and which constructs the very objects it studies. Any discipline or field of study can be treated as discourse and analyzed as such. To do so requires studying *the language of the field*. (p. 7, emphasis in original)

In this chapter, we have applied this idea to the teacher education curriculum. Treating the teacher education curriculum as text means looking closely at the discourse of the field, including books and articles in the scholarly literature, but also including unofficial and informal texts such as newspaper editorials, news magazine articles, website statements, blogs, public debates, and popular literature.

As text, the teacher education curriculum is dynamic and complex—much more than any particular sequence of courses or experiences that are required for certification or credentialing purposes. Ginsburg and Clift’s (1996) concept of the hidden curriculum in teacher education calls attention to missing, obscured, or subverted “texts” in teacher education—what is left out, implied, veiled, or subtly signaled as the norm by virtue of being unmarked or marked with modifying language. Along somewhat similar lines, King (in press) draws on Noffke’s (1999) observation that in practitioner research there has been only marginal attention to theory and practice generated from the work and lives of people of color. King argues that these perspectives in the teacher education curriculum are often an “absent presence” that primarily “meets the needs and dispositions of white teachers.” King calls instead for a “blues epistemology” in teacher education that incorporates the worldview perspectives and social vision of people of color and is intended to promote the cultural well-being of diverse populations and counter the dominant ideology.

We link King’s argument to our assumption that curriculum should be read as political text. Castenell and Pinar’s (1993) collection of essays titled, *Understanding Curriculum as Racial Text*, located curriculum issues within the context of public debates

about the canon and about the racial issues embedded within the curriculum controversies of the time. They suggested that it was critical to analyze the school curriculum to see what kind of message or story about race and racism was being told, what assumptions were being made, what identity perspectives and points of view were implicit, what was present and what was omitted, and what was valued or devalued. Cochran-Smith (2000) applied this perspective to the teacher education curriculum that she and others had constructed at one university where the intent was to prepare teachers as agents for social change in urban schools. She looked at explicit and implicit messages about race and racism, discovering that what was intended in the formal documents describing the curriculum was not the same as what was conveyed to teacher candidates through the emphases and omissions in the program's readings, written assignments, fieldwork placements, membership, and leadership.

All of these issues are part of what Apple (1986) was referring to some twenty years ago when he asserted that all curriculum was in part political:

The curriculum is never simply a neutral assemblage of knowledge, somehow appearing in the texts and classrooms of a nation. It is always part of a selective tradition, someone's selection, some group's vision of legitimate knowledge. It is [always] produced out of the cultural, political, and economic conflicts, tensions and compromises that organize and disorganize a people... There is, then, always a politics of official knowledge, a politics that embodies conflict over what some regard as simply neutral descriptions of the world and what others regard as elite conceptions that empower some groups while disempowering others.

We use Apple's comment to link our broad definition of curriculum to our theoretical perspective of reading the curriculum as political text. Although there are, of course, other ways to read the curriculum, we have found this perspective to be very useful in unpacking controversies about teacher education, particularly in analyzing how proponents and opponents of different aspects of the teacher education curriculum not only construct their own positions but also construct, deconstruct, and counter the positions of those with whom they disagree. We use this perspective to analyze the three cases that are presented in the final section of this chapter.

Teacher Education in the U.S.: Curriculum Variation

Like several of the other chapters in this handbook, this one concentrates primarily on curriculum issues in the U.S.. The reason for this focus is, in part, our own location as American teacher education researchers and practitioners and thus our own greater familiarity with the U.S. However, it is important to note that, unlike the situation in some other nations, in the U.S. there is enormous variation rather than uniformity in the teacher education curriculum, and variation has been the case for decades. In addition, as the comprehensive report of the AERA Panel on Teacher Education and Research (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005) concluded, research on teacher education has been marginalized for many years, and there is no conclusive evidence about the outcomes or impacts of particular teacher education program structures, curricula, or pathways.

Despite recent moves to centralize teacher certification through the stipulations of Title II of the Higher Education Act (U. S. Department of Education, 1999) and the requirements regarding "highly qualified teachers" in the landmark "No Child Left Behind" federal legislation (P.L. 107-110, 2002), matters related to education are constitutionally the purview of the states. Although there is federal money for elementary and secondary education with numerous stipulations attached, and there is no national curriculum or testing program. As of 2005, there were at least 1323 colleges and universities in the U.S. approved to prepare teachers (US. Department of Education, 2005). In most states, this means that each program was accredited by the state through periodic review of the curriculum, resources, and faculty, but there are different standards and procedures for teacher education program

approval across the states. For example, the Secretary's fourth report indicated that as of 2005, all states had some form of quality standards that applied to all teaching fields and grade levels, but 15 did not have content area bachelor's degree requirements for any of their entry-level teaching licenses. Wilson and Young's (2005) analysis of teacher education accountability indicated that 14 states had commissions or boards for developing the requirements for state licensure, but states varied considerably in additional requirements for teacher licensure. The 2006 *Quality Counts* report (Education Week, 2006), also noted that states varied substantially in terms of requirements for state-approved teacher preparation programs.

In addition to state-level program approval, about half the collegiate teacher education programs in the U.S. are approved through regional accreditors, and, although national accreditation is not required, some 40% receive national accreditation through the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) (S. Wilson & Youngs, 2005). In addition to variations in state program approval requirements, as of 2005, 43 states had teacher tests (US. Department of Education, 2005), which were required for certification either in addition to completion of a state-approved program or as a stand-alone requirement for certification. As of 2005, two testing companies were the primary providers of teacher tests (S. Wilson & Youngs, 2005), but one of them provided some tests that were described as tailor-made for the individual state, and some states used their own tests. More recently, supported by funds from the Department of Education, the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence developed the "Passport to Teaching" test to assess subject area and professional teaching knowledge which, as of 2006, was recognized as a test-only route to teaching certification in five states (American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence, 2006).

Given differences in approval criteria, accreditation procedures, and testing requirements between and among the states, it is clearly an understatement to conclude that variation in the teacher education curriculum is the rule rather than the exception in collegiate programs the U.S.. And even with collegiate programs that must meet the same requirements in the same state, there are substantial differences in the missions of institutions and in the conceptual frameworks that guide programs. For example, over the last decade and a half or so, some programs in the U.S. have sought to prepare teachers specifically for urban schools; some have focused on preparation for schools serving particular ethnic, cultural or language groups; some have taken up a social justice mission; and some have concentrated on preparing teachers who are certified in content shortage areas such as mathematics and sciences. Still other programs are grounded in innovative partnerships with local schools, responding to the needs of particular communities or regions.

In addition to these differences, increasing numbers of teachers in the U.S. are being prepared through pathways and routes that are not college or university-centered in the traditional sense. Across the 50 states, alternate providers include school district-based teacher preparation programs, computer-based distance learning programs and other alternate entry and certification routes, with test-only routes in some states. Of the approximately 300,000 teachers certified to teach in the U.S. in 2004, some 35,000 were prepared through "alternative routes to certification," although these "come in many shapes and sizes" (US. Department of Education, 2005, p. 8). Some alternate routes are attached to universities, while others bypass them altogether; some differ from university based programs only in the timing or scheduling of courses, while others are based on completely different approaches. In addition, for-profit teacher preparation is a growing trend in higher education in the U.S. wherein proprietary, degree-granting and accredited institutions offer occupational training for entry-level positions in a variety of areas (Morey, 2001).

The U.S. situation is quite different from the situation in some other parts of the world where the scale is much smaller and uniformity is the norm. In Singapore, to offer a single example, there is one national curriculum for students that is closely aligned with high stakes tests that determine the educational “streams” into which students are placed (Gopinathan & Ho, 2000). All of Singapore’s teachers are prepared to teach at the National Institute of Education (NIE) at Nanyang Technological University. NIE also provides most of the 100 hours of professional development per year that is available free of charge to all teachers. In Singapore there is no teacher education program approval process, no teacher testing, and no national accreditation, nor is there any need for these, given the single provider of teacher preparation and the fact that the Ministry of Education governs both K-12 curriculum and the NIE.

The curricular variation in the U.S. and the curricular uniformity in Singapore are neither good nor bad in and of themselves. But the situations are completely different from one another. Even in light of major global economic and educational trends since the 1980s, which are affecting teacher education in the U.S. and in Singapore (in addition to most of the nations in the world), differences among national contexts continue to be striking.

Curriculum Traditions: Making Sense of Variation

As alluded above, the teacher education curriculum has been characterized by variation for nearly as long as teacher education has existed in the U.S. Over the years, there have been multiple efforts to make sense of that variation. Part of the difficulty in doing so, however, as Zeichner and Liston (1990) have pointed out, is that much of the discourse around teacher education occurs within an ahistorical vacuum that lacks “clarity about the theoretical and political commitments underlying specific reform proposals” (p. 3) regarding teacher preparation. Reflecting this lack of clarity, popular terms like “reflection” or “inquiry-oriented teaching” are--to use Zeichner and Liston’s words--“bandied about with a great deal of confusion about the underlying commitments and assumptions that distinguish one proposal from another” (p. 3). Several scholars developed conceptual frameworks during the 1980s and 1990s to sort out the variation in the teacher education curriculum and organize the field for critical analysis and discussion.

In this section, we briefly describe three well-known frameworks intended to sort out variation in the teacher education curriculum: Zeichner’s (1983) paradigms of teacher education, Feiman Nemser’s (1990) structural and conceptual alternatives, and Tom’s (1985) dimensions of inquiry-oriented teacher education. When they were written, each of these was useful for differing analytic purposes, and in fact, they continue to be helpful today for a variety of purposes. However, today’s far-reaching global trends along with the shift in the location of education policymaking in the U.S. from low profile and local decision makers to highly publicized and high level state and federal decision makers (Oakes *et al.*, 2006) have made the teacher education scene very different from what it was in the 1980s and 1990s. Our argument in this chapter, then, is that new frameworks-- such as the one we use in this chapter--which help to identify and interrogate curriculum controversies in light of larger professional and political agendas and broader policy debates, are needed.

Both “Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education” (Zeichner, 1983), which appeared in the *Journal of Teacher Education*, and “Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives,” (Feiman-Nemser, 1990), which appeared in the first *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (Houston, 1990), offered detailed analyses of varying conceptual approaches to the teacher education curriculum during the late 20th century. Zeichner described four paradigms. “Behaviorist teacher education” was based on a positivist epistemology and emphasized the development of predetermined and observable teaching skills in candidates. Here, the prospective teacher was viewed as a more or less “passive recipient” of knowledge that had been produced through empirical research on teacher

effectiveness. Zeichner's "personalistic teacher education" paradigm was rooted in a phenomenological epistemology that centered on the personal growth and psychological maturity of future teachers. Unlike the first paradigm, with the second, it was assumed that the knowledge and skills needed for teaching could not be predetermined. Instead, the "behaviors of teachers and the environments they create[d were] assumed to result largely from the particular meanings and purposes of teacher" (pp. 4-5). "Traditional-craft teacher education" regarded teaching as a craft passed down to prospective teachers by expert teachers. Thus learning to teach was based on an apprenticeship model, and knowledge about teaching came from the "wisdom of practice," which was gained through experience within particular spaces and times. Zeichner pointed out that while the sources of knowledge about teaching were assumed to be different with the first and third paradigms (i.e. empirical research vs. experience), the traditional-craft paradigm was similar to the behaviorist paradigm in that both viewed the prospective teacher as an empty vessel waiting to be filled with knowledge about teaching.

The primary purpose of Zeichner's final paradigm, "inquiry oriented teacher education," was to assist prospective teachers in developing the capacity for "reflective action" and "fostering of a disposition towards critical inquiry" (p. 6). This was accomplished by helping prospective teachers critique the personal, political, and professional issues that shaped their everyday thinking and practices as well as the institutional characteristics of schooling that affected the lives of their future students. Through this process, prospective teachers were to become agents of social change working for a more just and democratic learning experience for students. This last paradigm differed from other three in that it challenged the idea that current educational and social arrangements were certain and unchangeable.

Feiman-Nemser (1990) offered a similar frame for understanding teacher education's curricular alternatives, which she referred to as "conceptual orientations"-- "practical," which was similar to Zeichner's traditional-craft paradigm; "technological," which aligned with Zeichner's behaviorist paradigm; "personal," which was like Zeichner's personalistic paradigm; "critical/social," which was close to Zeichner's inquiry-oriented paradigm; and, "academic," the only one of Feiman-Nemser's orientations not consistent with Zeichner's paradigms. According to Feiman-Nemser, the purpose of the "academic" orientation was the transmission of knowledge and the development of understanding rooted within a rigorous liberal arts education. Zeichner stressed the importance of a liberal education for prospective teachers, but did not identify this as a full-blown alternative since it was already embedded within each of other four. Feiman-Nemser, on the other hand, argued that the academic orientation was a "missing paradigm" (p. 228) in discussions about the teacher education curriculum. Rather than assuming that subject matter knowledge was outside the realm of the teacher education curriculum, Feiman-Nemser suggested that teachers needed more than content knowledge; they also needed that "special blend of content and pedagogy that Shulman (1986) labeled pedagogical content knowledge" (p. 212).

Both Zeichner and Feiman-Nemser provided comprehensive analyses of variations that existed among teacher education curricula in the 1980s and 1990s. Except for Zeichner's "inquiry oriented paradigm" and Feiman-Nemser's "critical-social orientation," however, they did not say very much about the larger social and political issues that drove various approaches to teacher education. For example, when discussing the importance of the academic orientation, Feiman-Nemser did not mention the politically-charged critiques that had been leveled against traditional liberal arts curriculum by feminist scholars and scholars of color who argued that this orientation was based on an androcentric, Western canon, which generally excludes the contributions of women and people of color.

Both Zeichner and Feiman-Nemser acknowledged that, while held together by a distinctive set of beliefs and assumptions, each paradigm or orientation also contained within it many different versions and practical applications. Along somewhat similar lines, Tom (1985) suggested that of Zeichner's four paradigms, the inquiry-oriented approach to teacher education was the least well-defined and had the most variation. In order to make sense of this variation, Tom developed a framework with three "dimensions" or continua that got at differences among inquiry-oriented approaches— "the arena of the problematic," "the model of inquiry," and "the ontological status of educational phenomena" (p. 35). Tom suggested that there was a continuum concerning what was made problematic in the teacher education curriculum "ranging from a focus on the teacher-learning process to one on the interrelation of educational and other societal institutions" (p. 39). Situated between the ends of the continuum were "intermediate arenas such as 'subject matter knowledge' and 'teaching, including underlying ethical and/or political principles'" (p. 37).

Tom's models of inquiry continuum ranged from commonsense approaches that offered the least guidance to teacher educators and separated knowledge from action to discipline-based approaches that offered the most guidance for teacher educators and attempted to link knowledge and action. Tom's third dimension, the ontological status of educational phenomena, ranged from the idea that educational phenomena were stable, law-like entities emerging from nature to the idea that educational phenomena were as socially constructed events bound by a particular time and space. Zeichner's (1983) analysis had suggested that inquiry-oriented teacher education curricula constituted a critical paradigm wherein institutional, political, and social aspects of schooling as well as teaching and learning processes were problematized. However, Tom's framework found that *within* the inquiry-oriented approach there were ideological, epistemological, ontological, and structural differences, not necessarily compatible with a critical perspective. Rather, it was possible to have different forms of inquiry-oriented teacher education that were complementary with other paradigms or conceptual orientations. Feiman-Nemser (1990) made a similar argument when she noted that she did not include a "reflective" orientation within her framework because this did not represent a distinctive conceptual orientation of teacher education. Instead, it could be defined as a method or "generic professional disposition" (Feiman-Nemser, 1990, p. 221) found within all other paradigms of teacher education.

These three frameworks are good examples of ways scholars have made sense of variations in the teacher education curriculum. Although we have noted minor differences among Feiman-Nemser's, Zeichner's, and Tom's analyses, what is most important to our discussion here is that each was centered on what was happening *inside* college and university curricula. There was little emphasis, except in the case of critically oriented paradigms, on the larger issues that were shaping the political landscape *outside* of the university or how these influenced the development of different approaches. Although these frameworks continue to inform discussions, the teacher education curriculum of the 21st century is located within a very different professional and political context than previously. Today, the teacher education curriculum is not the purview simply of the education school or the teacher education department. Rather, either by design or by default, in many places, there is a greater sense of whole-university responsibility for teacher education, which may bring with it new resources as well as new criticisms and new directions for reform.

In addition, partly as a result of major demographic changes, shifts in political ideologies, and a number of educational movements, the teacher education curriculum is now the focus of close and critical attention from many new players, including policy makers and politicians at the highest levels of visibility and influence. Many of the new players have brought openly critical and sometimes even hostile perspectives about collegiate teacher

education, and today's teacher education curriculum is highly publicized and politicized. Given this situation, it is necessary to unpack and analyze controversies about the teacher education curriculum by connecting them to competing political, professional, and policy agendas. The framework we use here is intended to do so.

Teacher Education as Text: Three Contemporary Curriculum Controversies

During the last two decades of the 20th century and the early years of the 21st, momentous changes occurred that affected education practice and policy in the U.S. and in many other nations. These involved shifting population patterns, major swings in the political pendulum, the culture wars, the growth of a complex global economy, and a number of educational and political movements, including the standards/accountability movement, initiatives to privatize education, the press for market-based reform, and the emergence of access to quality education as a civil rights issue. In addition, changing notions of educational accountability, the emergence of education as policy problem for the new global economy, and the elevation of science had a strong impact on teacher education and on the many controversies that emerged regarding curriculum.[i]

The final section of this chapter focuses on three contemporary controversies related to teacher education curriculum in the U.S.: (1) teacher education curriculum and the professional knowledge base, (2) teacher education curriculum and the "science" of reading, and, (3) teacher education curriculum and social justice. Using the theoretical perspective described above, we present each controversy along with its social and political contexts, and then we "read" each controversy as text, unpacking underlying assumptions and showing how each is shaped by the educational and political trends discussed above. For each of the controversies, we also consider the metaphor of teacher education as "bridge," examining whether and how this applies and how it illuminates the roots and implications of the controversy.

Controversy #1: Teacher Education Curriculum and the Professional Knowledge Base

The personal qualities, teaching strategies, and knowledge teachers should have in order to teach well—and thus, what the teacher education curriculum ought to include—have been debated in the U.S. for more than a century. Historically and not surprisingly, controversies about the teacher education curriculum were linked to controversies about the K-12 curriculum (Cochran-Smith & Fries, in press). During the 1910s and 1920s, the Dean of Teachers College, James Earl Russell, laid out a basic "blueprint" for the curriculum of teacher preparation, which included: "general culture" (general knowledge), "special scholarship" (learning across several disciplines), "professional knowledge" (a systematic inquiry into the theory and practice of education), and "technical skills" (practical pedagogical skills) (Cremin, 1978; Lucas, 1999). For much of the 20th century, although there were endless iterations of the knowledge debate, the teacher education curriculum followed this general blueprint and was organized around some combination of general, disciplinary, professional, pedagogical, and practical knowledge.

A Professional Knowledge Base for Teaching? Beginning in the mid to late 1990s and continuing into the 2000s, however, the debate about the teacher education curriculum changed somewhat. Although it continued to reflect longstanding disputes about pedagogical and academic knowledge, it was transformed by changing notions of educational accountability, which hinged on results rather than resources (Cuban, 2004), and by the emerging evidence-based education movement, which carried the assumption that educational policies and practices should be determined by scientific research (Mosteller & Boruch, 2001). In teacher education, assessment shifted from what is retrospectively referred to as

“inputs,” such as institutional commitment, qualifications of faculty, content and structure of courses and fieldwork experiences, and the alignment of all of these with professional knowledge and standards to measurable and reliable outcomes, including evidence regarding the impact of teacher preparation on teachers’ and students’ learning and/or performance (Cochran-Smith, 2005b).

Both shaped by and helping to shape these shifts in teacher education, a heated controversy emerged about the very existence of a knowledge base for teaching that had an empirically-documented impact on students’ achievement and, consequently, about whether there was or was not a need for a regulatory apparatus, either professional or governmental, to ensure that new teachers had that knowledge. The argument in favor of a teacher education curriculum that revolved around the professional knowledge base for teaching is represented well in Gary Sykes’ (1999) introduction to *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice* (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999), which appeared just at the end of the 1990s:

This book is based on a deceptively simple premise coupled with a hypothesis. The premise is that the improvement of American education relies centrally on the development of a highly qualified teacher workforce imbued with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to encourage exceptional learning in all the nation’s students. The related hypothesis is that the key to producing well-qualified teachers is to greatly enhance their professional learning across the continuum of a career in the classroom. (p. xv)

At the same time that Darling-Hammond, Sykes, and many others were building the case for a professional knowledge base, detractors were arguing against its existence and thus against the need for a teacher education curriculum designed to deliver that knowledge. This view is represented in the Fordham Foundation’s “manifesto” on how to get the teachers the nation needs (Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, 1999), which appeared at just about the same time as the statement above:

Today, in response to widening concern about teacher quality, most states are tightening the regulatory vise, making it harder to enter teaching by piling on new requirements for certification. On the advice of some highly visible education groups such as the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, these states are also attempting to ‘professionalize’ teacher preparation by raising admissions criteria for training programs and ensuring that these programs are all accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). That organization is currently toughening its own standards to make accredited programs longer, more demanding, and more focused on avant-garde education ideas and social and political concerns. (p. 4)

These diametrically opposed points of view yield very different conclusions about the teacher education curriculum, the appropriate site for the education of teachers, and permissible pathways into teaching.

Professionalization vs. Deregulation. To unpack this controversy about the knowledge base, it is necessary to locate it within two competing agendas for reforming teaching and teacher education--the professionalization agenda and the deregulation agenda.[ii] Although there have been efforts to make teaching a profession since the 1800s, the current iteration of this agenda was prompted by *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and other indictments of teaching and teacher education in the 1980s and, along different lines, by early work about the importance of teachers’ thinking and

knowledge. The current professionalization agenda aims to make teaching and teacher education a profession with a research-based and formal body of knowledge that distinguishes professional educators from lay persons (Gardner, 1989; Murray, 1996), has jurisdictional responsibility for defining and acting on professional problems (R. Yinger, 1999; R. Yinger & Hendricks-Lee, 2000) and works from consistent standards for professional practice (National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1996). This agenda builds on long efforts by the professional organizations related to teacher education with the goal of ensuring that all teachers are fully-prepared and fully-certified in accordance with professional knowledge and standards.

How advocates of the current professionalization agenda envision the teacher education curriculum is perfectly captured in the work of the Committee on Teacher Education (CTE), sponsored by the National Academy of Education and co-chaired by Linda Darling-Hammond and John Bransford. The group produced *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able To Do* (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), which was intended to lay out a vision for a professional teacher education curriculum, as the preface makes clear:

Although this book has benefited greatly from the work that has preceded it, it is different from these other efforts in two ways: first, it seeks to inform the curriculum for teacher education by considering how what we know about *student learning* and teaching should inform what teachers have the opportunity to learn. Second, it considers emerging evidence on *teacher learning* and teacher education to suggest some of the strategies that may help new teachers learn this material more effectively. This report does not develop new standards or lists of all the things that teachers should know. Instead it includes recommendations for how knowledge deemed essential for beginning teachers can be incorporated into the initial teacher education curriculum... A major emphasis is on preparing teachers for future learning as professionals. (pp. viii-ix, italics in original)

Based on the premise that teaching is a profession serving democratic purposes, the report recommends that every preparation program and pathway should provide a curriculum through which prospective teachers develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions about the following: learners and their development within social contexts; subject matter, including how pupils learn content-specific knowledge and which subject-specific pedagogies and curricula are appropriate to various educational purposes; and teaching, including how to create, use, and interpret effective and appropriate instructional, assessment, and management strategies. The CTE report assumes there is a body of research in a number of domains related to teaching that ought to inform the preparation of every new teacher. It conceptualizes the outcomes of the teacher education curriculum as the preparation of professional teachers whose performance is aligned with professional standards, who have a positive impact on students' learning, and who reflect on and learn from their own work.

It would be an understatement to say that there is controversy about the existence of a professional knowledge base for teaching that should be the centerpiece of every teacher education curriculum. In fact, proponents of deregulation completely reject this notion and favor the elimination of most requirements for entry into the profession along with the licensing/ certification apparatuses that operate in each of the 50 states. They advocate opening multiple entry routes into teaching, with pupil test scores the bottom line for determining who should be teaching. Based on the assumption that most entry requirements simply keep bright young people out of teaching and focus on social goals rather than pupils'

achievement (Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999), advocates of deregulation want to break up the profession's "monopoly" (Abell Foundation, 2001; Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999), "tear down the wall" of teacher certification (Hess, 2001, p. 22), and expose schools of education to "the cleansing waters of competition" (Hess, 2001, p. 22).

Those who favor deregulation argue that research indicates that courses in pedagogy and other experiences associated with the traditional teacher education curriculum have no significant impact on pupils' achievement (Abell Foundation, 2001; Ballou & Podgursky, 2000). The deregulation agenda is consistent with other market-based approaches to reform and with the larger movement to privatize health, education and other services. Proponents of deregulation favor alternate routes into teaching, some of which require that teacher candidates have subject matter knowledge in the areas they will teach with little or no preparation in pedagogy, teaching and learning, assessment, culture, language, and all the other areas that are the mainstays of the curriculum envisioned by those who favor professionalization. From the perspective of the deregulationists, questions related to the teacher education curriculum are basically irrelevant, since it is assumed that any bright young person who knows subject matter can teach, picking up other information while on the job.

Teacher Education Curriculum as Bridge? Underlying Controversy #1—teacher education curriculum and the knowledge base—are two quite different sets of assumptions about the teacher education curriculum thought of, metaphorically, as a kind of architectural structure: one side sees the curriculum as a bridge, the other sees it as a wall. Those who believe the answer to the problem of school reform lies primarily in the provision of high quality, fully prepared, and fully-certified professional teachers for all students assume the teacher education curriculum has the potential to be a strong bridge between higher education and the teaching profession, on one side, and the performance of the nation's K-12 teachers and students, on the other. They see "teacher education" as a continuum across the professional lifespan—something like the world's longest bridge--rather than as a single point in time. Likewise, they regard the curriculum as a way to socialize beginning teachers into a lifetime of learning, which includes posing as well as solving problems of practice, reflecting on the work of teaching, altering curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners, and working with others in communities of learners who use the data of classroom life to improve practice.

On the other hand, those who believe the solution to the problems of schooling is letting into teaching anyone who can raise students' test scores see the teacher education curriculum as a barrier or a wall that keeps people out of teaching. From this perspective, the teacher education curriculum is a collection of useless theories, fads, and leftist-leaning social and political ideas based on logic, tradition, and ideology rather than empirical evidence of student achievement and loosely coupled with an unnecessary regulatory apparatus. From this point of view, tearing down the teacher education curriculum wall would allow the invisible hand of the market to solve the problems of the nation's schools.

Controversy #2: Teacher Education Curriculum and the Science of Reading

A heated controversy about teacher education was sparked by a recent study that asked whether or not the curriculum adequately exposed prospective teachers to the "science of reading" (Walsh *et al.*, 2006). This controversy is linked to a number of enduring debates--what it means to learn to read, what strategies and materials promote this learning, the politics of knowledge for and about teaching, and legitimation of knowledge sources in the teacher education curriculum. In addition, this controversy is entangled with profoundly disputed ideas about who should control teachers' work and whether (or how) the teacher education curriculum should function as a control mechanism.

The Science of Reading? In May of 2006, *What Education Schools Aren't Teaching about Reading and What Elementary Teachers Aren't Learning* (Walsh et al., 2006, emphasis in original) was published by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), a Washington organization that has been an advocate of market-based teacher education reform and a harsh critic of schools of education since its inception in 2001. The report's intentionally provocative title provides a good précis for its major conclusion: "Most education schools are not teaching the science of reading" (p. 22). This conclusion was based on a study of syllabi for required reading courses for a stratified random sample of 72 institutions with education schools (about 5% of education schools offering elementary certification).

Syllabi were obtained through the internet or by paying local students to provide them; course texts and readings were also obtained. Each course/institution was rated on three factors—"quality of required texts," "course objective and lecture time," and "kind of assignment" required of students—to determine "the degree to which the five components of good reading instruction were taught (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension)" (p. 17). Noting that courses and institutions received a passing grade "even if course materials merely referenced each of the five components of good reading instruction" (p. 22), the study concluded that "almost all of the 72 institutions in our sample earned a 'failing' grade...even after we set the bar for passing so low" (p. 22). The report lists the names of all institutions in the sample as well as their ratings, which were computed as the percentage of the "science of reading" included in the curriculum (i.e., 100% for covering all five components of the science of reading, 80% for covering four of the five components, and so on) (p. 24).

The NCTQ report concluded that many courses fostered ideas that were "incompatible with science" (p. 29), such as the idea that learning to read is a natural process developed through experience with literature or the idea that direct instruction is an outmoded teaching strategy. Based on analysis of the 226 books used across the reading courses, the report concluded, "The quality of almost all the reading texts is poor. Their content includes little to no hard science and in far too many cases the content is inaccurate and misleading" (p. 33). The report offered many recommendations for states, professional organizations, the federal government, textbook publishers, and education schools such as requiring stand-alone tests of reading instruction for licensing, withholding accreditation from institutions that do not teach the science of reading, and building the capacity of university faculty.

To interpret the "science of reading" controversy as a political text, we focus on two issues. The first has to do with science, including disputes about whether there is a "science" of reading, what rigorous scientific research about reading shows, and what "scientific" or other knowledge teachers need. The second has to do with the control of teachers' work and with current attempts to shift control of teacher preparation away from higher education.

The NCTQ report begins with the premise that the report of the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000) on early reading instruction represents a conclusive, authoritative, and undisputed body of knowledge about early reading and reading instruction that constitutes "the science of reading." This is clear in the report's frequent comments about whether a given course or institution adequately covered "the science" and in definitive statements, such as this one: "While some findings by the National Reading Panel were initially met with resistance, with many educators expressing skepticism over its methodology and findings, no subsequent work of serious scholarship has challenged its findings" (p. 8). This position is consistent with the language of the No Child Left Behind legislation (P.L. 107-110, 2002) and with comments about the law's implementation by President Bush and members of his administration (e.g., Bush, 2002).

Critics of the NCTQ report and its stated implications for the teacher education curriculum do not share this view about “the science of reading” nor did they find the research methods used in the NCTQ study itself scientific. For example, the Director of the Center for Teaching Quality, Barnatt Berry (2006b), argued that the study used “sloppy” and “bizarre” research methods, such as relying solely on syllabi with the rationale that interviews with students would only get at their perceptions of a course, “not what is in it actually” (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000, p. 21). Berry also asserted that a more careful study conducted by the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation (2002) had shown that effective teachers of reading used a repertoire of teaching strategies, and not what Berry (2006b) called the “phonics-only” approach emphasized by NCTQ.

Richard Allington (2006), Immediate Past President of the International Reading Association, argued that consensus about teaching and learning reading, which is an explicit premise of the NCTQ study, was simply not the case. Referring to the study as a “fundamentally flawed piece of propaganda,” Allington commented: “The kicker in the NCTQ report for me, at least, is the assertion about the report of the NRP that: ‘No subsequent work of serious scholarship has challenged its findings’ [p. 8]. What about these published challenges?” Allington then listed 14 articles published in “leading peer reviewed journals,” as well as three book-length critiques of the NRP report, all written by “leading scholars in the field” and published on the basis of peer review. Allington concluded:

These authors [just listed] criticize the methodology of the NRP from several points of view (meta-analysis incorrectly done, meta-analysis results not correctly interpreted, restriction to experimental methodologies, missed studies, etc)... in my view, you’ve got a poorly designed and conducted [NCTQ] study based on a widely criticized federal [NRP] report. Then, that ‘study’ was sent directly to the press and to deans with no peer review.

It seems clear that NCTQ conclusions about the teacher education curriculum depend on what are purported to be consensual, but are in fact, very controversial notions regarding “science” and “the science of reading.” NCTQ’s assumptions are consistent with the evidence based education movement, wherein it is assumed that a scientific body of evidence about education practices and strategies “that work” should be applied directly to practice by teachers who have been trained to implement them without deviation or mediation based on professional judgments, context, or local knowledge.

Controlling the Teacher Education Curriculum. To make sense of this controversy, it is instructive to consider analyses by John Furlong (2005), immediate Past President of the British Educational Research Association, concerning developments in teacher education policy during the first two terms of the New Labour government in the U.K.. Furlong argues that “the new [teacher] professionalism” in the U.K. marked the end of a 30-year shift from the “individualised professionalism” of the past to new forms of “‘managed’ and ‘networked’ professionalism” (p. 120).

According to Furlong, this shift turned on the idea that decisions about teaching and assessing students’ learning were rightly made, not by teachers, but at larger school and national levels. Acceptance of this idea ended “an era” when initial teacher education had been at the heart of national policy debates and relegated it instead “to the back waters” (p. 120), where it currently resides. Furlong suggests that during the Conservative era, there was unprecedented government intervention in initial teacher preparation:

Those in higher education, with their focus on theory and critique, were seen as associated with more traditional forms of professionalism prioritising individual knowledge, autonomy and responsibility (Hoyle & John, 1995). What was needed, therefore, was to wrest control of the system from higher education and to develop a

more practically based form of preparation with an emphasis on training rather than education. (p. 121)

Accomplishing this shift in the U.K. required new management and inspection agencies with more and more precise stipulation of criteria and required that funding be linked to public performance data. Furlong points out that within just a 15 year period and despite the resistance of higher education, “the system...moved from one of diversity and autonomy to a ‘command economy’ with unanimity and central control” (p. 121). Furlong’s analysis concluded that in the U.K., standard-setting coupled with insistence on multiple providers maintained the teacher education market, but also ensured that teacher education was “narrowly functional, an entirely ‘technical rationalist’ enterprise” (p. 127).

Teacher Education Curriculum as Bridge? Applying Furlong’s analysis to the current controversy in the U.S. about the science of reading and the teacher education curriculum points to the fact that the U.S. controversy is not simply about the science of reading, but is also about power and accountability in the schools, or to borrow from the title of Richard Ingersoll’s (2003) sociological study of schools as workplaces, the controversy is about “who controls teachers’ work.” Ingersoll notes that two long-standing perspectives on this question are, on the one hand, that schools are too decentralized and teachers exercise far too much individual autonomy, and, on the other hand, that schools are too top-down and bureaucratized with the result that teachers are deskilled and deprofessionalized. Although Ingersoll suggests that neither of these viewpoints adequately understands the work of teachers and the school as workplace, it is precisely these two views—extrapolated to teacher education and with an important twist—that underlie Controversy #2. The NCTQ study (along with many similar reports and commentaries) assumes that the teacher education curriculum is in disarray, inconsistent with scientific research, and un-accountable. Proponents of this perspective want teaching (and the teacher education curriculum) to be closely controlled through aggressive state/federal intervention in the content, methods and day-to-day work of teaching. Many of those who reject this perspective—and this is the twist—*also* often assume that the teacher education curriculum is too diverse and unaccountable. But they want to clean up teacher education’s disarray through a more consistent teacher education curriculum nationally and the professionalization of teaching and teacher education. Interestingly, the bridge metaphor applies to both sides of this curriculum controversy, but opponents have two very different kinds of bridges in mind. Those who want to eliminate the disarray of teacher education through consistent professional standards want a bridge that connects the profession to the performance of teachers in K-12 schools, in much the same way as described for Controversy #1 above. However, those who want to clean up the chaos of the teacher education curriculum through aggressive regulatory control want a bridge that is more like an enclosed, one-way tunnel—a bridge wherein the teacher education curriculum is a direct conduit from government-certified scientific information about “what works” to teachers’ and students’ performance in K-12 schools.

Controversy #3: Teacher Education Curriculum and Social Justice

The third curriculum controversy we analyze here came to a head during the winter of 2005-2006, when it seemed that nearly everybody in the U.S. was talking about social justice and the teacher education curriculum. Although the flashpoint was ignited by an article that appeared in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in December of 2005, the controversy actually has deep roots in the larger and ongoing culture wars in the U.S., and, more particularly, in the curriculum wars related to history, the social studies, and literature. These are connected to sharply contested ideas about the purposes of schooling in society, the politics of knowledge, and the current backlash against universities, which are characterized by some conservatives as hotbeds of radical thought and revolution.

Social Justice or Knowledge? An article in the widely-read *Chronicle of Higher Education*, headlined, “We Don’t Need That Kind of Attitude,” and sub-titled, “Education schools want to make sure prospective teachers have the right disposition” (R. Wilson, 2005) offered a chilling story about a prospective teacher who had dropped out of her teacher preparation program because teacher educators were “more interested in students’ political views than in their classroom performance” (p. A8). According to the *Chronicle*, there were similar grievances pending at other institutions where teacher candidates were expected to acknowledge ideas such as “white privilege,” agree to be “agents of change,” and/or meet specific program criteria regarding their dispositions for social justice. The *Chronicle* story was picked up by many journalists, cartoonists, and bloggers, including conservative *Newsweek* columnist, George Will (2006), who opened his January 16, 2006, column with this: “The surest, quickest way to add quality to primary and secondary education would be addition by subtraction: Close all the schools of education.” Will went on to say: “The permeation of ed schools by politics is a consequence of the vacuity of their curricula...The dogma has been that primary and secondary education is about ‘self actualization’ or ‘finding one’s joy’ or ‘social adjustment’...but is *never* about anything as banal as mere knowledge.” Commentaries like Will’s added fuel to the already hotly burning fires of doubt about the value of the collegiate teacher education curriculum. Some scholars inside the teacher education community also challenged the social justice agenda, however, arguing that the agenda was long on political arguments and making sure students felt good and short on content.

The social justice curriculum controversy is especially interesting since it is directly and overtly about the politics and purposes of teacher education. Two underlying issues are central. The first has to do with the assumed dichotomy between social justice and knowledge and the second with the relationship between curriculum and ideology.

Many of the critiques of the social justice agenda in teacher education suggest that teaching for social justice is about teachers being nice, children feeling good, and everybody ignoring knowledge. Although this critique has a long history (Fine, 1995), social justice advocates argue that it is based on the erroneous perception that teacher preparation for social justice is about something amorphous related to love and self esteem, which is predicated on a false dichotomy between social justice and knowledge (Cochran-Smith, 2006b).

Proponents of a social justice agenda in teacher education have produced a considerable body of scholarship over the last two decades.[iii] From this perspective, the bottom line of teaching and teacher education for social justice is--to use Oakes and Lipton’s (1999) language--to “press everyone toward learning and social justice [and] to provide broad and deep access to learning” (p. 330). As Oakes and Lipton use the word, press means “an institutional imperative, an alignment, a social consensus, an inevitability that each person in the culture will be immersed in particular cultural values” (p. 331). From this perspective, pupils’ learning is neither peripheral nor optional; it is imperative. But it is a particular kind of learning that social justice educators have in mind (Michelli & Keiser, 2004). In addition to learning “the facts” or “the canon,” this includes unpacking the assumptions and values that shape these, evaluating the evidence for competing claims, and being unafraid of critique (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). With the social justice agenda, there is no assumption that knowledge is neutral and objective (Grant & Wieczorek, 2000). Rather, it is assumed that knowledge is shaped by human interests and that it reflects the social, economic and political relationships in society (Banks, 1997; Sleeter, 1995a).

Social Justice and Power. This leads to what we think is the real issue underlying the controversy about social justice in the teacher education curriculum—that it focuses squarely on the political aspects of schooling and raises questions about power, access to opportunities, equity, and the status quo. The recent actions of the National Association of Scholars (NAS),

an organization long opposed to social justice agendas, make this clear. NAS requested that the U.S. Department of Education's Assistant Secretary for Post Secondary Education formally investigate the "educational and constitutional propriety" of the reference in NCATE's standards to social justice,[iv] a term NAS argued was "necessarily fraught with contested ideological significance" (National Association of Scholars, November 2, 2005). The NAS position was that teacher education programs should be based on "objective" standards and "core knowledge" rather than ideology. In the same letter, NAS also challenged standards at a school of social work, where the stated purpose was to prepare social workers to help alleviate poverty, oppression, and social injustice, an assumption NAS decried as "progressive political activism."

Explicit in these NAS charges, and implicit in similar criticisms that the social justice aspects of the teacher education curriculum are ideological is the assumption that there is some other kind of professional education that is not ideological or political—some kind of professional education that is "neutral" when it comes to values and ideals. On the contrary, advocates of social justice in the teacher education curriculum argue that a neutral and value-free kind of teacher education is neither desirable nor possible. Advocates of the social justice agenda (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1999), assume that education (and teacher education) are social institutions that pose moral, ethical, social, philosophical, and ideological questions, which cannot be treated as if they were value-neutral and ideology-free. In the sense meant here, all of teacher education is ideological—including decisions the curriculum's focus on learning, subject matter, pedagogy, culture, assessment, and schooling, as well as how fieldwork experiences are arranged and the ways candidates are selected and recruited. All of these involve choices about what is included and what is left out, whose viewpoints and interests are served and whose may not be, which aspects of teaching and schooling are made problematic and which are taken-for-granted, and what assumptions are made—whether spoken or unspoken--about the purposes of teaching and schooling in a democratic society.

When the ideological basis of teacher education is recognized, it comes as no surprise that debates about the curriculum deal with the difficult choices and trade-offs that all choices about values and ideology entail. The controversy described above, however, reflects efforts to move in the opposite direction. Opponents of the social justice agenda challenge the very idea that teacher education should have anything to do with values. Instead they assert that their own positions are neutral, a-political, value-free, and based on objective empirical evidence (or common sense) rather than related to larger purposes that are both political and ideological. Along these lines, opponents of the social justice agenda often use the term, "ideological," in the way NAS does--as an epithet to discredit and dismiss opposing views. This strategy has been successful, at least in some instances. In June, 2006, in the face of intense pressure, although NCATE President Art Wise made clear that, contrary to claims, NCATE had never had a mandatory social justice standard, he also announced that NCATE had decided to withdraw from its standards all language related to social justice on the grounds that "the term is susceptible to a variety definitions" (Inside Higher Education, 2006).

Teacher Education Curriculum as Bridge? Underlying controversy #3—teacher education curriculum and social justice--is the assumption that the teacher education curriculum is not only a bridge between colleges/universities and K-12 schools, but is indeed a very powerful bridge linking the two. The knowledge, ideas, and ideals conveyed in the collegiate teacher preparation curriculum are assumed to have a striking impact on how teachers construct curriculum in K-12 schools and how they shape young people's understandings of the history, identity and values of the nation. Interestingly, proponents on both sides of this controversy (even those who would do away with collegiate teacher preparation) apparently share this assumption. If they did not, the debates would not be so

contentious, and the efforts to expunge from the curriculum all references to social justice would not be so relentless. If they did not, there would not be accusations such as those made by Sandra Stotsky (2004), who argued that many materials and programs for teachers' professional development had been infiltrated by a "stealth curriculum." In the guise of combating tolerance and expanding students' knowledge of multiple cultures and points of view, the "stealth curriculum," Stodsky asserted, recruits "unwitting teachers as agents in cultivating hostility toward America as a country, toward Western culture, and toward Americans of European descent" (p. 12).

The assumption that the teacher education curriculum is a strong bridge is shared by those with different perspectives. Nonetheless, they have diametrically different ideas about what the bridge should be made out of and, to continue the metaphor, what kind of girders should span and support it. On one side, proponents of social justice want the teacher education bridge to be constructed out of subject matter and pedagogy with the girders that span and support the bridge made out of critical understandings of schooling and society, including the idea that teaching includes being part of larger social movements to challenge those school arrangements and teaching practices that perpetuate inequities. On the other hand, however, those who are opposed to social justice in the teacher education curriculum, want the teacher education bridge to be built with "objective" and "core" knowledge with its girders made out of the understanding that the purpose of teaching is conveying a well-established body of knowledge to the next generation, including the idea that teachers and teacher educators should eschew all things political.

Conclusion: Teacher Education Curriculum as Bridge

Just as this chapter went to press, the latest scorching report about teacher education in the U.S. was issued. Arthur Levine, President Emeritus of Teachers College and President of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, authored "Educating School Teachers," based on case studies and national surveys over four years and selected student achievement data. With provocative language that was picked up in news stories across the country, the report asserted, "Teacher education is the Dodge City of the education world. Like the fabled Wild West town, it is unruly and chaotic. Anything goes and the chaos is increasing as traditional programs vie with nontraditional programs" (p. 3). Although the report identified several model teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities, it concluded that most were inadequate and outmoded, that there was no uniform curriculum or quality control mechanism, that many faculty were disconnected from schools, and that too many teachers were being prepared in non-research institutions with low admissions standards, a factor the report connected to lower pupil performance. The report called for locating teacher preparation in professional development schools, measuring the success of programs based on students' achievement, making five year programs the norm, establishing quality controls by reinventing accreditation, and closing down failing programs (most of which, the report noted, would be at masters rather than doctoral degree-granting institutions) while simultaneously enhancing the resources devoted to teacher preparation at research universities.

It would be an understatement to say that Levine's long-awaited report caused a stir in educational and policy communities in the U.S.. In addition to featured stories in *Education Week* and newspapers across the country, a number of prepared statements were released almost simultaneously with the report (Association of Teacher Educators, 2006; e.g., Berry, 2006a; Robinson, 2006; Wise, 2006). Most cautiously agreed with some or even many of Levine's criticisms, but also pointed out that his recommendations were not exactly new, that many teacher education reforms were already underway, and that the implicit elitism of the recommendations failed to acknowledge the disconnect between the astronomical costs of an education at a research university and the average salary for new teachers. A statement from

President Curris (2006) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, which represents institutions that were formerly normal schools for teacher preparation and thus would be most heavily affected by Levine's recommendations, was more blunt. Curris called the Levine report a "very weak contribution to the litany of reports on our nation's schools," with little relevance to the serious problems facing public education, and reflecting an "elitist philosophy [that] has been repeatedly rejected by the American public."

There is clearly much more that could be said—and no doubt will be said—about this latest teacher education controversy. Although we do not take up the task in this chapter, we think the approach we have used here—reading teacher education curriculum controversies as political texts—would work well as a way to illuminate and identify the larger political, social, curricular, and policy issues embedded in the report and its responses as well as the historical threads that run through them. It is clear that the Levine report works from the assumption that the teacher education curriculum is—or, more correctly, should be—a bridge between higher education and teaching as a profession, on one side, and the performance of teachers and students in schools, on the other. Interestingly, the Levine report spends a fair amount of time focusing on questions we listed at the beginning of the chapter, but which are not as salient in the other controversies we have described—questions such as: Who should be allowed to build the teacher education curriculum bridge? Who should be encouraged to cross it? And who should be in charge of inspecting its structural integrity? Levine concludes, as noted, that too many of those currently doing the building, crossing, and inspecting should not be, thus opening up old questions wrapped in the threads of new global and national trends in policy and politics.

As we stated, our purpose in this chapter has been to provide a conceptual framework—which we have labeled "reading the curriculum as political text"—and the metaphor of teacher education curriculum as bridge as a way to explicate the intense, and outwardly intractable controversies that emerge about the teacher education curriculum in the U.S. where curriculum variation rather than uniformity is the norm. Based on our analysis of three key curriculum controversies, we have argued that issues regarding the teacher education curriculum are complex and messy—entangled with long-standing historical debates about the purposes of schooling and about the knowledge that is of most value for teachers and of most worth for the next generations of citizens in our society. As importantly, we have argued that contemporary controversies are also shaped by more recent trends, particularly the emergence over the last 30 years of a globalized knowledge economy (Luke, 2004) and the general acceptance by those in policymaking positions of a social ideology supported by conservative think tanks and foundations (Oakes et al., 2006). Our point is that, in the final analysis, controversies about the teacher education curriculum are always about what knowledge is worthwhile and what purposes schooling should serve. Our argument here, however, is that these controversies are also perennially about who has the power to decide these issues, especially who has the authority to establish the fitting and proper ends and means of the teacher education curriculum.

REFERENCES

Abell Foundation. (2001, October). Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality. 2001, from <http://www.abell.org>

- Allington, R. (2006). What the nctq did not investigate. Comment by r. Allington. *Educational Equity, Politics and Policy in Texas Blog* Retrieved August 12, 2006
- American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence. (2006). American board for certification of teacher excellence website.
- Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York, NY: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Association of Teacher Educators. (2006). *Response to "educating school teachers" by dr. Arthur levine from the associatio of teacher educators*. Manassas, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: What is the evidence? *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 5-27.
- Banks, J. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bell, L. A., Washington, S., Weinstein, G., & Love, B. (1997). Knowing ourselves as instructors. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 229-310). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berry, B. (2006a, September 12, 2006). Educating school teachers: A critique. Retrieved September 25, 2006, 2006
- Berry, B. (2006b). Teaching teachers to teach reading: A critical review. *Building the Teaching Profession* Retrieved August 1, 2006, June 7, 2006
- Bush, G. (2002, September 4, 2002). Press release: President highlights progress made in education reform. *The East Room, the White House, Office of the Press Secretary*, http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020904_6.html Retrieved May 1, 2006
- Castenell, L., & Pinar, W. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as racial text: Representations of identity and difference in education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 51(3), 279-310.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(2), 157-190.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001a). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 17(5), 527-546.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001b). Reforming teacher education: Competing agendas. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), 263-265.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Sometimes it's not about the money: Teacher education and heart. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005a). The new teacher education: For better or for worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34(6).
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005b). Teacher education and the outcomes trap. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 411-417.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006a). *Policy, practice and politics in teacher education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006b). Teacher education and the need for public intellectuals. *The New Educator*, 2, 1-26.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 30(8), 3-15.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005a). The aera panel on research and teacher education: context and goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying*

teacher education: The report of the aera panel on research and teacher education. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005b). Paradigms and politics: Researching teacher education in changing times. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the aera panel on research and teacher education.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (in press). Research on teacher education: Changing times, changing paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *The handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the aera panel on research and teacher education.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cremin, L. (1978). *The education of the educating profession.* Washington, DC: AACTE.

Cuban, L. (2004). Looking through the rearview mirror at school accountability. In K. Sirotnik (Ed.), *Holding accountability accountable* (pp. 18-34). New York: Teachers College Press.

Curris, C. (2006). Statement on the report "educating school teachers": American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world. Report of the committee on teacher education of the national academy of education.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Education Week. (2006). *Quality counts: A decade of standards-based education.* Washington: Education Week.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 212-233). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Fine, M. (1995). *Habits of mind: Struggling over values in america's classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Furlong, J. (2005). New labour and teacher education: The end of an era. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(1), 119-134.

Gardner, W. (1989). Preface. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher.* New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goodwin, A. (2000). Teachers as (multi)cultural agents in schools. In R. Carter (Ed.), *Addressing cultural issues in organizations: Beyond the corporate context* (pp. 104-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gopinathan, S., & Ho, W. K. (2000). Singapore. In P. Morris & J. Williamson (Eds.), *Teacher education in the asia-pacific region* (pp. 199-226). New York: Falmer Press.

Grant, C. (1997). Critical knowledge, skills, and experiences for the instruction of culturally diverse students: A perspective for the preparation of preservice teachers. In J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners* (pp. 1-26). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Grant, C., & Wieczorek, K. (2000). Teacher education and knowledge in "the knowledge society": The need for social morrings in our multicultural schools. *Teachers College Record*, 102(5), 913-935.

- Hess, F. (2001). *Tear down this wall: The case for a radical overhaul of teacher certification*. Washington: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Houston, R. (Ed.). (1990). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Hoyle, E., & John, P. (1995). *Professional knowledge and professional practice*. London: Cassell.
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Inside Higher Education. (2006, June 6, 2006). A spirited disposition. *Inside Higher Education*.
- Irvine, J. (Ed.). (1997). *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Kanstoroom, M., & Finn, C. (1999). *Better teachers, better schools*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- King, J. (in press). Critical and qualitative research in teacher education: A blues epistemology, a reason for knowing for cultural well-being. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.
- King, J., Hollins, E., & Hayman, W. (Eds.). (1997). *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. In A. Iran-Nejad & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 24, pp. 211-248). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Lucas, C. (1999). *Teacher education in america: Reform agendas for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Luke, A. (2004). Teaching after the market: From commodity to cosmopolitan. *Teachers College Record*.
- Michelli, N., & Keiser, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Teacher education for diversity and social justice*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Morey, A. (2001). The growth of for-profit higher education: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), 300-311.
- Mosteller, F., & Boruch, R. (2001). *Evidence matters, randomized trials in education research*. Washington: Brookings Institute.
- Murray, F. (1996). Beyond natural teaching: The case for professional education. In F. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Association of Scholars. (November 2, 2005). Letter to assistant secretary for post secondary education, united states department of education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation. (2002). Teacher education programmes and children's reading achievement. In R. Fisher, G. Brooks & M. Lewis (Eds.), *Raising standards in literacy* (pp. 175-189). New York/London: Routledge/Falmer.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for america's future*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the national reading panel, teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (No. National Institute of Health Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Oakes, J., Likpton, M., J., R., & Renee, M. (2006, July, 2006). *Research as a tool for democratizing education policymaking*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at International Invitational Symposium on Figuring and Re-configuring Research, Policy and Practice for the Knowledge Society, Dublin, Ireland.
- Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1999). *Teaching to change the world*. Boston: McGraw Hill Publishers.
- P.L. 107-110. (2002). No child left behind act: Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary act. Retrieved June, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov>
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (Eds.). (2002). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, S. (2006, September 18, 2006). Response to educating school teachers by dr. Arthur levine. Retrieved September 24, 2006, 2006
- Sleeter, C. (1995a). An analysis of the critiques of multicultural education. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 81-94). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Sleeter, C. (1995b). White preservice students and multicultural education coursework. In J. Larkin & C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula* (pp. 17-30). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Stotsky, S. (2004). *The stealth curriculum: Manipulating america's history teachers*. Washington, DC: The Fordham Foundation.
- Sykes, G. (1999). Teacher and student learning: Strengthening their connection. In L. Darling Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 151-179). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. (1999). The teachers we need and how to get more of them: A manifesto. In M. Kanstoroom & C. Finn (Eds.), *Better teachers, better schools* (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Tom, A. R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(5), 35-44.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1999). *Data system for accountability provisions of the higher education amendments of 1998, title ii*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Education.
- US. Department of Education. (2005). *The secretary's fourth annual report on teacher quality: A highly qualified teacher in every classroom*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D. (2006). *What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning*. Washington, DC: The National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). Educating the 'good citizen': Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science and Politics*, XXXVII(2), 241-247.
- Will, G. (2006, January 16, 2006). Ed schools vs. Education. *Newsweek Magazine*.
- Wilson, R. (2005). 'we don't need that kind of attitude'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(17), A8.

- Wilson, S., & Youngs, P. (2005). Research on accountability processes in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the aera panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 591-644). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher.
- Wise, A. (2006, September 12, 2006). Statement of arthur e. Wise on the release of 'educating school teachers' report. Retrieved September 20, 2006, 2006
- Yinger, R. (1999). The role of standards in teaching and teacher education. In G. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers: The 98th yearbook of the nsse* (pp. 85-113). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yinger, R., & Hendricks-Lee, M. (2000). The language of standards and teacher education reform. *Educational Policy*, 14(1), 94-106.
- Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 3-9.
- Zeichner, K. (1993a). *Educating teachers for cultural diversity* (National Center for Research on Teacher Learning Special Report No. ERIC Document, ED 359 167). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.
- Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1990). Traditions of reform in united states teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 3-20.

[i] These changes, and their implications for teacher education, have been discussed in detail elsewhere (Cochran-Smith, 2005a, 2005b; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005b), so we do not further elaborate them here.

[ii] This description draws on Cochran-Smith's analyses of these and other agendas for the reform of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2001a, 2001b, 2004, 2006a; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001, 2005a).

[iii] We mention here only a few of the scholars who have contributed to this body of knowledge (Bell *et al.*, 1997; Cochran-Smith, 1991, 2004; Gay, 2000; Goodwin, 2000; Grant, 1997; Irvine, 1997; J. King *et al.*, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Michelli & Keiser, 2004; Oakes & Lipton, 1999; Sleeter, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Zeichner, 1993a; Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

[iv] Teacher education programs seeking accreditation from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) must show evidence that their programs meet all of NCATE's standards regarding teacher candidate performance and institutional capacity and resources. NCATE's Standard #1 states that all teacher candidates must "know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn." Until June of 2006, NCATE's glossary of terms defined "dispositions" as: the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions

are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice... ”