

Venture Philanthropy and Teacher Education Policy in the U.S.: The Role of the New

Schools Venture Fund

Ken Zeichner

Cesar Pena Sandoval

University of Washington, Seattle¹

Abstract

This paper focuses on the growing role of venture philanthropy in shaping policy and practice in teacher education in the United States. Our purpose in writing the paper is to bring a greater level of transparency to this private influence on public policy and to promote greater discussion and debate in the public sphere about alternative solutions to current problems in schooling and teacher education. The particular focus in the paper is on the role of one of the most influential private groups that invests in education, the New Schools Venture Fund (NSVF), in promoting deregulation and market-based policies.

We examine the changing role of philanthropy in education and the role of the NSVF in developing and promoting a bill in the U.S. Congress (The “GREAT Act”) that would create a system of charter teacher and principal preparation programs throughout the nation. We also examine the warrant for claims that Education schools have failed in their mission to educate teachers well and the corresponding narrative that entrepreneurial programs emanating from the private sector are the solution. In doing so, we examine the ways in which a 2006 study of Education schools by Arthur Levine has been used and misused by the media, reformers and policy makers.

We reject both the position that the status quo in teacher education is acceptable (a position held by what we term “defenders”) and the position that the current system needs to be blown-up and replaced by a market economy (“reformers”). We suggest a third position (“transformers”) that we believe will strengthen the U.S. system of public teacher education and provide everyone’s children with high quality teachers.

More important than our particular beliefs, is the urgent need we highlight for greater transparency about the work and evidence related to the various positions on improving teacher education and for more trenchant public dialogue about how to move forward.

¹ Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 2013.

In a democratic nation, it is altogether proper that private efforts to reshape public institutions even for the most beneficent purposes be accorded the same hard look that greets any policy proposal... Addressing the implications of these developments requires an informed public conversation that establishes the facts and in turn enables reformers, policymakers, donors, parents, and citizens to grapple with them. Unfortunately, the deliberations today are clouded by ambiguity surrounding even the most elemental facts (Hess, 2005, pp. 8-9).

This paper examines the increasing role of venture philanthropy (Reckhow, 2013; Saltman, 2010)², the ideas of educational entrepreneurship and “disruptive innovation” (Smith & Peterson, 2006)³ in influencing the course of federal and state policies and practices in teacher education. We focus in particular on one example of these under-scrutinized influences on public policy: The influence of the NSVF in supporting policy and programs intended to “profoundly disrupt the current teacher education market”⁴

² According to Saltman (2010), Venture Philanthropy (VP) “is modeled on venture capital and the investments in the technology boom in the early 1990s... VP treats giving to public schooling as a social investment that, like venture capital must begin with a business plan, involve quantitative measurement of efficacy, be replicable to be brought to scale and ideally leverage public spending in ways compatible with the strategic donor... One of the most significant aspects of this transformation in educational philanthropy involves the ways that the public and civic purposes of public schooling are redescribed by VP in distinctly private ways.” (pp.2-3).

³ Smith & Peterson (2006) define educational entrepreneurs as “visionary thinkers who create new for-profit or nonprofit organizations from scratch that redefine our sense of what is possible. These organizations stand separate and independent from institutions like public school districts and teachers colleges; as such the entrepreneurs who start them have the potential to spark more dramatic change than might otherwise be created by status quo organizations.”(pp. 21-22).

⁴ <http://www.newschools.org/initiatives/ltt-2013-eir>

Stances Toward the Status Quo in Teacher Education

From our perspective, there are three major positions taken by those interested in improving the current situation in teacher education in the U.S. First, there is the position taken by some college and university teacher educators that the criticisms from the outside teacher education are wrong and motivated by a selfish desire to make money and/or advance one's personal or professional standing at the expense of students who are currently underserved by public schools. We call this the position of the **defenders**. The defenders call for greater investment in the current system of teacher education in order to build greater capacity in the existing institutions that currently prepare teachers (i.e., colleges and universities). The defenders do not see the need for significant changes in the way things are now done.

Second, there are groups of outsiders to the current system, and even some within, who have argued that education schools have failed and that the current system needs to be “blown-up” or “disrupted”⁵ and replaced by an alternative one based on deregulation, competition and markets.⁶ These critics refer to themselves as. **“reformers”**⁷

⁵ Liu (2013) explains the concept of disruptive innovation as when a product of service “instead of competing head-on with existing players, serves new customers with a cheaper, simpler, or more convenient solution than current existing options. Eventually, the disrupter improves to the point that it can serve the upper tiers of the market with less expensive and good-enough performance.” (p. 2).

⁶ According to Smith & Peterson (2006), “this view holds that the public education system must change so profoundly that only the disruptive force of entrepreneurs who think beyond the current constraints and resources can get us there.” P. 42

⁷ The reformers usually refer to teacher education as “teacher training.” Teacher education is also referred to in this community as a component of “human capital

If history is any guide, it is unlikely that today's colleges of education will substantially reform themselves without substantial competition from other providers. In other words, new entrants to teacher training⁸ hold the most promising prospects for redirecting the massive resources now sunk into ineffective teacher education programs (Rotherham, 2008. p. 112).

Finally, there are those, who see the need for substantive transformation in the current system of teacher education, but who do not support "blowing up" the current system and replacing it with a deregulated market economy. This position is that of the **transformers**.

Those located within the transformation camp have sought to improve the quality of teacher education in many different ways in recent years including: (a) developing more shared responsibility for teacher education among schools, universities, and local communities; (b) connecting coursework in programs more strongly to the complexities of the schools for which teachers are being prepared; (c) focusing more strongly on helping teacher candidates learn how to enact teaching practices that will promote student learning; (d) strengthening accountability systems for teacher candidates and programs; and (e) strengthening the quality of school and community experiences in teachers' education and the quality of the mentoring that supports those experiences (e.g., Berry, et.al. 2008; NCATE, 2010; Zeichner & Payne, 2013).

development" (Goldhaber & Hannaway, 2007) or "strategic talent management" (Odden, 2013).

Of course a system of categorization like this inevitably oversimplifies a much more complex and messy situation. There is much variation within each of these three camps (e.g., in terms of the intensity and substance of positions) as well as multiple points of overlap between positions (e.g., transformers who like defenders, support maintaining aspects of the current system). That said, the distinctions between groups offer a meaningful lens for considering differing views on how to move forward in education generally and teacher education specifically.

Despite the fact that the two of us are largely seen by the reformers as defenders of the current system because we are situated in an education school and have been critical of privileging market-based solutions to problems of teacher quality and teacher preparation, we have called for fundamental changes in pre-service teacher education and position ourselves within the transformation camp. Our location in this camp reflects our recognition that an “education debt”(Ladson-Billings, 2006) is owed to many students living in poverty who attend our public education system, and that improving the quality of teaching and teacher preparation is part of the solution to paying it off. We also recognize though that the quality of teaching, although fundamentally important, is not the major cause of the education debt and that there is a need to vastly improve working conditions for educators within public schools, their access to high quality professional development, and a need to address the roots of poverty as well as its consequences for student learning.

We also locate ourselves in this transformation camp because we have not been persuaded by the evidence that the entrepreneurial solutions seen by funders

and policy makers as the answers to our problems will address the injustices in public schooling. In fact, we believe that the deregulation and disruption of our public education and teacher education systems that is being aggressively promoted by private interests with little public discussion and debate will serve to widen rather than eliminate the opportunity and achievement differences between the quality of education that is available to children from different backgrounds.

Why Have We Written This Paper?

It is clear that there is potentially a lot of money to be made by those who want to replace education schools in teacher preparation; indeed market advocates sometimes show unembarrassed excitement as public education is privatized. For example, entrepreneur Naveen (2013) recently proclaimed in a Forbes magazine article “I want all entrepreneurs to take notice that this (public education) is a multi-hundred billion dollar opportunity that’s ripe for disruption”(p.1).

Despite the potential to make a lot of money by investing in the disruption and re-creation of the current public education and teacher education systems,⁹ the high degree of confidence and sometimes blatant arrogance of some reformers about the superiority of their entrepreneurial ventures,¹⁰ we do not question the motives of those who seek to dismantle the current system of teacher education in the U.S. and replace it with a deregulated market. Self-serving behavior, greed, and

⁹ In a press release, News Corporation Chairman and CEO Rupert Murdoch estimated the value of the education market at \$500 billion (See Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p.2). In the educational entrepreneurship literature there is frequent reference to the “education industry.” (e.g., Sandler 2010).

¹⁰ According to Smith & Peterson (2004), “ It is important to understand that entrepreneurs have a vision for a better way of doing things; thinking beyond the constraints of current rules and resources.” (p.22).

lack of concern for the common good can be found in all of the various camps on educational reform including in Education schools. So too can genuine concern for the common good be found in all sectors of the education debates.

Our purpose in writing this paper is not to throw stones or impugn the character of those with whom we disagree. Rather, our purpose is to bring a greater level of transparency to the forces influencing public policy in teacher education so that they can be more clearly seen, discussed, and debated. Discussion and debate of public policy issues is a fundamental aspect of a healthy democratic society,¹¹ and we are greatly concerned that many educators and the general public seem to be largely unaware of the ways in which private money and interests are determining the future of teacher preparation in the U.S. We are also concerned about the lack of discussion and debate in the public arena of these issues and practices.

Katz (2013) has recently pointed out that in the early part of the 20th century philanthropists such as Carnegie and Rockefeller encountered a severe backlash for what was perceived to be their efforts to subvert democratic policy making.¹² This same concern now exists as major foundations such as The Walton Family Foundation, The Broad Foundation, and The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and groups like the New Schools Venture Fund employ an aggressive stance and actions in efforts to shape public policy with regard to education and teacher education.¹³

¹¹ See Nelson & Jones, (2007).

¹² Katz refers specifically to the hearings and report of the Walsh Commission during which it was alleged that “philanthropists were using their ill-gotten gains to subvert democratic public policy making.”

¹³ Hess (2012) has used the term “muscular philanthropy” to describe the way in which current venture philanthropists are unapologetically tied to influencing

Bringing Teacher Education into the Story of Crisis and Salvation¹⁴

Parker (2011) has discussed the dominant narrative that has framed discussion about public schooling for the last 30 years. In this narrative, public schooling is seen as the cause of all of our economic, social and political problems and as a panacea for solving them. According to Parker what we have seen for the last 30 years is:

A stream of disdainful talk and action about public schooling, animated by the belief that public schooling is miserably broken, but also that it is the one thing that can save our society (p. 413).

As part of locating the blame for our problems and the potential for salvation in public schooling, a “discourse of derision” is needed to convince policymakers and the public about the failure of the current system. What we have experienced in recent years is the blaming of teachers and their unions, school administrators, and now education schools for the alleged failures of public schooling (Barkin, 2011a). Despite the fact that most of the variance in student achievement is related to out of school factors like poverty and the related factors such as the lack of access to high quality early childhood education, health care, nutritious food and so on (Berliner, 2014; Duncan & Murnane, 2012; Rothstein, 2004), reformers assert that educational interventions alone can fix the inequities in opportunities to learn and in educational outcomes in public schools. Furthermore, they argue that deregulation

education policies in particular ways to create an environment supportive of their preferred market-based solutions.

¹⁴ We are indebted to Parker (2011) for the general analysis that we have expanded into teacher education.

and markets, and entrepreneur-led charter schools and teacher education programs are the particular changes that will solve our problems (Ball, 2012).¹⁵

What Parker (2011) describes in relation to public schooling in general can also be seen with regard to teacher education, which despite all of the changes that have taken place in the last 30 years, still remains largely a public enterprise. We hear the constant drumbeat that tells us that education schools have failed in educating our nations teachers well, and that if we replace this system with deregulation and markets, better teachers will result and all of our problems will be solved. Meredith Liu, a fellow at the Innosight Institute, an organization devoted to promoting “disruptive innovation” in education and healthcare recently shared the following comments about Education schools and their role in teacher preparation:

From a societal perspective, such programs appear to be a questionable investment given the limited evidence that they at least in the aggregate are actually creating effective teachers... Education schools with their high costs and stranglehold on the teacher preparation market are ripe for disruption. (Liu, 2013, pp. 1-2).

This kind of dismissal of the value of teacher education offered by Education schools has led to calls for the elimination of the states’ role in monitoring the quality of new teachers in favor of a teacher education market to regulate quality.

¹⁵ We do not oppose public charter schools that are designed by teachers and administrators and the local communities in which they exist to address needs that have not been met by the existing public schools. We do however, oppose charter schools (even so-called public ones) that are run by charter or education management organizations in which teachers and the local communities do not have a role in developing and running them, schools like those discussed by Goodman (2013).

For example, John Chubb,¹⁶ the interim CEO of *Education Sector*, has argued that policymakers:

Should end teacher licensure as we know it. Given the lack of firm knowledge of how best to prepare teachers for the classroom, state policymakers should lift all public school teaching requirements other than a bachelor's degree and a background check for public school teachers... It makes no sense to require specific forms of training or testing when there is no evidence that those requirements improve teaching. The federal government should lift the "highly qualified" teacher provisions of the Elementary and Secondary School Act that mandate certification. Schools and school systems should be free to decide what training they want to require. (p.)¹⁷

Many scholars believe that we have learned a number of things from research about the characteristics of effective teacher education programs such as a clear and consistent vision of teaching that is shared across the program, and carefully supervised clinical experience (e.g., Boyd, et.al. 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Humphrey, Wechsler, & Hough, 2008; Zeichner&

¹⁶ That John Chubb, who is now head of an allegedly non-partisan education think tank, would advocate for the deregulation of teacher education should be no surprise given his advocacy of choice for K-12 education in the past. "Without being too literal about it, we think reformers would do well to entertain the notion that choice is a panacea... It has the capacity all by itself to bring about the kind of transformation that for years, reformers have been seeking to engineer in a myriad of other ways" (Chubb & Moe, 1990 p. 217. Cited in Rechkow, 2013. p 22).

¹⁷ Co State Senator Mike Johnston a former TFA corps member who went on to write a book about his TFA years, helped found New Leaders for New Schools and led a school himself, is working on building support for legislation in his state that would eliminate most current state certification requirements for teachers.

(<http://www.ednewscolorado.org/news/capitol-news/school-finance-bill-has-temporary-hole#license>).

Conklin, 2005). The problem is that these characteristics do not exist in every teacher education program.

Clearly, there are some programs run by universities and by others that are weak and have not been improved or shut down under current accountability mechanisms. Rather than disrupt the system of teacher education because of the uneven quality in programs, transformers seek to independently evaluate and then redesign program accountability systems as recommended by the National Research Council (2010) study of teacher education in the U.S., and to strengthen the ways in which teacher candidates are assessed prior to licensure (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2010, Zeichner, 2011).

The Growing Influence of Venture Philanthropy in U.S. Education and Teacher Education

Public policy can create new opportunities for entrepreneurs by changing the structure of the market. It can also create opportunities by reallocating resources which usually means an increase or decrease in dollars available and who can access them (Smith & Peterson, 2006, p. 28).

Historically, private foundations and the federal government have invested heavily in improving the design, quality, and content of teaching and teacher education in the U.S. (e.g., Lagemann, 1992; Suggs & deMarrais, 2011; Sykes & Dibner, 2009; Woodring, 1960). Examples of federal investment in strengthening

the college and university system of teacher education include the National Teacher Corps (1965-1981) that focused on preparing teachers to teach in poverty impacted urban and rural schools (Smith, 1980) and the current Teacher Quality Partnership grants that fund school and university partnerships in teacher education including a number of urban teacher residency programs across the country.¹⁸ The Ford Foundation and Carnegie Corporation as well as the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund are examples of foundations that have invested for many years in stimulating various kinds of innovation in the public system of teacher education. The \$100 million plus "Teachers for a New Era" project from 2001-2009 led by Carnegie is the most visible recent example of the efforts of foundations to improve the quality of our current teacher education system (Kirby et al., 2005). Over the years, private foundations have supported a number of the major reports on U.S. teacher education (e.g., Charters & Waples, 1929; Conant, 1963; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie, 1986) and reform initiatives (e.g., Goodlad, 1994; Stone, 1968; NCTAF, 1996).

Recently, it has become clear that the philanthropic community has turned away from building capacity in the current college and university system of teacher education and toward funding alternative teacher education providers and programs.¹⁹ Major conferences and the national media have been flooded with

¹⁸ The Obama administration budget proposal presented to Congress in April 2013 recommends cutting these partnership grants. Some see this as a disinvestment on the part of the administration in partnerships with college and university-based teacher education.

¹⁹ Reckhow (2013) describes a similar shift in philanthropy in K-12 education since 2000 from funding school districts directly to funding non-profits and charter schools that compete with school districts.

speeches, papers, and opinion pieces that question the very idea of a college and university system of teacher education (e.g., Hartocollis, 2005; Payzant, 2004, Vedder, 2011). Levine (2010) has claimed that “there is a growing sense among the critics that it would be more fruitful to replace university-based teacher education than to attempt to reform it.” (pp. 21-22).

Frustrated by the apparent resistance of these institutions to change, many funders have turned their attention to alternative pathways to certification. These include support for new organizations focused on recruiting and training teacher candidates and for teacher residency programs (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011, p.14).

An example of this can be seen by examining funding for Teach for America (TFA). Between 2000 and 2008, TFA received about \$213 million in foundation grants, which represents 31 percent of foundation grants during this period to teacher and teaching related matters (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011).²⁰

As interest in TFA and other non-traditional programs has increased, funder interest in schools of education as a mechanism for bolstering the supply and quality of teachers has lagged (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011, p.35).

Whereas a guide for funders who were interested in improving teacher education prepared for the Kellogg Foundation by the Educational Development Center in 1999 focused exclusively on strengthening university teacher education

²⁰ Additionally, since 2000, TFA has received over \$200 million in federal funding (www.usaspending.gov). In 2011, the Walton Foundation gave TFA \$49.5 million to help double its size (Schiller, 2012). And yet, the 8,200 TFA corps members in 2010-2011 represented less than 1 percent of the teaching force in the U.S. that year (Suggs & deMarrais 2010).

programs (EDC, 1999), a recent report commissioned by the Ford Foundation (Suggs & deMarrais, 2011), Rotherham's guide for investors who want to help improve teacher and principal quality (Rotherham, 2008), and the actual funding allocations to various kinds of teacher education programs all make clear that disrupting the current system of college and university teacher education to provide room for new entrants to a teacher education market has become today's philanthropists' preferred solution to the alleged ills of the field. For example, Democrats for Education Reform (DFER), an advocacy group that focuses on creating a political environment favorable to market-based solutions in education²¹ has stated:

We must encourage and invest in new models and enlist a broader range of expertise to develop and nurture the next generation of educators (Democrats for Educational Reform, 2011).

Unlike educational philanthropy of the past- *before* the entry into teacher education of individual venture capitalists and large funders like the Gates Foundation and the Walton Foundation- current educational philanthropy in teacher education has taken a more hands-on approach and openly political role in pushing particular policies through their allocations of funds. This new wave of philanthropy supports policies that create conditions favorable to creating a teacher education market and room for new entrants to enter the field (Ball, 2012; Barton, 2011b, Reckhow, 2013; Saltman, 2010). This new brand of activism by

²¹ Sawchuk (2012) quotes DFER's Executive Director Joe Williams as stating that DFER "was set up in 2005 with the express goal of helping to elect politicians who were less beholden to teachers; unions." (P. 5).

philanthropists in promoting particular policies has managed to shape contemporary debates about teacher education policy, and to advance particular definitions of what it means to be an educated person, what good teaching is, and how what should be involved in judging the quality of a teacher education program.

Specifically, the entrepreneurial community has been able to establish the criterion for judging the quality of a teacher education program based on how many of its graduates are able to raise students' standardized test scores at a given moment in time. They have been successful in drawing attention away from questions about the potential costs incurred in doing so (e.g., narrowing the curriculum in both K-12 and teacher education), how long these graduates stay in teaching, and how well they are able to support student learning in a broader sense beyond test scores do not get raised and discussed in this environment.²²

They have also been able to establish, as evidenced by Secretary of Education Duncan's "Blueprint for Teacher Education" (Duncan 2011), the idea that the quality of teacher education programs should be judged by the value-added test scores of the students taught by teacher education program graduates. This has been the case despite the substantial concerns that have been raised by assessment experts about the appropriateness of using student test scores to evaluate teachers and teacher education programs (e.g., Plecki, Elfers, & Nakamura, 2012; Economic Policy Institute, 2010).

²² Quinn, Tompkins- Stange, & Meyerson (2013) argue that developing and enforcing evaluative frameworks to assess the alternative institutional forms their funding helps create is one of the social processes that has been used by philanthropists to elevate and scale-up the new entrants to the education field that they fund.

The history of the role of philanthropy and public policy reveals that foundations have always been key participants in the “politics of knowledge” (Lagemann, 1992) that is associated with the allocation of private funds.

There is nothing especially novel in the subject of foundations and public policymaking, especially when we ask what tactics foundations have had at their disposal in the pursuit of new or changed public policies. They have worked to shape policies by using their influence on boards, by molding elite public opinion, by pursuing campaigns of public information and education, by creating demonstration projects, by using their financial resources strategically to leverage public funds, and by pursuing direct legislative lobbying, judicial strategies, and executive branch persuasion. They have worked at every level of government (Smith, 2009).

Despite this role of foundations in advocating particular policies, there has also been a focus over time in philanthropy in the U.S. on what has been called “scientific philanthropy.” Here, foundations have encouraged the study of problems and the exploration of various solutions and there was an effort to base the advocacy of particular positions on sound scientific evidence (Smith, 2009; Zunz, 2012). There also has been an emphasis historically on institution building, strengthening the capacity of the public institutions to deliver various services such as education (Gassman, 2012). Finally, although philanthropy has played a role in education in the U.S. for many years, the amount of money that is now provided to education is much larger now than it has been in the past. Quinn, Tompkins-Stange, and Meyerson (2013) note that “ the combined asset size of approximately 76,000

grant making foundations in the United States increased from \$272 billion in 1995 to \$625 billion in 2012.” (p.1).

There is a growing concern that the new turn in educational philanthropy toward shifting control of public education institutions to private concerns will narrow the purpose of public education to its economic aspects and ignore the broader civic and political purposes²³ that have historically been a part of our hopes for our public education system (Cuban, 2006).

The commodification of the social world imperils collective public values and collective political agency as well as the public deliberation necessary for democratic governance (Saltman, 2010,p.16).

Although the efforts of private foundations to shape public policy in education and teacher education are not new, what is new is the effort to disrupt and dismantle public institutions in favor of a preferred *a priori* solution of deregulation and markets in the absence of sound empirical evidence that has been subjected to a rigorous vetting process of peer review (Reckhow, 2013).

Although many of the new “ventures” in public education and teacher education are referred to as nonprofit, they receive generous tax advantages from the public and are able to outsource services to for-profit providers who are often associated with the venture organizations. Saltman (2010) discusses this “circle of privatization” where the public finances giving control of public institutions to private interests, and public institutions are controlled more and more by private entities using public funds.

²³ See Labaree (1992) for a discussion of the multiple purposes of public education over time.

The New Schools Venture Fund and the Disruption of the Teacher Education Market

Well beyond its financial investment, New Schools has helped shape the ideas that brought Relay Graduate School of Education into being and continues to be supportive in creating the field in which we operate, said Norm Atkins, RGSE's Co-founder and President. New Schools funded the charter school movement, and now it's playing a key role in teacher preparation (New Schools Venture Fund, 2013).²⁴

The NSVF was founded and developed in 1998 by social entrepreneur Kim Smith²⁵ and venture capitalists John Doerr and Brook Byers (Horn & Libby, 2011). According to their website, New Schools:

Has invested in more than 100 nonprofit and for-profit organizations and raised nearly \$180 million. New Schools runs 250 schools across the country-equivalent to the 33rd largest district in the country... New Schools human capital ventures have trained more than 120,00 teachers, who have reached over 12 million students (2013).²⁶

²⁴ <http://www.newschoools.org/venture/relay-school-of-education>

²⁵ Kim Smith, along with another key former NSVF staffer Jonathan Schorr, was also part of the founding team of *Teach for America*.

²⁶ The 2012 annual report for NSVF presents more recent data on everything but how many teachers have been prepared by its teacher education programs. It states that their ventures operate 331 schools that enroll 130,500 students (83 per cent of whom are low income) and that 350,000 students have been taught by teachers trained by their ventures. It also states that since its founding in 1998 it has raised \$248 million dollars. <http://www.newschoools.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012AnnualReport.pdf>

The NSVF²⁷ has been a major player in the K-12 charter school movement investing mainly in established charter management organizations that have included ASPIRE, the Achievement Network, KIPP, MATCH Rocketship, Uncommon Schools, and the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) that runs “turn around schools” in Chicago. New School’s work in “disrupting” K-12 education has brought it and its current CEO, Ted Mitchell, acclaim from *Forbes* magazine. In 2012, *Forbes* named NSVF as one of its top two choices for philanthropically minded donors and put CEO Ted Mitchell on its list of the top 15 “education disruptors.”

Although NSVF’s role in teacher preparation has been relatively minor to date, it has funded a number of the most visible “early entry” programs²⁸ including Teach for America, The New Teacher Project, and Relay Graduate School of Education as well as residency program for MATCH charter schools. It has also funded the Urban Teacher Center that prepares teachers for charter and public schools in Baltimore and Washington, D.C. The goal of the investments of NSVF has been to promote deregulation and privatization in K-12 and teacher and leader education so that there will be room for the new programs they fund.²⁹

²⁷ NSVF provides a list of its donors, which include both individuals and foundations at <http://www.newschools.org/donors>. The website of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation lists a little over \$76 million dollars of grants that it funneled through New Schools between 2003 and 2012. These grants supported a range of activities, with the emphasis on supporting Charter Management Organizations.

²⁸ Grossman & Loeb define “early entry” programs as those where individuals complete much of their teacher education program while they are teachers of record fully responsible for classrooms.

²⁹ 990 Tax forms indicate that NSVF invested \$3,312,253 in the New Teacher Project between 2007-11, \$1,108,125 in TFA in 2009-2011, \$500,000 in Relay School of Education in 2011, and \$1,563,722 in the Urban Teacher Center between 2009-2011. The investments in two of these programs listed on the 990 forms differ from those listed on the NSVF website, where the amounts are actually significantly

In teacher education, NSVF has adopted the mantra that the college and university system needs to be “profoundly disrupted” and that the belief that current teacher education programs serve as unnecessary barriers to entry to teaching and focus too much on what is viewed as unnecessary educational theory (e.g., Hess, 2009; Matthews, 2010). The teacher education ventures supported by NSVF have focused on making teacher education more clinically based, on preparing teachers for the “gritty realities” of teaching, and using an accountability model that requires its teachers to demonstrate that they can raise their students’ standardized test scores a certain degree before they can complete their programs. According to former NSVF staffer Jonathan Schorr (2012).³⁰

The new generation of teacher education programs offer new solutions to an old problem and are committed not to fixing ed schools, but to reinventing them. Most emerge not from universities, but from autonomous, typically non-profit organizations. They move the locus for much of their training to the school building, aiming to be more practical and clinical in approach than their traditional forbearers (p. 5).

The Role of New Schools in the GREAT Act

New Schools aims to seed a market of autonomous, outcomes-oriented teacher preparation organizations, and set a new standard for teacher preparation with student learning at the center... Our policy advocacy work

higher- \$1,000,000 in Relay Graduate School of Education, and \$2,438,722 in the Urban Teaching Center- and accompanied by a \$1,000,000 investment in the MATCH teacher residency program.

³⁰ Schorr has just joined the communications team in the U.S. Department of Education.

supports this effort by advancing public policy that helps to create demand and provide support and funding for performance-based teacher preparation (New Schools Venture Fund).³¹

The move to create a vibrant market for high quality teacher training took an important step today (Riley, 2011).³²

In order to further the goal of creating a market in teacher education by reducing the role of university teacher education programs thereby “creating space for innovation” (Riley, 2011),³³ two staff of the NSVF together with two other leaders in efforts to disrupt the teacher education market and “create space for innovation” (Riley, 2011)³⁴ helped develop and promote a particular piece of legislation that will potentially have a major impact on the nature of teacher education in the U.S. In March 2011, four people came together in Washington D.C. to discuss ways to further the deregulation of teacher education with several sympathetic legislators and their staff: these four people are: Norm Atkins, the founder of Teacher U/Relay Graduate School of Education, Tim Knowles, the

³¹ <http://www.newschoools.org/funds/investment/people>

³² <http://www.newschoools.org/blog/great-act-update> 2/27/12. This post was written after the House version of the legislation discussed in this section was introduced by John Kline of Minnesota (R) the chair of the House Education and Workforce Committee.

³³ <http://www.newschoools.org/blog/great-act-qa>

³⁴ <http://www.newschoools.org/blog/great-act-qa>

director of the Urban Education Institute at the University of Chicago, Julie Mikuta³⁵ who leads human capital investment work for NSVF and Ben Riley, a staffer at NSVF.

The result of these conversations was a legislative initiative, co-sponsored by Colorado Senator Michael Bennett (D), Tennessee's Lamar Alexander (R), Maryland's Barbara Mikulski (D) and Mark Kirk (R) of Illinois. This bill, the "Growing Excellent Achievement Training Academies for Teachers and Principals Act" (GREAT Act) would provide for state-based competitive grant programs to essentially create charter teacher and principal preparation programs that would not be subject to many of the current state regulations that are used to monitor the quality of preparation programs.³⁶

On May 23, 2013, the GREAT Act was reintroduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives in the 113th Congress by two bi-partisan groups of representatives and Senators.³⁷ The charter teacher preparation programs which would result from the passage of these bills³⁸ in Congress would be required to prepare teachers to serve in "high needs" areas and hard to staff subjects³⁹ would have the following characteristics: (a) "rigorous selection" based on potential to be

³⁵ Julie Mikuta is also a former TFA teacher, Vice-President for Alumni Affairs for TFA and the former chair of the Board of Stand for Children.

³⁶ The original Senate version of this bill is SR1250 and the original House version is HR3990. They were included as a part of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reauthorization that was not acted on in the 112th Congress.

³⁷ Amy Klobuchar (MN-D) joined the original group of five sponsors (see above) in the Senate, and the House version was reintroduced by Tom Petri (WI-R) and Jared Polis (CO-D). <http://www.bennet.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/bennet-introduces-bipartisan-bill-to-create-academies-that-prepare-great-teachers-and-principals>. <http://petri.house.gov/press-release/petri-polis-introduce-bipartisan-bill-improve-teacher-and-principal-preparation>.

³⁸ These bills are HR2196 and S 1052.

³⁹ We will focus only on the teacher education aspects of this legislation.

an effective teacher; (b) hands-on clinical training that will prepare teachers to be effective from their very first day on the job; and (c) a program completion requirement standard that requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to improve student academic achievement to complete their program.

A key element of the legislation is that states and state authorizers of the charter programs must agree to enable these programs to be free of “unnecessary input-based regulations” that currently exist to monitor the quality of teacher education programs. It is not clear from the legislation itself or from commentary about it exactly what regulations these programs would need to be exempted from, but the intent here is very clear, to bypass state regulations that are felt to inhibit innovation in preparing teachers. Interestingly, Education schools can apply to be classified as charter programs or academies and to receive the money that these programs would be granted by states.

The logic here is very similar to the strategy that has been used by the Obama administration in the Race to the Top (RTT) competition. States will be able to compete for federal funds to support charter teacher academies if they agree to policy conditions that are supportive of the market-driven reforms favored by the administration.⁴⁰ It should be noted that Joanne Weiss, former Chief Operating Officer of NSVF, and the current Chief of Staff for the Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, directed the initial RTT competition.⁴¹

⁴⁰ According to Crowe (2011), this strategy was enormously successful in getting states to change their teacher education regulation such as allowing non-university programs to operate within their borders.

⁴¹ James Shelton, a former NSVF and Gates Foundation staffer was brought in by Duncan to direct the Office of Innovation and Improvement that runs the other

A letter dated 6/21/2011 was circulated to selected groups and individuals across the county to seek endorsements for the GREAT Act. Among its advocates are organizations that have been supportive of the agenda of New Schools and in some cases have been invested in by them. These include a number of major charter management organizations like Green Dot, KIPP, Aspire and MATCH, teacher education programs like Teach for America, The New Teacher Project, the Urban Teacher Center, Boston Teacher Residency, Academy for Urban School Leadership, Relay School of Education; educational advocacy organizations such as Democrats for Education Reform, Stand for Children, the Education Trust, and various individuals such as Karen Symms Gallagher, the Dean of the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California, Johns Hopkins School of Education, Jane Hannaway of the Urban Institute, and Jean Claude Brizard, the former CEO of Chicago Public schools.⁴² Tax forms for New Schools indicate that it spent \$90,000 in lobbying for charter schools, the GREAT Act and teacher preparation in 2011 and 2012. It is not clear from these forms how much of the \$90,000 went to support the charter teacher and principal preparation bill.

major competitions run by the Education Department- the Innovation in Education Grants. Three additional former New Schools staff also went to the U.S. Education Department as Director of Special Initiatives in the Office of Improvement and Innovation (Shivam Shah), as Specialist in the Office of the Secretary of Education (Marisa White Bold), and as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Communication Development (Jonathan Schorr).

⁴² The endorsement by the Dean of USC's Education school does not necessarily imply the endorsement by the faculty. It is unclear what the endorsement of the Johns Hopkins School of Education means. Julie Mikuta of NSVF and one of the key players in pushing the GREAT Act was a visiting Fellow at this Education school in 2011. The Hopkins School of Education which did not publically support the original bill signed on in support of the bill after Mikuta's time there.

It is very clear that NSVF is seeking to position its current and future ventures in teacher education as the prototypes to be scaled up once the GREAT Act passes, and to use these ventures to shut down and/or mold existing university teacher education programs.

The vision is to keep expanding so that in a decade from now, 10,000 teachers in cities around the country are enrolled in an umbrella of Relays (Caperton & Whitmire, 2012, p.80).

Jonathan Schorr, (2012) a former NSVF staffer, published an article in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* in which the Relay Graduate School of Education is featured as the future for the field. This and other articles such as Kronholtz's (2012) piece on Relay in the journal *Education Next*, identify the program as bold and innovative and Schorr (2012) claims that Relay "has become the leading symbol of a burgeoning revolution in how America is learning to teach" (p.2). Caperton & Whitmire (2012) in a College Board publication assert that Relay is "a leader in the burgeoning movement to overhaul the way America trains its teachers for work in the highest-need schools (p.76). Finally, Kronholtz (2012) quotes Arthur Levine whose 2006 report on education schools in the U.S. is quoted by every reformer who declares university teacher education to be a failure as stating that "Relay is the model...It is the future" (p. 2).⁴³

Two reasons are given by most for calling it a bold an innovative program: Its

⁴³ Articles proclaiming Relay as bold and innovative have also appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* (LeMov, 2012), and the *New York Times* (Otterman, 2011). These and other articles have appeared praising the innovativeness of Relay despite the fact that "even Relay's admirers concede that it's too soon to tell whether the model works." (Kronholtz, 2012, p. 2).

requirement that teachers⁴⁴ must demonstrate their ability to increase student achievement on standardized tests in order to complete the program and its emphasis on what is referred to as “hands on clinical training.” No data has been provided about the success of Relay graduates beyond personal testimonials such as the following:

Many also told me that Relay’s lessons have changed their classroom culture.

“The culture went from being compliant to being invested,” said Max Silverstein, a Penn State business major now teaching in an early-childhood classroom at Newark Legacy charter school. I heard the same thing from Alonte Johnson, a Morehouse College English major who is teaching middle school English at Kings Collegiate Center School in Brooklyn. A few days earlier, his students designed a seating chart that paired the better and slower readers. “The environment is more interdependent instead of everyone working for me, he said” (Kronholtz, 2012, p. 6).⁴⁵

A video presentation by Brent Maddin the “provost” of Relay on the development and content of the program⁴⁶ does not indicate attention to any existing research in teacher education in the development of the program and indicates a strong emphasis in the curriculum on ensuring that its teachers master the classroom management strategies compiled by Relay faculty member Doug Lemov (Lemov, 2010) who is also the managing director of Uncommon Schools, one

⁴⁴ All of the teachers in Relay are teachers of record fully responsible for classrooms.

⁴⁵ After our search of the literature for studies on the impact and effectiveness of the program did not turn up any studies, we confirmed with Relay’s research director Billie Gastic that there is no existing research on the program.

⁴⁶ <http://www.teachingworks.org/training/seminar-series/event/detail/relay-graduate-school-of-education>

of the three charter school networks that was involved in the founding of Relay.⁴⁷ Lemov's (2010) strategies are based on his own observations and conversations with teachers and administrators in various charter schools that he claims are high performing. By any reasonable standard, these strategies do not possess the kind of rigorous scientific warrant that is being called for in teacher education curriculum (Pianta, 2011). In fact, there is substantial evidence demonstrating the negative effects on students living in poverty of an obsessive pursuit of higher test scores in "no excuses" environments such as when the curriculum is stripped down to focus primarily on drill and practice for test taking (Nichols & Berliner 2007, Lipman, 2004; McNeil, 2000; Valenzuela, 2005).

Beyond the media blitz promoting Relay, the most obvious effort of the NSVF to position its own ventures to be ready to expand and grow as soon as the GREAT Act becomes law and begins to be adopted by states⁴⁸ is its recently announced "Learning to Teach Entrepreneur in Residence Program" ⁴⁹developed in partnership with Teach for America. In this program, which begins in the summer of 2013 New Schools will fund two TFA alumni or teams of TFA alumni to spend from six to ten

⁴⁷ Otterman (2011) argues that LeMov's work is the "backbone of instruction" at Teacher U which evolved into Relay.

⁴⁸ Another example is NSVF support for the extension of the temporary federal waiver that allows individuals who have not yet completed their teacher education programs to be classified as "highly qualified." See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/18/house-panel-mulls-legislation_1683925.html. This waiver was a way for the U.S. Education Department to get around the ruling against them in the Renee vs. Duncan decision in the ninth Circuit Court in a lawsuit by parents and advocacy groups in California objecting to calling teachers "highly qualified" who were completing their preparation as teachers of record.

http://www.lawyerscommittee.org/projects/education/press_releases?id=0143

⁴⁹ <http://www.newschools.org/initiatives/ltt-2013-eir>

months “laying the groundwork for a new organization that will prepare teachers for schools in low- income communities” (p.1). The NSVF proudly proclaims that it:

is aiming to profoundly disrupt the current teacher preparation market by unleashing talent in growing bold, innovative solutions where the primary focus is on developing new teachers who are able to make student growth of at least one year from their first year as a classroom teacher. (p.1).⁵⁰

The entrepreneurs will receive assistance from NSVF and Teach for America in developing their ventures (program models) and will be able to learn:

“from other pioneers” (other founders and funders) in the field by spending time with New Schools existing portfolio organizations like the Relay Graduate School of Education, New Teacher Center, the Urban Teacher Center, Match Charter Sposato School of Education/Match Teacher Residency.” (p.1)

Another effort by NSVF to legitimate its ventures in teacher education and position itself and its ventures to be in a position to develop and grow in influence in the field is its formation in 2009- with support from the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and later from the Gates Foundation- of a Learning to Teach Community of Practice. This Community of Practice involves about 40 teacher education programs including those situated in Education schools at Stanford University, the University of Michigan, University of

⁵⁰ All of the teachers in Relay are teachers of record fully responsible for their own classrooms. One likely consequence of this requirement if it becomes established as the measure of a good teacher education as NSVF intends is that there will be a growth in “early entry” programs where teachers complete their preparation while they are teachers of record.

Southern California and the University of Washington, and what are referred to as “entrepreneurial” programs such as Relay, the Boston Teacher Residency, the Academy for Urban School Leadership Residency, Match Teacher Residency, The New Teacher Project, and TFA.⁵¹

NSVF has since partnered with the School of Education at the University of Michigan to form *Teaching Works* an organization that brings together entrepreneurial and university programs that are identified on the Teaching Works website as “leading innovators across the country who are engaged in major redesign of teacher training and beginning teacher support.”⁵² *Teaching Works* holds regular seminars at the University of Michigan where leaders of the various member programs present aspects of their work.⁵³

While there is nothing wrong per se with bringing together teacher educators from a variety of different programs to share practices and learn from one another, many entrepreneurial programs are linked to a movement aiming to reduce or eliminate public oversight over the preparation of teachers and create a market economy in teacher education in the U.S. *rather* than investing in building greater quality and capacity in Education schools. While both sets of programs share a concern with teaching teachers how to enact teaching practices for which there is allegedly some basis for believing that they will support desired student learning outcomes, the university and entrepreneurial programs often have very different visions of the role of teacher for which individuals are being prepared and about the

⁵¹ <http://www.newschools.org/event/learning-to-teach-community-of-practice>

⁵² <http://www.teachingworks.org/about/annualreport>

⁵³ <http://www.teachingworks.org/training/seminar-series>

measures of teaching success. Entrepreneurial programs like Relay and the AUSL residency are designed to prepare teachers for “no excuses” charter and turnaround schools that emphasize increasing student test scores as the major goal⁵⁴

Conversely, many university programs which are under attack link the preparation of teachers to enact “high-leverage” teaching practices to the teaching of particular subject matter content and to a broader view of the teaching role, and they focus more on providing students with access to a rich curriculum that includes a focus on understanding, critical thinking, and the application of knowledge to real life contexts (Zeichner, 2012). Market-based solutions and the “no excuses” schools that are a central part of venture capital and big philanthropy’s approach to educational reform are staffed mostly by those prepared in the entrepreneurial programs and exclusively serve children living in poverty. In these “no excuses” schools there is substantial evidence of the narrowing of the curriculum (Berliner, 2011) and of limiting students’ opportunities to interact with knowledge in meaningful and genuine ways in these stripped down versions of schools (e.g. Cuban, 2012; Goodman, 2013; Orfield & Frakenberg, 2013)

One argument put forth by some faculty in Education schools that are involved with NSVF is that getting involved with them will create potential opportunities to influence them and educate them about the field they seek to

⁵⁴ See Goodman (2013) for an example of how this exclusive focus on raising test scores rather than a focus on learning. It should be noted that the curriculum of the AUSL residency is broader than that in the RELAY program, and that based on our observations and interactions with program faculty, there appear to be tensions between the AUSL and National Louis University partners in the Chicago residency around the amount of emphasis that should be given to Lemov’s strategies.

transform but often know little about.⁵⁵ We believe that this belief is illusory and that in the end entrepreneurial programs will benefit from the status of research universities like Stanford, Michigan and Washington, but that they will allow little influence on their policy agendas. This belief is confirmed by a session at the 2012 New Schools Annual Summit that attracts funders and reformers from throughout the nation on “Building better teachers: How to start a teacher education program” that included participants from several entrepreneurial programs (Aspire, MATCH, and AUSL teacher residencies and Relay), but not a single university teacher educator although a number of them were in attendance. This belief is also confirmed by the comments of Ben Riley of NSVF in a symposium at the 2013 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Education in which he spoke about the need for Education schools to accept the definitions of accountability and responsibility promoted by the entrepreneurial community based largely on standardized test scores.⁵⁶

One thing that the Education schools can potentially gain from linking up with the New School Venture Fund and programs like the ones it funds is access to some of the enormous amount of money that has been accumulated in the entrepreneurial sector. Given the deep cuts that have been made by states in public universities in recent years and the limited degrees of freedom Education schools

⁵⁵ It is typical for the developers of entrepreneurial teacher education programs to ignore scholarship in the field and by independent analysts (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; National Research Council, 2010; Wilson, Floden & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001) in discussions of what they examined in developing their programs. The Teaching Works discussion of the development of Relay School of Education (<http://www.teachingworks.org/training/seminar-series/event/detail/relay-graduate-school-of-education>) is a good example of this.

⁵⁶ https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=136&ref=

have to raise tuition (e.g., Lyall & Sell, 2006; Newfield, 2008), many public Education schools have been put in the position of having to find new revenues to replace the lost state support. For example, Teaching Works' Partnership with NSVF led to an investment in their work of \$100,000 by NSVF in 2012.⁵⁷

In a recent article in *Education Week* titled "Teacher-Prep programs zero in on effective practice" (Sawchuck, 2013) several teacher education programs (MATCH & Boston Teacher Residencies, Relay, and the University of Washington elementary teacher education program) are lumped together because of their common focus on wanting to provide strong school-based clinical experiences for teacher candidates where they learn to enact a set of teaching and classroom management practices that there is reason to believe will help them be successful in the settings for which they are being prepared to teach. They do this by repeated practice of these teaching strategies in real classrooms with careful mentoring.

What is not addressed in this article or in the alliance within *Teaching Works* of entrepreneurial and university programs are the different visions of the role of teacher and what is required to teach well that exists among these programs. For example, programs like Relay that place a strong emphasis on the mastery of Lemov's (2010) 49 techniques to become a champion teacher (e.g., "strong voice").⁵⁸ University programs like those at the University of Washington situate the acquisition of the ability to enact high-leverage teaching practices within a vision of the role of teachers who understand the communities in which they work and are culturally competent, have acquired adaptive expertise and the ability to adapt their

⁵⁷ www.newschools.org/venture/teachingworks

⁵⁸ <http://www.relay.edu/videos?vidid=6>

teaching to meet the constantly changing needs of their students, have learned how to learn in and from their practice to become better at teaching as long as they teach and have an in-depth understanding of content knowledge and the pedagogical practices to help promote understanding of this content, research on learning and development, assessment, how second languages are acquired and so on. The different ideological agendas with which these programs are associated are also ignored: one set of programs seeks to contribute to strengthening public education while the other aims to deregulate and create market competition in public education and teacher education.

Has University Teacher Education Failed and is Educational Entrepreneurism the Answer?

By almost any standard, many, if not most of the nation's 1,450 schools, colleges, and departments of education are doing a mediocre job of preparing teachers for the realities of the 21st century classroom (Duncan, 2009,p.).

America has a broken teacher preparation system. The majority of teachers attest to feeling ill-equipped for the classroom and leave the profession at astonishing rates (Knowles, 2013,p.6).

The mantra recited over and over by reformers in the academic literature and popular media that the university teacher education system is broken and

needs to be replaced by deregulation and greater competition⁵⁹ is based on several major assertions such as: teacher education programs are not selective in who they admit, teacher educators spend too much time on theory *at the expense of* the acquisition of practical expertise, teacher educators lack recent teaching experience and are not familiar with the schools for which teachers are being prepared, about one-half of teachers leave teaching by the end of 5-years, and universities do not adequately support their teacher education programs (e.g., Knowles, 2013; Kronholz, 2012; Levine, 2011).

The reform literature never cites any of the major peer-reviewed studies of the field sponsored by such groups as the National Research Council the American Educational Research Association, or the National Academy of Education (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2005, National Research Council, 2010).⁶⁰ The only study that is cited in almost every indictment of the

⁵⁹ NSVF staffer Ben Riley referred to teacher education as “the most retrograde sector of education” in his remarks to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in February, 2013.

(https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=136&ref=rl)

⁶⁰ One exception to this is in a July 24, 2012 hearing on Alternative teacher certification in the House Education and Workforce Committee where reference was made twice to an AERA peer-reviewed synthesis of the research on alternative pathways to teaching (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). In these references to this review by the chair of the committee and one of the witnesses who was asked to testify, the review was inaccurately portrayed as concluding that there is no difference in the competence of teachers who were prepared in traditional university programs and alternative programs. In fact, one of the main conclusions of the review was that there was more variation within than between these categories.

http://edworkforcehouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=105

current system of teacher education is the study of teacher education programs that are sponsored by Education schools conducted by Arthur Levine (2006).⁶¹

Arthur Levine's Study of Teacher Education in Education Schools

There are several aspects of Levine's (2006) report that should be noted in light of the extensive reference to it by critics of university teacher education who advocate for deregulation and a teacher education market. First, is the lack of any evidence of the simplest test of rigor: independent peer review. Although there are elements of truth revealed in this report about weaknesses in some teacher education programs, there are a number of instances where inadequately substantiated assertions are made that highlight the negative, and in some cases either overstate a point, or are clearly inaccurate. Take, for example, the inaccurate assertion is a statement about the alleged lack of attention to clinical experience in teacher education programs:

Students have limited clinical or fieldwork experience today in most teacher education programs; it consists only of the short time spent student teaching (p.39).⁶²

While this statement may have been true in the 1960s and 1970s, most states have formulated regulations over the last 30 years that not only require student teaching, but also additional pre-student teaching clinical experiences. For example, the current requirements for clinical experiences in teacher education according to

⁶¹ Arthur Levine is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Relay Graduate School of Education.

⁶² Duncan (2011) goes further in misrepresenting the reality in university teacher education by asserting "Only 50 percent of current teacher candidates receive supervised clinical training" (p. 5).

the database compiled by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification ⁶³ include 38 states that require observation and clinical experiences prior to student teaching, and 36 states that require at least 10 weeks of student teaching. Additionally, in the state of Washington all programs include clinical work of at least 10 weeks of student teaching even though this is not required by the state in its competency-based requirements.

These data are confirmed by a recent report done by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2013) that includes survey responses from 95 percent of its 800 institutional members. With regard to the issue of how pervasive clinical experiences are in university sponsored teacher education programs the report states:

Virtually all programs require supervised student teaching or an internship for graduation, although the required duration varies: The average bachelor's-level clinical requirement ranges from 500 to 562 total clock hours (mean=14.50 weeks); the average master's-level clinical requirement ranges from 480 to 586 total clock hours (mean=14.52 weeks). Preparation programs also require students to participate in early field experiences: The average bachelor's-level requirement ranges from 114 to 189 clock hours; the average master's-level requirement ranges from 111 to 164 clock hours(p.9).

A second aspect of this report is extreme and unsupported comments made by Levine (2006) in various places in his report that would never survive a rigorous peer-review process. For example, Levine asserts:

⁶³ www.nasdtc.net

Most universities, after a barrage of reports over the past two decades on the need to strengthen teacher education did little or nothing (p. 22).

Levine also attempts, without any grounds for doing so, to tie the alleged lack of clinical experience in programs to graduate dissatisfaction of program graduates with their preparation programs. One element of Levine's (2006) study is a series of surveys of university teacher education faculty, Deans of Education schools, graduates of university teacher education programs, and principals.

Alumni who were critical of their teacher education programs often pointed to the price they paid later for their limited practical experience. As one of them put it, "I do not feel that I was prepared for the realities of life in a school or classroom as a teacher" (p.41).

Another graduate is cited as saying:

I could talk about Carl Jung, scaffolding, cooperative learning groups (and) the advantages of constructivism," but had no idea about what to do when "Johnny goes nuts in the back of the class, or when Lisa comes in abused, or when Sue hasn't eaten in three days."

Citing Levine's (2006) study as evidence that university teacher education graduates do not think that their preparation prepared them for teaching has become common practice among reformers. For example, Schorr (2013) notes:

In a seminal 2006 study by Arthur Levine, more than three in five teachers said their training left them unprepared for the classroom and principals agreed (p.3).

Arne Duncan (2009) also referred to Levine's (2006) surveys in his address to Teachers College, Columbia University.

As you know, the most recent comprehensive study of teacher education was carried out by Arthur Levine, President of Teachers College... More than 3 in 5 ed school alums surveyed for the Levine report said that their training did not prepare them adequately for their work in the classroom (p. 3).

Finally when the GREAT Act was reintroduced to the Senate and House of Representatives on May 23, 2013 both Senator Michael Bennett (CO-D) in the Senate and Tom Petri (WI-R) in the House referred to the Levine (2006) study as part of making their case for the bill. No other study or report was referred to in either presentation.

A leading study of 28 teacher training programs revealed that more than 60 percent of alumni said that they were not adequately prepared for the classroom ⁶⁴

According to a leading study 61 percent of ed school alumni reported that schools of education at four-year colleges did not adequately prepare their graduates for the classroom. ⁶⁵

Although the surveys in Levine's (2006) study identify some of the problems in teacher education that have been discussed in the literature for many years, it is not the only survey that has been conducted on teachers' assessments the value of

⁶⁴ <http://www.bennet.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/bennet-introduces-bipartisan-bill-to-create-academies-that-prepare-great-teachers-and-principals>

⁶⁵ <http://petri.house.gov/press-release/petri-polis-introduce-bipartisan-bill-improve-teacher-and-principal-preparation>

their preparation programs.⁶⁶ Although some of the more recent surveys also show that teachers have problems with aspects of their preparation, they also present a more positive picture than Levine's surveys. For example, a recent survey of 500 beginning teachers in the first three years of their careers commissioned by the American Federation of Teachers (2013) found that:

Two-thirds (66 percent) of new teachers felt completely (19 percent) or mostly (47 percent) prepared when they first started teaching while 34 percent said they felt just somewhat prepared or not prepared at all... (p.21).

This study also found that:

Teachers who completed an alternative training or certification program recall feeling less prepared (only 42 percent felt completely or mostly prepared) than teachers who followed the traditional path (p.22).

Several other surveys of teachers which asked them to evaluate the quality of their preparation programs also show a more positive portrait of teacher education programs than Levine's surveys including: (a) Eduventure's (2009) study of 1,504 teachers with five years or less in the field which indicated that 78 percent of teachers felt well prepared when they entered the field; (b) the National

⁶⁶ It is not clear from the information that has been made publicly available by Levine whether those who actually responded to the surveys: 53 percent of the Deans, 40 percent of the faculty, 34 percent of alumni are representative of the population surveyed. No claims were made about the representiveness of the sample of principals. It is also the case that inadequate information is provided about how the specific data collected in the case studies were gathered and how the examples from the case studies cited in the report are warranted by these data. The sparse description of the case study methodology and total lack of discussion of the analysis process would not pass the test of an independent peer review.

Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality and Public Agenda surveys of 641 first year teachers conducted in the spring of 2007 which indicated that 80 percent of teachers felt very or somewhat prepared for teaching in their first year (Public Agenda 2008) ; and (c) a 2011 survey of 2,500 randomly selected K-12 public school teachers, which found that 65 percent of teachers rated their preparation program as excellent or very good and another 24 percent rated it as good (Feistrizer, Griffin, & Linnajarvi, 2011).

All of these surveys reveal some teacher dissatisfaction with the quality of their preparation for teaching, and none of them were independently peer-reviewed. The question is why critics of university ed schools and advocates for deregulation and markets continue to cite only Levine's (2006) study and additionally only report the negative aspects of Levine's findings while ignoring the positive things that he says about university teacher preparation and other similar surveys.

Despite the negative assertions made by Levine about the satisfaction of teacher education program graduates with the quality of their preparation programs, there are a number of places in the report where Levine notes excellence in university teacher education or the limited amount of responsibility that can reasonably be placed on education schools alone for the problems in public education. For example,

It is critical to recognize that weaknesses in teacher education are not the primary reason we do not have more and better teaching. Schools and government bear a larger responsibility for low salaries... for an absence of

teacher induction programs, low hiring standards, and poor working conditions which cause high teacher turnover (p.21).

Despite these moments of more balanced analysis, the overwhelming focus in public accounts of the report is on what are seen to be negative aspects of teacher education. This negativity was picked up by the media reports of the study soon after its release with titles like “ Study Says Teacher Training is Chaotic,” (Feller 2006), “Prominent Teacher Educator Assails Field,” (Honawar, 2006), “Report Critical of Training of Teachers,” (Finder, 2006), and “No Teacher Left Behind.” (Dow Jones, 2006).

Theory vs. Practice in Teacher Education

One major aspect of the critique of the role of universities in educating teachers is the construction of stereotypes about the nature of these programs where they are seen as emphasizing theory *at the expense of* preparation in effective teaching practices. Capperton & Whitmire’s (2013) discussion of what they see as the positive aspects of the Relay Graduate School of Education’s teacher preparation programs clearly reveals this caricature of university teacher education.

Gone are the courses on education theory and history with no practical bearing... Professors are not lofty academics, they are accomplished practitioners in the field (p.77).

Relay provost Brent Maddin said the key is not to weed out theory, but rather to distill it down to essential points for the extremely busy teacher (p.83).

The image of university teacher preparation that is presented in the reform literature is of preparation programs with instructors who have not been teachers for many years and who are out of touch with the complexities of today's public schools. In contrast the reform oriented teacher education programs like Relay are portrayed as intensely focused on drilling teachers in the mastery of particular teaching and classroom management practices. For example, a class at Relay is described as follows:

The classroom lessons are heavily scripted. During the first three minutes of the Engaging Everybody class, for example, the Relay students are to report on how often they're using the four techniques. The script then lists four paragraphs of narrative and questions for the Relay professor⁶⁷ to pose over the next four minutes. For five minutes after that, there's a review, with 10 questions for the professor to ask, and then a suggested transition: "All right, our minds are fresh on today's content and we're ready to move." Then there's a guided 7-minute guided "table discussion," 5 minutes of classroom discussion, 11 minutes of partner feedback, and so on (Kronholz, 2012, p.4).

The caricature of university teacher education programs that is common in the reform literature ignores the growing presence of teachers and former teachers with recent experience in instructional and coaching roles in teacher education programs (Zeichner, 2010), the shift over the last two decades to conducting more of teacher preparation in schools, and the shift over many years toward a

⁶⁷ Although Relay is authorized to offer Master's degrees through the state of N.Y., it is not a university but a free -standing normal school type institution.

competency and standards or practice-based based approach that focuses on the acquisition of particular teaching strategies (Zeichner, 2005).

What's Wrong with the Critique of Ed Schools?

The peer-reviewed literature on teacher education shows variable quality with regard to the indictments of the current system of preparing teachers. While there is some truth to the criticisms of the reformers, their analyses greatly oversimplify a much more complex situation.

To hold teacher education up as solely responsible for the problem of teacher quality and retention in urban schools, as much of the reform literature and both the Senate and House introductions of the GREAT Act in the 113th Congress have done, ignores a substantial amount of evidence that ties for example, teachers learning and leaving the profession to the quality of the conditions in their workplace (e.g., Johnson, Kraft, & Papay, 2012). To only look at which teachers can raise standardized test scores at a given moment in time and to ignore the inservice realities and retention of teachers as well as variation in different communities' access to experienced teachers flies in the face of research that has documented the value of teachers' working conditions and teacher experience to student learning (Ronfeldt, Loeb, Papay, 2013) and the high cost of teacher turnover (NCTAF, 2007)⁶⁸.

To compare the academic qualifications of the graduates of elite universities who are in some of the "early entry" programs like TFA with that of the graduates of

⁶⁸ Even advocates of deregulation accept the research showing the importance of teacher experience. For example, "research is very clear that teachers become more effective in raising student achievement with classroom experience. (Chubb, 2012, p.66).

university teacher education programs in general ignores the evidence that shows the improvements made over time in the academic competence teacher education students particularly at the secondary level (e.g., Gitomer, 2007); such comparisons also ignore the challenges posed by the size of the teaching force in the U.S. (about 3.6 million) versus in other countries like Finland and Singapore which only admit individuals from among their top secondary school graduates to teacher education programs (Tucker, 2011). Finally, to indict teacher educators in university programs as being uniformly out of touch with current classroom conditions ignores the growing presence of hybrid roles in teacher education that have engaged more practicing teachers in instruction in university preparation programs (Zeichner, 2010).

Advocates of disrupting the teacher education system frequently call for only admitting individuals to teacher education and teaching from the top tiers of secondary school performance and point to the strong academic caliber of the TFA and other early entry program recruits who mostly do not continue in teaching beyond the first few years.⁶⁹ They claim that it is possible for us to staff our nation's schools with academically stronger individuals if we increase our reliance on these programs that encourage individuals to teach only for a few years.

There are several issues here that we would like to raise. First, the strong academic backgrounds of TFA like recruits do not necessarily mean that their

⁶⁹ Although a recent study that found that more Teach for America Teachers stay in teaching somewhat longer than is generally thought by critics, it concludes that the “revolving door transfer of teachers from the schools that most need skilled, experienced teachers remains a serious problem.” (Donaldson & Moore Johnson, 2011, p.51).

backgrounds are relevant to teaching successfully, particularly in poverty-impacted schools. In the TFA program run by faculty at our own university, several students who were accepted by TFA to teach particular subjects and were sent to Seattle to enter the certification program did not meet the subject matter standards at our university for entering a teacher education program in those subject areas. While it may be less expensive in the short run to depend on a teaching force with a larger percentage of cheaply paid and temporary teachers to be replaced when they leave with similar teachers, using this as a strategy for improving teacher quality is problematic given the research on the negative effects of teacher dropouts on student learning (Ronfeldt, Loeb & Wykoff, 2013). This strategy becomes more problematic when we consider that these short-term teachers teach almost exclusively in schools attended by urban and rural students in communities greatly impacted by poverty (Peske & Haycock, 2006).

It is clear that there is a need for much improvement in our college and university system of teacher education and that state program approval and national program accreditation has failed to improve or get rid of some weak programs (National Research Council, 2010). The need to improve the system does not mean that many improvements have not been and are not currently being made and that the solution is to turn the job of preparing teachers over to the private sector.

Are Entrepreneur Designed Programs the Solution?

On the other side, the claims about the superiority of the programs like Relay that have been funded by venture philanthropy over university programs are based

on an acceptance of the claim that these programs have proven their ability to produce graduates who have demonstrated their ability to raise student standardized test scores at least a year. Advocates also sometimes point to some evidence that standardized test scores have gone up and more students than before have gone to college in the charter schools where teachers prepared by the entrepreneurial programs have taught.

The educational entrepreneurs who are brought in by venture philanthropists to develop and run start-up teacher education programs are referred to in glowing terms in the literature on educational entrepreneurship. For example, Hess (2006) refers to them as “pioneers,” “visionary thinkers,” “the engines of progress,” “imaginative, creative and talented,” and these assertions are taken at face value in calls to deregulate and create a market economy in U.S. teacher education.

The absence of research demonstrating the superiority of entrepreneurial programs supported by NSVF like Relay, MATCH teacher residency, and the Urban Teaching Center in the preparation of teachers even by their own standard of quality based in student standardized test scores raises serious questions about the warrant for these claims. Saying over and over again that these programs are innovative, groundbreaking and bold does not make it true in the absence of solid research evidence.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ It is ironic that university teacher education is criticized for not being able to put forth evidence demonstrating the efficacy of its programs, when those who engage in these criticisms are unable to do so themselves.

Even in some cases where it can be shown that students in charter schools staffed by graduates of these entrepreneurial programs show improved test score results and graduation rates, it has not been demonstrated that the nature and quality of the teacher education programs has been responsible for these gains. (See Zeichner & Conklin, 2005 for a discussion of this issue).

Further concerns are raised about the ethics of this approach when we read statements like the following in the literature on educational entrepreneurship.

The expectation is not that the typical venture will improve upon the status quo, only that some will do so. Some ideas won't pan out and many will fail. (Hess, 2006, p.3).

Both philanthropists and the broader public must accept that it is ok for investments to fail, so long as the failure is in pursuit of results-oriented solutions." (Hess, 2006,p.253).

We must not forget that these entrepreneurial solutions for the ills of teacher education have direct consequences exclusively for children living in poverty and not for the children of the entrepreneurs and middle and upper middle class children generally. This situation has negative consequences for the quality of our society as well given the consequences of creating a stripped down and inferior set of schools for many students living in poverty. We are comfortable in asserting that very few if any entrepreneurs and other advocates for teacher education programs like RELAY send their own children and grandchildren to the schools that they refer to as "tremendously innovative" (Riley, 2013) that are staffed by teachers

who enter teaching through these entrepreneurial programs.⁷¹ Is it really ok to be using the children who can least afford to experience diminished opportunities for access to a rich learning experience in schools as guinea pigs for the entrepreneurial revolution in teacher education? We do not think so.

The Uncritical Reproduction of the Narrative of Derision and Salvation
through Entrepreneurism by the Media.

In addition to the uncritical promotion of entrepreneurial teacher education programs like Relay described earlier, the local and national media have taken up in an uncritical way the narrative about the failure of university teacher education that is being promoted by groups like the New Schools Venture Fund, and Democrats for Education Reform⁷² which are shaping teacher education policy in the Obama administration and in the current Congress.⁷³ For example on October 7th, 2011 the *Seattle Times* lead editorial “Refocusing the Teacher Quality Debate” praised the main element in Duncan’s plan for teacher education accountability that requires the value-added evaluation of teacher education institutions and then reprinted the following comment made by a teacher educator in an forum in Washington DC. Sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute. This quote was probably taken by the *Seattle Times* from the Democrats for Education Reform white paper “Ticket to

⁷¹ Henig et. al’s (2001) study of school reform in Baltimore, Detroit, and Atlanta support this assertion.

⁷² http://www.dfer.org/2011/01/dfer_for_teach_1.php

⁷³ For example the Democrats for Education Reform white paper “Ticket to Teach” became the basis for the bill that is currently moving through Congress that would authorize charter principal and teacher education programs.

Teach” or from the inclusion of the quote in articles by the *New York Times* and *U.S. News and World Report*.⁷⁴

A growing chorus of critics including prominent education professors are amplifying concerns about weaknesses in teacher-prep programs. The director of teacher education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education was quoted on a *New York Times* online forum as saying that of the nation’s 1300 graduate teacher training programs only about 100 were doing a competent job. The rest could be shut down tomorrow, said Harvard’s Kay Merseth. (p. A.13).

This type of derogatory depiction of university teacher education programs has been repeated over and over again in local newspapers around the country.⁷⁵ It does not matter that there are not 1,300 graduate teacher education programs in the country or that Duncan’s (2011) assertion in his blueprint for teacher education that “only 50 percent of current teacher candidates received supervised clinical training.” (p. 5) was inaccurate. It seems that people can say whatever they want or call things whatever they want and their assertions are taken at face value. When the National Council on Teacher Quality issues a report on university-based teacher education, it is covered by the national media (e.g., Levin, 2011) as if it has been

⁷⁴ <http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/08/16/education-degrees-and-teachers-pay/> and <http://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/on-education/2009/03/25/what-you-should-consider-before-education-graduate-school>

⁷⁵ The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education weekly News Stream bulletins regularly includes these kinds of articles and editorials (press@aacte.org). These attacks on the role of Education in teacher education appear in media across the political spectrum including the so-called liberal N.Y. Times (e.g., Hartocollis, 2005).

vetted through an independent peer review process. It does not seem to matter that these reports have not been reviewed independently.⁷⁶

Conclusion

The future of the public system of teacher education in the U.S. is in doubt as the movement to deregulate and privatize the preparation of teachers gains resources, policy support, and momentum. Teaching and learning are clearly not at acceptable levels in all of our public schools given the undeniable existence of many aspects of the “education debt” that continue to exist for many students living in poverty in our nation. Also, despite the fact that some university teacher education programs have been long committed to self-improvement and have been doing high quality preparation for many years (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2006), overall things are not okay in the world of business as usual in teacher education. While there is no disagreement that both public schooling and teacher education need to be greatly improved, we disagree with advocates of deregulation and privatization in teacher education about the causes of our problems, whether university teacher education programs have been changing and improving, and about how to address the problems.

There is no evidence in our view that the entrepreneurial teacher education programs that have been touted as the future of teacher education are the bold, innovative and pioneering entities that they are claimed to be. Merely requiring teachers to demonstrate their ability to raise standardized test scores to complete a

⁷⁶ It should be noted that serious questions have been raised about methodological problems in the NCTQ studies of teacher education. NCTQ has included many of these concerns on its website http://www.nctq.org/transparency.do?actionType=ALL_STATES

program is not the kind of measure of teaching performance that we need to use to assess the readiness of teachers to be successful in the classroom (Zeichner, 2011). Just because we hear endlessly that these entrepreneurial programs are revolutionary does not make them so. The programs themselves are too new to have long-term retention data or data about the quality of graduates' teaching over time.

Reducing the measure of success in schooling to how much standardized test scores can be raised at a given moment in time or even over the 3-year minimum period required for sound value-added analysis, only for students living in poverty, while we continue to seek a richer and broader education in the arts, humanities, critical thinking and so on for middle class children is ethically unacceptable.

One of the biggest flaws in the arguments of advocates of deregulation and privatization in teacher education is their claim implicit or otherwise that educational interventions alone can address our education debt and the serious differences in opportunities to interact with knowledge in school in meaningful ways that exist for students of different backgrounds. While improvements in teaching, schooling, and teacher education are a part of the solution, we must also address the numerous consequences of poverty for many students in our public education system. Without doing this, any solution to our educational problems will fall short of success (Noguera, 2011; Carter & Weiner, 2013).

We are on a course to dismantle and replace the college and university system of teacher education that continues to prepare most of the nation's teachers. This would be a serious mistake in our view. Among countries that have performed strongly on international comparisons of student achievement none has a market

system of teacher education nor have any of these nations utilized the kind of deregulation and privatization that is being put into place in the U.S. On the contrary, a strong university system of teacher education is a prerequisite for a strong system of public schooling in most high performing countries (Darling-Hammond & Liebermann, 2012).

Advocates of deregulation and markets frequently complain about the high cost of university teacher education and the waste of public resources. Most of the federal contributions to teacher education in public universities are in financial aid to students and not in funds to develop innovation in programs.⁷⁷ Over the last decade or more, there have been severe cuts in the state contributions to our public universities that have undermined efforts to innovate in teacher education programs and make them become more connected to and responsive to the needs of public schools (Newfield, 2008).

The Obama administration which has largely been supportive of deregulation and developing a market in teacher education has taken an ironic stance by calling for lowering standards for the preparation of teachers while calling for raising standards for K-12 pupils through its advocacy of the Common Core.

We agree with Kevin Weiner (2011) who has argued that:

Educational opportunities should be one of our most precious public goods.

While public education does provide important private benefits to children and their families, it also lies at the center of our societal well-being.

⁷⁷ Duncan (2009) has stated that “all told, the federal government provides \$4 billion a year in Pell grants and federal loans to support students and our university teacher education programs.” (p. 2).

Educational opportunities should therefore never be distributed by market forces because markets exist to create inequalities- they thrive by creating winner and losers (p. 40).

As an alternative to the market-based solutions to problems of teacher education that we criticize in this paper, we have suggested here and elaborated elsewhere elements of what we have referred to here as a transformation agenda for teacher education.⁷⁸ We believe, based both on socio-cultural theories of learning and empirical research (e.g., Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), and a belief in a strong public sector, that these changes will better address the enduring the problems of the field and will be more likely than market-based approaches to provide a high quality teachers and education for everyone's children Zeichner & Payne, 2013).

These strategies that build on the work over many years of John Goodlad and many others who have worked for many years for significant transformation of teacher education in the U.S. (Goodlad, 1991) emphasize: (a) more shared responsibility for preparing teachers among universities or other program operators, schools, and local communities; (b) situating the process of learning to teach more strongly in relation to the kinds of settings for which individuals are being prepared to teach while preparing teachers who have the content and professional knowledge needed and are knowledgeable of and committed to the communities in which they work, (c) focusing on preparing teachers to be able to enact teaching practices that evidence suggests will help provide opportunities for

⁷⁸ Examples of the elaboration in own work of a transformational agenda can be found in Zeichner (2009, 2010, Zeichner & Payne, 2013; and Zeichner & Bier 2013).

students to interact with knowledge in authentic ways and develop understanding, and (d) strengthen accountability systems for teacher education programs in ways that involve the assessment of teachers abilities to promote student learning beyond their ability to raise standardized test scores.

Finally and most importantly, it is crucial that the agendas and activities of venture philanthropists like those connected to the New Schools Venture Fund and their partnerships with those working in higher education be more visible to the public and scholarly communities in education so that their assertions and claims can be given the same scrutiny and critique as any other set of proposals deserves in a democratic society. This is particularly important when the proposals involve the shifting of the control of the largely public system of teacher education to private entities.

Since the beginnings of philanthropy in the U.S. there has always been public skepticism about its possible negative effects on democratic deliberation about public policy.

At no time in American history-not even now-, when private wealth and its creators are so effusively celebrated- have these nonprofit institutions been unshadowed by public skepticism and distrust. Inevitable, private initiatives in the public interest, whether promoted by wealthy individuals or by groups of citizens in support of causes that do not command majority support, are- and always have been- problematic among people with a foundational commitment to democratic governance and principles of equality (Hall, 2013, p. 139).

Although he is a strong supporter of market-based approaches to education reform, Hess of the American Enterprise Institute has (2012) has called for a new level of civic responsibility and willingness to embrace criticism and feedback with regard to philanthropic efforts to improve education. He criticizes the lack of openness to dialogue and criticism among the major foundations that have been steering education policy and reform and concludes:

Hard-hitting public exchanges-no-private confabs- are the most effective forums for surfacing overlooked challenges, informing courses of action, or reframing the context in which decisions are made. The groups convened by foundations tend to include, naturally enough, friends, allies, and grantees. These aren't the folks likely to offer a fresh take on strategy or to challenge comfortable assumptions-especially given the sensible disinclination of grantees to offend benefactors or of reformers to offend the engine funding their cause (p. 5).

In addition to the invitation -only Annual Summits sponsored by New Schools and similar gatherings sponsored by other entrepreneurial groups and by university teacher education organizations, we all should be seeking actively and with great humility to support a genuine public dialogue about the wisdom of market-based and other solutions to the problems of teacher education. Given the size of the U.S. teaching force at over 3 and one half million, it is unlikely that any system of teacher education can be developed that does not include significant involvement of the nation's colleges and universities. The problems of public education and teacher education are too important to be permitted to operate

without rigorous vetting of claims about innovative practices and a trenchant public dialogue.

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2013). *The changing teacher preparation profession: A report from AACTE's professional education data system (PEDS)*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- American Federation of Teachers(2012). *Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the teaching profession*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- Ball, S. (2012) Voting with dollars: Philanthropy, money, and educational policy. *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society*, 20(3), 485-491.
- Barkin, J. (2011a). Firing line: The grand coalition against teachers. *Dissent*. Retrieved from http://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/firing-line-in-the-grand-coalition-against-teachers July 5th, 2011.
- Barkin, J, (2011b). Got dough? How billionaires rule our schools. *Dissent*. Retrieved from www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=3781 on February 14, 2012.
- Berliner, D. (2011). Rational responses to high-stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(3), 287-302.
- Berliner, D. (2014). Effects of inequality and poverty vs. teachers and schooling on America's youth. *Teachers College Record*. 116(1). Retrieved from www.tcrecord.org on April 1, 2013. ID Number 16859.

- Berry, B.; Montgomery, D. et.al. (August, 2008). *Creating and Sustaining Urban Teacher Residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare and retain effective teachers in high needs districts*. Center for Teacher Quality. The Aspen Institute.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P.; Lankford, H.; Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J. (2008). Surveying the landscape of teacher education in New York City: Constrained variation and the challenge of innovation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 30(4), 319-343.
- Caperton, G. & Whitmire, R. (2012). *The achievable dream*. New York: The College Board.
- Carnegie Corporation (1986). *A nation prepared: Teaching for the 21st century: Report on the Taskforce on Teaching as a Profession*. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Carter, P. & Weiner, K. (2013) (Eds). *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance*. Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press.
- Charters, W.W. & Waples, D. (1929). *The Commonwealth teacher training study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chubb, J. (2012). *The best teachers in the world: Why we don't have them and how we could*. Palo Alto, CA: Hoover Institute Press.
- Chubb, J. & Moe T. (1990). *Politics and markets in America's schools*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (2005) (Eds). *Studying teacher education: The*

- report of the American Educational Research Association Panel on Research in Teacher Education in the U.S.* New York: Routledge.
- Corcoran, S.P. (2009). Human capital policy and the quality of the teacher workforce. In D. Goldhaber & J. Hannaway (Eds.). *Creating a new teaching profession*. (pp. 29-52). Washington, D.C: Urban Institute Press.
- Crowe, E. (March, 2011). *Race to the Top and teacher preparation*. Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.
- Cuban, L. (2006). Educational entrepreneurs redux. In F.M. Hess (Ed). *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities*. (pp. 243-260). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Cuban, L. (February 19, 2012). Are Rocketship schools the future? Part 3. In *Larry Cuban on school reform and classroom practice*.
<http://larrycuban.wordpress.com/2012/02/19/are-rocketship-schools-the-future-part-3/>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (October, 2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005) (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Lieberman, A. (2012) (Eds). *Teacher education around the world: Changing policies and practices*. New York: Routledge.

- Democrats for Education Reform (2011). *Ticket to teach*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/TickettoTeach_1.3.11.pdf on January 3, 2012.
- Donaldson, M.L. & Johnson, S.M. (2011). Teach for America teachers: How long do they teach? Why do they leave? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(2), 47-52.
- Dow Jones Web Report Service (2006). No teacher left behind. *Wall Street Journal*. Published September 22, 2006. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/news/Wall_Street_Journal_092206.htm on April 15, 2013.
- Duncan, A. (October, 2009). *Teacher preparation: Reforming the uncertain profession*. Remarks of Secretary Arne Duncan at Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/> on November 15, 2009.
- Duncan, A. (September, 2011). *Our future, our teachers: The Obama administration's plan for teacher education reform and improvement*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education.
- Duncan, G. & Murnane, R. (2012) (Eds). *Whither opportunity: Rising inequality schools, and children's life chances*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Chicago: Spencer Foundation.
- Economic Policy Institute (August, 2010). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- Educational Development Center (October, 1999). *Improving teacher preparation programs: A Briefing paper for funders*. (Prepared for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation). Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

- Feistritzer, E.; Griffin, S. and Linnarjarvi (2011). *Profile of teachers in the U.S.*
Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Information. Retrieved from
http://www.ncei.com/Profile_Teachers_US-2011.pdf
- Feller, B. (2006). Study says teacher training is chaotic. *Associated Press*. Published
on September 19, 2006. Retrieved from
http://www.edschools.org/news/Associated_Press_091906.htm on April 15,
2013.
- Finder, A. (2006) Report critical of training of teachers. *New York Times*. *September
19th*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.org on April 15, 2013.
- Gassman, V. (2012). What's new is old? Philanthropic influences on education. *Phi
Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 8-11.
- Gitomer, D. (2007). *Teacher quality in a changing policy landscape*. Princeton, N.J:
Educational Testing Service.
- Goldhaber, D. & Hannaway, J. (2009) (Eds). *Creating a new teaching profession*.
Washington, D.C: The Urban Institute.
- Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education.
Educational Leadership, 49(3), 4-10.
- Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, J. (2013). Charter management organizations and the regulated
environment: Is it worth the price? *Educational Researcher*, 42 (2), 89-96.
- Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the*

- new landscape of teacher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hall, P.D. (2013). Philanthropy, the non-profit sector and the democratic dilemma. *Daedalus*, 142(2), 139-158.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capita*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hartocollis, A. (2005, July 31). Who needs education schools? *The New York Times*, 24-28.
- Henig, J.R.; Hula, R.C.; Orr, M.; & Pedescleaux, D.S. (2001). *The color of school reform: Race, politics, and the challenge of urban education*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Hess, F.M. (2005). Introduction in F.M. Hess (Ed). *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. (pp. 1-17). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hess, F.M. (2006). Politics, policy, and the promise of entrepreneurship. In F.M. Hess (Ed). *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities , challenges, possibilities*. (pp. 243-260). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hess, F.M. (2009). Revitalizing teacher education by revisiting our assumptions about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 450-457.
- Hess, F.M. (2012). Philanthropy gets into the ring: Edu funders get serious about education policy. *Education Week*, May 16th. Retrieved from www.edweek.org on February 14, 2013.
- Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State

University College of Education.

Honawar, V. (2006). Prominent teacher educator assails field, suggests new accreditation body in report. *Education Week*, 26. Published September 20th. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Education_Week_092006.pdf on April 15, 2013.

Horn, J. & Libby, K. (2011). The giving business: Venture philanthropy and the New Schools Venture Fund. In P. Kovacs (Ed). *The Gates Foundation and the future of U.S. public education*. 168-185. New York: Routledge.

Jain, N. (March 24, 2013). Rethinking education: Why our education system is ripe for disruption. *Forbes Magazine*. Retrieved from www.forbes.com on April 1, 2013.

Humphrey, D.C.; Wechsler, M.E.; & Hough, H.J. (2008). Characteristics of effective alternative certification programs. *Teachers College Record*, 110, (1), 1-63.

Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johnson, S.M.; Kraft, M. & Papay, J. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record*, 114, 1-39.

Katz, S.N. (2013). Reshaping U.S. public education policy. *Stanford Social Innovation*

- Review, Retrieved on March 15, from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/reshaping_u.s._public_education_policy
- Kirby, S.N.; McCombs, J.S.; Naftel, S.; Barney, H. (2005). *Teachers for a New Era: Some promising indicators of change*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Knowles, T. (January, 2013). *New pathways for teachers, new promises for students: A vision for developing excellent teachers*. Washington, D.C: American Enterprise Institute, Special Report 3.
- Kronholz, J. (2012). A new type of ed school: Linking candidate success to student success. *Education Next*. Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/a-new-type-of-ed-school/> on August 26, 2012.
- Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39-81.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Lagemann, E.C. (1992). *The politics of knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, philanthropy, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeMov, D. (2012). Practice makes perfect and not just for jocks and musicians. *Wall Street Journal*, October 26, 2012. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB100014240529702045305045780786023>

- [07104168.html?mod=googlenews_wsj#articleTabs%3Darticle](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/01/us/politics/07104168.html?mod=googlenews_wsj#articleTabs%3Darticle) on November 1, 2012.
- Levin, T. (2011). Training of teachers is flawed study says. *New York Times*, July, 21st. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/> on July 21st, 2011.
- Levine, A. (September, 2006). *Educating school teachers*. The Education Schools Project. http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf.
- Levine, A. (2010). Teacher education must respond to change in America. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92,(2), 19-24.
- Levine, A. (2011). The new normal of teacher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 8th. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-New-Normal-of-Teacher/127430/> on May 10, 2011.
- Lipman, P. (2004). *High-stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform*. New York: Routledge.
- Liu, M. (2013). Disrupting teacher education. *Education Next*, (13), 3. Retrieved from educationnext.org/disrupting-teacher-education/ on April 11, 2013.
- Lyall, K., & Sell, K. (2006). *The true genius of America at risk: Are we losing our public universities to de facto privatization?* Westport, CT: Prager.
- Matthews, J. (2010). ED school professors resist teaching practical skills. *Washington Post, Class Struggle Blog*, October 2nd. Retrieved from <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/class-struggle/2010/09/26-week/> on October 2, 2010.
- McNeil, L. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: The costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.

- National Commission for Teaching and America's Future (September, 1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York City: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2007). *The high cost of teacher turnover*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda (2008). *Teaching in changing times. Lessons learned: New teachers talk about their jobs, challenges, and long-range plans*. Washington, D.C: Authors. Retrieved from http://www..public.agenda.org/files/pdf/lessons_learned_3.pdf
- National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (November, 2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- National Research Council (April, 2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, D.C: National Academies Press.
- Naveen, J. (2013). Rethinking education: Why our education system is ripe for disruption. *Forbes Magazine*, March 24th. Retrieved from www.forbes.com/sites/naveenjain/2013/03/24/disrupting-educataion on April 10, 2013.
- Nelson, T. & Joanes, A. (2007). The end of the "public" in public education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 5-10.
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nichols, S. & Berliner, D. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education press.

- Noguera, P. (2011). A broader, bolder approach uses education to break the cycle of poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, xx, 8-14.
- Odden, A. (2013). *Getting the best people in the toughest jobs: Changes in talent management in education*. Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.
- Orfield, G. & Frankenberg, E. (2013) (Eds).. *Educational delusions? Why choice can deepen inequality and how to make schools fair*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Otterman, S. (2011). Ed schools Pedagogical puzzle. *New York Times*, July 21st. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/education/edlife/edl-24teacher-t.html?pagewanted=all> on July, 22, 2012.
- Parker, W. (2011). Constructing public schooling today: Derision, multiculturalism, and nationalism. *Educational Theory*, 61(4), 413-432.
- Peske, H. & Haycock, K. (June 2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality*. Washington DC: Education Trust.
- Payzant, T. (February, 2004). *Should teacher education take place at colleges and universities?* Invited address presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.
- Pianta, R.C. (November, 2011). *Teaching children well: New evidence-based approaches to teacher professional development and training*. Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress.
- Plecki, M.; Elfers, A. & Nakamura, Y. (2012). Using evidence for teacher education

- program improvement and accountability: An illustrative case of the role of value-added measures. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(5), 318-334.
- Quinn, R.; Tompkins, S., & Meyerson, D. (April, 2013). *Beyond grant making: Philanthropic foundations as agents for change and institutional entrepreneurs*. A Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Reckhow, S. (2013). *Follow the money: How foundation dollars change public school politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ronfeldt, M.; Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50, 4-36.
- Rotherham, A. (2008). *Achieving teacher and principal excellence: A guidebook for donors*. Washington, D.C: Philanthropy Roundtable.
- Rothstein, R. (2004). *Class and schools: Using social, economic, and educational reform to close the Black and white achievement gap*. Washington, D.C: Economic Policy Institute.
- Saltman, K. (2010). *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sandler, M. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship in education: Private ventures for the public good*. New York: Roman & Littlefield.
- Sawchuck, S. (2012). New advocacy groups shaking up education field. *Education Week*. March 14th. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/05/16/31/adv-overvie...>
- Sawchuk, S. (2013). Teacher-prep programs zero in on effective practice. *Education*

- Week, March, 25th*. Retrieved from www.edweek.org on April 1, 2013.
- Schiller, J. (2012) Venture philanthropy's market strategies fail urban kids. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 12-16.
- Schorr, J. (2012). A revolution begins in teacher prep. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11(1). Retrieved from <http://www.ssireview.org/> on December 12, 2012.
- Smith, J.A. (2009) Private foundations and public policymaking: A historical perspective. In J. Ferris (Ed). *Foundations and public policy*. (pp. 41-78). New York: The Foundation Center.
- Smith, W. (1980) The American Teacher Corps programme. In E. Hoyle & J. Megarry (Eds) Professional development of teachers (pp.204-218) London: Nichols.
- Smith, K. & Peterson, L/ (2006). What is educational entrepreneurship? In F.M. Hess (Ed). *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, and possibilities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Suggs, C. & deMarrais, K. (July, 2011). *Critical contributions: Philanthropic investment in teachers and teaching*, Atlanta: Kronley & Associates.
- Sykes, G. & Dibner, K. (March 2009). *Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal*. Washington, D.C: Center on Education Policy.
- Tucker, M. (2011). *Surpassing Shanghai: An agenda for American education built on the world's leading systems*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (2005). *Leaving children behind: How "Texas style accountability fails Latino youth*. Albany, N.Y: SUNY Press.
- Vedder, R. (September, 2011). Who should educate the educators? *Chronicle of*

- Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations>
- Weiner, K. (Spring, 2011). Free-market think tanks and the marketing of educational policy. *Dissent*, 39-44.
- Weiner, K.; Hinchey, P. & Molnar, A. (2010) (Eds). *Think tank research quality: Lessons for policymakers, the media, and the public*. Charlotte, N.C: Information Age Publishing.
- Wilson, S.; Floden, R. & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps and recommendations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Woodring, P. (1960). The Ford Foundation and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 62(3), 224-231.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Learning from experience with performance-based teacher education. In F. Peterman (Ed). *Designing performance assessment systems for urban teacher education*. (pp.3-19). New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2010) Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 89(11), 89-99.
- Zeichner, K (2011). Assessing state and federal policies to evaluate the quality of Teacher preparation programs. In P. Earley, D. Imig, & N. Michelli (Eds). *Teacher education policy in the United States: Issues and tensions in an era of evolving expectations*. (pp. 75-105). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education.

Journal of Teacher Education, 63(5), 376-382.

Zeichner, K. & Bier, M. (2013). The turn toward practice and clinical experiences in

U.S. teacher education. *Beitrage Zur Lehrerbildung*, 30(2) (*Swiss Journal of Teacher Education*), 153-170. (Published in English).

Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-

Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. & Payne, K. (2013). Democratizing knowledge in urban teacher

education. In J. Noel (Ed). *Moving teacher education into urban schools and communities*. (pp. 3-19). New York: Routledge.

Zunz, O. (2012). *Philanthropy in America: A history*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton

University Press.