The University for
World-Class Professionals

Manchester Metropolitan University

The beginnings of school led teacher training: New challenges for university teacher education

School Direct Research Project Final Report

Professor Tony Brown, Dr Harriet Rowley and Kim Smith

Contents

The beginnings of school led teacher training: New challenges for university teacher education

School Direct Research Project Final Report

Professor Tony Brown, Dr Harriet Rowley and Kim Smith

Introduction

The School Direct Research Project began in May 2013 and was funded by Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU). Led by Professor Tony Brown with Dr Harriet Rowley and Kim Smith, the work builds on earlier practitioner research studies undertaken by the team members which were concerned with how conceptions of theory had changed for teacher educators and trainees as a result of participation in an earlier school-based model (Smith and Hodson, 2010; Hodson, Smith and Brown, 2012; Smith, Hodson and Brown, 2013). The present research project began with an original purpose to better understand the implications of School Direct (SD) for university teacher education, towards rethinking the distinctive role of universities in teacher education.

The project is located within the activities of the Building Research in Teacher Education (BRiTE) group, at the Education and Social Research Institute (ESRI), MMU. The research group has a growing membership and comprises a group of around thirty researchers in the Faculty of Education whose work is centred on exploring the opportunities afforded by combining a world leading education research group with a substantial, 'outstanding' teacher education unit. In this sense, the School Direct Research Project is central to the Faculty's efforts to maximise its position by using research to locate and drive forward improvement both in terms of the Initial Teacher Education provision at MMU and more broadly the higher education sector.

This report marks the end of the School Direct Research Project and seeks to detail the knowledge we have gathered through undertaking this work. It begins with a brief review of the professional context, which gives an outline of recent policy changes and developments in teacher education together with key themes from the academic debate that is taking place within the field. The section following this outlines the methods that were used to gather data during this project. The analysis of the findings is presented through the use of six assertions; these statements have been formulated to describe what can be supported on the basis of the data we have collected and analysed. For each assertion, we provide a detailed discussion of the data relevant to each statement including supporting evidence. A conclusion summarising the main points and implications of the research project is offered at the end of this report.

Executive Summary

Partnerships between English schools and universities in support of teacher education are long established, having been developed in response to successive policies increasing the proportion and influence of teacher education taking place in schools. The latest initiative in England, School Direct, which was formally commenced in 2012, has resulted in teacher education becoming school led as well as school based. This new and expanding one-year postgraduate route often runs in parallel with the previously existing one-year university-led model but has demanded that the academic element of training is fitted more directly around the demands of immediate practice in schools. Here trainee teachers spend most of their training period in schools under their direction, with universities providing accreditation but a smaller component of training.

The reconfiguration of how training is distributed between university and school sites consequential to School Direct has altered how the content and composition of that training is decided. Most notably, local market conditions rather than educational principles can determine the design of training models and how the composition of teacher preparation is shared across sites. This contingency means that the content and structure of School Direct courses varies greatly between different partnership arrangements across the country, leading to greater fragmentation within the system as a whole. Thus, there is not only increased diversification in terms of type of training route but also diversification of experience within each route.

Recent policy changes including School Direct have also altered the balance of power between universities and schools, and in turn, their relationship with one another. Although teacher training has long been composed through a partnership model between universities and schools, the ascendance of school-led training has altered how the responsibilities of each party are decided. These new arrangements are impacting on the relationship between university and school-based personnel and how the categories 'teacher educator', 'teacher' and 'trainee' are defined. In particular, the function of 'teacher educator' has been split across the university and school sites, displacing traditional notions of what it means to be a 'teacher' and 'teacher educator'. The flux is leading to uncertainty across role boundaries and, in turn, changes in practice. Furthermore, as those in different locations negotiate territorial boundaries, this can activate anxiety and tension within the workforce.

Those teacher educators located within universities have witnessed major changes in their professional roles and responsibilities as a consequence of the shift in power towards schools. In particular, recruitment patterns have often favoured candidates with recent or extensive school experience. Within this climate, longer serving university teacher educators are being encouraged to adjust to ever-changing conditions and new job descriptions but can feel displaced. Newer entrants to the profession may continue to define their practice with reference to their own expertise in schools, rather than feel obliged to develop the more traditional academic capabilities mentioned in their new job descriptions.

From the other side, the new models of training also substantially change the requirements of students aspiring to join the teaching profession and the demands that they make on their tutors. Ironically, however, university tutors, both new and old, are now less able to compete with school-based teacher educators in meeting the demands of immediate practice. This redistribution of teacher education has eroded key elements that have previously distinguished the university contribution. Moreover, the new priorities of practice in universities have been supportive of schools in reducing their need for a university input as they expand their own provision of teacher education. This is having substantial impact upon the basis upon which universities can defend a distinctive contribution to teacher training.

The push to a greater emphasis upon school-based practice and knowledge is also reconfiguring how trainee teachers experience and understand practice-based pedagogical knowledge, or put more simply the relationship between theory and practice. Increasingly, teaching is conceived in craft-based, technicist terms strengthened by increasing prescription and performativity measures, which require teachers to present and shape knowledge in particular ways. Within this context, conceptions of the relationship between theory and practice have been progressively replaced by conceptions of practice that integrate situated conceptions of theory responsive to the needs of practice. Furthermore, many re-conceptualisations of teacher education have privileged practical components to the detriment of theory and analysis.

University and school-based teacher educators are aware, to differing degrees, of how this situation affects trainees' conceptions of how to teach. Those in different locations also hold differing beliefs and enact various understandings of ideal notions of breadth and type of professional experience. Those who are critical of such changes often believe that such conceptions are leading to a narrowing field of expertise and professional basis. Changes in the structure, length and type of school placements are further strengthening such fears. Trainees are forced to assimilate, not only, these often incongruent conceptions of what makes a 'good' teacher or pedagogue, but also navigate conflicting structures within partnership arrangements between schools and universities which such beliefs are producing. The complexity of the situation is heightened further because of how local market conditions dictate the modus operandi of different training models, rather than efforts to build a consensus between teacher educators.

Conceptions of substantive subject and pedagogical subject knowledge are also varied amongst teacher educators in different locations; there are also differing understandings of how such elements of training are being satisfied within more recent models of school-based teacher training. Traditionally, subject knowledge has occupied a distinctive part of the university input and is conceptualised as the adjustment that the trainee makes from their own academic study of a subject within a university degree to a more pedagogically oriented conception of that subject for teaching in schools. However, within a school-based model progression to pedagogical knowledge is increasingly shaped by demands of the regulative policies and highly structured frameworks as enacted within schools where trainees spend the majority of their time. In this scenario, teachers craft their understandings according to the legislative framework in which their practices have become ever more strictly articulated, rather than being educated so much in universities to engage critically with evolving demands.

With respect to subject knowledge, university-based teacher educators also face longer-term changes as academic priorities in schools change the curriculum structure and the relative inclusions of different subject areas. For example, tighter specification of core subjects such as mathematics, English and science has led to a compression of staff specialising in music, drama and art as student recruitment in those areas has been reduced. Subjects such as psychology, sociology and law have become even more difficult to support by university tutors as they have often been conflated into generic social science due to demands made by the National Curriculum. Tutors have become increasingly wrested from the support they are able to offer in terms of meeting the reduced specialist subject needs of 'their' students. Thus, this set of challenging circumstances makes it more difficult for universities to defend a distinctive contribution on the basis of subject knowledge input.

Alongside these changes, attitudes towards research are also changing whilst the function of research is also being crafted as 'evidence' that can be used in a straightforward manner to improve narrowly defined educational outcomes, rather than progressing critical or analytical ideas of what it means to educate. Such conceptions are concurrent with the increase in external specification and surveillance, which conceives teaching in particular ways and, in turn, has an impact upon how teacher professionalism and agency is understood and enacted.

This report details the results from the School Direct Research Project undertaken by a team of academics from Manchester Metropolitan University. It concludes five years of research into the effects of school–led training on the rationale and composition of university teacher education and considers the impacts of recent changes on the teaching profession

Literature Review

Teacher education in England

Political intervention on how teachers are trained has gradually intensified across a variety of education systems as economic competition and international comparisons of performance have become drivers for change. In this sense, teacher education is positioned as an important lever for raising achievement and improving schools (Murray, 2014; Furlong Barton, Miles, Whiting, and Whitty, 2000). England's Initial Teacher Education (ITE) system is no different in this respect, and offers an interesting example of a highly regulated, centralised system which has been subject to a variety of frequent and directive policy interventions, even more so than other parts of the UK (Menter, Brisard and Smith, 2006).

What has been particularly stark when compared to other parts of the UK, Europe and indeed other parts of the world with the exception of the US, is what Furlong and Lawn (2011: 6) refer to as the 'turn to the practical.' Two very different state-led responses to changing teacher preparation have taken place in Europe. Teacher education in England increasingly comprises a vocational employment-based model of training located primarily in schools. This approach is in sharp contrast to models followed in continental Europe subject to the Bologna Process, where student teachers follow a university course of some four to five years. These two approaches reveal radically different conceptions of how teacher quality might be improved in the name of international competitiveness. In England, teacher education has been wrested from its traditional home within the academy where universities play a support role to what has become 'school-led' training where government funds for teacher education have been diverted to schools. Teacher professional identity has been referenced to skill development within this frame and the wider assessment culture (Ball, 2001; Lasky, 2005). The university component with a specifically educational component can often be as low as thirty days in a one-year post-graduate course. Indeed, in an earlier pilot model, the Graduate Teacher Programme, in some instances student teachers could spend less than ten days in university (Hodson, Smith and Brown, 2012). The Bologna model, meanwhile, is characterised by reinvigorated faith in academic study and the promotion of individual teachers, where a pedagogical dimension in included from the outset of undergraduate studies, but with relatively brief periods spent in school. Once qualified, however, following an extended school placement after the academic component has been completed, rather more professional autonomy can be asserted. Yet, this intensification of the academic component can be seen as a further distancing from practical concerns for student teachers in those countries.

The trend to practical school led training has been intensified by recent UK governments of a range of political persuasions and is in keeping with the growing dominating culture within education. This places the importance of compliance and regulation on a predominantly practical, relevant and school-led curriculum and assessment framework (McNamara and Murray, 2013; Beauchamp, Clarke, Hulme, and Murray, 2015; Brown and McNamara, 2005, 2011). The prevailing ideology positions teaching as essentially a craft rather than an intellectual activity, meaning that teacher training is viewed as an apprenticeship, best located in the workplace (McNamara and Murray, 2013). It rests on the assumption that 'more time spent in schools inevitably-and unproblematically-leads to better and 'more relevant' learning' (ibid: 22). Conversely, there has been a declining focus on more academic elements of teacher preparation traditionally located within universities, which means that theory, subject knowledge and research-informed conceptions of pedagogy have become squeezed. Thus, the university contribution has been forced to fit the demands of immediate practice more snugly whilst university-based teacher educators have witnessed a diminished position of power.

When the coalition government came to power in 2010, they signalled their strong intent to expand school-based routes into teaching in the first White Paper, The Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010). Later they issued an implementation plan Training our next generation of outstanding teachers, which introduced School Direct, a school-based and school-led training system where schools would be responsible for recruiting and selecting their own trainees. The government proposed two strands, a salaried employment-based route, which replaced the previous Graduate Teaching Programme and a non-salaried route where students would be required to pay tuition fees but offered incentives in the form of bursaries for highly qualified graduates and subject shortage areas. In both cases, a strong feature of the marketing of School Direct was the idea that students would be employed at the end of the training. However, later the government had to issue guidance that this was expected rather than guaranteed. Schools were required to work in partnership with an accredited provider but as was the case with the Graduate Teacher Programme, this could be a School Centred Training Initiative Provider (SCITT). However, unless such SCITTs were working in partnership with a university, they would not be able to offer the PGCE qualification.

The involvement of universities in teacher education was further adjusted by changes to student allocations and the abolition of the Teaching and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), which previously was responsible for regulating teacher supply. In the case of universities, initially only those rated 'outstanding' by Ofsted received protected numbers of funded places. Later all providers were reduced to

a 'level playing field' as these protections were dropped and all providers competed in an 'open' marketplace. However, as Estelle Morris (2014), a former Education Secretary recognises, with the cessation of the TDA and the responsibility of recruitment given directly to schools through School Direct, effectively 'no one was in charge' of ensuring sufficiency in trainee teachers or school places. Furthermore, School Direct failed to recruit as expected whilst the majority of universities were forced into a reactive position.

The University Council for the Education of Teachers, (UCET) which represents all university education departments in the UK, has sought to defend the contribution that the higher education sector makes to teacher training. For example, from when School Direct was first introduced, and indeed throughout its history, there have been concerns with regard to impact upon student recruitment and teacher quality. As this initial statement shows:

> *To impose ultimate responsibility and accountability for the commissioning and quality assurance of entry to the profession on 23,000 schools would destabilize a teacher supply and training structure that has demonstrated capacity for continuous improvement and development (UCET 2011: 1).*

Browne and Reid (2012) carried out a small scale, desk-based investigation into teacher educators' initial responses to the proposals and found that actions taken by institutions were extremely varied whilst they were largely dependent upon the nature and locality of the existing/partnership arrangements. They found that the majority of institutions were under-going change; in the extreme, providers were witnessing wholesale restructuring, concern about financial viability and possible closure. The majority were actively seeking new partnerships whilst strengthening existing arrangements with schools. Some institutions were more protected by their high Ofsted rating or by income from research activity and were less responsive to these changes.

The Carter Review was published in January 2015 and sought to assess the quality and effectiveness of ITT courses. Andrew Carter, Headteacher, leader of a SCITT and ITT lead on the Teaching Schools Council was appointed as the independent lead whilst a range of specialists and non-specialists also formed the panel members. Whilst the report recognised the strength of school-university partnerships it also made the recommendation that the Postgraduate Certificate in Education should be regarded as 'optional'. Furthermore, although the review recognised the contribution that universities made to ITT in the form of expertise in research and subject pedagogy it recognised that quality was variable whilst the diversity of different training routes was seen as a strength of the current system.

The recent change of government makes it difficult to predict the future role of universities in ITE, but aside from possible policy developments, there are ideological preferences coming to the fore. For example, neoconservative ideology can be traced in terms of the emphasis on an academic knowledge-based curriculum and attempts to attract 'high-quality' applicants. Whilst justifications for diversifying the ranges of routes, relaxing regulations that those employed to teach do not need qualified teacher status and devolving responsibility to the market, demonstrate a commitment to neoliberal principles.

Although there have been clear trends within ITE policy, there have also been distinctly mixed messages with regard to the valuation given to research-informed teacher education and the profession more broadly. For example, there has been a renewed commitment to evidence-policy and practice (DfE, 2013) whilst in his Analytical Review (2013), Goldacre argued that the education profession is still far from evidence-based and in order to gain credibility should be aligned with how research is used in other professions such as medicine. A number of research funding opportunities have ensued but have tended to position research in particular ways, valuing approaches, which demonstrate positivistic understandings of 'what works'. Such understandings of research are thus consistent with reductionist models of what counts as 'knowledge' as something, which is a commodity that can be delivered and received according to external specification whilst positioning educational practice as defined by quality assurance structures and indicators. Furthermore, those schools that have been deemed as successful in the system and graded 'outstanding' by Ofsted have been rewarded by opportunities to gain 'Teaching School' status enabling them to take a lead on school-based teacher training whilst also have a responsibility to demonstrate research activity but within a relatively confined model focused on improving outcomes.

Against this backdrop, universities have maintained a commitment to research-informed modes of teacher education and by working in partnership with schools have tried to balance this with official requirements which privileges modes of external specification, assessment and an emphasis on the practical (Beauchamp et al., 2015; Baumfield, 2014; Childs, Edwards, and McNicholl, 2013; Wilson, 2012). However at the same time, reduced funding streams for educational research and limited accessibility for university departments to research teacher education have also contributed to depleting activity and capacity in university-based teacher education research (Christie et al., 2012; Menter and Murray, 2009). Furthermore, the introduction of School Direct and increased emphasis on school-based teacher training routes also threatens the financial stability of Faculties of Education and their ability to plan strategically, thus contributing to trends of an increasingly casualised workforce and possible losses in staff with research-informed knowledge and skills (McNamara and Murray, 2013). Such trends increasingly threaten the ability of universities to provide a distinctive contribution comprising research-informed, high quality teaching.

Meanwhile, research activity amongst university-based teacher educators has continued to occupy contested space. Traditionally, teacher education has suffered from a lowly status (Laberee, 1996) whilst university-based teacher educators were viewed as 'janus-faced' (Taylor, 1983), caught between the practical demands of the teaching profession and the knowledge-creating demands of higher education meaning that they have struggled to gain recognition in the academy. As teacher education has moved more into schools, expectations to carry out research have been superseded by 'relationship maintenance' as school and university staff share the challenge of training in a contested and shared space (Ellis et al., 2013: 270). For Ellis, (2013) their experiences are that of a proletarianised worker, required to be endlessly flexible but denied the opportunity to accumulate academic capital within the labour system of higher education which values research activity above the practical demands of teaching. In a separate study, focusing on the analysis of job descriptions and recruitment texts, Ellis et al (2012) recognise how university-based teacher educators occupy an exceptional category of academy work where they are expected to be an expert practitioner, requiring them to prioritise recent school-experience yet depending on the context of the university, also develop a research profile.

Similarly, various authors have discussed the challenge faced by new entrants to the profession of teacher education (Harrison and McKeon 2010; McKeon and Harrison, 2010; Shagrir, 2010; Van Velzen, Van Der Klin, Swennen and Yaffe, 2010; White, 2014; Williams and Ritter, 2010). Boyd and Harris (2010: 10) report on how uncertainties in 'the workplace context encourage the new lecturers to hold on to their identity and credibility as school teachers rather than to pro-actively seek new identities as academics within the professional field of teacher education'. Whereas our own research (Brown, Rowley and Smith, 2014) has shown that long-term teacher educators feel so displaced by the recent changes and loss of space for professional autonomy, that some feel retirement is the only option.

Those which have been located in the academy for some time, are feeling the effects of how initial teacher education has shifted from earlier notions of promoting teacher autonomy for 'student' teachers to be educated, to supporting 'trainee' teachers in being trained to comply with externally imposed teaching and assessment regimes (Brown and McNamara, 2011; White, 2012). This echoes the situation of teachers described by Passy (2012: 1), where primary teachers had previously been isolated but where their individualised 'substantial self' had been encouraged. However, recent developments now mean that a 'situational self' is more apparent, governed by externally defined competencies. She reports how teachers have mixed views as to whether the authoritarian apparatus thwarts individual professionalism or provides a much-needed structure to follow amidst rapid changes that are difficult to assimilate.

These changes in personnel reflect how the designation 'teacher educator' relates to a function that has primarily been split between either former school-based practitioners now working within a university setting or, increasingly, those still employed in schools with an expanded teacher education role. Such displacement for teacher educators and teachers alike, not only challenges notions of what it is to be a teacher but also what it is to educate them. Reynolds et al. (2013: 307) rather optimistically argue that more modest adjustments in Australia require 'both groups to get out of their comfortable spaces and engage with each other in constantly moving situations'.

Subject knowledge meanwhile has been susceptible to being understood in multiple ways as adjustments to curriculum and training arrangements have affected the spaces in which it is encountered. University teacher educators and school mentors may have different priorities for their roles in teacher training (e.g. Price and Willet, 2006), such as those relating to how subject knowledge is understood, meeting the demands of testing, effectively using materials, etc. There are different ways of understanding the disciplinary knowledge that teachers need; schools may prioritise the immediacy of classroom practice or following centralised guidance, whilst universities may prioritise the more intellectually based elements such as subject knowledge, building professional autonomy, or meeting the demands of formal qualification (Hobson, Malderez and Tracey, 2009; Jones and Straker, 2006; McNally, Boreham, Cope and Stronach, 2008; Hodson et al., 2012). Meanwhile, the government's high profile strategy of taking charge of school practices through a multitude of regulatory devices, such as through testing, prescriptive curriculum and school inspection (Brown et al., 2005; Askew, Hodgen, Hossain, and Bretscher, 2010; Brown, 2011) has resulted in teaching becoming understood through a culture of performativity (Pampaka, Williams, Hutcheson, Wake, Black, Davis, and Hernandez-Martinez 2012). For example, the normative insistence of the (still influential) Numeracy Framework in mathematics had dictated in great detail how teaching the curriculum subject should be conducted (Brown and McNamara, 2011). This insistence on policy targets deflected attention from knowing how the re-distribution of teacher education resulted in trainee teachers actually teaching the subject.

In summary, recent policy changes in how teachers are trained coupled with increased surveillance and specification have meant that the landscape for those involved in initial teacher education continues to change at a rapid pace. The relationship between universities and schools within the traditional partnership model of teacher education continues to be reshaped by local market conditions and changes in responsibilities and personnel. As a consequence to these shifts, the composition and content of courses is also changing and this has implications for the ways in which teachers 'do' and 'think'.

Methods

The project comprises over one hundred and twenty hour long interviews with university-based teacher educators, school-based mentors and trainee teachers involved in the School Direct programme. The interviews span twenty universities and twelve MMU partnership schools. Additionally, faculty partnership meetings were attended and recorded whilst some trainee lessons were observed. To gain an international perspective, interviews were conducted with teacher educators from New Zealand, Japan, Germany, Spain and Sweden.

The university-based educators were interviewed across a range of sites in England and were sampled through our networks. We were able to achieve a geographical spread of institutions across the country whilst also interviewing teacher educators at a range of levels and different stages of their careers. Furthermore, the institutions also differed in terms of history, size, research capabilities and range of professional programmes. In this sense, they occupied different positions within the market and cultivated different suites of activities depending on the reputation they sought to promote. Interviews were designed to assess the impact of recent reforms on teacher educators across a range of areas including changes to job responsibilities/descriptions, influence of external apparatus upon their practice both in terms of institutional and governmental legislation, the perceived impacts of the market and competition from other providers, changes to their relationships with schools and the impact of these various factors on their academic work/identity particularly with respect to the use of theory, research and subject pedagogy. We were also concerned with broader questions about how they understood the distinctive contribution of universities to teacher education and how they sought to occupy different spaces to defend this. The interviews were transcribed and have been thematically coded using NVivo. To analyse the data, alternative theoretical lenses were applied depending upon the particular interests and expertise of the research team members. For the purposes of this report, the analysis of the findings is presented through the use of six assertions, which were formulated to describe what can be supported on the basis of the data we have collected and analysed.

Analysis of Findings

Local market conditions shape teacher education provision

Local market conditions as well as educational principles dictate models produced and how the composition of teacher preparation is shared across sites. This effect on provision means that the content and structure of School Direct courses varies greatly between different partnership arrangements across the country, leading to greater fragmentation within the system as a whole.

Across the data set we found repeated incidences of local market conditions being mentioned to explain why certain models of teacher education were being produced. Those located in universities also frequently reported reduced influence when making arguments on intellectual grounds because economic factors and how the market operated was said to dictate the product to a greater extent. The variety of factors at play within a given local context produced an array of responses meaning that the content and structure of School Direct courses varies greatly between different providers. This suggests that not only is there increased diversification in terms of type of training route due to the introduction of school-based programmes but also diversification of experience within each route. In consideration of how teachers are trained as a whole system in England, it seems that similar to school governance arrangements, there is growing fragmentation.

A variety of external factors were cited as contributing to this situation. Amongst one of the most common, was reports of how changes to trainee allocations had contributed to uncertainty and constant flux within university education departments meaning that the financial viability of courses had come to the forefront of concerns. As one teacher educator told us:

> *The uncertainty is definitely one change…I'm facing the possibility of leading a large team next year, none of which have a permanent contract because the numbers of students are so unpredictable, so will they support me? Will they be loyal to the university?*

Thus, the unpredictability of income from ITE due to changes in allocations thus had direct effects on staff contracts whilst also raised concerns for those in management positions in terms of the quality of training experience they were able to provide.

Education departments which were judged by Ofsted as "grade two" or lower and thus did not have their core allocation of student numbers protected in the first year of School Direct, were forced into a reactive position where rather than being able to strategise or raise their position, they aimed to minimise damage and avoid closure. One teacher educator described how the numbers they received 'were a massive shock, no one was expecting it, people thought the numbers might go down a bit, but not to the point where courses would have to close.' She went onto describe how for some subjects such as mathematics, their numbers had been cut from thirty to ten whilst English had been cut completely for their core PGCE programme. This meant that they were obliged to engage with School Direct to a much greater extent than they had planned whilst in order to avoid closure, the university employed an ex-headteacher to 'drum up business from his networks' meaning that they were now offering places for subjects where they did not have existing subject specialists.

Some education departments were in stronger position than others because those judged as 'outstanding' by Ofsted had protected allocations for their core PGCE courses and were relatively able to withstand unpredictable and frequent pressures to adjust staffing levels to meet new requirements. This put them in a stronger market position and do could be more flexible and had the freedom to offer a School Direct programme, which was roughly in line with their core PGCE programme. For example, one teacher educator explained how they had been 'fortunate' because they could rely on their 'Ofsted outstanding status' and 'therefore there are schools that want to work with us'. Thus, she felt that management had 'been really good at handing the difficult relationship with schools' and offered a School Direct package that was roughly the same as their core PGCE programme. However, in the second year of offering School Direct this altered as the regulations changed so regardless of status, no departments had protected core student allocations. The same teacher educator described how this change had led to the department management to start offering different types of packages where 'it's up to the school about how much they're buying in for the university input.' Such changes meant redesigning courses, which for this teacher educator represented a 'mammoth task.'

The degree to which the university relied on the income from the education department also had an impact upon how much pressure there was to make School Direct programmes viable and income generating. This is turn seemed to impact how School Direct courses are structured and what sorts of content are prioritised.

There was evidence to show from one education department that they were able to rely on their income from research, and due to the unpredictability of income from ITE courses, they

were looking to reduce their involvement. The department was situated in a research intensive, Russell group university with a strong market position. Thus, even though the income of the education department was according to the Head of Department, a 'pin-probe' in terms of the entire income of the university, education was seen as 'something that adds social value' rather than something that was income generating. Furthermore, due to this relatively safe position, the department was able to 'hold the line' and refuse to partner with schools who were demanding greater flexibility or reduced university input. However, staff could not afford not to be 'research-active' whilst some staff were moved to 'teaching-only' contracts but those working in research tended to be more highly valued and rewarded by the institution. We also found that those in weaker market positions were obliged to meet the demands of schools to a much greater extent and offer a range of packages, which reduce and marginalise the university input. In some cases, this means that the university input is reduced to a quality assurance and/or pastoral role. For example, one teacher educator described how because those on the salaried school direct route had such limited university input 'schools put them on a 90% timetable from day one' 'they are almost seeing them as a NQT (Newly Qualified Teacher) ', from the university's point of view this meant that they had to enforce a strict application procedure 'to make sure we will get the right sort of candidates who will be able to cope.' However, the same teacher educator went onto describe how not all of them did cope and 'were allowed to struggle for a number of weeks before we knew what was going on.' Such situations required the university to increase the support and input to these trainees but was not able to regain the costs for staff time. Universities in a weaker market positions also seem to be obliged to meet school demands to a much greater extent due to the shifts towards a school-led model. Thus, not only are universities competing against one another in terms of student allocation for their core PGCE programmes, but also which schools will work in partnership with them on their School Direct programme. As one university-based teacher educator explained, different universities are charging schools differing amounts for the school-based placement, forcing universities to 'undercut one another' whilst schools are choosing to go with another provider 'because they're cheaper' whilst from their perspective it is an advantage 'that they don't spend so much time in university' because they 'want them at school.' The same teacher educator also expressed how she felt that this level of competition was also forcing universities to 'offer more for less', in the form of 'goodwill packages in order for them to stay in the game.' This meant that her own university was stuck in the difficult position of knowing whether to;

> *'stand back' and say as a university 'this is the quality of what we offer you in support, this is the quality of the underlying pedagogy, this is our vision of our teacher that we'll develop with you' or say 'we'll do minimum input but then you'll have to buy us back if you then need more input.*

She hoped that in terms of the former option, schools would buy into this model but recognised there was a risk of losing business whilst the latter presents an issue in terms of quality assurance. As she further explained:

> *We are supposed to be here producing a whole generation of outstanding teachers, and that's what we're supposed to be doing, but we're stumped, how do you do that, with funding models like that. It's difficult.*

Similarly, another university-teacher educator explained how due to central university management pressure, the department had been forced to succumb to the demands of the market and offer a variety of university packages which schools could choose from. In some cases, the university input was greatly reduced, consisting of offering qualified teacher status only without PGCE. And, although they had tried to 'hold the line' on the basis of academic arguments, they had experienced 'series of management malfunctions' meaning that the 'decision making isn't with the people who know what is best to do.' Instead, such moves were justified on account of 'opportunism in the market' meaning that possible financial gains trumped those on academic grounds.

There was also a sense that due to the increased competition and position of power that schools now enjoyed, partnership arrangements had the potential to be transient. Thus, university-based teacher educators were in the difficult position of having to make major changes to meet the demands of schools, which may choose to partner with another provider the following year. Furthermore, there was also evidence that schools were making demands on different providers, using their bargaining power and trying to get a more competitive price from the university by threatening to leave. As one teacher educator explained:

> *I had some very strange meetings last year with a particular school, quite a big mover and shaker. Every time I met them last year, they threatened to go with another provider because they were paying £1,000 more and actually they stuck with us and I thought after all that palaver, so they're playing us off against each other and what are you going to give us for that amount of money.*

Thus, it seems the new model is changing the position of schools to operate like consumers and for universities, as one person commented to act like 'gas providers.

The extent to which students were able to make an informed choice in terms of the differences between types of courses and providers was also variable. The majority of trainee teachers we interviewed who had opted for a school-based training route had done so on the basis that they believed that gaining more practical experience would be advantageous. Many also preferred the opportunity to apply directly to a school and thus have a greater degree of control in terms of where they would undertake school placements. However, apart from some logistical and structural differences, the majority of trainees had a limited understanding of the actual differences between new school-based routes and the traditional PGCE programmes. It was common for trainees to continue to hold that they had made the right choice to opt for a school-based route possibly because of proximity of experience although some trainees later regretted their choice because of some of the teething problems of School Direct because of the newness of the course.

Overall, there was much variation in terms of how different universities were responding to the changing market conditions. Thus, there seems to be greater diversification in the system as a consequence to the introduction of School Direct. Although we have limited data on what impact this is having on student experience, it seems that universities are having to compromise their position, the content and structure of their courses in order to survive.

School led-training is altering the balance of power away from universities

The ascendance of school-led training is altering the balance of power between universities and schools and in turn their relationship with one another. The partnership model and the responsibilities of schools and universities are being altered and reshaped.

The shift towards school-led programmes has tipped the balance of power within partnership arrangements. Analysis of the data showed that this was having an impact on how responsibilities were being shared across universities and schools whilst the designation for different categories of different personal was also changing. Most notably, it was evident that schools have taken on increasing responsibilities with regard to the organisation of training courses and the delivery of teacher knowledge. However, within the data set, there was a prominent theme of doubt as to whether schools had the necessary expertise. For example, some university-based teacher educators felt that those in schools tended to have more context specific and shallower subject pedagogical knowledge. As one teacher educator explained:

> *I know far more about mathematics than I ever did when I was teaching or even when I was an undergraduate, because of my research but also because of my teaching about mathematics. I can remember when I was a very young lecturer having a situation where we were doing something about calculating miles per hour. And a teacher said to me, well how can you divide miles by hours? Now that's something I never ever thought about before then, but actually it's a really interesting question. And what do we mean when we say miles per hour? And what does it mean to divide one measure by a completely different measure?*

Thus, in contrast to those based in universities, school teachers were positioned as not having the time or the access to research or theoretical models meaning that they had a less developed understanding of pedagogical concepts specific to their subject.

The diversity and breadth of university-based teacher educators' expertise was also seen as enabling them to talk about classroom practice in a much more analytical and critical way than those who were part of school structures and practices. For example, one teacher educator described a scenario where a colleague was recounting what they thought they knew after twenty years in higher education that they didn't know when they were a school teacher; 'And he said, I'm not sure it's that I know different things, but I'm able to talk about them. I've got a language to talk about them.' The same teacher educator further reflected and said:

> *We see lots of schools and lots of classrooms. And most teachers don't. And you do learn an awful lot by seeing different contexts and seeing that…the most trivial things that are a huge problem in one school are just dealt with in another school. Things that people get exercised about organisationally they're just different. But also you learn a lot by watching a lot of teachers, watching a lot of students. And that's not an experience that a teacher in school can have even in the days when there is much more opportunity to observe other teachers. You're usually only observing people in your own school; you're not getting that breadth of experience and when you are under the same pressures and routines it is harder to step outside of that and view practice critically.*

Changes to recruitment and the involvement of schools in the selection and interview process had also led to some tensions between university and school-based staff. For example, a number of university-based teacher educators expressed concern that schools were not equipped with the necessary skills to see potential in candidates. For example, as one teacher educator explained how schools only have the benchmark of interviewing NQT's for jobs 'and so they see these candidates and think they're completely hopeless because they don't have the experience to judge the potential of what a beginning PGCE student looks like compared to an oven ready NQT.' This situation was recognised to having a direct impact upon student recruitment and in turn the university's income. Furthermore, the same teacher educator expressed concern in terms of how this area of university-based expertise was under-recognised whilst she also felt that due to the present re-adjustments in responsibilities it had the potential to be lost. She added; 'obviously there will be individual mentors who are very good, but actually if you add up the years of experience in a school of education like this, you'll probably have several hundred years of experience between us.'

There were also numerous incidences of disagreements between the school and the university in accepting candidates on the School Direct course and what the criteria should be. In some cases, it was reported that acceptance letters had been sent by the school but where the university had not approved the candidate resulting in the offer being withdrawn. In other cases, schools were asking universities to relax certain expectations whilst teacher educators also reported being under pressure from senior managers to do this in order to retain the business. For example, one teacher educator explained how one partnership school refused for a student to do a subject enhancement course despite not having a degree in their chosen specialist subject area. Although the teacher educator felt this was something she 'absolutely could not accept', the pressure was being put on her 'because the school are saying 'we'll go somewhere else' but university management said 'we need the numbers, you can't let them go somewhere else.' Due to shifts in power and responsibility, schools were thus seemingly gaining more confidence and demanding a greater share of responsibility. The changing context of the relationship between schools and universities were thus testing the lines of accountability, however universities continued to carry the burden and possible penalties of quality assurance procedures such as Ofsted.

At the far end, the shift of power and responsibility moved towards schools converting to School Centred Initial Teacher Training Providers (SCITT's). In some cases, these providers were still maintaining a relationship with a university whereas others were independent. Some teacher educators were fearful of what the increased competition might mean whilst they were also frustrated with the political intervention that had taken place to encourage schools to convert. As one teacher educator exclaimed, when schools are given SCITT status, 'it is like a pat on the back, it is like saying you are a good provider.' Other teacher educators were also being put in

the paradoxical position of supporting schools to become SCITTs by helping them to develop their professional training programmes. As one teacher educator remarked; 'you are preparing them to leave you, it's like you know, here's the knife cut your own throat.' However, as he further explained he was 'operating under instructions from higher up, higher power…you know, it's just in order to keep them on board for this year.'

Although there was an air of resentment on the part of teacher educators towards schools due to the ascendance of their position, many also recognised some of the benefits of schools taking on more responsibility for teacher training. In some cases, this was simply due to improvements in logistical arrangements such as alleviating previous issues around finding school placements for students. However, some went further than this and recognised how the introduction of School Direct was an opportunity to improve teacher preparation, drawing on the expertise of both schools and universities. They recognised that due to the amount of policy changes, the responsibilities of schools and universities had become confused and in some case misplaced. Thus, a more balanced partnership model could enable elements do become re-aligned and re-distributed to ensure that they fitted with the expertise of staff in each setting. For example, one teacher educator who we interviewed did not see the movement of staff from universities back into schools as 'necessarily a bad thing' whilst the re-organisation of responsibilities was opening up the opportunity for his department to 'develop a masters programme through to doctoral level programmes for teachers.' For him this was 'the work the university should be doing, not fiddling around with Ofsted criteria and sitting in the back of a classroom grading lessons.' As he further elaborated:

> *What am I doing sitting making judgements about this student's teaching and how they're interacting with these children? I've never seen these children before and I'm never going to see them again. How on earth can I judge the quality of that interaction?" Surely there is somebody in schools who is better placed to do that.*

There was much confusion however about what in practice, a school-led model meant. For example, teacher educators also spoke of how the language and rhetoric being used to satisfy shifts in powers towards schools was also being used to mask what was happening at a ground level, which was further antagonising the relationships between universities and schools. Furthermore, in reality partnership arrangements had been in existence for a long time whilst positive developments were also happening in terms of how universities and schools were seeking to work together. Those in the universities spoke of how they were being forced to adopt language influenced by governmental ideology and rhetoric when speaking to certain audiences, but in practice they were forced to play more of a strategic, negotiating role. For example, when we interviewed the Director of ITE at one institution he described his role as follows:

> *I think it's a very complex role…well it's not really a role because it's about occupying a space between the two institutions … and also managing this notion of a school-led partnership, whatever that means. Because clearly whatever we do, however we go about it – negotiations, arrangements, sometimes it's about contractual level arrangements, sometimes it is more broader, collaborative agreements – it has to be done with this sub-text of however we approach this we must present this to NTCL, to the government, as being school-led. Now some schools want it to be that way in reality and others don't and are actually quite resentful, and others would prefer it not but they understand the context, so we have these multi-layered conversations where we know we both have to present it differently to an external audience. Then of course there are senior managers within the university who we have to present a very different face to, who are very resistant and at times outraged at the notion that schools should have such a voice.*

Another major change in the balance of power between universities and schools was how schools now choose which provider to work with. As this teacher educator further explained:

> *The school chooses a uni, the school is almost seen as we're brand viewing, 'it's our funding and it's our programme and we are buying back the services of the university'. Okay that's a complete shift to 'we would like you to place our student', they're their students, they're buying, 'what is our role?' Our role is very much changing.*

Furthermore, in order to be in a sustainable position, universities were also seeking to offer slimmed down input especially for salaried School Direct students. However, in order to make partnership arrangements work they found themselves actually doing more, having to pick up the pieces and play a relationship maintenance role. As the same teacher educator explained:

> *We envisaged, at first, with the salaried, they were going to come to us and we were going to do the assignments, the assessment, right, not a QTS (Qualified Teacher Satatus) but of masters level work and that was it, the school would do the rest but that's not how it's morphed. Those students need far more input on teaching and learning because of the nature of their huge timetables, because of the nature of not having a 24-hour mentor whose class you are taking. So we've had to do more on teaching and learning than we envisaged at the beginning and a lot more support because many are struggling to cope. So we are having to put strategies in place as the schools were just leaving them to struggle.*

These themes show that the ways in which schools and universities were operating consequent to changes in how responsibilities were shared were having significant consequences for partnership arrangements. In some cases, this is resulting in new developments and changes in practice however, this is also causing some friction and tension between educators in different locations.

The composition of universities' contribution to teacher training is changing

University teacher educators have witnessed major changes to their professional roles and in turn their activities. This is having an impact upon how universities seek to defend a distinctive contribution to teacher training.

As a consequence to changes to the role and remit of university-based teacher educators there was evidence to show that traditional, 'bed-rocks' of the university contribution are seemingly becoming usurped by schools or dropped altogether. Such findings have serious implications for how universities seek to maintain power within the new landscape and, in particular, how they defend a distinctive contribution within an ever-competitive marketplace.

In one case, a teacher educator explained how previously 'non-negotiable' elements of the course such as subject pedagogy and masters-level inputs had become 'negotiable.' For the other teacher educator who was interviewed at the same time, this had 'happened without my noticing' citing the pace of change as a reason as to why it was difficult to keep up with such developments. The moves were in response to a revalidation process, which had been pressed upon them by senior management. However, both teacher educators were not sure who in the partnership schools would deliver these units and whether there was set criteria to meet or whether they would have the necessary expertise.

Another teacher educator spoke of how she was aware that they are 'operating in a mixed economy' in that schools want different things, this presented challenges in terms of how universities seek to articulate their contribution. For example, he recognised that the 'research centres' within his department were 'attractive to some schools, but not all' whilst some schools were operating as large Teaching School Alliances and some preferred to remain single, more autonomous players. Although, his department were trying to 'market who we are and what we can bring to the partnership' this was difficult when seeking to work with such a diverse array of partnership schools. Furthermore, in their attempt to 'hold the line' and retain some elements of the university contribution, they had lost the business from some potential partnership schools. As she further explains:

> *We lost a major teaching school alliance last year who wanted more of that training and I use 'training' on purpose. And they wanted to do more of that. And so they've gone to another provider and we held firm on that.*

In contrast, other departments we spoke to were experimenting with a range of different models and meeting the demands of schools to a much greater extent in order to gain their business. For example, one teacher educator explained how for a large Teaching School Alliance, they were 'blurring the boundaries' between the university and school by staffing all training with one university-based teacher educator and one school-based teacher educator on the school site. In this case, students would only be required to attend an induction and exit day at the university whilst the rest would be provided at the lead teaching school. As he described:

> *They'll come for induction so they can have a library induction so they can understand they are part of something bigger, but because this teaching alliance is at a distance they would prefer all of their training to be there at their alliance, which is what the facility is for. So we will be staffing that.*

The teacher educator saw these developments as positive and a way to further expand the university role, as he explains:

> *What's interesting is that you begin to expand your idea of what School Direct could mean and what it could be about because we're already getting to a point where we're seeing that CPD within our alliances is something that's been requested.*

Interestingly, he did not regard such moves as 'letting go' but retaining responsibility for the management of the programme particularly in terms of the university playing a quality assurance role. As he further explained:

> *I don't regard it as a letting go really… It is the idea that I'm not letting go of something that I want to hang on to. I am still hanging onto it. I still feel as though – and it's taken to a year where I've got to the point where I feel this – but I do feel that I have the ability to maintain responsibility for the programme and to take a lead in coordinating it. And, interestingly enough, the alliance leaders I think feel that they want that. They like to feel there is somebody there who is keeping an eye on things, monitoring things, and trying to coordinate things in some kind of effective way.*

Regardless how such developments are viewed, such instances demonstrate one of the earlier assertions, which recognised how local conditions in the market are influencing the composition of models are being produced.

There was also evidence to show that attempts by universities to experiment with different packages were also further complicating funding models. Thus, by offering reduced models of input, universities were able to offer competitive rates to schools in an attempt to increase their share of the market. In this sense, efforts to retain distinctive elements of the university contribution was seen to be in competition with market logic and decisions made on economic grounds. For some teacher educators, increased collaboration and a united response from the university sector was the answer. As one teacher educator explained:

> *I think we should be saying what is our stance and what is our position and actually we weaken ourselves by saying, right, well, if you're doing that for £4,000, we'll do it for £4,100 because then you're hitting…you're pulling trade in on the basis…I can get a bit more cash rather than being a provider of choice, so I think we should work more collaboratively than we have done… I think there's a sense of strength in numbers, but also because I think we can give a consistent message about what the value of the university input is.*

However, another teacher educator expressed how attempts had been made to form a regional alliance of university providers, and although the majority were co-operating, one provider has chosen not to join and instead 'very aggressively markets against the rest of us…so there is a fear that if we

agree on something they will just undercut all of us.' Such examples show that whilst universities were attempting to present an allied response, the very nature of operating in a competitive market challenges such efforts.

One of the other challenges facing universities attempts to defend a distinctive contribution is the variance of position across the workforce in terms of their beliefs of what the university input should consist of and which elements are seen as distinctive. For example, some teacher educators we interviewed viewed themselves as expert practitioners and due to their relatively recent school experience were comfortable in negotiating with schools and essentially playing a support role. For these teacher educators it was essential to increasingly blur the boundaries between universities and schools by further experimenting with a partnership model where responsibilities were shared and divided across teacher educators based in universities and schools. For example, teacher educators within this group spoke of how they were in favour of shared appointments across schools and universities whilst some were already working under such arrangements. Whilst teacher educators in this group had currency with the schools, they sometimes lacked capital within their host institutions as their expertise in managing relationships or meeting the needs of schools was not valued as much as other staff's ability to maintain a research record for example. They also showed frustration at some university practices and traditions because they recognised how these acted as barriers to engagement with schools. For example, as one teacher educator explained:

> *Sometimes there are things that we've done and I think, god, we've done a really good job there and then the way in which we present it to the schools…and you think why on earth have we said it like that; that's just utterly ridiculous or there're things that we do and…you know, like there was a thing where we'd got a sort of package for schools and we sent it out and, when I was looking at it, I said it hasn't got any prices on and the response was, well, we want them to express an interest and then we'll negotiate the price, but if I'm a head, I'm going to want to see can I afford it – yes/no. If there's no price on it, I'm going to put it in the bin because I'm busy. I'm not going to take the time to ring up and say I'm interested in this, but can I afford it, so surely we have to put a kind of price even if we then say this will drop if more people…so there're bits like that where I think we don't do ourselves any favours in terms of how we necessarily present ourselves, so I do wonder about our marketing of ourselves with the schools as well.*

However, at the other end of the spectrum there was also evidence to show that due to changing priorities within the educational landscape, areas that some longer-term teacher educators had traditionally regarded as distinctive had already disappeared. For example, one teacher educator described how due to the way that pedagogy of her subject has changed as a consequence to increased specification, her subject and how it is taught was now very different from her own pedagogical conceptions which had been acquired within the academy. As she further explained in relation to recent observations of trainees in schools:

> *Nothing they seem to be doing bears any relation to any kind of research or ideas about learning or how kids learn…I think it's really sad. [A really good student]… said something like, 'what I've learned is that if you're doing an investigation (in mathematics), it can't last more than twenty minutes'… I've seen some really lovely ideas I would have spent hours on with kids. He allowed three minutes for it…and they did it! I'm a bit cynical really. Even my younger colleagues, they think that's as it is now really - some, but not all…*

For this teacher educator the changing circumstances meant that retiring was now the logical option. Incidentally, this was a reoccurring theme for teacher educators within this demographic group.

For other teacher educators that we spoke too, becoming more research active was an important way of managing the changing environment. As one teacher educator explained:

> *For me, doing the PhD over 6 years, it's given me this thinking … a bit of me time. Okay, there's not time really in the system for me, but that gives me headspace to … because I'm having to change with that, that assists me managing some of the changes that are happening around me, because I'm pushing my own comfort zone … I'm pushing myself out of who I was. So the fact that things are changing round me is… I'm finding it probably easier to work with because I have new tools through the PhD to even question and think about those and think, okay, that's interesting…*

However, it was also not uncommon for university-based teacher educators to find it difficult to have the time to do research whilst the push towards practice and burden of administrative tasks meant that research had become a lower status priority. Ironically, one teacher educator remarked that she felt that she had more time to read as a school-based English teacher than a university-based lecturer. Such themes within the data further mount challenges in terms of defending a distinctive university contribution on the basis of research-informed teaching.

The supporting data for this assertion shows that there are a variety of factors that impinge upon the central tenets that are often cited when defending a distinctive university contribution. Such findings present challenges for those seeking to retain significant involvement of universities within teacher training on the basis of these grounds whilst also showing that the changing policy landscape is altering the priorities and activities of those involved.

The composition of trainee pedagogical experience is being reconfigured

University and school-based teacher educators are aware, to differing degrees, of how School Direct trainees' pedagogical experiences are being reconfigured as a consequence of school-led arrangements. Educators hold differing beliefs in terms of the breadth and type of professional experience that trainees need and this is having an impact upon the composition of student experience.

When analysing the data pertinent to this assertion it became increasingly obvious that not only course structures changing in terms of the location of where trainees are taught but also the nature of their pedagogical experiences in terms of how the relationship between theory and practice is conceptualised. In particular, the emphasis placed upon practice seems to have progressively replaced the relationship with an understanding of practice that is integrated with situated conceptions of theory, which are reduced in terms of their utility or responsiveness to the needs of practice. These reconceptualisations thus privilege practical components at the detriment of theory and analysis. For example, one university teacher educator explained there was neither the time of the expectation for 'addressing whole piles of texts' so that theory can be dissected and applied to practice, instead trainees are given 'readers and things, which are potted distillations of key ideas. Papers, which are shortish, they can get their heads around …get to the crux of the arguments people are making so they can easily be applied to specific elements of practice.'

University and school-based teacher educators are aware, to differing degrees, of how this situation is impacting trainees' conceptions of how to teach. For example, one teacher educator recognised how that due to the emphasis on the importance of practice there is a danger that more practical elements are used as a descriptor to contrast more academic or theoretical elements, which are 'being seen as not much use'. For him, this danger had 'the potential to diminish the teaching profession because I think it has the potential for ignoring a lot of work that's been done in trying to understand what happens in teaching and learning, …it simplifies what is actually a very complex business that we're in.'

Such fears do not seem altogether unjustified when analysing this against what some trainees told us in terms of their opinion of some of their university-based sessions. For instance, many of the trainees favoured the more practically-oriented training they received in schools which tended to focus on how to adopt particular behaviours or approaches in the classroom rather than a more theoretical understanding that could inform practice. As one trainee explained:

> *Some of the articles we read were really helpful and were really interesting. But sometimes I just felt I would learn so much more if I was just sat observing in a classroom or being shown how to deal with a child who has ADHD rather than just being told what the condition is. Or if I was out doing something in a classroom, even it was just like helping one particular kid who has ADHD I'd feel like I'd learnt so much more doing that instead of just being sat at university learning about SEN (Special Educational Needs).*

However, as trainees developed during the course and became more confident in the classroom, we found evidence that during the later stages of their course they began to value the more critical and theoretical aspects that they had learnt predominantly within the university settings. For instance, one newly qualified teacher we interviewed explained why she had decided to undertake credits for a Masters in her first year of teaching:

> *I've noticed me thinking less critically and deeply, and that's why when the Masters opportunity came up I thought, I want to do that, to keep that link, because on a day to day, you're busy. Five periods a day of thirty kids, you don't have enough time to sit back and go, hmm, why am I doing this, because you've got a hundred million and one things to do, and by doing a Master's it encourages you to engage, to read and think why you are doing something rather than just ticking a box and trying to be an outstanding teacher…*

There was also evidence to show that trainees were having to assimilate quite different understandings of pedagogy between school-based and university-based training sessions whilst efforts to mesh what was being taught within each setting was often limited. It was not uncommon for trainees to feel that content had been repeated by the school and/or university. Furthermore, there was evidence that those delivering taught sessions in schools and university settings were often not fully aware of the elements that were being covered in each. For some teacher educators this was because of the changes in how schools were now responsible for delivering more parts of the training whilst the pace of change and different models in operation were also adding to confusion. One school-based mentor expressed how she felt there was reluctance from the university to share information due to increased competition, whilst another said she had received a course handbook but had not looked at it because 'bearing in mind their reputation I trust they will cover what is needed'. Amongst university-based teacher educators, there was evidence to show that the opportunity to develop new understandings of the relationship between theory and practice had simply not been fully utilised.

These findings show how the new arrangements are changing the pedagogical experiences of trainees and in particular how the relationship between theory and practice is configured. There are differences in structure of how content is presented in terms of setting but also attempts to mesh different conceptions of theory and practice together. Furthermore, there is a range of beliefs about what is favourable or deemed 'useful' depending upon location, underlying principles and stage of development. Although there seems an opportunity for schools and universities to think creatively about how to develop understandings of pedagogy and the relationship between theory and practice, it will require both to challenge underlying assumptions about the role that each other plays within the training process.

Conceptions of pedagogical subject knowledge vary between schools and universities

Conceptions of substantive subject and pedagogical subject knowledge vary between school and university teacher educators and this may affect coherence of provision across different locations.

Traditionally, subject knowledge has occupied a distinctive part of the university input and is conceptualised as the adjustment that the trainee makes from their own academic study of a subject within a university degree to a more pedagogically oriented conception of that subject for teaching in schools. However, within a school-based model this progression is increasingly shaped by demands of the regulative policies and highly structured frameworks as enacted within schools where they spend the majority of their time. As one trainee further explained:

> *I think I have learnt more about how to teach my subject at school rather than uni. I mean the uni sessions are interesting because it is making me think about my subject in different ways but it's at school where I have really got to grips with what I have got to teach. My department is great because the unit specifications are all mapped out for you, it shows clearly how each of the topics should be set out, how it links to learning outcomes and how they will be tested so it all straight-forward.*

Thus in this scenario, the trainee crafts his understandings according to the legislative framework in which his practices have become ever more strictly articulated rather than being educated so much in university to engage critically with evolving demands.

However, it is not only the influence of increased specification and how this is used in schools, which seems to be shaping trainees' pedagogical understanding of their subject. There was also evidence to show that within university-based subject specific sessions, the expectation to deliver lessons using a particular structure was also influencing how student teachers were being trained to teach their subject. As one trainee described:

> *I do think the fact that in university, everywhere it's drilled into you that you need to have a starter, a main (activity) and a plenary. I think sometimes that can be quite constraining especially in English. If they've not finished their main activity, having to stop because some of them have finished or it's time to do the plenary because you will be judged badly if you don't have one. I think it can be quite constraining in that sense especially when you have to feel like you have to make them active and interesting and stuff like that.*

There was also evidence to show that although university-based teacher educators often prided themselves on their substantive subject and pedagogical subject knowledge there was decreasing space for these elements within school-based courses. For some, as was identified earlier by the long-term teacher educator, it was because increased specification has changed how underlying conceptions of their subject are now taught but for others it was simply because these aspects were simply not valued within the new regime. As one teacher educator explained:

> *I could go on for hours about little bits of mathematical reasoning that I've had the opportunity but also the need to think deeply about but that's not important to learning how to teach anymore, it is more about being able to prove that a particular approach will mean that the kids will get good results.*

Within school-based models there are also changes in location of delivery of subject knowledge. It was common for schools to be responsible for delivering subject knowledge although exactly how the content was co-ordinated across university and school-based sites often seemed to be problematic. As one teacher educator described:

> *So I said to the trainees 'have you been able to do the subject development task that we'd set up for the school-based sessions', we build that in as a development task, and we quite clearly picked topics that we felt that schools would be able to support, we thought that they would be able to do that but those haven't happened for one reason and another mainly I think because the school don't see it as their concern.*

There was also an apparent reluctance and perhaps lack of confidence when we talked to school-based educators about the delivery of subject-specific pedagogy. For example, a school-based mentor said:

> *In schools we're very good at teaching the teenagers and the students what they need to know. We are very busy doing that and we're clearly experts in delivering that curriculum in a way that's manageable for them. Perhaps what we're not experts in is really the pedagogy behind it because we don't have that time to reflect on what we're doing and why we're doing it, it's very much in the moment. So I think universities are best placed to deliver subject specific training.*

Despite this, due to a greater proportion of trainees' time being spent in schools, many university-based teacher educators said that the number of university-based subject specific sessions had decreased with the expectation that this would be covered in schools. For one university the reduction was apparently more than two thirds. However, the ability of schools to provide subject-specific sessions was in doubt particularly because the number of trainees for each subject was small with more generic sessions being the norm.

There was also evidence that the breadth of expertise in different subject areas was also reducing due to the prioritisation of particular subjects in specified curriculum structures and in turn in schools. For example, tighter specification of core subjects such as mathematics, English and science has led to a compression of staff specialising in music, drama and art in schools. Conversely, falling numbers of trainees choosing arts-based subjects meant a reduction of university-based teacher educators specialising in these areas. Furthermore, subjects such as psychology, sociology and law have become even more difficult to support by university tutors as they have often been conflated into generic social science due to demands made by the National Curriculum. As one university-based teacher educator explained, for subject-specific training for her trainees specialising in social science, she needed to meet their generic subject needs whilst recognising that once they are qualified teachers it is likely that they would be expected to teach psychology, law or sociology at A-level (18+).

These findings make it difficult for universities to defend a distinctive contribution on the basis of subject knowledge input but also raise questions as to how trainees substantive subject and pedagogical subject knowledge is being developed within school-based programmes.

New research priorities are redefining teacher educator professionalism

Official specification and surveillance of teaching practice coupled with competing conceptions of the functions of research is having an impact upon how teacher educator professionalism and agency is understood and enacted.

Interviews with university-based and school-based teacher educators revealed evidence that attitudes towards the role of research were changing. For those in university, research remained part of professional expectations and featured in performativity frameworks. Many felt, however, that research valued in the academy was not consistent with that deemed useful to schools, whilst more broadly they were perceived by other academics as the 'rejects of the university, the people that don't do real research.' Such fears were also compounded by demands to make university sessions more practice focused and by prevalent discourses that conceptualised teaching as a craft. It was also common for university staff to feel like they did not have time to do research whilst maintaining their primary identity as an expert practitioner with 'recent school experience' needed to gain kudos from school-based colleagues.

Despite these issues, there was a growing interest amongst school-based educators in how research can be used to inform practice and how they could work more closely with universities for CPD purposes. As one university-based teacher educator explained:

> *I think that schools themselves have been told you have to find local models of improving teaching and learning and I think there's been a shift. The schools are now seeing their own staff as being the people who can do their own research, who can go and reengage in university journals, who can do that. And we, one of my roles within School Direct, getting to know the schools even more, is they're asking us to go in and work with their staff on doing some action research. Not just with the trainee teachers but with their own staff and I think that's been quite a shift, and I think School Direct could actually get a closer relationship with us doing that and with all their staff and not just the trainees. So I think that's a really good thing.*

However, such opportunities do bring challenges, as the same teacher educator went onto elaborate:

> *There has been a recognition by the government of the importance of teachers doing their own action research and reflecting more in the classroom. You've got papers like "bad science", have you seen that paper? And whether we flippantly look at it and say 'Well you know,' ….the question is do we have the capacity to do it, you know, the funding models have changed, how are we going to sustain and be able to do that? Are schools going to have to, you know, buy the universities more in order to do that because I don't think that will wash…'*

Here it seems that this teacher educator stops short of recognising some of the more complex issues of the differences between conceptualisations of research as being crafted as 'evidence' that can be used in a straightforward manner as opposed to those more traditionally located within the academy. More recently, the former have enjoyed status in popular rhetoric and were recognised by other teacher educators as having currency within schools due to their consistency with efforts to improve narrowly defined educational outcomes within an increasingly prescriptive framework. However, this is at odds with those purported within the university, which positions research as progressing critical or analytical ideas of what it means to educate. This disjuncture again highlights friction between popular conceptions of teachers as technicians, emphasising the practical nature of their jobs rather than the more complex aspects of pedagogy. Furthermore, such issues reflect broader debates in terms of the professional basis of teaching and in turn the agency of teachers to influence educational change.

Future Implications

A distinctive role for universities in teacher education

Schools are now taking the lead in many areas of teacher education that had previously been the responsibility of university departments. With our data we have had access to the insider experience of practitioners addressing these new demands. We have provided little more than a snap shot of a highly varied and rapidly changing situation. Yet there are many commonalities in people's experiences. The growth of teacher educators in universities from school backgrounds, perhaps with a different pedagogical understanding of subject knowledge, has shored up the new operationally oriented priorities. At the same time these teacher educators have become disconnected from the primary source of their own expertise in schools as they have become stranded in a newly defined space, whilst leaving their former school colleagues to pick up the spoils of newly located teacher education. It allows for a reformatting of the teacher educator's sense of her identity and a potential distancing from the reductive discourses troubling subject knowledge construction.

The teacher educator and trainee each have an understanding of their own practice. Yet these understandings are referenced to discursive parameters that encapsulate particular ideological slants on the matters in hand. People are processed through the metrics that are compliant with structures rather than understood as humans in a standalone sense. The commodification associated with the economic metaphors (delivery, providers, quality, performance, account) changes connections of individuals to different areas of their practice. For example, subject domains and individuals assume a partiality towards each other in terms of assessment orientation, reshaping of professional roles and structural rearrangements of institutions, which are intensified as a result of market or regulative fluctuations (Brown, Rowley and Smith, 2015). An Ofsted result can redistribute local provision. Participants in learning encounters have often become programmed to speak, hear or see only certain words as understood within a particular register.

Perhaps ultimately the new role of universities is to provide a platform from where both tutors and trainees can critically analyse the issues arising in school practice. This new focus would be on building generic analytical capability that supports learning by the trainees in association with their school-based mentors. The challenge would entail supporting trainees in becoming more independent research-active teachers through building a productive critical relationship between university sessions and their developing practice in school. Here universities would assist trainees in developing practitioner-oriented research and connecting it with the broader body of research knowledge. That is, reflective practice would comprise a creative ongoing process of practitioner research that progressively defined the parameters of teaching, whilst negotiating a path through the external demands that trainees will surely encounter. Collaborative, reflexive, practitioner-oriented action research would underpin successive reconceptualisations of practice towards enhancing trainees' abilities to claim intellectual space in these regulative times.

New priorities may require many aspirant teacher educators to remain in schools, or to change their practice to meet the new composition of work demanded of universities. For some tutors currently in universities, however, it seems that these demands are such that the changes may be enacted by a new generation.

Outputs from Project

Publications

Brown, T. Rowley, H. Smith, K. (2015) Sliding Subject Positions: Knowledge and Teacher Educators, British Educational Research Journal.

Brown, T. Rowley, H. Smith, K. (2014) Rethinking Research in Teacher Education. British Journal of Education Studies. 62: 3, 281-296

Allied Publications

Brown, T., Hodson, E. and Smith, K. (2013) TIMSS maths has changed real maths forever, For the Learning of Mathematics, 33: 2, 38–43.

Hodson, E., Smith, K. and Brown, T. (2012) Reasserting theory in professionally-based initial teacher education, Teachers and Teaching, 18: 2, 181–195.

Smith, K. and Hodson, E. (2010) Theorising practice in initial teacher training, Journal of Education for Teaching, 36: 3, 259–275.

Smith, K., Hodson, E. and Brown, T. (2013) Teaching educator changing perceptions of theory, Educational Action Research Journal, 21: 2, 237–252.

Smith, K., Hodson, E. and Brown, T. (2013) The discursive production of classroom mathematics, Mathematics Education Research Journal, 25, 379–397.

Presentations

Brown, T. (2014) Re-thinking research in university teacher education. Talk presented at the University of Manchester. Repeated in New Zealand at Massey University and Auckland University of Technology.

Brown, T. (2014) TIMSS maths has changed real maths forever. Presented at the conference of the British Society for Research to Learning Mathematics. Cambridge University.

Brown, T. (2015) Experiencing change in initial teacher education: A Lacanian perspective. Seminar presented at Kings College London.

Brown, T. Rowley, H. and Smith, K. (2014) The Impact of New Forms of Professional Training on Long-term Teacher Educators. European Conference for Educational Research, Porto. Repeated at British Education Research Association Conference, London, Teacher Education Association Network, Birmingham, and at Cumbria University.

Brown, T. Rowley, H. and Smith, K. (2014) School Direct Research Project. Two staff development seminars. Manchester Metropolitan University.

Hanley, C. and Brown, T (2015) Learning the language of teaching: The acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge in English. European Conference for Educational Research, Budapest.

Rowley, H. Brown, T. and Smith, K. (2014/15) Reforming Teacher Education in the UK: Teacher Educators' Experiences of an Increasingly Marginalised Position. The Battle for Teacher Education: Reform in International and National Contexts, Bergen. Repeated at Brunel University and European Conference for Educational Research, Budapest.

References

Askew, M., Hodgen, J., Hossain, S. and Bretscher, N. (2010) Values and variables: A review of mathematics education in high-performing countries. London: The Nuffield Foundation.

Ball, S. (2001). Teachers' soul and the terrors of performativity. Unpublished manuscript, University of London at London, England.

Beauchamp, G. Clarke, L. Hulme, M. and Murray, J. (2015) Teacher education in the United Kingdom post devolution: convergences and divergences, Oxford Review of Education, 41:2, 154-170.

Bamfield, L. (ed.) 2014, The role of research in teacher education: reviewing the evidence: interim report of the BERA-RSA inquiry, British Educational Research Association, London, 2015, <http://www.bera.ac.uk/system/files/BERA-RSA%20Interim%20Report.pdf>

Boyd, P. and Harris, K. (2010) Becoming a university lecturer in teacher education: expert school teachers reconstructing their pedagogy and identity, Professional Development in Education, 36: 1–2, 9–24.

Brown, T. Rowley, H. Smith, K. (2015) Sliding Subject Positions: Knowledge and Teacher Educators, British Educational Research Journal.

Brown, T. Rowley, H. Smith, K. (2014) Rethinking Research in Teacher Education. British Journal of Education Studies. 62: 3, 281-296

Brown, T. and McNamara, O. (2011) Becoming a Mathematics Teacher. Identity and Identifications. Dordrecht: Springer.

Brown, T. and McNamara, O. (2005) New Teacher Identity and Regulative Government: The Discursive Formation of Primary Mathematics Teacher Education. Dordrecht: Springer

Browne, L. and Reid, J. (2012) Changing localities for teacher training: the potential impact on professional formation and the university sector response, Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 38: 4, 497–508.

Carter, A. (2015) Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399957/Carter_Review.pdf

Childs, A. (2013) The work of teacher educators: an English policy perspective, Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 39: 3, 314–328.

Childs, A., Edwards, A., and McNicholl, J. (2013). Developing a multi-layered system of distributed expertise: What does cultural historical theory bring to understanding workplace learning in school-university partnerships? In O. McNamara, J. Murray, and M. Jones (Eds.), Workplace learning in teacher education. London: Springer.

Christie, D., Donoghue, M., Kirk, G., McNamara, M., Menter, I., Moss, G., Noble-Rogers, J., Oancea, A., Rogers, C., Thomson, P., and Whitty, G. (2012). Prospects for education research in education departments in Higher Education Institutions in the UK. London: BERA-UCET Working Group on Education Research. http://www.bera.ac.uk/news/beraucet-report

Department for Education (2010) The Importance of Teaching. The Schools White Paper. London: The Stationary Office.

DfE (2011)Training Our Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers. London: The Stationary Office.

Department for Education (2013) School workforce in England. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/193090/SFR_15_2013.pdf

Ellis, V., McNicholl, J. and Pendry, A. (2012) Institutional conceptualisations of teacher education as academic work in England, Teacher and Teacher Education, 28: 5, 685–693.

Ellis, V., Glackin, M., Heighes, D., Norman, M., Norris, K., Spencer, I. and McNicholl, J. (2013) A difficult realisation: the proletarianisation of higher education-based teacher educators, Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 39: 3, 266–280.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., and Whitty, G. (2000) Teacher education in transition. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Furlong, J., and Lawn, M. (eds). (2011) Disciplines of education: Their role in the future of education research. London: Routledge

Goldacre, B. (2013). Building Evidence into Education. http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/b/ben%20goldacre%20paper.pdf

Harrison, J. and McKeon, F. (2010) Perceptions of beginning teacher educators of their development in research and scholarship: identifying the 'turning point' experiences, Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 36: 1, 19–34

Hobson, A.J., Malderez, A. and Tracey, L. (2009) Navigating initial teacher training: Becoming a teacher. London: Routledge.

Hodson, E., Smith, K. and Brown, T. (2011) Reasserting theory in professionally-based initial teacher education, Teachers and Teaching, 18: 2, 181–195.

Jones, M. and Straker, K. (2006) What informs mentors' practice when working with students and new teachers? An investigation in mentors' professional knowledge base, Journal of Education for Teaching, 32: 2, 165–184.

Labaree, D. (1995) The Lowly Status of Teacher Education in the United States in Shimahara, N.K and Holowinsky, I. Z. Teacher Education in Industrialized Nations. New York: Garland Publishing.

Lasky, S (2005) A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. Teaching and Teacher Education, 21: 8, 899–916

Menter, I., Brisard, E., and Smith, I. (2006) Convergence or divergence? Initial teacher education in Scotland and England. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

McKeon, F. and Harrison, J. (2010) Developing pedagogical practice and professional identities of beginning teacher educators, Professional Development in Education, 36: 1–2, 25–44.

McNamara, O., and Murray, J. (2013) The School Direct programme and its implications for research informed teacher education and teacher educators. York: Higher Education Academy.

McNally, J., Boreham, N., Cope, P. and Stronach, I. (2008) Learning as work: Teaching and learning processes in the contemporary work organisation. Final Report. Economic and Social Research Council, Swindon

Morris, E. (2013) 'Michael Gove has washed his hands of planning for the future' The Guardian. http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/sep/23/shortage-of-teachers

Murray, J (2014) Teacher educators' constructions of professionalism: a case study, Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 42:1, 7-21

Pampaka, M., Williams, J., Hutcheson, G., Wake, G., Black, L., Davis, P. and Hernandez-Martinez, P. (2012) The association between mathematics pedagogy and learners' dispositions for university study, British Educational Research Journal, 38: 3, 473–496.

Passy, R. (2012) Surviving and flourishing in a neoliberal world: primary trainees talking, British Educational Research Journal, 39 : 6, 1060–1075.

Price, A. and Willett, J. (2006) Primary teachers' perceptions of the impact of initial teacher training on primary schools, Journal of In-Service Education, 32: 1, 33–45.

Shulman, L. (1986) Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching, Educational Researcher, 15: 2, 4–14.

Reynolds, R., Ferguson-Patrick, K. and McCormack, A. (2013) Dancing in the ditches: reflecting on the capacity of a university/school partnership to clarify the role of a teacher educator, European Journal of Teacher Education, 36: 3, 1–13.

Shagrir, L. (2010) Professional development of novice teacher educators: professional self, interpersonal relations and teaching skills, Professional Development in Education, 36: 1–2, 45–60.

UCET. (2011) 'National College Designates 100 Teaching Schools in England.' http://www.ucet.ac.uk/search?q=Press+releases.

Taylor, W. (1983) 'Teacher Education: Achievements, Shortcomings and Perspectives.' Paper presented at The John Adams Memorial Lecture. London: The Institute of Education

White, E. (2014) An exploration of the development of academic identity in a School of Education, Professional Development in Education, 40: 1, 56–70.

White, J. (2012) Turning a scholarly blind eye, in: H. Gunter, J. White, T. Fitzgerald (Eds), Hard labour? Academic work and the changing landscape of higher education. International perspectives on higher education research, Vol. 7 Bingley: Emerald, (pp. 87–111).

Williams, J. and Ritter, J. (2010) Constructing new professional identities through selfstudy: from teacher to teacher educator, Professional Development in Education, 36: 1–2, 77–92.

Wilson, E. (2012) Building social capital in teacher education through university–school partnership. In M. Evans, (ed.). (2012). Teacher education and pedagogy: Theory, policy and practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Velzen, C., Van Der Klink, M., Swennen, A. and Yaffe, E. (2010) The induction and needs of beginning teacher educators, Professional Development in Education, 36: 1–2, 61–75.