

Facing up to the Fading Face of the University: the Nature and Quality of School-university Partnerships

Maxine C. Cooper,

Director, Centre for Professional Development

School of Education and Professional Studies

Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus

Queensland 9726

m.cooper@mailbox.gu.edu.au

Anne M. Jasman

Director, Division of Professional Experiences, Partnerships and Development

Faculty of Education, A35-609

University of Sydney

Sydney

New South Wales 2006

a.jasman@edfac.usyd.edu.au

Abstract

It has been argued that teacher educators are increasingly marginalised and have become largely invisible in both schools and universities (Jasman, 2002). The implications of this for the quality and future of teacher education programs and schooling are significant.

Accordingly, this paper examines the perceptions and experiences of teachers in schools, student teachers and university staff involved in innovative attempts to develop school-university partnerships. Specifically, the nature and quality of school-university partnerships are discussed with reference to three varied case studies.

The metaphor of 'face', derived from one teacher's comment that what s/he wanted was contact with "someone who had a permanent face at the university", is used to explore these case studies. This paper will consequently examine a range of strategies designed to create less uncertainty in school-university partnerships. These strategies include the maintenance of continuity in relationships, increasing opportunities for and the frequency of communication and conversations, both face-to-face and virtual; and effective networking between schools and universities.

Introduction

In this paper, we interpret the nature and quality of school-university partnerships through the analysis of data from three case studies drawn from varied contexts. These are explored through the use of the metaphor of 'face' and with reference to the constructs of invisibility, influence and identity discussed in Jasman . In doing so, this paper examines the 'fading face' of the university, interprets the nature and quality of school-university partnerships and suggests strategies designed to increase certainty in these partnerships. Identified strategies include: ways of maintaining continuity in relationships, increasing opportunities for dialogue, both face-to-face and virtual; and creating possibilities for networking between schools and universities. To provide background to the paper, relevant literature is summarised below.

The fading face of the university: a brief literature review

Australian Federal and State governments as well as teacher unions and professional associations have expended funds on continuing professional development and lifelong learning. Sachs argues that far from being peripheral, teacher-educators have been able to create spaces and places that enable genuine participation in the continuing professional education agenda and school-university partnerships. *Innovative Links* and the *National Schools Network* (NSN) were such programs developed in the early to mid-1990s, and are examples of what Sachs has referred to as a new form of professionalism - that of the activist professional.

Jasman (2002) argues that initial teacher education, however, has been largely ignored throughout the 1980's and 1990's. The release of the Ramsey Review and the Commonwealth Review of Teaching and Teacher Education (see Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002) have aided in reorienting focus towards teacher education and teacher educators.

At the same time, opportunities for teacher educators to assume a more activist role within their marginalised positions have emerged and some teacher educators have assumed prominent roles in 'setting the agenda for quality in curriculum, pedagogies and assessment in teacher education' (Jasman 2002, 1). Paradoxically, whilst some teacher educators have developed a more activist role, other conditions in the context of their work have contributed to the marginal position of initial teacher education and teacher educators. For example, tertiary educators have faced the conflict of re-negotiating their work both within universities and schools as these organizations underwent significant reform in the 1990's (Jasman 2002).

A result of this reform, coupled with decreasing federal funding to tertiary institutions, has seen the intensification of the teacher educator's work to encompass teaching, research and community service. This reflects a number of shifts in tertiary education, not the least of which relates to the growth of research as an avenue for the generation of university income.

Money and the rapidly growing scale of the system created the modern research university in which the production of knowledge and its publication became virtually the sole criterion of academic success.

Jasman (2002) argues that this shift and the historical contexts within which it is immersed have three major implications for teacher-educators:

1. Initial teacher education has become almost *invisible* to the profession, community and politicians.

2. A decline in the number of teacher-educators working within the academy has resulted in less opportunity to interact with and therefore **influence** the profession and universities.
3. There have been and continue to be differences in the status of 'traditional' university academics and teacher educators. This has implications for the ways in which teacher educators define their role and develop a sense of professional **identity**.

Further, schools and universities have different working cultures and varying expectations of each other. The challenge for change has therefore been to address the invisibility and lack of influence of teacher educators and to allow opportunities for the development of a new sense of teacher-educator (and teacher) professional identity. In short, efforts towards change have attempted to redress the fading face of universities through the development of new patterns of research and new ways of working that 'interrupt' traditional structures of decision-making and work in these institutions, in a mutually beneficial way. To this end school-university partnerships have been developed for the purposes of supporting the design and delivery of teacher education, professional development, as well as research and development.

Development of partnerships

A significant and growing body of educational literature has acknowledged the importance of building and sustaining school-university partnerships. Such research has broadly canvassed the aims, experiences, benefits and challenges of school-university partnerships, their relationship to initial teacher education programs, professional, research and the key players involved (see for example

A variety of models of school-university partnerships exist in a number of States, for example,

- mentoring and induction programs (Master of Teaching, University of Sydney and Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus),
- Key School Network (University of Melbourne),
- Schools as Collective Learning Communities project (Flinders University,),
- through reflective practice (Edith Cowan University),
- the development of a secondary BEd program that encouraged partnership between schools, the university and the community.

These initiatives often involve the development of partnerships between university-based teacher educators and school teachers to foster the professional learning of teacher education students as well as that of university academics and teachers. For example, Department of Education and Training in New South Wales and ten universities have entered into formal agreements to provide mentor training programs to support the practicum and internships. This is part of their recognition of the role of accomplished teachers in the development and support of beginning teachers, student teachers and their colleagues.

The internship provides a rare opportunity for reaffirmation of experienced teachers daily work ... the nature of the mentoring services to redefine a teacher's commitment and mission which are attributes often underestimated and unkindled by their employer and wider community, the mentors valued the opportunity provided by the university to meet with equally competent peers ... such meetings constitute a forum where excellent teachers articulate and hone their own and our understandings of professional roles and practice. Through the constancy of dialogue, professional debate and a

shared responsibility for the growth of the interns in their school environment, this is a valuable experience for all participants. 3

Hargreaves comments that such emphases on 'school based initial teacher education, school based research, evidence-based professional practice' arising from school university partnerships are consistent with

deeper social changes by which many kinds of knowledge production are moving from what Gibbons et al (1994) call mode 1 - pure, disciplinary, homogenous, expert-led, supply-driven, hierarchical peer-reviewed, university-based - towards mode 2 - applied, problem-focussed, trans-disciplinary, heterogenous, hybrid, demand-driven, entrepreneurial, accountability-tested, embedded in networks.

These initiatives provide new pathways for initial teacher education. One of the consequences of such approaches has been the development of the more flexible delivery of programs resulting in more equitable access. Initial teacher education programs also use a variety of delivery modes including intensive winter and summer schools, weekends and distance learning including the use of information and communication technologies to support off campus learners.

In each partnership context there is the need to have legitimate expectations and realistic resources to be in place, with a sense of ownership for all involved (Jasman et al 2001). These new contexts within which school-university partnerships are immersed can provide for new spaces and places for the complex relationships between school and university staff to engage and develop a more activist professional role. However,

within this climate one of the most difficult areas to maintain is the face of the university teacher educator within schools. We would argue that it would be desirable that in the future university teacher education will no longer be 'a fading face'. Kalantzis and Harvey envisage

Prospective educators must enter the profession knowing that they have the opportunity not only to **influence** children at school, but to promote an **new cadre of knowledge workers** (new identity). Far from ending in the classroom, the impact of effective educators will be **visible** throughout and across those students' lives. (Emphasis added)

This is no less true of teacher educators where

It has been argued that initial teacher educators have been invisible, lacked influence and have been negotiating changes to their professional identities during the last decade. This is evident in both the literature for the (re)visioning of initial teacher education and reports on innovative practices that are emerging following development in the 1990's. (Jasman 2002)

Our understanding and development of the constructs invisible, influence and identity proposed in Jasman are further explored through the use of the metaphor of 'face' in our analysis of the nature and quality of three innovative approaches to school-university partnerships. These approaches were designed to bring more focus and clarity so that the nature of the complex relationships between schools and universities are more predictable and less uncertain.

The metaphor of the face

Here, the metaphor of 'face' becomes a useful mechanism for exploring the role of teacher-educators in school-university partnerships, from a variety of viewpoints. argue that metaphors are blueprints of thinking about teaching and learning - they are not just figures of speech but constitute an essential mechanism of the mind. In this sense metaphors provide us with an avenue to explore our taken-for-granted assumptions and beliefs.

To explain, Phillips contends that 'we may be insulated from ideas coming from outside and can easily get sucked into this self-sustaining whirlpool of thinking guided by metaphors - as long as we are unable or do not try to get access to our metaphors' (as cited in Martinez et al 2001, 966). Uncovering the metaphors teacher educators and others use to understand the role they play in school-university partnerships is essential as it allows insight into previously unacknowledged perceptions.

Metaphors not only help us to see the essential similarities between entities but also the

Use of metaphors provides a productive way of reflecting on our professional lives and practices in that it allows us to explore these lives and practices from a diversity of perspectives (face[t]s) and over time. Thus use of metaphor encourages this process of reflection to be ongoing and purposeful.

... Putting together some of our experiences through metaphor provides a **mirror** by which we can **see more clearly** something of the different speeds, different directions and different contexts within which we work to bring about the changes in our lives and work situations.

These understandings have influenced the approaches used in researching, analysing, interpreting and writing in this paper.

Research design

This research draws upon data collected in three studies conducted throughout 2000 and 2001, and evaluation data of professional experience programs collected between 1998 and 2002 in three different universities in three Australian states. The cases described in this research include a regional campus, developed in the 1990's as part of an urban university; an urban university built in the 1970's and a "Group of Eight" university over a hundred years old.

Case 1 draws on the evaluation of a professional experience program at a regional campus of a large urban university. This campus has a strong emphasis on service within the community, social justice agendas, and interdisciplinary studies. Relatively small Teacher Education programs have attracted students with high entry scores and diversity of background experiences. Some are attracted to the amenities within the region. There is also an increasing number of mature entrants to university studies. Many of the students are working to support themselves and their families.

Case 2 draws on research of the work of university teacher educators in school university partnerships that was conducted at an urban university built in the 1970's. This university has offered distance education with the student body comprising 50% mature age and 50% school leavers. Student teachers attracted to these programs had high entry scores and are perceived as socially critical and working towards social justice goals. They were also seen as a very different type of teacher from that graduating from the former College of Advanced Education in that State. There is a strong community service and second chance orientation.

Case 3 draws on a study of a 'Group of Eight' University located close to the CBD in a large metropolitan city. This university has both undergraduate and large post-graduate teacher education programs whose graduates are highly regarded within the professional community. Typically students enter these programs directly from school or from an undergraduate degree program.

Each of these universities has attempted to develop school-university partnerships using a variety of strategies. These include:

- explicating in general terms how the nature and quality of school university partnerships develop
- conjoint appointments where teachers are paid in part by a State department of education or an individual school and in part by the University to undertake teaching in schools and in the university
- school-based staff may also be employed by the university to undertake some of the work of a university-based teacher educator on the school site and also within the university
- a dedicated association between a school and a university developing research relationships as well as working in initial and continuing teacher education
- enabling continuity in the personnel in contact with particular schools
- virtual communications and
- where larger groups of students are placed in one school thus providing more opportunity for the university-based teacher educators to be visible within an educational context.

Data analysis and interpretation: decreasing the uncertainty of school-university partnerships by

1. Invisibility - moving from invisible to visible

Invisibility

The sense of invisibility of university staff in their relationships with schools possibly stems from the idea that some academic staff do not prioritise professional school experience liaison work because of the emphasis university promotion procedures place on university staff to focus on research and publication of their work, academic teaching responsibilities and community service. Therefore, for some staff the time and energy needed is seen to detract from their own research and teaching focus. Engaging in contact with schools; visiting students in school settings and taking part in dialogues about their progress in understanding; making theory and practice connections; considering issues related to their assessment and the complex curriculum and pedagogical changes that are going on in schools is seen as onerous. Some school staff comment on the lack of this engagement by some universities and particular programs in universities. A teacher laments these changes.

Where a staff member actually comes out during the round and just checks the students and checks on schools so it's a two way thing too, asking whether they're

being treated fairly and properly by the school and also the school gets asked how the student's going. So that's the sort of **face to face** feedback that the University doesn't do.

There are many other possible reasons for this invisibility. School staff and university staff have faced extensive contractions in resource allocations over the past ten years. They are trying to present quality programs for their students while class sizes increase and resources decrease. University staff often have difficulty communicating with schools because of the problems of making direct phone contact with school staff, particularly classroom teachers. There are also the difficulties of communications within schools. These are complex learning organisations with multiple roles for all staff concerned with students learning programs. The added responsibilities presented by a number of teacher education students in different years of their courses and in multiple programs further complicates communication. This issue is also exacerbated by the difficulty of synchronising the school and university time frames and demands on staff throughout the different school and university yearly calendars and short and long term agendas for change.

Visibility

In terms of increasing visibility some school staff commented on the ways university staff are becoming more visible in schools. For those university programs where academic staff are increasingly becoming involved with professional practice programs which involved school visits by academic staff there is a more obvious sense of 'face' or 'presence'. One school teacher remarked,

Well I probably would think that there would be a familiarity with the school with which they're (faculty liaison staff) working. They would get to learn about expectations, standards and values. The University [staff] would get an understanding of the schools themselves and the way they work.

Additionally a Professional Experience Coordinator commented on her schools support for strengthening the relationship of a formal 'school university network',

It's probably supported in the sense that people are happier with the quality of liaison between students, between the University and the school. It's a **permanent face** to it, an ongoing contact with it and it's an opportunity if they use it to engage in dialogue.

This is echoed by a teacher educator who said

Given the kind of school experience we have (I've been to most of the schools that we use) I have been able to establish a real relationship with many teachers. Communication is much easier for them (and for me) and if there's a real problem we can actually deal with it together.

The chance for school and university staff to 'engage in dialogue, to converse about the bigger picture issues and concerns in both schools and universities is crucial to developing the types of relationships and visibilities of each in the others workplace. 'To be seen' as well as conducting conversations is a vital part of grappling with some of the same professional concerns around broad educational debates and the influences of each as stakeholders in making changes to educational contexts.

2. Influence - moving from little influence of university staff on school staff and vice versa to mutual exchange of ideas and influence.

Influences

In terms of exerting influence and having an effect upon each others ideas and practices it is important to think of school university relations as a parity of esteem, a parity of power relationships where each others views are understood and taken into account.

For example, one teacher suggested that the recently developed close school university relationships were important in the process of moving more closely together for the purposes of closer dialogues around teaching and learning.

Look, schools often think that they're at the implementation phase, at the **coal face** and there's, sometimes there's a thought: well what are they teaching them in the University? So this is a way to break down those barriers. And I don't think we have that problem anymore. I think ... it's a team effort. So that's good. The student teachers who come to us learn a team approach.

Another teacher commented on the 'us and them approach'.

The profession in general, I think the networking system, the (school network) works really well because it actually smoothes over an 'us and them approach' which shouldn't really happen but sometimes it does.

Therefore the theory-practice divide is seen as being broken down through team work, collaboration and partnerships between schools and universities around issues of common concern. The importance of this being a two way process is emphasised by a teacher educator who said

Yes, they (the student teachers) basically benefit from the fact that I know about the schools I know about the teachers I can actually pre-empt problems by not placing a certain kind of student with a certain kind of teacher, but I can also help the students to understand that a particular situation may not be their fault.

One student teacher who was completing an internship at a school reported on her perceptions of the 'two way influence' and a 'permanent face'.

I thought that it was good that there was a link with the school and the University and you could feel that they were liaising together. With being a student you knew they had common concerns and interests about you and you felt looked after. I thought that was beneficial and they knew what was going on. You never felt that, you never heard one thing and went to the school and found a different thing. Everyone was working together. They knew what was going on. They knew what was required of them and they knew what was required of me because the university and the school had been liaising together.

In some contexts there was a sense that more influence for the school was being advocated. Some universities are certainly working on ways to increase the role of classroom teachers in particular programs. As one teacher responded,

I think that it's important to be part of it, to be part of the dialogue about the idea of training student teachers.

A classroom teacher who is employed on a sessional basis to teach in a Graduate Entry Teacher Education Program explained her role as,

to demonstrate (through tutorial and classroom [work]) good teaching practices; to motivate students, to guide them in practical, innovative and creative learning experiences.

So there are a number of teachers who see themselves working more closely in partnership with university staff in university based lectures and tutorials and in conducting school based workshops for teacher education students. What then does this mean in relation to the changing sense of identity of the teacher educator in the universities and the schools?

3. Identity - moving from a single face identity to a complex network with face[t]s involving complex communication, conversation and dialogue between equals.

Identity

One teacher reported that she had some difficulty with her role in negotiating between her experiences of meeting with university staff at network meetings, supporting teacher education students in her school and also communicating clearly the changing nature of the school university partnership with other supervising teachers in her school. She said,

I'm focusing more on those functional things I was talking about, which are the matter of the conversations I've had. I don't know that I'm exploiting, at this stage, the participation in the network. It's not at the forefront of my mind when I'm performing my role and therefore it's certainly not something that I'm communicating to the other supervision staff of the school.

This links back to earlier points about the invisible role of the teacher educator and difficulties of communication within schools. For this teacher the changing role was not a visible role because it's not something she thinks about often and therefore she is not communicating these changes to her other teaching colleagues. Even though her colleagues may see it as important and be critical of the changing or unchanging nature of the school university partnerships.

The teacher educator's sense of identity is constructed through social relationships and continuous communication on an equitable and mutual basis. One teacher reported that she liked the

'idea of having a person I can contact when there's a problem with a student, which doesn't happen very often but that avenue of communication needs to be available. It's just having that person to talk things through with.

Another school coordinator commented about the connections she has with university personnel,

It's usually 'Margaret' I have contact with for placement. These are via email usually, although we have had **face to face contact** so I know the person at the end of the line on the phone or at the other end of the email.

This is also evident from the teacher educator's point of view as can be seen from the following comment that emphasises both the importance of the professional community and parity of esteem.

it's a professional relationship, a professional community that we're both party to and bring different expertise to, so they can use that more effectively as a result of that networking.

Commenting on the developments in technology that allow quicker and more direct communication possible another teacher reported,

Look, I think emails are fantastic. It gets things done quickly and with faxes so that will continue to be used. But as I say, contact with the University is always good, just to set up that liaison and know who's who, put a **face to the name**.

This idea of putting a face to a name is a twist on the more traditional expectation of meeting someone face to face before engaging in conversations, communications and dialogue. It is now often reversed where the name comes first and the face comes second. Nevertheless the face to face element is considered essential at some stage of the relationship and assists the sense of visibility for the participants. As another teacher reported,

I think the quality of communication has been quite good but I still think there needs to be a balance of emails, faxes and **face to face contact**. I think the University does that quite well

Teacher education students also had comments to make on the value of networks to support their professional experience programs.

.. it makes it easier to place us in schools ... And also they've built a relationship with most of the schools over a few years so if there's any problems ... I think that they have fairly good communication between the schools and faculty staff.

Also from the teacher education student perspective the close school university partnership was seen as important so that the students could build up their own support network. One commented,

Though really I think just networking with the right people and talking to the right people..... I had an interesting supervisor for my internship. She helped me out with advice for jobs or interviews.

Forms of networking are important and this idea of a network being for 'what we can get out of it' pervaded some of the comments. Another respondent, a teacher reported,

I think networking is important: one of the reference points for the people in it. The main thing at this point is what we can get out of it, the fact that there's sharing of experience and knowledge because people are participating and going through the common experiences. So there's a sharing of experiences, so when other people can look at [what is going on] and perhaps use that for the benefit of the whole group.

Another innovation that arises from the types of networks being developed moves the network beyond the university. Moving beyond the university as the hub of the network encourages schools and teachers to network broadly over diverse concerns in education. One teacher commented about strengths and potential of the school network and the idea of the network moving beyond the university.

I guess its forming communication between the university and between schools and also between schools as well because I mean that opens communication between them to talk about how they found different students and what they do with their students when they have them there.

This potential will take time to develop and as yet there was some disappointment expressed about the chance of it being developed.

I thought ... there might be more dialogue between participating schools.

What appears to be evident here is that the identity shifts from the focus on the singular and individual teacher and teacher educator to the multiple and group relationship being the important elements. This increasing complexity can be maintained and developed through virtual as well as face to face communication.

While we have seen the importance of shifts in visibility, influence and identity through an explicit partnership, other initiatives show similar outcomes as identified where school teachers take on additional face[t]s to their work extending their construction of their identities as shown by a Graduate Entry Focus Teacher who spoke about the importance of the program she was involved in.

Continuation of a program such as this is a necessary component in developing our future educators. More importantly there is increased communication between school and universities which enables both sites to meet the needs and interests of our ever changing educational communities.

The role was professionally rewarding [because]

1. doing workshops made me brush up on professional reading
2. had to rethink concepts, strategies etc and evaluate own teaching practices
3. really enjoyed interaction with enthusiastic peers

Loved the program, feel that it is just the tip of the iceberg, more of it please.

These, then are some of the strategies used by some teacher education faculties to create less uncertainty in school-university partnerships. There is a sense that there needs to be a focus on maintaining continuity in relationships for both teacher educators and classroom teachers who work with teacher education students. For the teacher educator, being available to the school staff, being in the school and having conversations, knowing what is going on in daily practice, having relevant knowledge is all part of the multiple face[t]s involved. As one university based teacher educator commented,

Recently whilst I was out on school experience I spent time swapping stories with the deputy about our experiences of working in the U.K. This dialogue was purely by chance but it wouldn't have happened if I hadn't been in the school or open to the conversation..... For me it's about how I present what I know and am able to do so that it can be seen to be of relevance to the specific context that the practitioners are working in.

Contextual knowledge and practical knowledge are important as ways of integrating theory and practice. It is a three way process through which all participants, the teacher education student, the university based teacher educator and the classroom teacher all work and learn together. This communication and interaction is complex and changing particularly in relation to the challenges of information communication technologies. For example, the increasing opportunities for communication and conversations both actual and virtual - face to face versus e-mail, telephone, fax indicates the multiple ways that these relationships can continue to be developed.

Overall the data shows a lot of movement around the 'fading face' of the university based teacher educator. There is movement from invisible to visible, movement from little influence of university staff on school staff and vice versa to mutual exchange of ideas and influence, and movement from a single face identity to a complex network with face[t]s involving complex communication, conversation and dialogue between equals.

There are now multiple opportunities for the school and university to interact face to face literally and virtually. But it must be meaningful and purposeful for all participants. Teacher educators, both university and school based need to ask themselves 'Does your face fit?' Which way are you facing? Is your face invisible, moving to the visible or are you too much 'in their face'? Is it a mutually enhancing relationship? How do your multiple identities fit within the changing contexts? What is your credibility and legitimacy of access like from the point of view of classroom teachers and teacher education students? Which ever way these questions are taken, resolved, resisted or renamed a closer networking between schools and universities is seen as being crucial to the maintenance of quality teachers and quality schools in the coming decades of the twenty-first century.

Conclusion:

We have argued in this paper that metaphor of 'face' is a useful device to explore the constructs of the invisibility, influence and identity of university-based teacher educators. It has been noted that teacher educators have become a 'fading face' within schools as supervisors of initial teacher education students, as well as in universities. This is somewhat a result of the changing nature of the work of all academics, but particularly those working within professional fields such as teacher education. However with this withdrawal from the primary supervisory role, academics involved in initial teacher education have bridged the gap by spanning the boundaries and created new face[t]s by working with or enabling experienced teachers to take on an extended role as school-based teacher educators to engage in the roles traditionally undertaken by academics.

We need to recognise the dangers involved in coopting teachers into a school-based teacher education role. As teachers engage in this wider role they may choose to pursue an academic career with a strong research component and move from the school into the university. This may result in them ceasing to have their core business as school practices of teaching and learning and crossing the border into a new territory of the academic teacher educator rather than remaining a boundary spanner. The distinction therefore is how to have a foot in both camps rather than have to constantly move across the border between schools and universities. Are we thus asking our teachers to replicate the difficult journey undertaken by initial teacher educators over the last ten years?

This is still a dilemma for many of us. How can we do it all? Even working together we still seem each to have to do it all? Are there too many face[t]s, too many faces, challenging us and constraining us in multiple ways.

Now our role seems to be to work with teachers who are taking a leading role within schools in the professional education of initial teacher education students, beginning teachers and supporting their colleagues in the continuing professional learning now expected of all teachers in the 21st Century. Yet there are huge issues around resourcing

that we really haven't discussed here. The importance of the lack of appropriate resources in all these messy moving mosaics is crucial to the directions of the changes.

Researching the issues of theory practice connections needs to be valued and seen as part of the new knowledge worker constructing knowledge and actively being a part of new ways of knowing. As Kalantzis and Harvey write,

Teacher education needs to be ongoing. The provision of continuing professional development will be crucial. While this remains largely neglected in Australia, there is progress elsewhere to provide sabbaticals, secondments and international exchanges. The need for greater creativity and resources here is pressing. We are unlikely to keep the finest teachers in the profession without more commitment to programs of re-skilling and professional development. (2002, 9)

How do we want to conceive of the new face or facets of teacher education both for people working in schools and universities? Kaleidoscopes, messy moving mosaics and rich tapestries are metaphors that come to mind as backdrops to our changing faces. It is certainly not a passive presence we are exploring, but a mutually beneficial culture of change. There are challenges and positive effects but also perhaps existing patterns of relationships that need to be interrupted. So; be interrupted! Think of your face[t]s, your invisibility, your influence and your identity and where your feet are resting and which way you are facing.

References