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Abstract—A school-based teacher education program is described. The focus of this research is the cooperating teacher. Specifically, the role of advisor (cooperating teacher) and the benefits and concerns are examined. Twenty-three advisors completed a questionnaire related to the school-based teacher education program. The benefits were personal and professional development, time to work with specific pupils and plan programs, meeting new people and the pleasure of watching a student teacher develop. The concerns were time constraints and problems with poor student teaching performance.

Practice teaching is one of the most important aspects of any preservice program, if not the main event (Henry, 1989; Silberman, 1970). According to student teachers the cooperating teacher plays a significant role in the development of the student teachers' skills, knowledge, and attitudes (Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Lowther, 1968). Copas (1984) reports that “the value of the direct learning experience in schools seems to depend upon the quality of the teacher with whom the student is placed” (p. 49).

The professional qualities that should be possessed by cooperating teachers are excellent teaching skills (Farbstein, 1965), the ability to explain the how and why of teaching (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Richardson-Koehler, 1988), and the ability to permit the student teacher the opportunity to experiment (Farbstein, 1965; Goodman, 1988). The role of the cooperating teacher is complex and has been found by Farbstein (1965) to include supervisory functions, provision of opportunities for growth in classroom instruction, demonstrating superior teaching skills, and exhibiting commendable personal and social traits.

The results of Copas’ (1984) study further defined the role as including the following behaviours: orienting, inducting, guiding, reflecting, cooperating, and supporting. Olson and Carter (1989) report that the role of the cooperating teacher includes the dimensions of model, mentor, provider of feedback, and coach.

There are barriers to the effective performance of the role of cooperating teacher. Role ambiguity is cited as a problem amongst cooperating teachers (Lipke, 1979; Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Warger & Aldinger, 1984). Effective communication skills were found by Hoover, O'Shea, and Carroll (1988) to be important in the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship. Finally, the need for training of cooperating teachers is frequently cited as a problem (Henry, 1989; Jacknicke & Samiroden, 1991; MacDonald, McKinnon, Joyce & Gurney, 1992; McIntyre & Killian, 1987; Theis-Sprinthall, 1986).

Research relative to the area of the cooperating teacher is largely from the perspective of the student teacher (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Copas, 1984; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Hoover et al., 1988; Jacknicke & Samiroden, 1991; Killian & McIntyre, 1986; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Smith, 1990). Specifically, previous studies show how the student teacher perceives the role of the cooperating teacher. This study examines the role, benefits, and problems of the cooperative teacher from the perspective of the cooperating teachers involved in a school-based teacher education program.
In recent years there have been important studies on teacher education that have made strong recommendations for reform, in the way teachers are educated (Carnegie, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). In Canada, Fullan and Connelly (1987) also recommended restructuring teacher education. They propose that teacher education might include alternate programs which are more school-based than is currently the practice. This arrangement could result in a partnership between faculty and classroom teachers in the delivery of teacher education programs in which theory and practice are closely linked. At the University of Ottawa such a collaborative alternate teacher education program has been developed.

**The On-Site Teacher Education Program**

The On-Site Teacher Education program is an alternative preservice teacher education program offered at the primary and junior divisions. It is a collaborative project involving the University of Ottawa and four boards of education in the Ottawa-Carleton region. The On-Site program has been in operation since the fall of 1989.

The two unique features of this program are (a) the partnership with the local boards, and (b) the school-based preservice education. Representatives from four boards, the Ontario Teachers Federation, the Ontario Ministry of Education, and the Faculty are members of a committee which oversees the operation of the program. Each year approximately 40 teachers from the four boards (4 multi 10) are selected by administrators to work with 40 student teachers. In most instances the schools are selected by senior administrators. The principals of the schools select one teacher from the primary division and one teacher from the junior division. The selection is based largely on the principal’s perception of the teacher’s ability to model and explain good teaching practice. The boards contribute meeting facilities and computer labs free of charge for participants of the program. The boards also assign staff members to act as counsellors for On-Site student teachers. The counsellors meet weekly with the student teachers assigned to their board in seminar groups. The students learn about the philosophical, sociological, and psychological underpinnings of teaching. Counsellors observe the students teaching in the classrooms. They also assist the students in their reflections in which they make sense out of life in the classroom and link theory with practice. Finally, consultants with the boards and faculty are occasionally asked to give presentations to these student teachers on practical topics, such as evaluating pupil progress.

Forty student teachers are involved in the On-Site program, which is a one-year postdegree program. In a traditional one-year program students first do their course work, then are placed in schools for one or more practice teaching sessions. In these programs it is assumed that the student teacher will apply theory (learned months ago) to practice. However, unless the student teacher is provided with specific opportunities to link theory and practice, the former is forgotten as the candidate struggles with the realities of life as a teacher.

In the On-Site program students spend most of their one year of preservice education in one school. A primary division teacher and a junior division teacher in the same school act as advisors for the two students. Pairs of students are assigned to their school starting on the first day of school in September. In the fall the two advisors each work with one student teacher, and in January the students switch advisors. Students are also encouraged to visit other classrooms to observe particular approaches and programs.

In each classroom student teachers observe the On-Site advisor (cooperating teacher) and the pupils, and they work with individuals and small groups. Students gradually assume most of the classroom teacher’s responsibilities. Eight weeks of formal practice teaching sessions are also conducted in an On-Site advisor’s classroom (four weeks per division). Throughout the academic year theoretical aspects of the program are presented in large group survey sessions. Students are expected to implement the theoretical constructs and practical strategies in the classrooms to which they have been assigned.

Foundations of education, such as psychology, sociology, and philosophy are taught by the counsellors. Topics are explored through readings, discussions, and small group seminars. The students are grouped according to the board in which they are assigned. In the small groups (approximately 10 student teachers and a board-
appointed counsellor) the students learn observational techniques, discuss observations, relate practice to theory, and develop their own knowledge about teaching. These seminar groups meet weekly.

The On-Site advisors receive two half-day inservice sessions related to the program. They are responsible for (a) modelling good teaching, (b) supervising and evaluating practice teaching, (c) teaching curriculum development, and (d) evaluating five units of study prepared by the student teachers. One faculty member is a counsellor for a seminar group assigned to one of the boards. He also coordinates the program and gives two half-day training sessions to advisors. Other faculty provide survey sessions for the On-Site student teachers.

In sum, the On-Site program is quite different from current preservice education programs in that it is based solidly in the schools. Students learn and implement theory during their placements in classrooms. It is also a collaborative project involving boards, the Ministry, federations and faculty. The situation for the advisor is different to that of a cooperating teacher because the student teachers arrive with little classroom experience and no theory. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the role of the advisor from his or her point of view. The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the role of the On-Site advisor?
2. How is it different to that of a cooperating teacher?
3. What are the benefits and concerns of On-Site advisors?

Research Methodology

A questionnaire was sent to the 41 On-Site teacher advisors during the third week of March of the academic year 1991–1992. Teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires within 7 days and return them using the self-addressed stamped envelope. By mid-April the questionnaires had been returned.

The instrument contained 20 items. There were six demographic items: length of time as an advisor, previous experience as a consultant, age range, highest degree, additional qualifications, and reasons for involvement. Respondents were also asked to describe their perceptions of the duties of the On-Site advisor. Other items required teachers to list the benefits of their involvement and the problems they encountered. There were additional items related to constraints, assistance to On-Site advisors, inservice, unit plans, workload, and the role of the faculty. Finally, teachers were invited to make general comments about the program. Of the above items 13 (65%) were qualitative and the remaining were quantitative. Four of the seven quantitative items provided demographic information, two more related to the inservice sessions (which ones were attended and their usefulness). The final quantitative item required advisors to assess whether they felt comfortable evaluating the unit plans (a yes/no response). The questionnaire was divided into nine sections: demographic, selection of On-Site advisors, role of the principal, role of the On-Site advisor, role of the student teacher, role of the faculty, knowledge of the rationale of the program, organization and administration of the On-Site program and assessments (including benefits to stakeholders, concerns, and attitudes toward the program). The response provided data for this study, as well as feedback to university administrators, on the implementation of the program.

There were 23 On-Site advisors who returned the questionnaire, which is a rate of 56%. This rate was disappointing but was related to teachers with one board of education taking work-to-rule action soon after the questionnaire was distributed. This situation likely reduced or eliminated responses from its 10 advisors. If the work-to-rule action is considered the response rate may have been as high as 75%. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive techniques. The qualitative data were analyzed to determine common themes, and frequency counts for each theme were computed.

The Sample

Twenty of the respondents indicated that they had been advisors for one year. It is the practice of the boards to change the schools involved in the On-Site program on a yearly basis. Fifteen of the advisors were between 40 and 50 years of age. Most had taken university inservice courses in such areas as mathematics, computers, and religious education. Seven advisors hold specialists certification in primary education, special education, or computers in education. The most
frequently cited reason for becoming involved was because the principal had asked them. Other reasons included: wanting to contribute to preservice education, wanting to further one's own professional development, feeling that this program was worthwhile. Ten of the advisors attended both half-day inservice sessions. Six only attended the spring session, and seven just went to the fall session. Eighteen advisors reported that the inservice received in regard to this program was adequate.

Findings

Role of the On-Site Advisor

The role of the On-Site advisors is complex. Teachers reported eight facets to their role as advisors to student teachers (see Table 1). The duty reported most frequently by 12 teachers was that the modelling effective instructional behaviours and classroom management approaches. One teacher wrote of her role, "to provide an example of teaching methods and style". Another teacher commented, "to model teaching strategies, practices and behaviours necessary to becoming a nurturing and effective teachers". This finding is not so surprising as these teachers participated because they or their principal felt they were competent.

The second element of the role of advisor reported by teachers is providing resources to student teachers. Two teachers described their role as a "resource person". Another person viewed the situation as one in which resources are shared with the students. Clearly these teachers recognize the need of student teachers to have supply of resources from which lessons and units may be developed.

Another element of the role of an advisor is that of facilitating emerging practice. One teacher commented on the role, "to ensure that the student develops in all areas". Two teachers suggested that the role of facilitator could be done through providing daily feedback to the students.

Four teachers reported that an element of their role was to act as a sponsor by including the student teacher in the life of the school. One teacher wrote, "to make them feel comfortable with the staff, students and parents". Four teachers also wrote that a facet of the role was to provide moral support. Two advisors elaborated on the concept of support. For them it took the form of engaging in discussions, providing a warm classroom atmosphere, and offering guidance. The role of providing support was also reported by Copas (1984) in this study of cooperating teachers.

Advisors also perceived their role as explaining to the students what is happening in the classroom and why. Providing opportunities for students to experiment with new techniques was cited by three advisors. One teacher wrote, "to provide a safe testing ground for the student to try out new ideas and strategies for self-evaluation purposes". Finally, advisors said that a facet of their role was to teach and model professional behaviours. One teacher wrote that part of the advisor's duties was to ensure that the student "is aware of the duties and responsibilities of the profession". Another advisor wrote, "to expose, guide, teach and model all aspects of the daily life of a teacher in a school setting regarding duties and responsibilities to staff and children on a personal and professional level".

Interestingly, comments about the supervisory/evaluatory function were not made by

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of teachers citing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrating effective teaching behaviours and classroom management strategies</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing resources</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Providing opportunities for students to develop their emerging practice</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Including the students with the life of the school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Providing support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Explaining what is happening and why</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Providing opportunities to experiment with new techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Modelling professionalism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All teachers included many elements as part of the role of the On-Site advisor. Hence the total number of behaviours is higher than 23.
teachers. Words, such as "providing feedback" and "coaching" were not found in the responses of advisors. However, advisors were obviously responsible for supervising and evaluating the progress of student teachers.

In this longer practicum (approximately 16 weeks per advisor) it is possible that the relationship between advisor and student teacher develops from one of inequality to one of equality. One teacher said, "She just fit right in ... halfway through she became a peer". In this case, the level of trust the advisor had of the student teacher had increased to the extent that they were working as a team (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Therefore, supervising and evaluating students near the end of the practicum experience (when data were collected) may not have been a major concern.


Benejits for On-Site Advisors

One benefit cited by advisors was personal professional development (see Table 2). Through working with the student teacher and reflecting on their own teaching practices the advisors experienced professional development. One teacher wrote of the On-Site program, "It was an opportunity to increase interpersonal skills, to polish professionalism, to reflect on strategies that work best with the children and to learn from the student teachers".

Another teacher commented that "it was re-energizing; it made me sharpen my skills and re-assess my teaching approach". They also benefited from the student who introduced and experimented with new ideas in the classroom. An advisor responded that it was, "a chance to grow, encouragement to keep current with educational issues and involvement in education beyond our walls and particular board affiliation".

A second benefit for advisors was that another adult in the classroom permitted the advisor time work with specific pupils and to plan programs. One teacher gained "an extra pair of hands in the room which provided more time for special need students". Another teacher commented that a benefit was to "free up the teacher (when student is teaching) to get to know students better". Another teacher reported the benefit of having "extra help with program planning and delivery". Essentially, the student teachers assisted the advisor, and in some cases worked as equal partners in the task of educating the pupils.

The third benefit was that of meeting new people who were entering the profession. Teachers seemed to appreciate "working with others" and the presence of their "new colleagues" in their classrooms. The final benefit to the advisors was professional satisfaction. Advisors commented on the enjoyment of working with another colleague and the pleasure of watching the student teacher develop. The following comments show this sense of satisfaction: "Watching the evolution of competence developing in the student teacher"; "The satisfaction of guiding a candidate to a successful completion of their goal of becoming an effective, caring teacher".

As stated previously, advisors' motives for becoming involved in the On-Site program related to personal professional development, extra assistance for pupils, and contribution to preservice education. It would seem, therefore, that generally the goals of the advisors were respect to their involvement in the On-Site program were achieved.

Concerns of On-Site Advisors

Although six advisors reported no problems, time constraints due to the increased workload was a concern stated by 6 of 17 advisors (Mac-
Donald et al., 1992). In this study advisors found that at the beginning of each of the two 8-week sessions much time was spent with the student explaining routines, planning lessons, and providing feedback. One teacher commented, “Much heavier workload as every approach needs explanation, a lot of time before, during, and after school necessary for feedback, team planning, phone calls, etc.” Another advisor wrote, “At least one hour a day in one-on-one discussion with the student”. Some advisors found the extra time requirement stressful. One advisor wrote, “Time — my needs were often not addressed this year and I experienced more stress due to student teacher problems”. The time commitment was sometimes burdensome as advisors had other professional commitments that also had to be met. One teacher explained, “There were numerous special programs which I felt I had to handle (V.I.P., confirmation, family life)”. Another advisor stated, “I must be responsible for my students plus the extra adult in the class adds stress”. These teachers were clearly experiencing role conflict and role overload. They coped by spending longer hours at school and by working weekends and in the evening. An advisor commented, “Time spent with the student necessitated that I bring home extra paper work”. However, in most cases the time commitment and workload decreased as the practicum continued. A teacher wrote, “Workload was heaviest at the beginning (time spent explaining and discussing all aspects of the program and class makeup and configuration and individual student differences)”. Another advisor explained, “My workload was heavy in the fall (more time discussing with student, techniques, routines and assisting student in planning). However, as the year progressed, we shared the workload and worked together”.

The second concern relates to the students. Five advisors reported concerns about students who do not respond to suggestions made by advisors and those who do not make adequate progress. Advisors were motivated to become involved in the On-Site program because they or their principal felt they had expertise in classroom practices which they wanted to pass on to a student teacher. At the very least, they expect suggestions made to their student teachers to be implemented. Teachers wrote the following about students:

Problems were created if the student teacher does not respond to critique and suggestions for improvements and if they have a difficult personality. Some students have difficulty accepting suggestions and some have difficulty with discipline. Not all students are born teachers and consequently were very time consuming and frustrating to work with.

While most student teachers progressed to the point where they were assuming all or most of the advisor’s classroom duties, the skill development of a few student teachers was disappointing. One advisor described a student who could plan lessons very well, but experienced difficulty executing them and disciplining the students. Both skills were never developed as well as the advisor would have liked. The advisor wrote, “When a placement does not work out (for whatever reason) the advisor can feel like a failure (which can have a great impact on one’s self-esteem and willingness to be involved further)”. This teacher volunteered because there was a desire to “… ensure that individuals were of high quality in the profession”. Instead, her efforts to improve the profession were proving to be fruitless. The advisor was clearly not comfortable in this situation.

As in the case of all practice teaching experiences, unsatisfactory student teaching progress may be related to a poor match between the student and advisor with respect to personality and philosophical orientation (Hoover et al., 1988; MacDonald et al., 1992). Another variable may be the advisor’s inability to explain what he or she is doing and why (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Finally, the student teacher may be incapable of improving his or her performance (Hoover et al., 1988).

Although not listed as a concern, some advisors commented on the need for more support from counsellors and other advisors. These teachers were responsible for demonstrating how to plan units and for evaluating the units developed by the students. Six of the 23 advisors reported feeling uncomfortable evaluating the unit plans. One advisor wrote, “I would feel more comfortable with more specific criteria; so would the students”. Another teacher reported, “I sensed that there were major variances in what was acceptable”. Some advisors may have been in the awkward position of assisting the student with the unit, then having to evaluate the product.
Advisors were also responsible for supervising and evaluating the official practice teaching sessions embedded into each of the 8-week practica. While most advisors felt comfortable performing this duty, a few did not. Teachers wrote the following comments:

A visit or two from someone else to observe the student in case the advisor is missing something or just to discuss.
More help with the evaluation of students (it is too big a responsibility for just one person).

It is clear from these comments that some teachers wanted more specific guidelines from the University with respect to these aspects of their role. They also wanted validation of their observations and assessments.

More than half of the advisors would have liked to spend more time with the counsellors. One advisor wrote, "I saw the counsellor three or four times for 15 minutes but usually he came unexpectedly so it was difficult to spend time with him to discuss". However, advisors noted that if the student is making good progress, there is little need for the counsellor's extensive involvement. An advisor wrote, "... very little involvement was required because I had a very strong candidate as my student". Other advisors would have liked more information about the students' course work. One teacher would have liked her counsellor to "... inform advisor of topics covered in seminar sessions and survey".

Advisors received two half-day inservice sessions in the On-Site program. In the first session the role of the advisor was discussed. Eighteen of 23 teachers found the two inservice sessions to be adequate, but five advisors were not satisfied. Some advisors also expressed a desire to meet periodically with other advisors to discuss various aspects of the program. Teachers wrote the following:

Local groups of advisors could have organized survey sessions (as do students) to voice concerns and share coping strategies, time management, and success stories.
Stronger, regular networking among advisors through bi-monthly sessions were successes and problem-solving strategies can be shared.
Discussions with other advisors regarding role expectations, support issues, and problem solving.

The previous comments would suggest that advisors want the support of the counsellors and their colleagues. Advisors also want guidelines related to the units: what constitutes a unit and how it should be evaluated. They also want reassurance that they are performing the role properly, and they want to discuss their experiences with other advisors.

Discussion

The role of the On-Site advisor is very similar to that of a cooperating teacher involved in an extended practicum. However, due to the nature of the program (i.e., advisors bear responsibility for teaching curriculum planning and classroom management, and evaluating five unit plans) the advisor plays a major role in the preservice education of the student teacher (MacDonald et al., 1992). This is not merely a situation whereby the student borrows the cooperating teacher's classroom for 5 weeks and the teacher writes a few reports. In the On-Site program the advisor works with the student from the first day of the one-year preservice program. He or she takes the student teacher from a very raw state, develops and refines his or her teaching skills. Advisor and student frequently work as equal partners by the end of the program. Advisors appear to have a much broader role and richer relationship with their student teachers than do most cooperating teachers. Advisors invest a lot of their time, knowledge, and emotion into the task of working with a student teacher. Most feel much satisfaction at the end of the program. However, if the practice teaching sessions do not work out well, the advisor may count the days till the program is over and may feel a great sense of frustration and failure.

Role ambiguity did not appear to be a problem. Certainly by the spring of 1992 advisors had a clear idea of their general role. This result obviously does not support the findings of other studies involving the cooperating teacher (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Grimmitt & Ratzlaff, 1986). This result also contrasts with that cited by MacDonald et al. (1992) who interviewed On-Site students from the 1989–1990 academic year (the first year of operation). It is possible that the difference in results may be related to the sample (advisors vs. students) or that the inservice sessions received by 1991–1992 cohort of advisors were superior to those received by the 1989–1990 group.
Most advisors entered the program knowing that their workload would increase and that time would be a scarce commodity. However, they were willing to accept this condition because they also knew that as the student became more skillful they would be relieved of many classroom duties. Most advisors felt some degree of frustration caused by time constraints, lack of clear instructions, and students who did not accept their suggestions (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Grimmitt & Ratzlaff, 1986). However, they overwhelmingly felt the benefits outweighed the concerns. One teacher wrote:

I feel very fortunate to have been involved in this program. Our on-site students were very talented, professional individuals who enriched our classrooms and indeed our entire school. I believe this to be a very effective program.

From this discussion it is clear that the role, benefits and concerns go beyond those of the cooperating teacher. In many ways they are similar to that of a mentor. In a review of mentoring by Warren-Little (1990) is described the role of the mentor as it relates to the protege. It is one in which the mentor provides socio-emotional support, resources, and assistance in curriculum and instruction. This role description parallels that of the On-Site advisors. Warren-Little (1990) also outlines benefits to mentors which include an expanded pool of ideas and increased learning as they attempt to review and reveal what they know to others. An implied benefit is the professional satisfaction of knowing they have helped a colleague. On-Site Advisors also reported these intrinsic rewards.

The concerns of mentors were lack of time and stress of role conflict and overload. The demands of teaching and mentoring were not always compatible (Warren-Little, 1990). These concerns were also expressed by the On-Site advisors in this study.

Warren-Little (1990) also reports that the success of the mentoring process is related to the protege’s willingness to be mentored. This finding suggests that not all proteges accept a mentor’s suggestions for improved performance. The findings of this study support the notion that not all proteges want to be mentored. However, in this study it is not clear that this variable is related to the success or failure of the program.

Similarities exist between mentors and On-Site advisors in terms of roles, benefits, and concerns. There are also some differences. The most striking difference between mentors and advisors is that mentors exert little influence on novice teachers’ thinking or performance (Warren-Little, 1990). In the On-Site program, advisors teach the student teachers the skills related to instruction and curriculum development. Therefore, advisors play a key role in the development of the students’ classroom practice. The second difference is that it is the student teacher and not the mentor who is regarded as a resource for the school. In some mentoring programs the mentors are responsible for organizing professional development activities for their colleagues (Warren-Little, 1990). Teachers in the On-Site program clearly see the student teachers as resources in their classrooms and schools, and not themselves.

The role of the advisor incorporates elements of that of the cooperating teacher and mentor. The benefits and concerns, however, are more similar to that of the mentor than cooperating teacher. Perhaps the role of the advisor may best be described as a quasi-mentorship or mentor-like role. However, the issue is not so much the categorization of the role of advisor along the cooperating teacher/mentor continuum but the potential for school-based teacher education programs to cause a redefinition of the role of a teacher and the expanded opportunities for leadership. A second issue is the need to rethink the role of faculty involved in school-based programs. These issues provide a point of departure for future research on school-based teacher education programs.

The results of this study have implications for school-based teacher education. Teachers require initial inservice sessions on the diverse elements of their role and expectations with regard to time and increased workload at certain times of the year. Advisors also require clear guidelines from the faculty regarding courses they are to teach their students. As well, it is possible that some advisors may require more on-going support from counsellors/faculty than others. The level of support may relate to the skill level of the students and the comfort level of the teachers. Finally, periodic meetings for advisors should be established, particularly at the beginning of the academic year so that the
teachers may share their experiences and offer support for one another. School-based teacher education offers many exciting challenges to teachers and faculty. It is important that both groups work as equal partners to provide a high quality teacher education program, one which will benefit teachers, students teachers, and pupils.
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