

## SPECIAL ISSUE

### New Public Management and the New Professionalism in Education: Compliance, Appropriation and Resistance

# education policy analysis archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,  
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 23 Number 89

September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015

ISSN 1068-2341

## Hybridized Teacher Education Programs in NYC: A Missed Opportunity?

*Angus Shiva Mungal*

The University of Texas at El Paso  
United States

**Citation:** Mungal, A. S. (2015). Hybridized teacher education programs in NYC: A missed opportunity? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(89). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.2096>. This article is part of the Special Issue on *New Public Management and the New Professionalism in Education: Compliance, Appropriation and Resistance* Guest Edited by Gary Anderson & Kathryn Herr.

**Abstract:** This qualitative study describes the development of hybrid teacher preparation programs that emerged as a result of a “forced” partnership between university-based and alternative teacher preparation programs in New York City. This hybrid experiment was a short-lived, yet innovative by-product of a somewhat pragmatic arrangement between Teach for America, NYC Teaching Fellows and various universities to meet state requirements for credentialization. The institutions benefited from the arrangement but noteworthy here is the documentation of how the teacher education programs informed each other and potentially created a richer educational experience for teacher candidates than either of the programs had alone. With the development of Relay, a stand-alone, alternate graduate school, the partnership, despite its early promise, was ended. With all of its challenges, this forced partnership was characterized by creative and competitive tensions, rather than what ultimately became two parallel teacher education systems largely isolated and in competition with each other.

**Keywords:** Alternative teacher preparation programs; schools of education; partnerships; innovation; qualitative research.

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>  
Facebook: /EPAAA  
Twitter: @epaa\_aape

Manuscript received: 4/9/2015  
Revisions received: 7/4/2015  
Accepted: 7/4/2015

### **Programas de Formación Docente Híbridos en la Ciudad de New York: ¿Una Oportunidad Perdida?**

**Resumen:** Este estudio cualitativo describe el desarrollo de programas de formación docente híbridos en la ciudad New York, los que emergieron de una colaboración “forzada” entre programas basados en universidades y programas alternativos de certificación. Este experimento híbrido fue breve e innovador, resultado de un arreglo pragmático entre Teach for America, NYC, Teaching Fellows NYC y varias universidades para cumplir con regulaciones estatales para la certificación profesional. Las instituciones se beneficiaron de este arreglo, pero lo destacable fue que los programas de formación docente se influenciaron mutuamente, creando una experiencia educativa potencialmente más enriquecedora que las que ofrecían cada programa por separado. La aparición de un programa de posgrado independiente, Relay, acabó con esta colaboración a pesar de su potencial. Aun cuando se presentaron importantes desafíos, esta colaboración “forzada” se caracterizó por tensiones creativas y competitivas, a diferencia de los dos sistemas de formación docente aislados y en competencia que terminaron siendo implementados.

**Palabras-clave:** programas alternativos de certificación, facultades de educación, asociaciones; innovaciones; investigación cualitativa.

### **Programas de Formação de Professores Híbridos em a Cidade de Nova York: Uma Oportunidade Perdida?**

**Resumo:** Este estudo qualitativo descreve o desenvolvimento de programas híbridos de formação de professores em Nova York, que surgiram a partir de uma colaboração “forçada” entre os programas universitários e programas alternativos. Este experimento híbrido foi breve e inovador resultado de um acordo pragmático entre Teach for America, NYC, NYC Teaching Fellows e várias universidades para cumprir com os regulamentos estaduais para a certificação profissional. As instituições se beneficiaram deste acordo, mas o mais notável foi que os programas de formação de professores se influenciaram uns aos outros, criando uma experiência educacional potencialmente mais enriquecedora que cada programa separadamente. Apesar do seu potencial, o surgimento de um programa de pós-graduação independente, Relay, terminou esta cooperação. Embora se apresentaram desafios significativos, esta colaboração “forçada” foi caracterizado por tensões criativas e competitivas, ao contrário dos dois sistemas isolados e em concorrência para a formação de professores, que acabaram sendo implementados.

**Palavras-chave:** programas alternativos de certificação, facultades de educação, associações; inovações; investigação qualitativa.

### **Introduction: Hybridized teacher education programs in NYC**

This study describes the development of a hybrid teacher preparation program that emerged as a result of a “forced” partnership between alternative and university-based teacher preparation programs in New York City<sup>1</sup>. This hybrid teacher preparation program, with characteristics of both programs, was a short-lived, yet innovative by-product of an attempt by some market-based reformers to deregulate teacher education. However before this innovative partnership between alternative and university-based programs could be formally recognized, those same educational

---

<sup>1</sup> The partnership was “forced” in the sense that in order to be state certified, the alternative programs needed to be associated with a university. The creation of the stand-alone Relay Graduate School of Education largely ended this partnership.

reformers ended the partnership with the education schools and established Relay, an independent graduate school. Thus, a potentially innovative partnership was ended in favor of an independent pathway for alternative teacher preparation programs. I will present evidence in this article that this was a missed opportunity to create a better experience for the teaching-degree candidates and for further self-reflection by both teacher preparation programs

The hybrid teacher education programs were the result of the recruitment of teaching-degree candidates by alternative programs such as Teach For America (TFA) and the New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF), who trained the recruits during an intensive but short summer session, and then required the candidates enroll in the university-based teacher education courses for further working regarding pedagogy and curriculum. Unlike university-based programs, alternative programs are viewed as *in-service* programs, where teaching-degree candidates are placed in high-need schools and become the *teacher of record*, earning a salary, before completion of their teaching certification. University-based teacher education programs on the other hand, are viewed as *pre-service* programs, where teaching-degree candidates first complete their training, then seek employment but are not guaranteed a teaching position. While my data is limited to the hybridized teacher education program I speculate on the emergence of a *hybrid teacher* – a teaching-degree candidate who had the experience of concurrent training in both the alternative and university-based preparation programs.

The growth of alternative teacher preparation programs in New York City forced a partnership with education schools that eventually ended with the creation of Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay or Relay GSE). From 1999 to 2012 alternative programs such as TFA and NYCTF were required to partner with education schools so their teaching-degree candidates could earn the state mandated master's degree in teaching. This partnership led to a number of changes to university-based teacher education programs that I document in this article, including how it benefited all the parties involved. The students received better grounding in pedagogy, the university programs and the faculty got students from more elite colleges and universities and the alternative programs got their teaching candidates the required courses and certification by the state (Mungal, 2012). With all of its challenges, this forced partnership was characterized by creative and competitive tensions, rather than what ultimately became two parallel teacher education systems largely isolated and in competition with each other.

The purpose of this paper is to explore teacher preparation when alternative and university-based programs are forced to partner. I begin by situating the paper within the framework of competition, market ideology and the new professionalism. I then describe the relevant history of the development of alternative pathways and the partnership between alternative and university-based programs, followed by a discussion of methods and findings. Finally, I discuss the implications of the hybrid teacher preparation programs in light of the emergence of Relay Graduate School of Education and other venues for teacher (and leader) preparation outside of universities.

## **Competition, Market Ideology, and the New Professionalism**

The emerging partnership between alternative and university-based teacher programs was largely one of convenience. From 1990 to 2012, alternatively recruited candidates received state certification through the universities and in return, the universities received more tuition-paying students. Underlying the partnership was also a strong sense of competition and criticism between the university-based education schools and alternative programs. Universities saw alternative programs like TFA and NYCTF as a threat to their more academically rigorous programs, while alternative organizations viewed university-based programs as overly academic and clinically weak.

As with other education reforms that endorse a market ideology, alternative programs promoted a common narrative of university-based teacher preparation programs as a bureaucratic monopoly being challenged by more agile, efficient and less costly deregulated alternatives. Breaking this university “monopoly” on teacher education through competition is a central tenet of present market-based reform. According to proponents, competition will lead to the creation of new and innovative ways to prepare teaching-degree candidates (Hassel & Sherburne, 2004). Under this perspective, competition from alternative organizations will pressure competitors to become more innovative or risk losing consumers to rivals (Hursh, 2005; Wells & Holme, 2005).

Critics of university-based preparation programs have focused on whether these programs are able to produce the type of teachers needed to educate students to compete in the present global market as espoused by the recent education reform initiatives (Aud et al., 2011; Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 2005; The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, 1990). Proponents of market ideology first argued that the public education system was not functioning properly and that by adopting principles of the free market, education would become more accountable and innovative (Hess, Rotherham, & Walsh, 2004; McCluskey, 2005).

This climate of reform allowed alternative programs to flourish. But as others have pointed out, when alternative programs such as TFA form partnerships of convenience with higher education institutions, there may be a lack of congruence of core beliefs and practices (Meyers, Fisher, Alicea, & Bloxon, 2014). The alternative programs saw, in part, as their mission the creation of a different type of professional, one that differed from the university-trained teachers who had been deemed inadequate. The new professional would seamlessly enter schools reformed around accountability measures where good results on high-stakes testing were privileged and promised via the practices of exceptional teachers.

### **Criticism of Teacher Education and The Emergence of Alternative Programs**

How alternative and university-based teacher education programs ended up partnering in universities and ultimately separating is a complex story that includes a mix of teacher shortages, market and deregulation ideologies, and state and local politics. The criticism of teacher education has existed since the creation of the *normal schools*, which trained high school graduates to be teachers. The public perception of a flawed education system was tied into the failures of the teaching corps and supported by critiques from James Koerner’s *The Miseducation of American Teachers* (1963) and James Conant’s *The Education of American Teachers* (1963). Among Koerner’s recommendations were for multiple routes to gain a teaching license (Koerner, 1963), while Conant emphasized the lack of rigor and issues with state requirements for certification as barriers for graduates (Conant, 1963). Recommendations such as these would form the basis of the deregulation movement that emerged in the 1980s.

Christopher J. Lucas in *Teacher Education in America* (1997) (as cited in Gallagher & Bailey, 2000, p. 12), listed the five major areas of criticisms of university-based teacher programs: (1) the poor quality of pre-service teacher candidates, (2) the weaknesses within the structure of preparation programs, (3) the length of pre-service programs, (4) placement and coursework sequence, and (5) student practicum or clinical training. Reports from the Abell Foundation (2001), Arthur Levine (2006) and the National Council on Teacher Quality (2013) highlighted examples of weak training programs. State and federal policymakers added their concerns about education school programs doing a mediocre job of preparing teachers (Duncan, 2009). In order to address these shortcomings,

proponents of teacher reform emphasized that deregulation and the alternative teacher preparation programs would present solutions to the criticisms.

### **Teacher Education and the New Professionalism**

The literature on teacher education defines teacher preparation in a variety of ways that reveal a lack of consistency throughout the nations' programs (Greenberg, McKee, & Walsh, 2013; Office of Higher Education, 2009; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). The more prominent route, sometimes referred to as *traditional*, has been associated with the university-based education schools only since the 1960s. This knowledge-based pedagogical route seeks to frame the teaching profession with a "research-based and formal body of knowledge that distinguishes professional educators from lay persons" (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 44). This knowledge-based pedagogical model supports the notion of differentiated learning practices that is part of the university-based teacher preparation programs. This contrasts with alternative programs that suggest that any person who can pass a test but without formalized knowledge is eligible to teach.

Arguments for strong university-based education school preparation programs asserted that it would lead to better-prepared teachers and increase the status of teachers, thus allowing teacher education programs to draw the best and brightest. A central belief is that these university-based education school programs produce stronger student gains – such as in overall learning and narrowing the achievement gap – than teachers who are alternatively trained (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) The university-based education school agenda sought to ensure that all teachers were prepared and certified using high professional standards and underscoring that teaching was, indeed, a profession.

Drawing on the sociology of the professions, Evetts (2011) argues that this notion of professionalism may be giving way to a "new professionalism" in which occupation-based professionalism is shifting to more managerial or organization-based professionalism. The new professionalism looks at the change from "notions of partnership, collegiality, discretion and trust to increasing levels of managerialism, bureaucracy, standardization, assessment and performance review" (Evetts, 2011, p. 407). New professionalism takes on the characteristics of the employing organization wherein they are now "organizationally defined and includes the logics of the organization and the market: managerialism and commercialism" (Evetts, 2011, p. 407). This shift away from occupational professionalism is, in part, a consequence of new accountability systems resulting in organizational audit cultures that limit professional judgment, and, in part, a movement to provide alternative pathways to teaching. This new professionalism provides a way of understanding the shift toward alternative teacher preparation and teaching and student learning that is increasingly controlled through standards and assessments. The next section provides some background on the emergence of alternative teacher preparation programs.

### **The Emergence and Growth of Alternative Routes toward Certification**

The shortage of teachers in the 1970s and into the 1980s suggested a need for innovative methods to draw individuals back into the profession. This led to calls for and the proliferation of modern alternative teacher preparation programs in the mid-1980s, "where projected teacher shortages pushed many state education departments and school districts to create ways of placing a certified teacher in every classroom (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007, p. 484). States such as Virginia and New Jersey experimented with alternative programs in the early 1980s to attract individuals into the teaching profession. At that time, the definition of an *alternative certification route* referred to "any pathway into teaching other than the traditional, college or university-based four-year teacher-preparation program" (Grossman & Loeb, 2008, p. 4).

These 1980s alternative programs emphasized distinct characteristics such as actively recruiting post-baccalaureates and career-changers; rigorous screening of candidates; mentorship and support systems; coursework before and during teaching assignments, and high performance standards upon completion of the programs (Feistritz, 2008; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). States also have some differing definitions of alternative preparation. They include abbreviated training, less time, lower cost, less coursework, short program length and better mentoring. Some states included emergency permits to fill essential needs (Glass, 2008). By the 1990s, concerns over teacher retention (Cochran-Smith, 2004) had replaced concern about teacher shortages. Critiques of teacher programs such as low standards, weak students and discrepancies in institutional quality and oversight, as well as the shift to economic market ideologies promoted modern alternative teacher programs.

Alternative programs are linked to the deregulation movement whose aim is to break the monopoly held by education school preparation programs (Tonna, 2007; Torres, 2005). This deregulation movement has some of its origins within the critiques of Conant (1963) and Koerner (1963), but also from the National Commission on Excellence in Education and their commissioned report, *A Nation at Risk* (1983). ANAR spread the belief that the education system was failing American children and the U.S. economy. With the reduction of government funding for social and education programs, other organizations moved in to provide services for supposedly less money (Zeichner, 2010). By 2007 alternative teacher programs were connected to colleges and universities, school districts, and private non-profits educational management organizations (Constantine et al., 2009; Raphael & Tobias, 1997). One survey reported that education schools ran 69% of the alternative certification programs in their sample and they “have come to dominate this enterprise, blurring the distinction that once made such programs ‘alternative’” (Walsh & Jacobs, 2007, p. 7)

In 1985 there were eight alternative teacher preparation programs in the United States (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; National Center for Alternative Certification, 2007). By 2012 there were 41 university-based programs and 219 non university-based programs in 45 states, and DC (U.S. Department of Education & Office of Postsecondary Education, 2013). They represent national programs such as TFA and Troops to Teachers (TTT), as well as state, local and district run programs that emphasize subject-knowledge, real world and life experiences (Ballou et al., 1999; Zumwalt, 1996).

This more recent introduction of alternative preparation programs has opened a market for teacher preparation, allowing competitors from a diverse group of providers and surprisingly alternative programs from within universities, to recruit and prepare teachers with certification still in the domain of the state government. Alternative programs have been viewed as the solution to end teacher shortages, diversify the teaching corps, and challenge the monopoly held by colleges and universities that prepare teachers.

### **Policy Changes in New York State**

Alternative teacher preparation programs emerged in response to social and economic changes as well as political pressure. A series of political decisions and policies ensured that alternative programs would survive and thrive. Prompted in part by ANAR, as well as a shift toward a free market economy – what was supposed to be a temporary solution to a teacher shortage in the 1980s would become a permanent aspect of teacher preparation by 2012, with the arrival of Relay GSE. These policy changes also forced the partnership that led to the hybridized teacher program.

Reformers pressured lawmakers to support alternative program legislation. With teacher shortages looming, New York City School Chancellor Harold O. Levy along with United Federation of Teachers president Randi Weingarten supported these early reforms (Goodnough, 2000). Joining

with the New York City Board of Education and the education schools, these interest groups partnered together to alleviate the teacher shortage and also to ensure that alternatively trained teachers would register “for programs run by colleges and universities offering mentoring and the equivalent of an education degree in evening, weekend and summer classes over as long as two years” (Keller, 2000).

Richard P. Mills, then Commissioner of Education for the State of New York (1995- 2009), supported the legislation in 1999 that required teaching-degree candidates to obtain a mMaster’s in Education (National Center for Alternative Certification, 2010). Mills effectively tied alternative teacher programs to university-based education schools and forced a partnership that would last 12 years (Mungal, 2012). As a result, TFA and the NYCTF would partner with various university-based education schools, allowing their candidates to earn a master’s degree while being teacher of record.

The release of *No Child Left Behind* (2001) once again cast education as needing greater standards, accountability and highly qualified teachers (Apple, 2006; Ryan, 2004). This was again highlighted by the *Race To the Top* component within the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act* (United States Department of Education, 2009). Around this time, non-profit educational management organizations (EMO) and philanthropic organizations saw financial incentives (Miron & Urschel, 2010) and opportunities to influence educational policy (Burch & Bulkley, 2011). Significantly, leaders from three charter school networks (KIPP, Uncommon Schools and Achievement First) and the Dean of Education for Hunter College, David Steiner banded together to create Teacher U – a program to prepare teachers specifically for the charter school networks (Carey, 2009; Mungal, 2012).

### **Relay Graduate School of Education**

With David Steiner becoming Commissioner of Education for the State of New York in 2009 (Cramer, 2011), the New York State Board of Regents introduced a clinically rich teacher preparation in 2009 (New York State Board of Regents, 2010). On February 3<sup>rd</sup> 2011, the Board of Regents granted a provisional charter to form an independent college named Relay Graduate School of Education (New York State Board of Regents, 2011).

This independent graduate school of education would have locations in Manhattan and Brooklyn and was authorized to offer a Master of Arts in Teaching degree (M.A.T.) in middle school education. Relay had no affiliation with the university-based education schools and was a stand-alone program. Their candidates would instead take modules offered by Relay. Relay’s model of teacher preparation focuses strongly on the clinical experience that is then reinforced via mentorship and teaching *modules* (Kronholz, 2012; Mooney, 2012; Otterman, 2011). These modules replace any of the pedagogical courses. A key point is, like Teacher U, Relay specifically prepares teaching-degree candidates for charter schools.

In four years Relay’s influence has spread to eight states (Relay Graduate School of Education, 2014a, 2014b) and has grown to include other charter schools (Aspire Public Schools, 2015; Harris, 2014; Hutson, 2014; New Schools for New Orleans, 2014). Alternative routes to teaching have evolved from originally addressing a teacher shortage to addressing retention. The creation of Relay GSE effectively ended the need for the partnership between alternative and university-based programs thus also ending whatever potential the hybridized teacher program held.

## Research Design

This research is a multiple interview study of faculty in university-based teacher education programs. The selected sites represented institutions of higher education that either directly or indirectly dealt with alternative programs. The interviewees for this study consisted of faculty members in six schools of education located in New York City. This research utilized a convenience sample of interviewees involved with preparing teaching-degree candidates in various capacities such as faculty, administrators, and so on.

The purposeful sample reflected diversity in terms of size, connection to alternative programs and type of institution (public or private). Table 1 provides an expanded account of the selected sites including information on type, affiliation and programs at the time of the study.

Table 1  
*Selected Institution Sites in the Greater New York City Area (2012)*

University Type	Site	Professional Route	Alternative Route TFA/ NYCTF
Large Public	Site 1	Yes	Yes
	Site 2	Yes	Yes
	Site 3	Yes	Previous Program
Large Private	Site 4	Yes	Yes
	Site 5	Yes	Yes
Small Private	Site 6	Yes	No

The research questions guiding this study are: (1) how do faculty and administrators in university-based education schools understand the forced partnership with alternative teacher preparation programs? (2) Have practices within education schools changed with this forced partnership? And if so, how? (3) How do faculty and administrators envision the direction of teacher preparation in the context of an independent graduate school?

I conducted 21 in depth interviews with participants from the six sites as well as document analysis of each of the programs. The interviewees include deans, chairs, professors, administrators, and directors of teaching and alternative programs. Seven individuals held deanship positions at various times. Five held the chair position. All interviewees taught teaching-degree candidates. The interviews consisted of open-ended questions and lasted between 75-90 minutes with follow-up emails for clarification. Interviews were transcribed and coded for relevant themes. I used the software Atlas.ti to help manage and organize the interview transcripts.

## Findings and Analyses

As we have seen, hybridized teacher preparation programs emerged due to the forced partnership that drew teaching ideologies from alternative and university-based programs. Both programs as well as the teaching-degree candidates benefited from this collaboration. The alternative programs used the partnership to get their candidates certified by the state during their in-service as teacher of record. The university-based programs were stabilized by the influx of alternative candidates and were able to use that funding to ease some of their financial burdens.



Most importantly, as I will describe, the university-based programs while initially resisting the alternative programs, began to self reflect on their practices and also on the order of courses that the alternative programs and their candidates demanded before entering the classroom. Lastly, the interviewees believed that the alternative candidates benefited from the greater exposure to educational foundational courses and pedagogical courses. This section contextualizes the emergence of the hybridized teacher program.

### **The Emergence of Hybrid Practices**

The 1999 New York State Board of Regents teacher education regulations allowed institutions of higher education to offer teacher preparation programs aimed at career changers, and individuals who held academic degrees or professional degrees. Importantly, the *Transitional C* program meant that all candidates would participate in a college program for the pedagogical component (University of the State of New York, 2010). The university-based programs provided the requirements for the alternative program candidates to become highly qualified teachers, which included the granting of a master's degree in teaching. One former dean discussed how the alternative programs benefitted from the partnership. She explained:

[They used] our original course of study. We had to use what we already had... because those were already approved by the state and the department. So we had to work within those limitations. What we did was, within each course we redesigned content differently. They took the support that we give our traditional students. And we basically made it available in addition to the coursework of the alternative programs, because...we provide that to our regular programs and the alternative programs wouldn't have built that in. But we did. (Former Dean)

This former dean noted that the early alternative programs were bound by the state regulations on content and hours. Since the university-based programs already had state approval for the coursework, it was easiest for the alternative programs to use what was approved than to create their own.

Both alternative and university-based programs were dependent upon each other to fill some essential needs. With declining enrollments, many university-based programs needed the numbers to maintain their programs. One associate dean described the state of her program before alternative programs:

[Our program] has not thrived as well. And so the numbers were always in jeopardy, they were always fewer than people thought were necessary to maintain a program. At that time our dean got involved with both Teach for America and New York City Teaching Fellows as a way to dramatically increase the New York City numbers and it worked. (Associate Dean)

Another acting dean agreed, adding that, "The graduate... numbers were fragile. I think that made the influx of this group of students, the 300 in the first year, very attractive. I mean one hundred to two hundred Fellows and 160 TFAs made it attractive." These interviewees noted that the relationship with the alternative programs provided benefits to both programs through faculty support and the state pre-approved regulations for coursework as well as generating money and increasing enrollment.

The partnerships brought changes to the way education schools viewed teacher preparation. One director of teaching summarized the relationship between the two programs:

I think we have found ways to work with alternative teacher education [programs]. I think that alternative teacher education recognizes that schools of teacher education and institutions are a very important resource and they've learned how to use us. If

anything, I think we each have adapted to each other in ways that have made many of these programs better. (Director of Teaching)

The directors' comments came before the arrival of the Relay GSE but were given in a political context in which alternative programs had to partner with the university-based schools.

### **Effects of Partnership on Teacher Preparation Programs**

Before the proliferation of alternative programs, the university-based education schools prepared nearly all teachers and the school districts' departments of education hired and placed teachers. Critics argued that the education schools were not properly preparing teaching-degree candidates (Lucas, 1997) and that local education authorities should have more input into the training of the people they were hiring for their schools. A number of interviewees alluded to the NYCDOE's support of alternative programs. The director of teaching explained why the local education agency would support alternative programs. He stated:

[They] were a primary motivating force. They historically had not been great fans of the schools of education. They have criticized schools of education for not preparing our students for success to become effective teachers in the inner-city schools.

(Director of Teaching)

This shift in power could be viewed as a case of self-interest for the NYCDOE, which gave them more control over teacher preparation and recruitment. The NYCDOE and many policymakers were critical of the programs within the education schools and they became prominent supporters of alternative programs.

A number of interviewees pointed out the evolving relationship between the New York City Teaching Fellows and the NYCDOE. The NYCDOE had criticized education schools for not producing the teachers needed for urban schools. At the same time, then Mayor Bloomberg and Chancellor Klein were pushing their agenda to undermine university-based programs (Tilson, 2011). One acting dean elaborated on this shift in power and explained that both the NYCDOE and TFA were now setting the standards for what they would accept as teacher quality. Another director summarized the relationship as, "Teaching Fellows, the external agency and the Department of Education are one and the same. It is run by the Department of Education in our city and it's an outgrowth of their organization" (Director- Alternative Programs). The alternative teacher preparation programs and the New York City Department of Education saw themselves as consumers and as such, could begin to make demands from the education schools as to what type of elements should be included in the training of teaching-degree candidates.

### **Re-organization of Teacher Preparation Programs**

While professional and alternative programs made the best of a relationship based on political compromise, they were also in competition with each other. Some interviewees described how this competition led to reorganization and streamlining within teacher preparation programs. A director whose institution is highly involved with alternative programs supported the notion of competition. He stated:

Good competition creates better quality products. I think here is an opportunity for competition – good, bad, or indifferent; if it causes people to stand up and re-think the work they are doing, with the possible notion of having a better product, I think it's a good thing. (Director-Alternative Programs)

Another interviewee described how he thought the competition from other alternative programs impacted education schools:

It's shaking the cobwebs off for some [teacher preparation programs]. You know when you think you're the only one who can create something you have no

competition, right? And all of a sudden you have competition and then you have to think about how you [are] doing things. (Professor)

Several interviewees discussed the positive ways that alternative programs informed the recruitment efforts of the university-based programs and a few admired the recruiting practices of Teach for America for attracting a more elite type of candidate. For instance one dean stated:

Teach For America does a great job recruiting. They're the best recruiters in the country right now, probably in the world because they're getting the best students from across the country from the best universities. They're bright, they're motivated, [and] they work really, really hard. And some of them succeed. So we should learn from Teach For America how to recruit. (Dean)

The recruiting practices of alternative programs have earned them accolades from government and business leaders (Bloomberg Businessweek, 2011; Sellers, 2006) and have caused faculty to acknowledge their lack of proactive recruitment strategies.

The alternative programs provide a number of incentives that the education schools cannot or have not been able to match. Alternative candidates are placed within a classroom as teacher of record and receive a competitive salary after only five-to-six weeks of summer training. TFA and NYCTF candidates were guaranteed a position within the district. NYCTF was the NYCDOE version of TFA – a more elite recruitment program that offered teaching positions in high needs areas. TFA candidates were also guaranteed positions as they too were partnered with the NYCDOE. TFA candidates however, were more likely placed within the charter schools, which were privately run public schools. Their work within inner city schools and the mission statement of being a local peace corps also served to strengthen their resumes for those who were looking at TFA or NYCTF as stepping-stones into other career choices.

The funding and connections to philanthropic organizations as well as a number of highly visible business and government organizations also made this alternative route to teaching a lucrative opportunity. The ability to earn a master's degree while teaching and having a majority of it paid for by the recruiting organization as well as the competitive salary made programs such as TFA and NYCTF highly sought after. University-based education schools are not able to compete with this model nor do they have the connections or financial incentives. However, it may cause education schools to come up with programs that get their candidates into the classroom sooner.

Interviewees also talked about the characteristics of the alternative teaching-degree candidates. A former chair noted:

TFA students are by and large, young recent graduates having recently changed what their career goals were, to teach for a minimum two years, to teach for at least two years in inner city schools. They are well educated. They are the smartest students, as a group that I've ever had. They come from very good universities and they're very competent, they're very capable, and they're very committed to serving these kids.

Other interviewees described TFA candidates “as very bright, highly motivated students” (Administrator). TFA and NYCTF candidates “were more curious. Many of the Fellows coming from private elite colleges and many did not attend New York City public schools” (Assistant Dean).

Another interviewee added:

The people, who come into Teach for America, by definition, come from the best and brightest. And because of the way they are screened, they end up being pretty sharp. Now that doesn't correlate perfectly with the teaching. But if I had to choose between picking someone who's been well-educated and smart, and someone well-educated and not so smart, but trained as a teacher – give me the well-educated,

smart one and I will teach that person to be a teacher. It won't take much. And I didn't used to think that way. (Dean)

Overall alternative teachers were “diverse in age, background, experience and ability” but not in cultural diversity (Assistant Dean). As the demographics of the teaching-degree candidates changed, so did the demographics of teachers in New York City. This research captured the perceptions of the interviewees on the demographic change. Arguments for alternative programs included the belief that it would increase the amount of minorities, men and career changers. One Dean noted that recruitment of alternative candidates did not focus on local communities. She explained, “Most of the teachers who would come into teaching here would be [local] based. Now you're talking about bringing in outsiders.” Another interviewee described the alternative programs as very homogeneous:

The Fellows in the beginning were not a diverse group of students at all – White people only. That was truly bothersome...the differences are many, socio-economically very different, culturally very different, worldview very different, expectations very different. Long-term vision in terms of teaching as a career, very different than a traditional student who sees this as more of career than the Fellows who will, as soon as they're in the program they're already thinking, “What I'm going to do when I'm done with my Master's degree?”(Assistant Dean)

The shift in recruiting practices suggested that fewer teachers would come from local neighborhoods and may not represent the demographics of the students they would be teaching. Table 2 provides an overall view of the demographics of New York City teachers and students collected from 2011-2014 (Casey, 2011; Klein, 2014; New York City Independent Budget Office, 2014a, 2014b; Teach For America Inc., 2014; U.S. Department of Education & Institute of Education Sciences, 2013).

Table 2

*Demographics of New York City Teachers and Students*

NYC Teacher/ Student Data %	Black	Latino	White	Asian	Other	Multi-Ethnic	Native American
TFA- National	21	13	48	6	--	6	1
TFA- NYC Teachers	9.8	9	65	9.2	--	5.4	0.4
Teachers- National	6.8	7.8	81.9	1.8	4	1.0	0.1
NYC- Teachers	19.9	14.4	58.6	5.9	--	--	--
NYC- Students- Public	27.3	40.5	14.9	16	--	--	1.3
NYC-Students-Charter	58.8	34.3	3.3	2	--	--	1.6
NYC- Students- Non-Public	12.8	13.7	62.9	5.4	--	--	5.1

According to the above collected data, TFA may have increased its diversity nationally, but some data indicated that there is still much more to do in New York City (Casey, 2011) as well as the New York City charter schools where TFA teachers are not representative of the students. However it is also evident that the public schools have diversity disparities.

**Innovation within university-based programs.** The length of programs also changed as traditional programs restructured, merging courses, omitting others and decreasing the number of credits needed to complete the degree. “What it forced teacher education programs to do is to rethink what their offerings are, to rethink their credit load” (Professor Emeritus). University-based programs reported that when they took in the alternative programs, they

wanted to ensure that those programs were not only as strong as the university-based programs, but also “in a couple of our programs we redesigned our, quote, regular programs to match our alternative certification programs in every way except in the order of classes” (Acting Chair).

Ultimately it may matter less who inspired whom, or who pushed whom, than the nature of the conversation that was occurring and the move by university-based programs to respond to an ever-changing teacher preparation environment. At some of the education schools, interviewees indicated that faculty not only were rethinking their programs in terms of course load and length and credits, but they had also implemented these changes as they began to reconsider what was important and necessary. While there was change and innovation within the university-based schools before the emergence of alternative programs, it is also evident from the interviewees that competition with alternative programs provided added impetus to innovate.

The partnerships were not without their detractors who believed there were underlying problems that shifted the oversight of teacher preparation away from the teacher preparation programs. Interviewees expressed concerns about the oversight of alternative programs. One administrator discussed the role of state government and believed “they would like Teach For America to do their own program and bypass the colleges” (Administrator), which would eventually happen. One former chair believed that the government wanted more privatization of education. Some interviewees believed that alternative programs were given greater leeway and had less oversight than university-based programs. Supporters and detractors of alternative programs wanted assurances from governing bodies that there would be fair and equal oversight for the alternative programs.

### **The Hybrid Teacher Preparation Program**

The partnership between the alternative and university-based programs presented a glimpse into what I believe was potentially one of the most interesting findings. The two programs shared the preparation of the alternative candidates and created a distinctive program that came about due to government policy, a need for teachers, and a rethinking of what is needed to be a highly qualified teacher.

Based on the descriptions of the interviewees, it appears that a somewhat unique process took place. By the time these alternative candidates had begun their coursework, they had already completed the five or six-week orientation provided by the alternative organizations. Some interviewees were critical of the alternative preparation programs pre-service component because the time was too short to become proficient to deal with classroom situations. One former dean explained:

I think in six weeks, you can only develop a small bag of tricks. I think without observing the teachers, and even if you know the tricks, [and] you know the repertoire you haven't had a chance to practice them.

A former acting dean concurred, stating that there was “not enough time in schools preparing before you become a teacher of record.” It was this short preparation experience that concerned many of the interviewees who felt it was not long or in-depth enough to properly prepare the alternative candidates to enter the local urban classroom.

For the most part the alternative candidates could complete the training and earn the master's degree as quickly as two to three years. Interviewees specifically described the content of the alternative program to include courses on methodology, classroom management, and pedagogy as well as courses that were done online. These courses were moved to the start of the program to prepare the alternative teaching-degree candidates who were entering the classroom with relatively

little training. Another dean believed that the alternative programs have their own objectives: She explained:

Teach for America has its program. Has its particular goals, which are to get the brightest people that are deeply trained in the content area in the fields that we need teachers, to equip them with what they need, and front-end load them what they can need to survive and put them in needy classrooms, and then support them through the process of learning.

Another interviewee added that some courses were more valuable to the students in the beginning. She went on to give an example, "Classroom management is key, key, key for alternative programs, you have to do it really soon" (Former Chair). The order of courses became more important as faculty recognized that there were some courses, which needed to be taught earlier. The hybrid aspect of the partnership meant that the university-based programs would fill in the gaps of the short summer induction as well emphasize a differentiated style of pedagogy versus the prescriptive alternative teaching methods.

Embracing the alternative programs was counter-intuitive to the purposes of the education schools. The alternative programs represented a top-down; prescriptive model while the education schools supported differentiated learning emphasizing issues of equity and differentiated learning. The following sections explore the elements of the hybrid teacher program that includes characteristics of the hybrid teacher and gives a summary of the potential for the hybrid teacher.

**Characteristics of the hybrid teacher program.** My data suggest that the partnership between the alternative and university-based programs may have ended up creating a kind of hybrid teacher preparation program. This hybrid of the two programs was the result of the merger of somewhat unstructured, ambiguous components from each partner. Both programs provided key assets for their mutual survival. The alternative organizations contributed training in the form of their summer institute, mentoring, clinical training, funding, module learning session, and a teaching position. The education schools contributed coursework geared for teachers who needed specific courses such as classroom management, foundations and methodologies while they were teachers of record. The education school also contributed mentoring and face-to-face and online courses. Both partners also supported certain ideological stances. Alternative programs stressed very prescriptive methods to promote student learning that can be viewed as more of a checklist compared to the education schools that focus on differentiated models of learning ("Education Schools: Prescriptive Training and Academic Freedom," 2014; Kronholz, 2012; Mada, 2014).

Proponents of the alternative route believed TFA and NYCTF promote increased competition with the education schools, less pedagogical training, emphasis on clinical training, deregulation of the profession, high stakes testing, and the elimination of regulatory bureaucracy that controls entry into teaching (Education Commission of the States, 2000; Sullivan, 2001). Prospective teachers are recruited from elite colleges and universities with the belief that they already have content knowledge. They are required to participate in a summer orientation by the recruiting organization where they are exposed to the philosophy and practice of the recruiting organizations. Finally these hybrid teachers may be more likely to remain in the education field but in positions of authority rather than in the classroom.

After their summer orientation they then enroll in university-based teacher preparation programs at various education schools. Here they are exposed to the philosophy, foundations of education and pedagogy. According to some interviewees the university-based program characteristics are associated with social justice agendas. These characteristics seek to strengthen the teacher preparation programs, set high standards, stress pedagogical knowledge and subject-specific

teaching skills, allow only fully qualified teachers into the classroom, and increase state support for quality development (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Sullivan, 2001). These characteristics are also reflective of the occupational professionalism that supports trust and high professional standards. Their courses are offered in class or online, and during the school year they have a continuing relationship with the alternative program.

Based on my data, I cannot describe the characteristics of the graduates of this hybrid program, but the forced partnership of the two organizations may have inadvertently produced a teacher with qualities from both programs. What we do know is that the graduates of these programs are moving into teaching, leadership, and policy positions. According to the interviewees, candidates that completed their hybridized program during this period were guaranteed teaching positions as per the partnerships between TFA, NYCTF and the NYCDOE. Interviewees also noted that some of the candidates had made inroads into administrative and government levels of education.

The notion of this hybrid teacher as a leader, policymaker and administrator emerged during one interview that took place in the lobby of the New York City Department of Education building. During the interview my interviewee and I were constantly interrupted by the flow of people walking by. The interviewee was a former dean who had originally opposed, but then supported the alternative programs. As the people passed us, the former dean stopped, looked around and segued:

At least five of the people that have walked past us are Teach For America folks. They would not be here at Tweed<sup>2</sup> doing this work if it had not been for Teach For America. And there are outside, for every one of those five – a couple that are still in teaching. That's because of the way our society currently perceives teaching, [they] would never ever have considered teaching as a viable career. So I really believe that Teach for America has made teaching viable for smart people. Smart people, probably privileged people as well, more often than not smart, privileged people because it just allows it. And so these people come here now and they're able to help with the reform efforts and help with schools, and they have that knowledge base, and they have that dedication, and that focus on education. (Former Dean)

The former Dean expressed excitement about the TFA alumni and their promise within the administration. This quote suggested three implications. The first implication is that TFA are becoming policy actors. Notably this shift to producing civic leaders has been one of Wendy Kopp and TFA's original goals (Wilgoren, 2000). The second implication is that a number of these TFA graduates remain in education in an administration role, often as leaders of charter schools. Feyerick & Steffen, (2009) and others provide evidence indicating that TFA alumni have remained in education as leaders. The third implication is that these alternative program educators, while energetic and intelligent, are, without this component of the university-based preparation, not hybrid teachers, but instead could be viewed as a de-professionalized teacher who will be credentialized after a short summer induction. While some TFA recruits will earn a master's degree in teaching from states with Relay – their training will not have the breadth of the university-based programs (Mooney, 2012) but instead be driven by shorter modules, many of which are during the summer induction (Coffino, Dillon, Brakke, & MPS & Northside Achievement Zone School Partners, 2014). This de-professionalized teacher is another avenue for future research.

The hybridized teacher preparation program held both promise and concern. Interviewees describe the candidates as intelligent and hard working, but they are unlikely to remain within the teaching profession, and they are less likely to be representative of the populations they are working

---

<sup>2</sup> Headquarters for the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE)

with (Casey, 2011; Domanico, 2014). However, they have had university-based course work culminating in a master's degree and therefore, they have hopefully been exposed to the intellectual debates that occur around teaching and learning, the history of schooling, issues of inclusion and culturally responsive pedagogies. They have interacted with university faculty and supervisors engaged in action research, and had opportunities to reflect rigorously on their practice. They are emerging from the program without the student debt associated with graduate degrees and are positioned well at a fairly young age.

The end of the forced partnership eliminated any opportunity to see how beneficial this hybridized program could be and the potential of the hybrid teacher. Instead this hybrid teacher may give way to (or perhaps, in a historical sense, return to) de-professionalized teachers that are the product of stand-alone alternative programs. Interestingly both the education schools and the alternative programs were resistant to the partnership. These resistances held both institutions back from recognizing that a partnership, even if forced, could stimulate some innovation in both programs.

### **The Hybrid Teacher and Demographic Changes**

As noted above, there is evidence that the hybrid Teach For America alumni have taken on positions as administrators within the Department of Education. These teachers from the hybrid teacher preparation program have both practical and theoretical grounding. I suggest that the de-professionalized teacher may also follow the career paths of the hybrid teacher, but will have the clinical/practical experience without the academic component.

As Scott (2009) points out, this recruitment of elite and mostly White teachers and leaders has implications for the diversity of our future leaders and who ultimately are designing the education that low-income students of color are receiving. TFA claims that 50% of nationwide members self-identify as people of color (Teach For America Inc., 2015). While Klein (2014) supports the notion that alternative programs are now recruiting more teachers of color, his claim needs to be explored to contextualize the changes and to see if this increase is a pattern or a blip. This recent claim does not take away from the previous 14 years where TFA numbers were strikingly different (Casey, 2011) and predominantly White. I suggest that such leaders will be responsible for the planning and implementation of policies that will impact these students. These policies, while appearing neutral, may benefit one group over others (House, 1999). The trends that are visible from the emergence of the Relay GSE indicate that the future leaders will be predominantly White and, should they remain in the field of education after their service to TFA, they will take up positions of power within education.

### **Summary of the Hybrid Teacher Program**

This research describes the phenomenon of a hybridized teacher education program that emerged from the forced partnership between alternative and university-based teacher preparation programs. I captured innovative practices where the candidates are trained with differing clinical and theoretical frameworks and potentially will remain in the field of education though not in the classroom. I see the alternative teaching-degree candidates that complete the hybridized preparation as a dual-program hybrid teacher. This hybrid teacher may change the expectations and objectives of what scholars and researchers have described as the archetypical teacher. What comes out clearly from the research is that, for many of these hybrid teachers, their identity as a teacher is a transitory one – that they see bigger and better opportunities for themselves – in or out of education.

Independently, critics viewed both types of programs as containing a number of weak elements. While the university-based programs tended draw more local and younger candidates, they were deemed too long, too repetitive and not enough clinical experiences. The alternative programs



were seen as too short on pedagogical training, focused primarily on content, a too short-a-term commitment, lacking a foundational piece, too prescriptive in their methods, and not enough emphasis on diversity. The strength of the alternative programs is recruitment of candidates from elite institutions, the completion of a paid master's degree as well as salaried position. But the alternative programs also emphasized that they were a local "Peace Corps" experience. Some interviewees noted that alternative teaching-degree candidates had a "savior complex" where they would go into these high needs urban areas and "rescue" students.

The age of this new hybrid teacher and program ended with the independent, stand-alone organization, Relay Graduate School of Education. Relay can grant a master's degree in teaching (M.A.T.) independent of universities. Relay effectively replaced the need for university-based teacher training while at the same time contributing to the erosion of the monopoly of education schools to train teaching-degree candidates.

The scope of my data did not explore the above claim that candidates from the hybridized teacher program in New York City took on administrative positions within the New York City Department of Education but there is evidence that TFA alumni are in important positions within the NYCDOE (Teach For America Inc., 2010) as well as within the charter schools and supporting the privatization movement (Ravitch, 2014)

This recent development can be viewed in three ways. One perspective is that these new administrators have had between two-to-three years of teaching experience within high-needs urban schools. This experience could potentially benefit policy and lawmakers who make create policies, which are more attentive to the needs of communities, schools and students in these areas. There is also the consideration that two-to-three year commitment is too limited and that these hybrid-educated administrators may not have enough experience to bring about change. There is also the concern that many of these hybrid-educated administrators will not represent the diverse students and the communities they served. While New York City is viewed as a diverse population, the public schools do not reflect the city diversity. As noted above in Table 1 there is a greater diversity within the schools than among the teachers. There is also a great disparity among the traditional public schools, the chartered public schools and the nonpublic schools. Table 3 shows the racial and ethnic make-up of students in the different types of New York City schools (Domanico, 2014) as well as a comparison of Teach For America teachers (Casey, 2011).

Table 3

*Racial/ Ethnic Make-up of Students in All Types of Schools and TFA Teachers*

Type of School	Hispanic %	Black %	Asian %	White %
Traditional Public School	41	26-27	15-16	14-15
Nonpublic School	13-14	11-12	6-7	62-63
Public Charter Schools	34-35	58-59	2-3	4-5
TFA-NYC Teachers	9	9.8	9.2	60-65 range

While now the overall teacher population on New York City is still far below the racial make-up of the schools, this was not so before the Bloomberg-Klein era in New York where there were greater numbers of Black and Hispanic teachers (Mungal, 2012). This more recent shift de-emphasizes the racial differences of students and teachers by focusing on the elitism and issues of poverty. While a majority of New York City public school teachers are local, the same cannot be said of TFA candidates who are recruited across the country from elite colleges and universities. They bring with

them regional values as well as middle or above- class values and may not understand much about the high need urban areas. They are also less likely to live in these high needs areas of their students.

### **Hybrid Programs and the New Professionalism**

Meyers et al. (2014) make the case that when alternative and university-based programs form partnerships of convenience, differing core beliefs and practices come into play and are exposed. Whether the “partners” can come to examine these core beliefs and create something that draws on these differing beliefs may depend on the ultimate aims and ideologies embedded in these varying stances. Evetts (2009) makes the case that a whole new sense of what it means to be a professional is incorporated into the goals of new public management. She documents a shift away from the professional identified with “common and lengthy systems of education and vocational training and the development of strong occupational identities and work cultures” (Evetts, 2009, p. 248).

In the past, these professional identities were framed within relationships of trust and respect. In contrast, current iterations of a new type of professionalism reflect a belief in managerial controls and standardized procedures and practices. These procedural moves are seen as replacing those based on trusting relationships whereby a professional could be entrusted and expected to exercise professional judgment. These shifts then bring to the fore questions such as: “What kinds of professionals are we preparing?” and “For what settings or contexts?” It is the shift from occupational to organizational (or “new”) professionalism that might help to understand the emergence of the hybridized teacher preparation program and its ultimate conversion to stand-alone, deregulated teacher preparation programs.

The hybrid graduate had the benefit of being exposed to the various ideologies and training from the two programs. Teaching-degree candidates were recruited by the alternative organizations from predominantly elite universities. These candidates were to represent a different type of candidate – elite, slightly older than the university-based candidates having completed their undergraduate degrees. These alternative pathway teacher candidates are precisely the type of teacher that traditional programs attempt to recruit, but have often not been able to because of competition from Law, Business, and Medical schools. This is also a generation of teachers with little knowledge of the norms of occupational professionalism that schools of education typically assume in their practice. These norms included developing and trusting ones’ professional judgment and internal forms of accountability that were congruent with the sanction of their professional organizations and unions.

However, these bright new prospective teachers enter a profession that is increasingly controlled organizationally and institutionally by the external measurement of competencies through high stakes assessments. Because most are not planning on long-term careers in teaching, the acquisition and honing of professional competence is not as salient a value. This leaves universities vulnerable in terms of the value-added they provide to the new professional, who is increasingly expected to follow the dictates of external accountability and commonly works in a school context that re-enforces this notion of teaching.

Both alternative and university-based candidates shared some of the managerial considerations of the new professionalism (Evetts, 2009). As teachers, they were seen as a public good and a value to the state. In fact TFA candidates were indoctrinated with founder Wendy Kopp’s dual goals for TFA, “To get bright young missionaries into some of the nation’s neediest classrooms and to create a cadre of civic leaders conscious of the challenges of education and poverty” (Wilgoren, 2000) and the echo of the earlier Peace Corps mission (Labaree, 2010; Reed III, 2009). The hybrid teacher had the training from both programs. The discussions of social justice

issues within the university-based education schools put the hybrid teacher in better position to be conscious of social issues and perhaps carefully consider “the challenges of education and poverty.”

But the alternative candidates also reflected the more cynical ideals of the new professionalism. TFA candidates were viewed as more prestigious than the university-based candidates, received more attention, financial support for master’s degree and greater status. Their salaries tended to be higher and they were guaranteed a position while completing their master’s. They were also more likely to take administrative positions within education instead of staying in the classroom, and are also less likely to have any type of conflict with newer reform policies designed to shape teacher education through incentives and accountability (Montecinos, Pino, Campus-Martinez, Dominguez, & Carreno, 2013). This may be in part due to the fact that their induction phase highlighted the benefits of these reforms to address education and poverty issues. Some of these hybrid teachers who did move on from the classroom used the dual training as a springboard into policy and administrative positions. Without these university-based components, the hybrid teacher would resemble a de-professionalized teacher whose only experience would be from the limited induction piece of the alternative programs.

Critiques of teacher preparation have highlighted examples of control and rational authority of the new professionalism (Zeichner, 2010). Education has already come under the aegis of an increased number of “external forms of regulation and accountability measures” (Evetts, 2011, p. 248). Created by lawmakers, the new policies that represent rational authority of government lend legitimacy to alternative pathways that are often exempted from many of these regulations. The hybrid partnership formed due to an increase in state regulations that made it necessary for teaching-degree candidates to obtain a master’s degree in teaching to qualified for the classroom. At that time, the education schools and teacher unions supported the connection to the university-based programs.

This support was to ensure that the occupational professionalism model of trust, ethics and occupational identities were included as well as to ensure that teaching-degree candidates were being properly trained in pedagogy. With increasing regulations opening up the market for the alternative programs, much of the effort of teacher unions and teachers have been shunted to the margins, replaced by managerial leadership and prescriptive teaching methods. As the partnership between the professionalized and alternative programs ended, so did the perceived need for a professional body such as professional associations and teachers unions. Instead, the alternative teachers may end up working within the charter school networks, which are more deregulated locally, but still controlled at a distance by high stakes testing.

Evetts (2011) also describes how professionalism can “be imposed from above” (p. 408) by employers and managers where the occupational control of the work shifts from the workers to the organizational managers and supervisors. An example of a push from above pertains to the criticisms from the NYCDOE as well as charter schools. As consumers for teaching candidates, both believed that they, and not the university-based programs, should have a greater say (and greater control) in the type of teachers they require. If the sellers, in this case the university-based education schools, were not producing the required teacher then they could seek out competitors who would produce this type of teacher. This gave rise to competition in the form of the Relay Graduate School of Education, which was established by the founders of three charter school networks (Mungal, 2012). This established a hierarchy where the consumers of teachers (the charter school networks) have managerial control and decision-making over the work as well as the workers (Evetts, 2011).

The increasing managerial control with standardized procedures and practices also lends itself to more de-professionalizing of teachers. This includes a highly structured classroom

management style perpetuated by alternative programs that some critics claim utilize a more militarized method to teach students (Jazzman, 2013; Strauss, 2013). Kopp's dual role of classroom teacher and leaders may also extend to the belief that such leadership practices would lead to the erosion, "of personal and professional autonomy, the restriction and denial of spaces for the encouragement of lived democratic practices, and tacit forms of encouragement for authoritarian behavior" (Hall, 2013). This is already evident in the "Engaging Everybody" segment of Relay teaching training (Kronholz, 2012) and the classroom management handbook from Match, another independent graduate school in Boston (Burris, 2012).

## Discussion

This article captured a wide variety of thoughts and ideas about the direction of teacher preparation in New York City and in the United States. Specifically I look at the forced partnership between alternative and university-based teacher preparation programs that formed a unique hybrid teacher program. I document the perceived benefits for teachers immersed in this hybrid experience.

The hybridized teacher preparation program was a moment in time where two ideologically opposing views were able to find some common ground. The product of the two programs, what I term a hybrid teacher, will have grounding in the practical clinical experiences and the theoretical knowledge. Through trial and error, the two partners created a hybrid program that went unnoticed.

This may have been a missed opportunity to strengthen teacher preparation through partnerships. Instead, educational reformers and a network of connected educational power brokers partnered up to create a competitor through Relay GSE. With the creation of Relay, this opportunity ended and was replaced by two parallel teacher programs, isolated from each other and in competition with each other. Notably this has recently occurred in New Jersey where former TFA executive and recent Newark Public Schools Superintendent Cami Anderson supported limiting stipends for graduate students of Relay GSE (Braun, 2015) and excluding local education schools.

The emergence of Relay Graduate School of Education has created a somewhat closed system where Teach For America would recruit elite candidates that would then be trained by Relay and placed within a number of charter school networks and independent charter schools, as well as public schools. No longer would there be a need for the education schools and their emphasis on differentiated learning and pedagogical courses. Instead Relay would promote their brand of prescriptive learning and classroom management methods to their students.

## Future Research

The forced partnership between the two programs created a number of opportunities for future research. Researching the graduates of these hybrid programs may offer an opportunity to see how many of them stayed in the classroom, or in education but in a different capacity. With the creation of Relay, there is the opportunity to research their graduates and see what paths they take upon completion of their contracts. The spread of Relay to other states can also inform researchers on Relay's relationship with charter schools and other new policy actors (Scott, 2009). While I have hypothesized the emergence of a de-professionalized teacher formed outside university teacher preparation programs, studies of Relay graduates will be necessary to determine the characteristics and career trajectories of these teachers. It would be interesting to determine to what extent these "de-professionalized" teachers are congruent with the tenets of new professionalism described above. Table 4 hypothesizes about the characteristics of the different types of teachers and could serve as a guide for future study.

Table 4  
*Characteristics of University-based, Dual-Program Hybrid and De-Professionalized Teachers*

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>University-based teacher education</b>	<b>Dual-program Hybrid Teacher</b>	<b>De-professionalized Teacher</b>
Recruitment	Minimal Local candidates	By alternative organizations	By stand-alone alternative organizations
Social Justice	Explore social issues	Explore social issues Elite institutions	May or may not explore social issues Elite institutions
School Demographics	Variety of institutions	2-3 year commitment	Elite institutions
Job Length	Potential career choice	May continue in field	2-3 year commitment plus
Degree	B.Ed. or M.Ed.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.
Type of Service	Pre-service. Degree at course completion	In-service. Teaching position before degree completion	In-service. Teaching position before degree completion.
Stipend	None	Salary	Salary
Program Length	1-2 years	5-7 week induction 2-3 year University based courses with mentorship	5-7 week induction with mentoring and module learning
Teaching Method	Differentiated	Prescriptive & Differentiated	Prescriptive
Where they come from	Predominantly local	Recruited from across US and local	Recruited from across US and local

Some good things happened with this forced collaboration between universities and alternative programs. Based on my data, teacher candidates seemed to have the opportunity to be better grounded in the tenets of education. In the past, alternative programs have stumbled over issues of social justice, differentiated learning and foundations and for a while, this brief while, university-based teacher programs contributed these missing pieces. It remains to be seen if programs such as Relay will incorporate these elements.

## References

- Abell Foundation. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore: Abell Foundation.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). Markets, standards, teaching and teacher education. In D. Hartley & M. Whitehead (Eds.), *Teacher Education: Major Themes in Education* (Vol. V- Globalisation, Standards and Teacher Education, pp. 17-38). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Aspire Public Schools. (2015). Locations. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from <http://aspirepublicschools.org/schools/>
- Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K., Frolich, L., Kemp, J., & Tahan, K. (2011). *The Condition of Education 2011*. In T. Nachazel & G. Hannes (Eds.), (pp. 382). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics: Institute of Education Sciences.

- Ballou, D., Brewer, D. J., Finn, C. E., Goldhaber, D. D., Hicoko, E. W., Kanstoroom, M., . . . Podgursky, M. (1999). Teacher training and licensure: A layman's guide *Better Teachers, Better Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.
- Bloomberg Businessweek. (2011). 43 Teach For America. Retrieved October 30, from Bloomberg L.P. [http://www.businessweek.com/careers/bplc/companies\\_43.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/careers/bplc/companies_43.htm)
- Braun, B. (2015). Look out Rutgers and Seton Hall-Cami's "Relay-GSE" is out to eat your lunch. Retrieved from <http://www.bobbraunsledger.com/look-out-rutgers-and-seton-hall-camis-relay-gse-is-out-to-eat-your-lunch/>
- Burch, P., & Bulkley, K. E. (2011). The changing nature of private engagement in public education: For-profit and nonprofit organizations and educational reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(3), 236-251.
- Burris, C. C. (2012). Some scary training for teachers. Retrieved from [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/some-scary-training-for-teachers/2012/07/25/gjQAzXyJAX\\_blog.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/some-scary-training-for-teachers/2012/07/25/gjQAzXyJAX_blog.html)
- Carey, K. (2009). "Teacher U": A model in employer-led education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/article/Teacher-U-A-New-Model-in/49442/>
- Casey, L. (2011). Talking about Race, Teachers and Schools: How I found myself featured in a right wing conspiracy theory (Updated). Retrieved November 27, 2011, from <http://www.edwise.org/talking-about-race-teachers-and-schools-how-i-found-myself-featured-in-right-wing-conspiracy-theory>
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). Stayers, leavers, lovers, and dreamers: Insights about teacher retention. *Journal of teacher education*, 55(5 (November/December 2004)), 387-392.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). The AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education: Context and Goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 37-68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Coffino, K., Dillon, D. R., Brakke, C., & MPS & Northside Achievement Zone School Partners. (2014). Alternative Pathways to Teaching: U of MN - TFA Partnership. *Program Design and Conceptualization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Commission on the Future of Higher Education. (2005). A test of leadership. Charting the future of U.S. higher education (The Spellings Report). In C. Olham (Ed.). Jessup, MD: Department of Education.
- Conant, J. (1963). *The Education of American Teachers*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Constantine, J., Player, D., Silva, t., Hallgren, K., Grider, M., & Deke, J. (2009). An Evaluation of Teachers Trained Through Different Routes to Certification, Final Report (NCEE 2009-4043). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institution of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Cramer, P. (2011). David Steiner, top state ed dep't official to leave at years end. Retrieved January 13, 2012, from Gotham Schools <http://gothamschools.org/2011/04/07/david-steiner-top-state-ed-dept-official-to-leave-at-years-end/>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able To Do*. San Francisco: Wiley.
- Domanico, R. (2014). How Many Students Attend Nonpublic K-12 Schools in New York City? Retrieved April 3, 2015, from <http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/printnycbtn27.pdf>
- Duncan, A. (2009). *Teacher Preparation: Reforming the Uncertain Profession--Remarks of Secretary Arne Duncan at Teachers College, Columbia University*. ED.gov Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/2009>.

- Education Commission of the States. (2000). Two paths to quality teaching: implication for policymakers. An ECS staff comparison of the positions of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation *Pros and Cons: Quality Teaching* (pp. 1-17). Denver: Education Commission of the States.
- Education Schools: Prescriptive Training and Academic Freedom. (2014). Retrieved from <https://educationrealist.wordpress.com/tag/relay-graduate-school-of-education/>
- Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology*, 59(4), 406-422.
- Feistritzer, E. C. (2008). *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis 2008*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Research.
- Feyerick, D., & Steffen, S. (2009). Teaching corps attracts recent graduates. Retrieved October 31, 2011, from CNN Living [http://articles.cnn.com/2009-05-28/living/teach.foramerica\\_1\\_teach-ivy-league-schools-low-income?\\_s=PM:LIVING](http://articles.cnn.com/2009-05-28/living/teach.foramerica_1_teach-ivy-league-schools-low-income?_s=PM:LIVING)
- Gallagher, K. S., & Bailey, J. D. (2000). The Politics of Teacher Education Reform: Strategic Philanthropy and Public Policy Making. In K. S. Gallagher & J. D. Bailey (Eds.), *The Politics of Teacher Education Reform: The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future* (pp. 11-24). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin Press, Inc
- Glass, G. V. (2008). Alternative Certification of Teachers. Tempe: Education Policy Research Unit.
- Goodnough, A. (2000). Levy offers plan for teaching licensing. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com> website: <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/06/23/nyregion/levy-offers-plan-for-teacher-licensing.html>
- Greenberg, J., McKee, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). Teacher Prep Review: Teacher preparation programs. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Grossman, P., & Loeb, S. (2008). Introduction. In P. Grossman & S. Loeb (Eds.), *Alternative Routes to Teaching: Mapping the New Landscape of Teacher Education* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hall, D. (2013). Drawing a veil over managerialism: leadership and the discursive disguise of the New Public Management. *Journal of Education Administration and History*, 45(3), 267-282.
- Harris, R. (2014). New charter school training headed for Chicago? *Catalyst Chicago*. <https://http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/notebook/2014/01/23/65354/new-charter-teacher-training-headed-chicago>
- Hassel, B. C., & Sherburne, M. E. (2004). Cultivating Success through Multiple Providers – A New State Strategy for Improving the Quality of Teacher Preparation. In F. M. Hess, A. J. Rotherham & K. Walsh (Eds.), *A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom? Appraising Old Answers and New Ideas*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Hess, F. M., Rotherham, A. J., & Walsh, K. (Eds.). (2004). *A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom? Appraising Old Answers and New Ideas*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- House, E. R. (1999). Race and policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(16), 1-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v7n16.1999>
- Humphrey, D. C., & Wechsler, M. E. (2007). Insights into alternative certification: Initial findings from a national study. *Teachers College Record*, 109(3), 483-530.
- Hursh, D. (2005). Neo-liberalism, markets and accountability: Transforming education and undermining democracy in the United States and England. *Policy Futures in Education*, 3(1), 3-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2005.3.1.6>
- Hutson, W. (2014). Charter School Network Launches New Teacher Recruitment Program. *DNAinfo Chicago*. Retrieved 2 August, 2014, from

- <http://www.dnainfo.com/chicago/20140130/englewood/charter-school-network-launches-new-teacher-recruitment-program>
- Jazzman, J. (2013). Re-upping on re-education: NJ schools to get military-style make over. *The Contributor*. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from <http://thecontributor.com/bizarre-teaching-approved-christie-coming-your-school>
- Keller, B. (2000). N.Y. Regents open door to alternative route to teaching. *Education Week*. New York City is, in fact, the only district in the state that will be experimenting with an alternative pathway this summer. In cooperation with the City University of New York, it established a program especially to prepare 250 new teachers for the SURR schools.
- Klein, R. (2014). A Majority of Students entering School this Year are Minorities but Most Teachers are Still White. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved October 26, 2014, from [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/09/03/student-teacher-demographics\\_n\\_5738888.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/09/03/student-teacher-demographics_n_5738888.html)
- Koerner, J. D. (1963). *The Miseducation of American Teachers*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Kronholz, J. (2012). A new type of ed school. *Education Next*, 12(4). Retrieved from Education Next website: <http://educationnext.org/a-new-type-of-ed-school/>
- Labaree, D. F. (2010). Teach for America and Teacher Ed: Heads they win, tails we lose. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 48-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347317>
- Levine, A. E. (2006). *Educating School Teachers* (pp. 1-140). Washington D.C.: The Education Schools Project.
- Lucas, C. J. (1997). *Teacher Education in America: Reform agendas of the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Madda, M. J. (2014). Teach for America responds to criticism, seeks to reform. Retrieved April 6, 2014, from <https://http://www.edsurge.com/n/2014-09-08-teach-for-america-responds-to-criticism-seeks-to-reform>
- McCluskey, N. (2005). *Corruption in the Public Schools: The market is the Answer Policy Analysis*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Meyers, B., Fisher, T. R., Alicea, M., & Bloxon, K. M. (2014). Unfinishedness: Striving for a viable partnership between TFA and its university partner. *Teachers College Record*, 116(100304).
- Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L. (2010). Equal or Fair? A Study of Revenues and Expenditures in American Charter Schools (E. a. t. P. I. C. (EPIC), Trans.). In K. Welner, P. H. Hinchey & E. Gunn (Eds.). Lansing, MI: The Great Lakes Center for Education Research & Practice.
- Montecinos, C., Pino, M., Campus-Martinez, J., Dominguez, R., & Carreno, C. (2013). Master teachers as professional developers: Managing conflicting visions of professionalism. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 1(18).
- Mooney, J. (2012). Alternative Grad School raises concerns about who's teaching NJ's teachers. *NJSpotlight*. <http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/13/07/09/alternative-grad-school-raises-concerns-about-who-s-teaching-nj-s-teachers/>
- Mungal, A. S. (2012). *Competition or Partnerships?: Faculty perceptions of Alternative and professionalized teacher preparation programs*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- National Center for Alternative Certification. (2007). Overview of Alternative routes to Teacher Certification. Retrieved February 10, 2009, from <http://www.teach-now.org/overview.cfm>
- National Center for Alternative Certification. (2010). Graduate Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Programs. Retrieved March 15, 2011, from National Center for Alternative Certification <http://www.teach-now.org/dispsstateform.cfm?statepageid=1406&state=NY>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation At Risk- The Imperative for Education Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.



- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2013). National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved March 9, 2014, from <http://www.nctq.org/about/>
- New Schools for New Orleans. (2014). Human Capital Investments. Retrieved 2 August, 2014, from <http://www.newschoolsforneworleans.org/human-capital-investments>
- New York City Independent Budget Office. (2014a). Demographics and Work Experience: A Statistical Portrait of New York City's Public School Teachers. *School Brief*. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from <http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/2014teacherdemographics.pdf>
- New York City Independent Budget Office. (2014b). *New York City by the numbers*. New York, NY: WordPress Retrieved from <http://ibo.nyc.ny.us/cgi-park2/?p=681>.
- New York State Board of Regents. (2010). *Emergency adoption of proposed regulation relating to the establishment of graduate level clinically rich teacher preparation pilot programs*. The State Education Department/ The University of the State of New York Retrieved from <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/April2010/0410hea4.pdf>.
- New York State Board of Regents. (2011). *Relay School of Education (Formerly Teacher U): Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Program in Middle Childhood Education*. The State Education Department/ The University of the State of New York Retrieved from <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2011Meetings/March2011/311bra2.pdf> or <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2011Meetings/.../211hea2.pdf>.
- Office of Higher Education. (2009). *The Alternative Teacher Preparation Program Fact Sheet*. New York State Education Department Retrieved from <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/FactSheet.htm>.
- Otterman, S. (2011, July 21). Ed Schools' Pedagogical Puzzle, *The New York Times* Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/education/edlife/edl-24teacher-t.html?pagewanted=all>
- Raphael, J., & Tobias, S. (1997). Profit-making or profiteering? Proprietaries target teacher education *Change*, 29(November/December 1997), 44-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091389709602346>
- Ravitch, D. (2014). Teach for America: Is the Magic Gone? Retrieved from <http://dianeravitch.net/2014/05/03/teach-for-america-is-the-magic-gone/>
- Reed III, S. (2009). Teach For America... The New Peace Corps. Retrieved from <http://thenotebook.org/blog/091619/teacher-america-new-peace-corps>
- Relay Graduate School of Education. (2014a). Opportunities Dean of Relay GSE Tennessee. Retrieved 2 August, 2014, from [http://relayschool.force.com/careers/ts2\\_JobDetails?jobId=a0xA0000004jiBwIAI&tSource=](http://relayschool.force.com/careers/ts2_JobDetails?jobId=a0xA0000004jiBwIAI&tSource=)
- Relay Graduate School of Education. (2014b). Opportunities - Denver Lead Planner. Retrieved 2 August, 2014, from [http://relayschool.force.com/careers/ts2\\_JobDetails?jobId=a0xA0000007g45kIAA&tSource=](http://relayschool.force.com/careers/ts2_JobDetails?jobId=a0xA0000007g45kIAA&tSource=)
- Ryan, J. E. (2004). The perverse incentives of the no child left behind act. *New York University Law Review*, 79(3). <http://www.nyulawreview.org/sites/default/files/pdf/NYULawReview-79-3-Ryan.pdf>
- Scott, J. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23(106), 106- 136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328531>
- Sellers, P. (2006). Schooling corporate giants on recruiting. Retrieved October 30, from Fortune [http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune\\_archive/2006/11/27/8394324/index.htm](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2006/11/27/8394324/index.htm)

- Strauss, V. (2013, February 28). It's time for Teach For America to fold - former TFAer, *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/02/28/its-time-for-teach-for-america-to-fold-former-tfaer/>
- Sullivan, C. C. (2001). Into the classroom: teacher preparation, licensure, and recruitment. Elements of teacher effectiveness *Elements of Teacher Effectiveness* (pp. 40). Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Teach For America Inc. (2010). The Role of Teach For America Alumni in Fueling the Movement to Eliminate Educational Inequity. from [http://www.socialimpactexchange.org/sites/www.socialimpactexchange.org/files/Alumni\\_Impact\\_Report\\_2010.pdf](http://www.socialimpactexchange.org/sites/www.socialimpactexchange.org/files/Alumni_Impact_Report_2010.pdf)
- Teach For America Inc. (2014). Who We Are. Retrieved October 26, 2014, from <http://www.teachforamerica.org/why-teach-for-america/who-we-look-for/who-we-are>
- Teach For America Inc. (2015). TFA On The Record. Retrieved February, 27, 2015, from <https://http://www.teachforamerica.org/tfa-on-the-record>
- The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. (1990). America's choice: high skills or low wages! (pp. 1-24): National Center on Education and the Economy.
- Tilson, W. (2011). Progress in New York City schools under Chancellor Joel Klein. Retrieved February 16, from Huffington Post [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/whitney-tilson/progress-in-new-york-city\\_b\\_823865.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/whitney-tilson/progress-in-new-york-city_b_823865.html)
- Tonna, M. A. (2007). Teacher education in a globalised age. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(1 May 2007), 1-28.
- Torres, C. A. (2005). No Child Left Behind: A brainchild of neoliberalism and American politics. *New Politics*, X(2).
- U.S. Department of Education, & Institute of Education Sciences. (2013). *Table 209.10 Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, by selected teacher characteristics: Selected years, 1987-99 through 2011-12*. Washington, DC Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13\\_209.10.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.10.asp).
- U.S. Department of Education, & Office of Postsecondary Education. (2013). *Preparing and credentializing the Nation's teachers- The secretary ninth report of teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html>.
- No child left behind, Public Law 107-110 C.F.R. (2001).
- United States Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the Top Executive Summary*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>.
- University of the State of New York. (2010). *The Intensive (Transitional C) Program*. Office of College and University Evaluation. Retrieved from <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/spr/intrototransc.htm>.
- Walsh, K., & Jacobs, S. (2007). *Alternative Certification Isn't Alternative*. Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.
- Wells, A. S., & Holme, J. J. (2005). Marketization in education: looking back to move forward with a stronger critique. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Policy* (pp. 19-51): Springer.
- Wilgoren, J. (2000, November 12). Wendy Kopp, Leader of Teach For America, Education, *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/12/education/wendy-kopp-leader-of-teach-for-america.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>

- Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1544-1522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004>
- Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. G. (2005). Teacher Education Programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-737). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zumwalt, K. (1996). Simple answers: alternative teacher-certification. *Educational Researcher*, 25(8), 40-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X025008040>
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' Characteristics: Research on the Demographic Profile. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 111-156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

### About the Author

#### **Angus Shiva Mungal**

The University of Texas at El Paso

[asmungal@utep.edu](mailto:asmungal@utep.edu)

Angus Shiva Mungal is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at The University of Texas at El Paso. He currently teaches and facilitates doctoral courses in Qualitative Research, and Policy Analysis in Education. He also facilitates a course on Leadership and Advocacy that sends researchers into the community to work with non-profit organizations that deal with marginalized groups. His research focuses are alternative teacher and leadership preparation, advocacy leadership, issues of social justice and educational policy as well as critical discourse analysis, and market ideology.

### About the Guest Editors

#### **Gary L. Anderson**

New York University

[gary.anderson@nyu.edu](mailto:gary.anderson@nyu.edu)

Gary L. Anderson is a professor of Educational Leadership in the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development at New York University. A former high school teacher and principal, he has published on topics such as educational policy and leadership, critical ethnography, action research, and school micro-politics. His most recent books include: *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty* (2015, Sage), with Kathryn Herr, and *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a Post-Reform Agenda* (2009, Routledge).

#### **Kathryn Herr**

Montclair State University

[herrk@mail.montclair.edu](mailto:herrk@mail.montclair.edu)

Kathryn Herr is a professor in the Department of Educational Foundations in the College of Education and Human Services at Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ. She currently primarily teaches qualitative and action research. Recent publications include *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty* (2015, Sage), with co-author, Gary Anderson.

**SPECIAL ISSUE**

**New Public Management and the New Professionalism in  
Education: Compliance, Appropriation and Resistance**

education policy analysis archives

Volume 23 Number 89

September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and Education Policy Analysis Archives, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or EPAA. EPAA is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A2 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, Socolar (China). Please contribute commentaries at <http://epaa.info/wordpress/> and send errata notes to Gustavo E. Fischman [fischman@asu.edu](mailto:fischman@asu.edu)

Join EPAA's Facebook community at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and Twitter feed @epaa\_aape.

education policy analysis archives  
editorial board

Editor **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University) & **Jeanne M. Powers** (Arizona State University)

**Jessica Allen** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Gary Anderson** New York University

**Michael W. Apple** University of Wisconsin, Madison

**Angela Arzubiaga** Arizona State University

**David C. Berliner** Arizona State University

**Robert Bickel** Marshall University

**Henry Braun** Boston College

**Eric Camburn** University of Wisconsin, Madison

**Wendy C. Chi\*** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Casey Cobb** University of Connecticut

**Arnold Danzig** Arizona State University

**Antonia Darder** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Linda Darling-Hammond** Stanford University

**Chad d'Entremont** Strategies for Children

**John Diamond** Harvard University

**Tara Donahue** Learning Point Associates

**Sherman Dorn** University of South Florida

**Christopher Joseph Frey** Bowling Green State University

**Melissa Lynn Freeman\*** Adams State College

**Amy Garrett Dikkers** University of Minnesota

**Gene V Glass** Arizona State University

**Ronald Glass** University of California, Santa Cruz

**Harvey Goldstein** Bristol University

**Jacob P. K. Gross** Indiana University

**Eric M. Haas** WestEd

**Kimberly Joy Howard\*** University of Southern California

**Aimee Howley** Ohio University

**Craig Howley** Ohio University

**Steve Klees** University of Maryland

**Jackyung Lee** SUNY Buffalo

**Christopher Lubienski** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Sarah Lubienski** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Samuel R. Lucas** University of California, Berkeley

**Maria Martinez-Coslo** University of Texas, Arlington

**William Mathis** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Tristan McCowan** Institute of Education, London

**Heinrich Mintrop** University of California, Berkeley

**Michele S. Moses** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Julianne Moss** University of Melbourne

**Sharon Nichols** University of Texas, San Antonio

**Noga O'Connor** University of Iowa

**João Paraskveva** University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

**Laurence Parker** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Susan L. Robertson** Bristol University

**John Rogers** University of California, Los Angeles

**A. G. Rud** Purdue University

**Felicia C. Sanders** The Pennsylvania State University

**Janelle Scott** University of California, Berkeley

**Kimberly Scott** Arizona State University

**Dorothy Shipps** Baruch College/CUNY

**Maria Teresa Tatto** Michigan State University

**Larisa Warhol** University of Connecticut

**Cally Waite** Social Science Research Council

**John Weathers** University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

**Kevin Welner** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Ed Wiley** University of Colorado, Boulder

**Terrence G. Wiley** Arizona State University

**John Willinsky** Stanford University

**Kyo Yamashiro** University of California, Los Angeles

\* Members of the New Scholars Board

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas  
consejo editorial

Editor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores. Asociados **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés) y **Jesús Romero Morante** (Universidad de Cantabria)

**Armando Alcántara Santuario** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México

**Claudio Almonacid** Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

**Pilar Arnaiz Sánchez** Universidad de Murcia, España

**Xavier Besalú Costa** Universitat de Girona, España

**Jose Joaquín Brunner** Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

**Damián Canales Sánchez** Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México

**María Caridad García** Universidad Católica del Norte, Chile

**Raimundo Cuesta Fernández** IES Fray Luis de León, España

**Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes** Universidad Iberoamericana, México

**Inés Dussel** FLACSO, Argentina

**Rafael Feito Alonso** Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España

**Pedro Flores Crespo** Universidad Iberoamericana, México

**Verónica García Martínez** Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco, México

**Francisco F. García Pérez** Universidad de Sevilla, España

**Edna Luna Serrano** Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México

**Alma Maldonado** Departamento de Investigaciones Educativas, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados, México

**Alejandro Márquez Jiménez** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México

**José Felipe Martínez Fernández** University of California Los Angeles, USA

**Fanni Muñoz** Pontificia Universidad Católica de Perú

**Imanol Ordorika** Instituto de Investigaciones Economicas – UNAM, México

**María Cristina Parra Sandoval** Universidad de Zulia, Venezuela

**Miguel A. Pereyra** Universidad de Granada, España

**Monica Pini** Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina

**Paula Razquin** UNESCO, Francia

**Ignacio Rivas Flores** Universidad de Málaga, España

**Daniel Schugurensky** Universidad de Toronto-Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, Canadá

**Orlando Pulido Chaves** Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Colombia

**José Gregorio Rodríguez** Universidad Nacional de Colombia

**Miriam Rodríguez Vargas** Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México

**Mario Rueda Beltrán** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México

**José Luis San Fabián Maroto** Universidad de Oviedo, España

**Yengny Marisol Silva Laya** Universidad Iberoamericana, México

**Aida Terrón Bañuelos** Universidad de Oviedo, España

**Jurjo Torres Santomé** Universidad de la Coruña, España

**Antoni Verger Planells** University of Amsterdam, Holanda

**Mario Yapu** Universidad Para la Investigación Estratégica, Bolivia

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas  
conselho editorial

Editor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)  
Editores Associados: **Rosa Maria Bueno Fisher** e **Luis A. Gandin**  
(Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul)

**Dalila Andrade de Oliveira** Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil  
**Paulo Carrano** Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil  
**Alicia Maria Catalano de Bonamino** Pontifícia Universidade Católica-Rio, Brasil  
**Fabiana de Amorim Marcello** Universidade Luterana do Brasil, Canoas, Brasil  
**Alexandre Fernandez Vaz** Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brasil  
**Gaudêncio Frigotto** Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil  
**Alfredo M Gomes** Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil  
**Petronilha Beatriz Gonçalves e Silva** Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brasil  
**Nadja Herman** Pontifícia Universidade Católica –Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil  
**José Machado Pais** Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal  
**Wenceslao Machado de Oliveira Jr.** Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brasil

**Jefferson Mainardes** Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Brasil  
**Luciano Mendes de Faria Filho** Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil  
**Lia Raquel Moreira Oliveira** Universidade do Minho, Portugal  
**Belmira Oliveira Bueno** Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil  
**António Teodoro** Universidade Lusófona, Portugal  
**Pia L. Wong** California State University Sacramento, U.S.A  
**Sandra Regina Sales** Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil  
**Elba Siqueira Sá Barreto** [Fundação Carlos Chagas](#), Brasil  
**Manuela Terrasêca** Universidade do Porto, Portugal  
**Robert Verhine** Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil  
**Antônio A. S. Zuin** Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brasil