

**Portrait of the Teacher Educator as a Weary Pedagogue:  
Narrating our Way to a Post-Pandemic Vision of Educator Preparation**

Kristien Zenkov

Mark Helmsing

Audra K. Parker

Holly Glaser

Mandy Bean

George Mason University

Abstract

In mid-March 2020, the spread of COVID-19 prompted colleges and universities to pivot to online instruction, resulting in myriad unanticipated challenges. As teacher educators working in distinct capacities across the Elementary and Secondary Education programs at George Mason University, we gathered to make sense of this shift and have engaged in a collaborative inquiry over the past seven months, with conversations focused on three main topics: how the pandemic confronted our philosophies of teacher education, how our teaching responded to external factors, and how we attempted to understand these new demands of teacher education. To examine what we most valued in our work, we used a “portraiture” methodology to construct self-narratives framed around these topics. Our portraits revealed that, despite facing a deep professional intensification, there were positive outcomes of this evolution from face-to-face to online teacher education. These insights suggest implications not just for a temporary distanced instructional mode, but for reimagining teacher education in the future.

*Key words:* portraiture, narratives, continuum, teacher educators, pedagogies

In mid-March 2020, the United States began to realize the dangers associated with the spread of COVID-19. PK-12 schools, colleges, and universities paused operations and pivoted to online instruction, many without the resources or expertise to do so. This turn was challenging for teacher education stakeholders, who had to learn how to balance a host of unanticipated challenges (e.g., working from home, quarantining, and the resultant anxiety). Many teacher

educators assumed new roles in supporting their own families with virtual learning, while attempting to instruct future teachers how to engage and educate other people's children. While many of these difficulties have been considered as pedagogical matters—questions of “how” to teach via online modes—teacher educators faced another dilemma: a sudden shift in their professional personas.

We—the first four authors of this manuscript, whose experiences we explore here—represent a continuum of university-based teacher educators: from a newly minted PhD in elementary teacher education (Glaser), to an established but pre-tenure early career assistant professor in secondary education (Helmsing), to a mid-career full professor serving as the program administrator for her elementary education program (Parker), to a more established full professor serving in a parallel administrative capacity with his secondary education program (Zenkov). The fifth author (Bean) is an established early career clinical professor in elementary education who is a member of our program teams but chose not to examine her experiences for this article. In search of practical support for our teacher education pedagogies, we (all five article authors) gravitated toward each other in May 2020 and have met almost weekly since.

As teacher education practitioners, our experiences mirror those of most of our US college/university counterparts in this pandemic: navigating the transition to virtual instruction despite limited experience in online teacher education environments, much less an understanding of virtual PK-12 learning for which we were preparing future teachers to teach. However, over the course of our conversations we have recognized how our experiences differ from our colleagues in other college and university disciplines.

Despite facing a deep professional intensification, we have discovered positive outcomes of this overnight evolution to online teacher education by examining stories shared in our weekly

gatherings over the past six months. In this article we offer “portraits” from four of our team members to illustrate these insights. These findings suggest implications not just for a temporary distanced instructional mode, but for teacher preparation in future times.

### **Teaching Teachers Online**

Online programs and courses are not a new phenomenon in higher education, and they represent an increasingly popular option as they afford students flexibility in terms of time and location (Duesberry, Frizelle, Twyman, Naranjo, & Timmermans, 2019; Ragusa & Crampton, 2017). In teacher education, online programs have historically been more prevalent in post-licensure and alternative certification routes than in traditional undergraduate and graduate licensure programs like those within which we, the authors, teach (Thompson, Miller, & Pomykal-Franz, 2013; Thornton, 2013). Online learning options in PK-12 contexts have followed a similar trajectory. The movement began with isolated virtual charter schools and online courses offered through a few state-supported virtual schools, but has grown to include myriad online private vendor programs and fully-online cyber schools across many states (Watson & Murin, 2020). Given the wide variety of offerings, it is not surprising to report the effectiveness of online learning both at the university level and in PK-12 settings is often context-specific, with researchers noting both positive and negative outcomes in studies of online learning (Prettyman & Sass, 2020; Watson & Murin, 2020).

The proliferation of online learning options for PK-12 students and online program options in teacher preparation has not translated into shifts in how teacher candidates are prepared for teaching in these contexts. In fact, teacher preparation programs often offer technology courses or methods courses online, but the pedagogies for teaching PK-12 online have not been routinely included in the curriculum. As a result, teachers report feeling

unprepared for such contexts (Koenig, 2020). Archambault and Kennedy (2014) suggest colleges of education could ameliorate this disconnect by recasting the definition of career-ready effective teachers as those who “can blend together the best technology-based resources with engaging pedagogical strategies in both online as well as face-to-face settings” (p. 226). They assert this transition should be informed by the TPACK framework (technological pedagogical content knowledge), and they note the foundations of effective teaching remain consistent regardless of learning environment. Because the principles of effective pedagogical implementation necessarily change in virtual contexts, Archambault and Kennedy recommend teacher preparation programs should include emphases on instructional design, online student engagement, and online student assessment.

A similar disconnect exists with regard to the clinical components of teacher preparation. Clinical—or field—experiences play a vital role in providing opportunities for theory-to-practice connections (AACTE, 2018; Zeichner & Bier, 2015). However, much like the lack of attention to the pedagogies of online teaching in methods courses, field experiences in virtual contexts have been largely absent from teacher preparation programs (Archambault & Kennedy, 2014; Koenig, 2020). Archambault and Kennedy suggest that virtual field experiences with mentors who are experts in online teaching are essential for preparing the next generation of teachers.

Given the current—and likely future—need for preparing teachers for online teaching and learning, we came together to share our experiences as teacher educators navigating our own pedagogical shifts. Given our roles, our own professional evolutions naturally extended to consider future teachers’ online pedagogies. In this paper, we reflect on moments we have felt resistant, ill-prepared, and even hopeful in readying teacher candidates for online teaching and learning.

## Methodology

This paper is the culmination of a collaborative inquiry we undertook during summer and fall of 2020 when we realized we were facing common dilemmas about our online pedagogies and the nature of our work across our teacher preparation programs. The emergence of these concerns began with the technical (e.g., How do we teach classroom management online?) and morphed into the existential (e.g., How do we face the altered demands of teachers' daily work?). We realized we needed to engage in some form of distancing to examine what we valued as teacher educators, while considering our varied individual teacher identities.

This investigation required a methodological orientation focused on theorizing these identities. Thus, we engaged with each other to produce “self-narratives” for the first four authors (Zenkov, Helmsing, Parker, and Glaser) that considered our values, philosophies of teaching, and moral stances to “support and sustain agency” in our work (Bullough, Jr., 2015, p. 82). The fifth author (Bean) engaged in these conversations but chose not to participate in the crafting of these self-narratives. These self-narratives were constructed from weekly conversations and structured reflections addressing two questions of this issue’s call: “What were some of the challenges of transitioning from face-to-face to virtual teaching in higher education?” and “What were some of the unexpected benefits of the transition?”

As analytic frames, the self-narratives we created are similar to what Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) term “portraiture,” a research method foregrounding context, voice, relationship, emergent themes, and aesthetic whole. In constructing portraits of our teaching practice, we sought to keep in mind the objective Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) foreground: “to capture the complexity, dynamics, and subtlety of human experience and organizational life” (p. xv). As a methodology, portraiture enabled us “to organize a narrative

around central themes” and “write layered stories” in which we think and write together as “the subjects, not the objects, of the research” (Hill-Brisbane, 2012, p. 645). The four portraits are organized by themes that emerged in our conversations: how the pandemic confronted our personal philosophies of teacher education; how our teaching responded to external factors; and how we are attempting to understand the COVID-19 demands of teacher education.

### **Portraits**

We were aware from our first gathering of the neat sequence of our membership attributes—alternating genders, a six- or seven-year gap in the career span (from year zero to year 21—Glaser to Helmsing to Parker to Zenkov), and interspersed elementary and secondary emphases. However, these markers were not predictive of our reactions to this swivel to online teacher education. As a result, the elements of our narratives shared in each section do not necessarily align with our demographic continuum.

### **Personal Philosophies**

Our teaching philosophies, personality traits, and prior experiences with, and attitudes toward, online teaching informed our approach to teaching and teacher education during the switch to online learning. We observed a continuum moving from Zenkov, to Parker, then to Glaser, and concluding with Helmsing.

**Zenkov.** Over more than two decades as a university-based teacher educator, I’ve settled on two intersecting goals for my courses, candidates’ clinical experiences, and my classroom-based research projects: I work to help future teachers develop their teaching identities while orienting them to the teaching profession. I have been able to enact my own identity through the teaching methods I employ and the ways I engage with young people in my research projects, with my future teacher students operating as apprentices in these endeavors.

Thus, one of my greatest sources of stress during the transition to virtual instruction has been my own prior achievement as a teacher education pedagogue. I worked and worried to ensure that my vision of myself as a teacher—as a teacher *of teachers*—would translate to this new format. Across these first months of this implementation of a different instructional mode, I’ve become aware that this was an unreasonable expectation.

As I’ve taught in our master’s licensure program over two semesters during the pandemic, I’m still left with more questions than answers about how I’m “translating” to my students. I worry most about those who are just beginning, in that first instructional methods class. My teaching and my students’ learning are much more sedentary, much less dynamic, and more rooted in orality. I am concerned this group of teacher candidates is having their identity development stunted by the limitations of this mode. But because ours is not a profession oriented around immediate gratification—the evidence of candidates’ growth appears in trickles, not in gushes—we won’t know if that is the case or what the implications are for years or even decades to come.

**Parker.** As a teacher and teacher educator, reflection is in my professional DNA: each class, each course, and each semester are revised based on reflection and student feedback. The phrase “lifelong learner” seems a bit cliché, but I enjoy trying to upgrade my courses each semester. I also place significant value on what I learn from my professional development school (PDS) site where teacher candidates are based; these experiences with exceptional PK-6 mentors drive course revisions and my personal learning.

Like many teacher educators, I am cognizant of the equal importance of 1) modeling effective teaching and 2) stepping outside of these pedagogies to consider their applications to PK-6 classrooms with preservice teachers. I think of myself as an innovator, but one that is

balanced by a perfectionist orientation. And, like many teacher educators, I have found myself stretched thin in recent months. Teaching, research, service, and leadership activities—and a desire to do all of these things well—are all factors in my current, off-the-charts stress level.

Philosophically, I have long been anti-online education. The face-to-face context gives me an opportunity to model building strong student-teacher relationships and creating a positive learning community. But my opposition to virtual instruction became moot in March 2020. I had to shift my thinking from “No way. Never online” to “I don’t have a choice so how do you do this (teach online) well.” I was willing to learn, trying anything and everything—Blackboard Collaborate Ultra, Padlet, Flipgrid. I recruited my friends to let me practice. I wrote out a detailed lesson plan—what I would say, what I would click on, how I would use breakouts. I was more prepared for those first few classes online than I had been since I was a teacher candidate in 1994! I sought to learn from those who I knew had online teaching experience and whose orientations towards teaching I respected.

**Glaser.** As a new teacher educator with only a handful of university teaching experiences, I met the prospect of teaching online with anticipation. During my PhD program, I relished opportunities to expand my teacher educator “skill set” in terms of format (e.g., asynchronous online) and student populations (preservice and inservice teachers). Synchronous online teaching seemed like another novel competency I could add to my repertoire. I dove into researching teaching technologies and reflected on how these fit into the epistemological framework of the teacher educator I wanted to be: social justice- and growth-oriented, dialogic, and reflective. Unlike most of my co-authors, I had several months to conceptualize how this might work.



A summer and fall of synchronous online teaching haven't altered my excitement around this new format, even if its affordances in terms of collaboration do not fully transfer to face-to-face or asynchronous environments. Interactive, technology-based focus lessons can be incorporated to account for students' varied processing speeds, and typically reticent students have multiple modes of expression: verbally, through text, using emojis. I have learned in tandem with my students how this format works for them—and where it falls short.

I have come to appreciate synchronous online teaching while also noting its drawbacks. I feel less in tune with my students and their affects than I would in a face-to-face environment because we have fewer moments where we occupy the same space. Conversations with students occur when they show up early, or remain after, an online session rather than when they are unpacking their backpacks. Early on, I decided mandating camera usage opposed my philosophy around equity; consequently, I do not receive the nonverbal feedback I relied on in face-to-face teaching. While I believe synchronous online teaching can be useful where circumstances require it, I know now it would be most consistent with my teaching philosophy in a hybrid learning environment.

**Helmsing.** As a metaphorical thinker and teacher, I describe my philosophy of teaching as a type of magic. Over the past several months, the effects of the pandemic have crept into my magician's chamber and thrown into disarray every potion and spell I've had at my disposal for my ten years as a teacher educator. As the pandemic wears on, I often think of the scene from the 2002 film *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers*, when King Théoden says to Gandalf the magician “you have no power here!” after Gandalf's mind control spell was rendered ineffective. The magic of the classroom encounters my students and I have in person is dulled through

disenchantment when we cannot improvise them together face-to-face, when feelings, hunches, and discoveries that emerge in a course meeting remain scripted and delivered on Zoom.

A second reason I feel I have lost my magic is in the absence of the everyday acts of teaching that would grab us during an in-person meeting. My philosophy centers on making the course an engaged space to *enact* the role of the teacher. We enact how to respond to spontaneous student thinking through questioning, guiding, and wondering aloud. We practice such enactments in my synchronous Zoom meetings, which is often what my classes now feel like: business meetings I host instead of magic shows I perform.

**Jointly.** As illustrated by the content and sequence of our self-narratives above, the lessons of the continuum of teacher educators' philosophies in this time appear to follow a path from concern (Zenkov), to resignation (Parker), to anticipation (Glaser), to frustration (Helmsing). These are not the only stages of this trajectory, but mapping the evolution of teacher educators' philosophies might help us grow toward a healthy engagement with—and even manipulation of—these tools more quickly.

### **External Factors**

Myriad external factors impacted our transition to online teaching. These ranged from university support for online teaching, to our own access to professional development, to personal situations constraining our efforts. Across our four markedly different sets of experiences coming into this online teacher education world, we observed a sequence that moves from Helmsing, to Parker, to Zenkov, and concludes with Glaser.

**Helmsing.** In late March, when my classes pivoted to synchronous online sessions, I lamented how we had just gotten to know each other well, maturing out of the honeymoon period from the first half of our semester into a critically reflexive understanding of our work and

each other. In April, a novel feeling to the experience emerged as meeting online for class in sweatpants, coffee mug in hand, and witnessing a student's dog jump into their lap helped us bond. My students and I approached the context with gusto, combing through online resources we raced to locate and share in hopes they would "show us the way" to making online teaching work for us.

This enthusiasm waned by early May. My students and I salvaged what remained of the semester, which felt frustrating as I usually welcome external challenges and breaking convention. In ten years of teaching teachers, I have never taught the same course the same way twice. However, this experience of going back to the drawing board to rethink my courses did not feel invigorating as course experimentation normally does. My redesign was done hastily, bypassing how the central task of learning to teach includes coming together in person to develop tools and dispositions needed to reflect about one's teaching together in collaboration.

**Parker.** From an institutional perspective, I felt supported in having the tools to teach my courses. By chance, I completed an online training course at the university just prior to the pandemic, but I had not enrolled in this professional development option with an eye toward moving my courses online. Supportive colleagues who were willing to share and troubleshoot my nascent digital pedagogies were also a key factor in my transition, and I attended two virtual sessions about online teaching offered by another colleague. These opened my eyes to possibilities and shaped how I approached online teaching.

Time—and not enough of it due to other responsibilities emerging during the pandemic—was a significant external factor impacting my transition to online teaching. I now recognize the absurdity of the suggestion from others to "just put it [a course or class session] online." The amount of time required to learn a new format to plan each instructional day was exhausting. But

rethinking my instruction to consider the pedagogies our future teachers would be using online and face-to-face—particularly when I had zero background in teaching online for PK-6 learners—added a layer of intensified labor.

While the level of fatigue encountered in order to sustain this conversion is one of the challenges of my experience, our elementary education teacher candidates have been engaged, resilient, and prepared. They have not just been supportive of me as I’ve navigated this new terrain; they have also helped analyze the bumps in my pedagogical road. Their orientation to this shift has been the most important factor in the quality of my experience, and their “glass half-full” stance has given me even greater hope for the future of the teaching profession.

**Zenkov.** The resources provided to make the conversion to online instruction have often come in a flood—with little organization or vetting and no way to determine their value. We have been offered access to tools by our university, colleagues, and professional associations, but what we needed was time to understand these and determine their effectiveness. When you think metacognitively about your pedagogy, as teacher educators must—we are *always* simultaneously enacting strategies and modeling them for our students’ potential application—the new online teaching tool isn’t “the thing.” “The thing” is the skill-building process with which any tool enables you to engage students and the skill-building processes with which that tool enables them to engage their own, future students.

Thus, being provided with a firehose stream of technology applications to consider has been more of an impediment than a support in the wholesale conversion of my professional practice. Time is the primary resource we have needed, in order to remind ourselves of our pedagogical purposes—course by course, class by class—and to examine these tools. But time is also the thing that’s in the shortest supply, as every task—especially planning for instruction—

now takes so much longer to accomplish. My most immediate colleagues, whose pedagogical skills and instincts I trust, are the best resource I have.

**Glaser.** Given the time I had to prepare for synchronous online teaching, I felt well-supported in making sense of what it might look like. The course I was teaching was one I had previously co-taught face-to-face. While resources and learning activities varied due to the conversion to an online instructional mode, the learning outcomes remained the same. I also had a collaboration partner—Audra Parker, a co-author of this article and an elementary education full professor who had taught the course for years and was finishing up her first round of synchronous online instruction.

We established a planning routine for the course, meeting at least weekly to co-develop each session’s slides and asynchronous work and explore the possibilities afforded by this new model. My excitement about this teaching format had me scouring the internet for ideas to make this not only “work,” but become something extraordinary. Several videos posted by another colleague were helpful in conceptualizing how different my synchronous class sessions would be from both face-to-face and asynchronous teaching. In the midst of this preparation, my senior colleague invited me to join this group to discuss how we could make sense of online teaching from the pedagogical perspectives of teacher educators. These forms of “just-in-time” mentoring and moral support proved indispensable in my transition to teaching online and from preservice to inservice teacher educator.

**Jointly.** While we note similar factors challenging us as teachers and teacher educators in this sudden switch to online instruction, it is the range of supports we’ve identified that are most instructive. Helmsing reminds us how our work is ultimately about the visions of teaching we share with future teachers, and Parker answers Helmsing’s worries about these perspectives with

the example of her students. But how do we reform our teaching to pinpoint and stay focused on these exemplars? Perhaps it is, as Zenkov shares, in the form of new networks and collegial interactions. Or maybe, as Glaser describes, it's via more intensive modes of mentoring and collaboration.

### **Teacher Education in the Time of COVID-19**

Across our nine months of meeting and reflecting—evidenced in the earlier sections of this paper—we have grappled with what it means to be a teacher educator during the mandatory metamorphosis to online learning. Our final reflections seem to flow best from Parker, to Helmsing, to Glaser, and then Zenkov.

**Parker.** I believe my online teaching experience from the past nine months expanded my teaching strategy repertoire as I've developed an effective online philosophical approach to teaching about teaching. At the heart of this is a “flipped classroom” method, where we rely on students reading prior to class and then making meaning of the readings in class. To account for the reduced class meeting time (from three hours to two, to minimize “Zoom fatigue”), I built in pre-class activities as asynchronous work using tools such as Nearpod to create interactive, multi-modal mini-lessons. Then our synchronous class block became about community-building and break-out room activities to make sense of the asynchronous work.

These structures have engaged *every* student in ways that may not have happened face-to-face. I used student responses as discussion points in group meetings, enhancing student accountability. Yet, I don't feel like I changed my philosophical orientation to teaching, or to teaching about teaching. Rather, I've found new tools to enact my philosophy, and in doing so, I've learned that some aspects of learning to teach are *better* served with online modes.

**Helmsing.** I keep thinking about the new pedagogical knowledge teacher candidates need in these uncertain times of teaching. This restlessness extends to how teaching as a profession may change during the pandemic in ways our field is not yet ready to address. If a well-informed understanding of what makes a good teacher is based on understanding the occupational demands teachers face, how can we prepare teacher candidates for demands that neither schools nor our field have established or studied?

In June and July of 2020, I asked colleagues across social media how their teacher preparation programs were adapting during the pandemic. Every colleague responded that, like I, they were waiting to find out what their programs and partner schools planned to do. I felt frustration that some broad, workable solution had not been offered by our profession. I have since made peace with not having a clear sense of the future of teacher education because we know education, and teacher education in particular, is messy work and always adapting to new contexts. There is no definitive magic spell I can use to prepare a perfect teacher. My frustration can be channeled into creating new opportunities to practice and enact the magic of teaching.

**Glaser.** Synchronous online teaching in a global pandemic is a unique endeavor. The stress teachers regularly experience has been amplified by the cognitive load of making sense of uncharted territory. As teacher educators, we are attempting to make our pedagogies transferable to synchronous online settings, with few models from which to draw. Figuring out how to translate what we do and know to an online setting is already exhausting; adding it as another layer of my new teacher educator experience makes it especially so.

When I reflect on what I anticipated from my initial experiences as a new teacher educator, I could never have imagined that it would come to be—that *I* would come to be—in a world so fraught with uncertainty. From a theoretical standpoint, I can identify who I want to be

as a teacher educator; I have seen different aspects of that modeled for me by my co-authors. In practice, however, I am still in the early stages of my metamorphosis from teacher-to-teacher educator. Research demonstrates this transition is not as simple as applying effective pedagogies from K-12 contexts to higher education (Boyd & Harris, 2010).

When the pandemic wanes, many classes will return in person. As a new teacher educator, it's difficult to identify what I would plan to do *differently* as a result of this experience. Rather, in true Freirean fashion, I look at teaching during this pandemic as a means to become a teacher-student alongside my student-teachers. I hope to emerge with not just a new set of skills, but a new framework for imagining what's possible in teacher education.

**Zenkov.** As veteran teachers and teacher educators, we think we can solve any teaching problem. We've faced so many teaching scenarios over the years that few really intimidate us. Not that we're cocky: in fact, the wealth of experience actually makes us a bit more humble. While we are rising to the challenge of building classroom communities in online courses—maybe the most difficult pedagogical task—we know it's neither enough nor the same to do so virtually. Students can't *see*—and are thus less likely to appreciate—the sentiments behind my own and their peers' statements, queries, and instructional methods and interactions.

There is a distance in this virtual mode: we're protected by the shells of our computer screens, and we can't ask as much of each other as we can when we share a space. The level of intensification—physical, intellectual, moral—is constant and impossible to measure (Apple, 2012, 2013). Physical in the sense that we expend so much energy trying to read each other through these cameras and monitors. Intellectual in the sense that we—teacher educators—must simultaneously consider not just how our lessons might be delivered in face-to-face modes, virtually, and how they might translate into our students' physical and remote instructional



modes. And moral in the sense that we all—teachers and teacher educators—feel the obligation to ensure we are serving our future teachers and their future students well.

### **(Very Tentative) Conclusions**

In the self-narratives above, we have offered a range of perspectives on our field, our pedagogies, and our identities. These include Parker’s simultaneously practical and philosophical reflection, Helmsing’s words of warning and reminders to remember the magic of our practice, Glaser’s hopeful notes about dialogic metamorphosis and the future of our field, and Zenkov’s observations about the often invisible intensification of our work. As our portraits illustrate, we now engage in not only substantially more work than our schedules previously required, but, as teacher educators, we are doing something akin to quadruple “time.”

We are not just teaching content, as all instructors and teachers do, and we are not merely considering how to share that content via online methods, as teachers in every context must. Now we are involved in new metacognitive exercises, imparting the theory, planning, and procedures of our pedagogies via virtual modes, modeling the conversion of traditional pedagogical methods to online approaches, while serving as exemplars of both face-to-face and virtual instruction. The nature of our exponential increase in labor is equal parts physical, temporal, emotional, and existential.

While we are experiencing a dramatic increase in our workloads, we are conscious of how we as teacher educators, the preservice teachers in our programs, and the classroom teacher mentors on whom we rely are struggling. While this is an unhealthy scenario, it’s also a consciousness-raising affair. We speculate that any eventual transition back to “normal” teaching and learning will include long overdue conversations about what is absolutely necessary in our

teaching and learning lives and what might constitute “governor”-like structures that will limit future increases in our professional workloads.

We are concerned about how events of the last ten months will compound education policy shifts and changes in public perception of teachers from the last two decades. Such changes have profound implications for the very nature of teaching, our teacher education field, and our roles as teacher educators. It’s hard to see silver linings within a pandemic, but we are already reimagining what teacher education might (and should) become. For example, through our collaborations and conversations, we have re-envisioned professional mentoring through a strengths-based, rather than a hierarchical, lens. Field experiences have been supplemented with video observations that serve as anchors for class discussions and offer additional perspectives on the work of teaching and learning. We have even considered what aspects of teaching and teacher education might be best enacted through virtual means. In other words, rather than clinging to the magic of teaching that was, we’re preparing to conjure up some of the magic of teaching that will be.

#### References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practices, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation*. Author.
- Apple, M. (2012). *Education and power*. (Classic edition). Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2013). *Can education change society?* Routledge.

- Archumbault, L., & Kennedy, K. (2014). Teacher preparation for online and blended learning. In R. E. Ferdig & K. Kennedy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on K-12 online and blended learning* (pp. 225-244). ETC Press.
- Boyd, P., & Harris, K. (2010). Becoming a university lecturer in teacher education: Expert school teachers reconstructing their pedagogy and identity. *Professional Development in Education, 36*(1), 9-24.
- Bullough, R. V. Jr. (2015). Theorizing teacher identity: Self-narratives and finding place in an audit society. *Teacher Development, 19*(1), 79-96.
- Duesbery, L., Frizelle, S., Twyman, T., Naranjo, J., Timmermans, K. (2019). Developing and designing open border teacher education programs: Case studies in online higher education. *Journal of Educators Online, 16*(1), 1-15.
- Hill-Brisbane, D. (2012). Portraiture. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research* (pp. 645-646). SAGE.
- Koenig, R. (2020, May 28). Pandemic (may) finally push online education into teacher preparation programs. *Edsurge*. Retrieved from <https://www.edsurge.com/news/2020-05-28-pandemic-may-finally-push-online-education-into-teacher-prep-programs>
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*. Jossey-Bass.
- Prettyman, A., & Sass, T. R. (2020). *The efficacy of virtual instruction in PK-12 education: A review of the literature*. Metro Atlanta Policy Lab for Education. Retrieved from <https://gpl.gsu.edu/publications/virtual-instruction-k-12/>
- Ragusa, A. T., & Crampton, A. (2017). Online learning: Cheap degrees or educational pluralization? *British Journal of Educational Technology, 48*(6), 1208–1216.

- Thompson, N. L., Miller, N. C., & Pomykal-Franz, D. (2013). Comparing online and face-to-face learning experiences for nontraditional students: A case study of three online teacher education candidates. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 14*(4), 233–251.
- Thornton, H. (2013). Middle level professors' perspectives regarding online teacher education: Middle level teacher educators report their view of online teacher preparation. *Middle School Journal, 44*(4), 30–38.
- Watson, J., & Murin, A. (2014). A history of K-12 online and blended learning in the United States. In R. E. Ferdig & K. Kennedy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on K-12 online and blended learning* (pp. 1-24). ETC Press.
- Zeichner, K., & Bier, M. (2015). Opportunities and pitfalls in the turn toward clinical experience in U.S. teacher education. In E.R. Hollins (Ed.), *Rethinking field experiences in preservice teacher preparation: meeting new challenges for accountability* (pp. 20-46). Routledge.