

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335025153>

Democratic Accountability in Teacher Education: Now More Than Ever

Article · January 2018

CITATIONS

3

READS

1,025

7 authors, including:



Elizabeth Stringer Keefe

Stonehill College

16 PUBLICATIONS 134 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Wen-Chia Chang

Nanyang Technological University/National Institute of ...

10 PUBLICATIONS 77 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



M. Beatriz Fernández

University of Chile

19 PUBLICATIONS 211 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Andrew F. Miller

Boston College, USA

8 PUBLICATIONS 66 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



CONICYT/FONDECYT INICIACIÓN 11170663 [View project](#)



Project TEER (Teacher Education and Education Reform) [View project](#)

Democratic Accountability in Teacher Education

Now More Than Ever

MARILYN COCHRAN-SMITH

MOLLY CUMMINGS CARNEY

ELIZABETH STRINGER KEEFE

STEPHANI BURTON

WEN-CHIA CHANG

M. BEATRIZ FERNÁNDEZ

ANDREW F. MILLER

JUAN GABRIEL SÁNCHEZ

MEGINA BAKER

ABSTRACT: During the two decades from 1998 to 2017, “holding teacher education accountable” emerged as the major approach to reforming teacher education in the United States (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016; Lewis & Young, 2013; Taubman, 2009). The logic was that greater accountability would boost teacher education quality, which would boost teacher quality (defined primarily in terms of students’ achievement), which would in turn ensure individual prosperity as well as the long-term economic health of the nation (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017). The key accountability assumption here is that enhanced teacher education quality depends on systematic and vigilant public evaluation and monitoring of outcomes related to teacher education institutions, programs, and teacher candidates. Across teacher education and other public domains, the rise in accountability regimes reflected the broad shift to a global and competitive knowledge society shaped by principles and policies derived from neoliberal economics and from the business world (Ambrosio, 2013; Furlong, Cochran-Smith & Brennan, 2009; O’Neill, 2002; Taubman, 2009).



This article is intentionally conceptual. Its purpose is to parse and theorize the dominant approach to teacher education accountability and then to theorize a radically different approach to accountability wherein it is assumed that accountability should serve democracy and that teaching and teacher education are indispensable to a democratic society. Accordingly, the article has two parts. First, the article unpacks what we have labeled “the dominant accountability paradigm” in US teacher education by identifying and critiquing its underlying values, the ways it frames teacher education as a “problem” to be solved by professional and regulatory policies, and its complex power relationships and political agendas. Second, the article proposes an alternative—“democratic accountability in teacher education”—using the

same framework of values, how teacher education is framed as a problem, and power relationships as above.

The authors of this article are a group of teacher education scholars and practitioners who have worked together over four years as members of Project TEER (Teacher Education and Education Reform) to track teacher education's accountability policies within the larger context of "ed reform" in the United States and to promote new directions consistent with the democratic enterprise. This article draws on the group's joint work and on ideas from our new book, *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education* (Cochran-Smith, Carney, Keefe, Burton, Chang, Fernández, Miller, Sánchez, & Baker, 2018). The book makes the broad argument that US teacher education needs to "reclaim" rather than reject accountability by reinventing it in ways consistent with the democratic project.

Unpacking Accountability in US Teacher Education

It would be an understatement to say that the teacher education accountability landscape in the United States is complex. As Romzek (2000) pointed out about public sector accountability internationally, Western democracies tend to use multiple accountability strategies, and new accountability forms are often layered on top of existing forms. In teacher education over the last two decades, there have been multiple coexisting accountability initiatives, policies, and mechanisms characterized by: differing goals and targets; contrasting historical and institutional contexts; multiple (and contested) jurisdictions; differing political affiliations, sponsors, and funders; new (and old) regulatory, professional, and advocacy actors; and crisscrossing local, state, national, and global influences.

Based on the assumption that accountability is not a unitary or one-dimensional construct, we created a framework to sort out the messy teacher education accountability landscape based on our analyses of contrasting accountability initiatives (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016; Cochran-Smith, Baker, Chang, Fernández, & Keefe, 2017; Cochran-Smith, Burton, Carney, Sánchez, & Miller, 2017) and informed by accountability theory in various fields (e.g., Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin, 2003; Powell, 2000; Romzek, 2000; Trow, 1996). As Table 1 indicates, our "accountability framework for teacher education" is comprised of eight dimensions—values, purposes, concepts, diagnostics, prognostics, control, content, and consequences, which are grouped into three thematic clusters—the foundations of accountability, "the problem" of teacher education, and power relationships.

The framework has two basic premises: all teacher education accountability policies and initiatives can be analyzed according to these eight interrelated dimensions, whether or not they are explicitly stated in policy documents and tools; and, in order to fully understand the practices and implications of

Table 1. An Accountability Framework for Teacher Education

Thematic Cluster	Description of Cluster	Dimension	Key Question and Description of Dimension
Cluster #1: Foundations of Accountability	This cluster is based on the assumption that neither teacher education accountability nor teacher education itself is value-free or neutral. Rather these are animated in part by ideals. This cluster has to do with the values, concepts, and principles underlying accountability.	Values	Why? Stated or implied cultural ideas, ideals, beliefs, and principles about the broad purposes and roles of teaching, schooling, and teacher education in the larger society
		Purpose	For what? Stated aims/objectives of a particular accountability initiative and what it is intended to accomplish in teacher education
		Concepts	What's common sense? Core definitions/key concepts about teaching, learning, and learning to teach that animate a given accountability policy or initiative and represent its "common sense" world view
			What's the problem? How the language and rhetoric of an accountability initiative construct or diagnose the teacher quality/teacher education problem, who or what "caused" it, and what kind of problem it actually is
Cluster #2: Framing "the problem" of Teacher Education	This cluster is based on the assumption that policy problems don't exist "out there," waiting to be taken up by policymakers. Rather problems and solutions are constructed as part of larger debates about educational ideas, ideals, and world views.	Diagnostics	What's the fix? How the language and rhetoric of an accountability initiative construct the prognosis or solution to the perceived problem, including what the theory of change is about how the accountability mechanism or system will "fix" the perceived problem
		Prognostics	

Cluster #3: Power Relationships in Accountability	This cluster is based on the assumption that teacher education accountability policies, like all teacher quality policies, are political, not neutral, in the sense that they involve power relationships and contestations. This cluster has to do with distribution of power and how power and control are related to stipulations about the content and consequences of accountability.	Control	Who decides? Jurisdictional issues involved in an accountability initiative, including who is in charge/should be in charge of how institutions, programs/ pathways, and/or individuals are assessed and held accountable for particular requirements, processes, results What counts? What an accountability initiative actually holds teacher education <i>accountable for</i> as well as <i>what counts</i> as valid and reliable evidence that it is being accountable for the requirements, processes, or results stipulated What happens? Intended—and unintended—results, effects, impacts, and implications of an accountability policy or initiative for the institutions, programs/ pathways and/or individuals that are their targets and implementers
		Consequences	

Source: Cochran-Smith et al., 2018. *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Used with permission.

a particular accountability initiative, all eight dimensions need to be taken into account. The dimensions accentuate the essential elements of any particular accountability policy or initiative and highlight both similarities and differences with other policies and initiatives. Just as importantly, grouping the dimensions into thematic clusters emphasizes that the dimensions operate together systemically as part of a larger whole. Applying the framework across initiatives at the cluster level helps to reveal the bigger picture of accountability in the field.

To look closely at the current state of accountability in teacher education, we analyzed the four most widely publicized, highly politicized, and dramatically impactful national-level accountability policies/initiatives that were proposed and/or implemented in the United States during teacher education's era of accountability. These include federally mandated and state-enforced reporting regulations stipulated in Title II/Higher Education Act (HEA) (approved in October 2016 at the end of the Obama administration and rescinded under the Trump administration in March 2017); the accreditation system and procedures of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), teacher education's major national accreditor; biennial evaluations of teacher preparation programs and pathways conducted by the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ) and widely publicly disseminated; and the nationally available teacher candidate performance assessment, the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), now used in multiple programs and states.

Drawing on hundreds of policy documents and tools, position statements, website items, media responses, and professional critiques, we analyzed each initiative or policy as a highly visible case of a controversial approach to accountability in teacher education. We considered how the developers and supporters of each initiative framed the problem and solution of teacher education as a teacher quality issue (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2017). For each case, we conducted an eight-dimension/three-cluster analysis, and we examined the initiative's history, the political and professional contexts from which the initiative emerged, and its implications for the future of teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018). We also evaluated the existing evidence for the claims the advocates of each initiative make about how it will improve teacher education quality and ultimately teacher quality (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016). Following these individual analyses, we conducted an analysis that cut across all the initiatives (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018).

The Dominant Accountability Paradigm in US Teacher Education

Looking across accountability policies and initiative, we found that despite some important differences, which we describe in detail elsewhere (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018), there is indeed a dominant accountability paradigm in US

teacher education. In other words, we found a clear and consistent conceptual and practical model for setting expectations, evaluating whether and to what extent programs, institutions, and candidates comply with these expectations, and determining the consequences, rewards, and penalties for compliance/noncompliance. Following the framework as laid out in Table 1, we describe the dominant paradigm in teacher education accountability by focusing on the foundations of the accountability paradigm, ways of framing “the problem” of teacher education, and power relationships.

The Foundations of the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

The first cluster of our framework—the foundations of accountability—assumes that no practice or policy in teacher education is neutral or value-free. Rather all practices and policies are shaped by underlying ideologies, values, beliefs, and principles related to the roles of teaching and teacher education in society, the causes and cures of inequality, and the meanings of teacher quality and teacher education quality. We found that the most salient themes in the foundations of the dominant accountability paradigm have to do with teacher quality, market ideology, and what we have called “thin equity” (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016).

Teacher Quality, Market Ideology, and Thin Equity

Although there are some differences across the major accountability policies and initiatives we examined (see Cochran-Smith, et al., 2018), the core values are remarkably consistent in language and logic. At one level, these values can be summarized in three words that became almost a mantra during the accountability era—“teachers matter most.” In the context of teacher policy, this mantra is more than two decades old. It harkens back to a series of reports by Darling-Hammond and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), arguing that what teachers know and can do is the single most important influence on what students learn (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; NCTAF, 1996, 1997), and to Sanders’ Tennessee studies of the value added by effective teachers to students’ achievement (Sanders, 1998; Sanders & Horn, 1998). During teacher education’s accountability era, many US reports argued that the country’s international competitiveness depended on the ability of its teachers to teach all students twenty-first-century knowledge and skills and recommended that the United States emulate the approaches of top-performing countries (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2015; Tucker, 2011).

Together these and many international reports (e.g., Office of Education Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2005; McKinsey & Company, 2007) created a kind of echo chamber among policymakers and education reformers about the importance of teacher quality defined in terms of impact on

students' performance on national and international comparisons. This ideology is clearly reflected in teacher education's dominant accountability paradigm in the United States. For example, under the Obama administration, the DOE boldly defined teacher effectiveness in terms of students' test scores, which was at the heart of the HEA/Title II regulations proposed in 2014. In something of a contrast, CAEP requires programs to document their teacher candidates' knowledge and skill *in addition to* impact on students' achievement, but makes it clear that "surmounting all other [efforts] . . . preparation [should] be judged by outcomes and impact on P-12 student learning and development" (Ewell, 2013, p. 9). Although NCTQ's reviews focus on course syllabi and program documents rather than outcomes, they assert that "whatever else they accomplish in the classroom, effective teachers must improve student achievement" (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013, p. 1). In terms of foundational values, edTPA is a little different. The language and rhetoric of its supporters coincide with the idea that teacher quality is paramount to securing the nation's economic success in the global marketplace (e.g., Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2015; Tucker, 2011). But this sits in tension with its creators' rejection of narrow definitions of teacher effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2015). Despite this tension, the policies and initiatives that make up the dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education consistently link teacher quality with market accountability.

It is important to note that the foundations of teacher education's accountability paradigm also include a commitment to equity in the sense that the goal is to close the teacher quality gap (Education Trust, 2008; Peske & Haycock, 2006) so that all students have access to a quality teacher. However, beneath the surface of the equity rhetoric of the dominant accountability paradigm are two critical assumptions. One is that the "teacher quality gap" is a major cause, if not the single most important determinant, of educational (and social) inequity. The other is that increasing the supply and equalizing the distribution of teacher quality will achieve equity without necessarily addressing the intersecting systems of inequality in education and also in health care, employment, transportation, housing, and early childhood services that produce and reproduce inequity. In short, a "thin equity" perspective assumes that teachers and schools are the cause of educational inequality and that access to better teachers will cure inequality. This perspective helps to define the dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education.

We want to be very clear here about what we are and are not saying. We are not saying that teachers don't matter. Nor are we saying that all the proponents of teacher education's major accountability initiatives fail to understand that poverty, income inequality, and lack of social policies have a harmful impact on school outcomes. For example, Darling-Hammond, one of the chief people who brought the importance of teacher quality to national attention, thoughtfully chronicles the impact of poverty on school achievement and lauds international education systems that fund schools equitably

to counteract families' income inequalities (Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2015; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). What we *are saying*, however, is that underlying the dominant accountability paradigm is the operating assumption that teaching and teacher education have the capacity to address unequal opportunity and mitigate the impact of poverty, an assumption that is consistent with the larger belief underlying US social policy since the 1960s that "inequality and poverty are susceptible to educational corrections" (Kantor & Lowe, 2016).

Critique of the Foundations of the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

In sum, the dominant accountability paradigm in US teacher education is animated by a key idea derived from market ideology (Engel, 2000; Stone, 2011): the quality of the country's education system—defined by the quality of its teachers and measured primarily by students' test scores—is the sine qua non of the nation's ability to compete in the global knowledge economy. This is presumed to be essential for the nation to survive and thrive in the twenty-first century. Specifically, the assumption is that strong teacher quality can ensure economic security for the nation and achieve equity across groups.

There are multiple problems with the market ideology underlying the accountability paradigm as others have argued in detail—it consolidates global economic power for the benefit of a few (Perkins, 2004; Sleeter, 2009), and it masks the systemic and structural aspects of inequality that reproduce inequities for marginalized groups (Au, 2016). In addition, the discourse of democracy is a silenced discourse in the accountability paradigm. In fact, in our examination of the four major accountability initiatives instituted during teacher education's accountability era, we found virtually no mention of democracy, democratic education, democratic goals, or teaching and learning in democratic societies. This is no accident. The premises of market ideology are fundamentally inconsistent with the premises of a strong democracy (Barber, 1984; Engel, 2000), which we explain in the second section of this article.

Framing "the Problem of Teacher Education" in the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

As Table 1 indicates, the second cluster in our accountability framework highlights the language and rhetoric used by the advocates of particular teacher education accountability initiatives to frame and promote particular viewpoints about who or what caused "the problem of teacher quality/teacher education" in the United States and what kind of problem it actually is. This also includes framing the strategies, treatments, tools, and approaches most likely to solve the problem.

Public Confidence and Meaningful Data

As we have shown, during teacher education's accountability era, major accountability initiatives and policies were designed to address the problem of alleged threats to the nation's economic health and security, which were presumed to depend on the quality of the nation's education system, particularly teachers. Directly connected to broad economic issues, the dominant accountability paradigm frames the problem of teacher education in terms of two failures—its failure to earn public confidence and its failure to collect and utilize meaningful data. Given this framing of the problem, it is not surprising that the solution to the problem in the dominant paradigm is framed as the creation and implementation of either a national data system that systematically rates, ranks, and evaluates preparation programs *or* a uniform national performance assessment that evaluates teacher candidates and—indirectly—the teacher educators and programs that prepare them.

From the perspective of the dominant accountability paradigm, the problem of teacher education has been wrapped up in what Stone (2011) calls a “story of helplessness and control” (p. 138). Stone argues that policy problems are often framed as narrative structures with: beginnings, middles, and ends; engaging characters, including heroes, villains, and victims; and, the forces of evil pitted against the forces of good. According to Stone, two story lines occur most often in the policy discourse. Stories of decline suggest that during a prior time period, things were good, but now they are bad, and something must be done to avoid further decline or avert a crisis. Stories of helplessness and control, on the other hand, suggest that things are bad, and we had thought the situation was out of our control, but now we have a way to fix it.

With the dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education, the problem of teacher education is framed as a story of helplessness and control. It goes like this: the pervasive low level of teacher quality in the United States is the fault primarily of mediocre teacher preparation. Even worse, the story goes, politicians, policymakers, and the public have no confidence that university preparation programs are able or willing to rise to the occasion and do a better job. In fact the public and policymakers thoroughly mistrust the motives, methods, and the will of teacher educators and their institutions. The story line continues—one good reason to mistrust preparation programs is that they operate blindly, uninformed by meaningful data about program impact and graduates' performance and without the benefit of a data system for continuous improvement. Without reliable data, the story continues, the situation is hopeless. However, there can be a happy ending! Regulatory, professional, and/or advocacy organizations can now control the problem by putting into place rigorous data systems, uniform indicators, cutting-edge assessment tools, and sophisticated data analytics. With these in place, the story concludes, good programs (and candidates) will rise to the top while bad ones can be remediated (or excluded).

Interestingly, one of the major differences across the major accountability initiatives we examined is who the “hero” of the story is. Although this is nearly always the organization that creates and implements the data system, the hero varies from federal/state regulators to national teacher education accreditors to private advocacy organizations to the groups that create and disseminate universal assessments.

Critiquing the Frames in the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

One of the problems with the framing of the dominant accountability paradigm is that many accountability policies and initiatives frame test scores as the decisive measure of teacher and program effectiveness and marginalize other outcomes. In addition, most major teacher education accountability initiatives work from a simplistic premise about the relation of policy and practice, assuming that there is a more or less linear link from teacher preparation to teacher quality to student achievement, despite the lack of evidence for this. Some initiatives frame market forces as the way to fix the problem of teacher education. One problematic assumption here is assuming that prospective teachers, employers, and teacher educators work from self-interested individualistic motives when making choices without concerns about the common good or about larger educational and social inequities. There is virtually no evidence to support this. Finally, many accountability initiatives that work within the dominant paradigm ignore the fact that a true profession cannot be built out of a system of compliance and control that ignores the importance of local communities. This is related to power relationships, which we take up below.

Power Relationships in the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

“Power relationships” is the phrase we use to refer to the third cluster in our teacher education accountability framework. This cluster is based on the assumption that no aspect of teacher education policy or practice is apolitical. This means that unpacking the power dimensions of accountability is not a matter of politicizing teacher education, as some critics argue, but a matter of recognizing that it is already and always politicized (Bruner, 1996).

Internality/Externality, Choice and Voice

Control is the key to the third cluster in our framework, as Table 1 emphasizes. This has to do with authority and jurisdiction—specifically, which institutions, professional organizations, regulatory agencies, or advocacy groups have (or should have) the authority to control teacher education accountability content and processes and determine the consequences.

In teacher education accountability, power issues are complex and multilayered. Romzek (2000) characterized control in public sector accountability by focusing on the sources of expectations and authority. She suggested sources of expectations range along a continuum from internal to external in relation to the occupational group being held accountable. With teacher education, however, there are tricky issues about whether internality and externality are defined relative to the preparation programs and institutions being held accountable or relative to “the profession” in some collective sense. For example, there is wide agreement that both Title II/HEA reporting requirements and NCTQ evaluations of teacher preparation are external to the teacher education programs and institutions they focus on and, to a great extent, external to the teacher education profession. In contrast, some people suggest that CAEP and edTPA are internal accountability initiatives because they were created “by and for” the profession. However, in 2015, AACTE sent a letter of no confidence to CAEP as a representative of the profession (AACTE, 2015). Meanwhile, a growing number of critiques characterize edTPA as an externally imposed assessment not respectful of or consistent with the values and norms of local work (e.g., Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016; Picower & Marshall, 2016; Lys, L’Esperance, Dobson, & Bullock, 2014). Despite some of the rhetoric to the contrary, then, we found that the dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education leans very far toward external control with little opportunity for the groups being held accountable to contribute to the development of standards and tools of evaluation and, except for CAEP which is optional in most states, to have the option of joining in or opting out of particular accountability schemes.

Critique of Power Relationships in the Dominant Accountability Paradigm

In short, within the dominant accountability paradigm, power and control are held by regulators and agencies outside of teacher education programs and institutions. With some state variation, there are few opportunities for participants to have a voice in determining accountability content and measurement tools or to have the choice of joining in or opting out. This reflects a deep mistrust of programs and the profession. The content of accountability—that is, what programs and institutions are actually held accountable for—varies somewhat across major accountability initiatives, although the bottom line is always effectiveness. This is defined in terms of programs’ and graduates’ impact on students’ learning *or* the program and course characteristics presumed to produce effectiveness *or* teachers’ performance that is presumed to predict effectiveness.

There are multiple problems with the power arrangements of the dominant accountability paradigm. Even with accountability systems or tools that were presumably created by and for the profession, implementation and

management arrangements have transformed these into external requirements with no room for the viewpoints and perspectives of multiple stakeholders. Just as problematic, and perhaps even more importantly, democratic education and preparing students to live and work in a deeply divided society have no part in what teacher education programs and teacher candidates are actually held accountable for. In fact, none of the standards and expectations across major accountability policies and initiatives speak directly to these goals, a failing we elaborate below.

Democratic Accountability in Teacher Education: A Powerful Alternative

As we argued above, the dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education is animated by market ideology, thin equity, externally controlled monitoring schemes, and narrow definitions of effectiveness. It is also based on deep mistrust of the profession and on theories of change that are not supported by strong evidence. We join many others in arguing that this approach has constricted the teacher education curriculum, reduced the spaces for critical discussion, and diminished the possibilities for teachers and teacher educators to work with others as agents of school and social change (Au, 2013; Goodwin, 2015; Picower & Marshall, 2016; Sleeter, 2007; Zeichner, Payne & Brayco, 2015). To a great extent, the dominant accountability paradigm has also reified test scores as the most important measure of students' learning and venerated international comparisons as the key indicator not only of a nation's place in the global economy but also of its educational values (Ambrosio, 2013; Lipman, 2011; Mehta, 2013; Taubman, 2009).

Despite these conclusions, we are not in favor of rejecting accountability or of making teacher education radically local with each program operating completely independently and responsible only to itself. Rather we believe that both local and larger goals are critical in a democratic society and that education professionals ought to be responsible for something beyond their own commitments and the priorities of their own communities. Instead of rejecting accountability in teacher education, then, we argue in favor of a democratic alternative to the dominant accountability paradigm. Conceptualizing a democratic approach to accountability requires redefining accountability's purposes and goals in terms of the common good, changing the narrative about the problem of teacher education, and radically disrupting existing power relationship.

In the remainder of this article, we conceptualize *democratic accountability in teacher education*. To emphasize the dramatic contrast between democratic accountability and the dominant accountability paradigm, we use the same three thematic clusters that we used to describe the dominant paradigm. The contrast between the two is represented in Table 2.

Table 2. Teacher Education Accountability: Comparison of the Dominant Accountability Paradigm and Democratic Accountability

	<i>Dominant Accountability Paradigm</i>	<i>Democratic Accountability</i>
Cluster #1: Foundations of Accountability	• market ideology • thin equity • democratic discourse absent • education as a private enterprise for individual goods	• ideology of strong democracy • strong equity • democratic discourse central • education as a public enterprise for the common good
Cluster #2: Framing "the Problem" of Teacher Education	• problem is teacher education's failure to produce a work force for the competitive global society • caused by teacher education's failure to earn public confidence and use rigorous data systems for improvement • problem of teacher education framed simplistically through a managerial/human capital lens • based on a problematic theory of change, which lacks evidence	• problem is teacher education's failure to prepare teachers and students to engage in deliberative democratic education • caused by the negative effects of the dominant accountability paradigm, which is subtractive and reproduces inequity • problem of teacher education framed in a complex way through a critical democratic lens • based on a democratic theory of evaluation and change that builds on promising practices
Cluster #3: Power Relationships in Accountability	• external control demands internal compliance • based on mistrust of the profession • excludes relevant local stakeholders from participation in accountability decision-making • external accountability mechanisms require compliance, uniformity, and standardization • programs accountable for preparing teachers to pass standard performance measures and enhance students' test scores • standard, universal, external measures, and accountability tools	• generative and reciprocal relationship between internal and external accountability • based on and fosters trust of the profession • includes active participation and joint decision-making among relevant local stakeholders • builds capacity for internal accountability mechanisms that focus on intelligent professional responsibility • programs accountable for preparing teachers to enact deliberative and critical democratic education so students can engage in democratic deliberation • multiple complex local and external measures and accountability tools

Source: Cochran-Smith et al., 2018. *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Used with permission.

The Foundations of Democratic Accountability in Teacher Education

As we noted above, the foundations cluster of our accountability framework emphasizes that practices and policies in teacher education are neither neutral or value-free. Rather they are value-laden and shaped by particular ideologies and principles regarding the roles and purposes of teaching and teacher education in society and the nature of inequality. As we conceptualize it, the core values and concepts that animate democratic accountability in teacher education are strong democracy and strong equity (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018).

Strong Democracy

In his discussion of the struggle for control of public education, Engel (2000) suggests that in contemporary American society, many people understand democracy primarily as voting in elections and organizing special interest groups to lobby for their own viewpoints and advantages. In this sense, market-based policies, on one hand, and democratic principles, on the other, are often seen as mutually reinforcing and are understood as one and the same. Engel argues that “it makes little sense to argue that educating for democracy is somehow antithetical to market ideology—unless the concept of democracy is understood differently” (p. 44).

At the very base of our conceptualization of a democratic alternative to accountability in teacher education is a notion of “democracy understood differently,” to use Engel’s words. This means that we define democracy as something well beyond voting and lobbying for special interests. Here, we draw on Barber’s (1984) concept of “strong democracy,” which he distinguishes from thin democracy, a distinction we borrowed for our notions of thin and strong equity (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016). Barber suggests that liberal democracy is a “thin” theory of democracy that focuses on individualistic ends, private property, and market capitalism while at the same time lacking a viable theory of citizenship, participation, public goods, and civic virtue. Thin democracy is “concerned more to promote individual liberty than to secure public justice, to advance interests rather than to discover goods, and to keep men [*sic*] safely apart rather than to bring them fruitfully together” (p. 4). In contrast, Barber’s strong participatory democracy depends on the idea of people with different interests living together in a political community capable of “transforming dependent, private individuals into free citizens, and partial and private interests into public goods” (p. 132).

It is clear that people are not born knowing how to participate in a self-governing community. Rather they must learn how to enact and participate in democratic practices in the crucible of social and political life. This means that inherent in the notion of strong democracy is a critical role for “education understood differently,” to tweak Engel’s phrase—that is, education

understood as the basis of strong democracy rather than education primarily for competition in the global market. In short, strong democracy depends on strong democratic education, which Dewey (1916) famously conceptualized and others have both critiqued and elaborated. Our argument here is that just as a strong democratic society depends on democratic education, democratic education depends on democratic teacher education and on democratic accountability in teacher education. From this perspective, democratic accountability in teacher education has three purposes. The first purpose is to assess the extent to which teacher education ensures that teacher candidates know how to enact deliberative and critical democratic education and that they prepare their students to participate in a democratic society. The second purpose is to evaluate the extent to which the power and knowledge relationships involved in the accountability process are democratized. Finally, a purpose of democratic accountability is to provide feedback that enhances program improvement and the learning of teacher educators and teacher candidates in keeping with the democratic project. We say more about these below.

Strong Equity

The second cornerstone in the foundations of democratic accountability in teacher education is strong equity, which, as noted, we contrast with thin equity. Although nearly all accountability initiatives in teacher education state that “promoting equity” is one of their goals, underlying most of them is a notion of thin rather than strong equity. From the perspective of thin equity, as we argue above, the operating assumption is that assimilation into “shared goals” (interpreted as *majority* values and goals) is a fundamental purpose of the education of minoritized students and that providing equal (i.e., “the same”) access to equal (i.e., “the same”) teachers, curriculum, and schools will bring about equity. Thin equity is in some ways consistent with notions of distributive justice, which grew out of liberal democratic theory, particularly its focus on equality of individuals and a common political commitment to all citizens’ autonomy (Rawls, 1971). From the distributive perspective, *injustice*—and *inequity*—are defined in terms of inequalities rooted primarily in the socioeconomic structure of society. Thus the remedy is redistribution of material and other goods, including access to “good” teachers, “good” curriculum, and “good” schools, with the goal of establishing a society based on fairness and equality.

In contrast, from the perspective of strong equity, the operating assumption is that there are highly complex and intersecting historical, economic, and social systems that create and maintain unequal access to teachers, curriculum, and schools. This means that although they are critically important, teachers, teacher educators, and schools alone—no matter how good—cannot bring about equity. From the perspective of strong equity, it is assumed that

genuine change requires identifying and undoing the racialized, structural, and systemic aspects of schools and society that maintain inequity *as well as* building on the knowledge and values of historically marginalized groups to establish curriculum, school policies, and “shared values.” These ideas about strong equity are in some ways consistent with the recognition view of social justice and with the argument that justice and equity are not reducible to distribution (Young, 1990, 2000; Honneth, 2003).

Drawing on the above work in political philosophy and on Cochran-Smith’s (2010) theory of social justice teacher education, our notion of strong equity as a cornerstone of democratic accountability in teacher education combines four core ideas: *redistribution*, *recognition*, *reframing*, and *resolving tensions*. First strong equity assumes that there must be wide *redistribution* to all schools of teachers who are committed to working with others for social change and who know how to prepare students to engage in democratic deliberation. The second idea is that there must be *recognition* of the school and societal structures and systems that produce and reproduce inequities, including the historical oppression and lack of representation of the values and knowledge traditions of minoritized students, families, and communities in the curriculum and school practices (King, 2008; Young, 1999). The coupling of these ideas in our concept of strong equity links redistribution with recognition, emphasizing that although redistribution is important, recognition is a central moral aspect (Honneth, 2003).

The third core idea is *reframing* common assumptions related to equity, equality, and justice. Colorblindness and meritocracy are among the most prominent educational frames that shape the ways we think about equity (Nasir, Scott, Trujillo, & Hernández, 2016). In contrast, with strong equity, there is an emphasis on unpacking, interrogating, and unlearning these and other powerful frames that assume objectivity and thus mask the structural and racialized nature of inequality within a discourse of individualism and equal access (Au, 2016). The fourth idea in strong equity is *resolving tensions*. This means acknowledging the inherent tensions and contradictions among competing ideas about the nature of equity and managing these in teacher education programs in knowingly imperfect, but concrete ways.

Accountability grounded in notions of strong democracy and strong equity is disruptive. It frames the problem of teacher education differently from the way it is usually framed, and, as we show below, it also calls for different accountability solutions.

Framing “the Problem of Teacher Education” in Democratic Accountability

As noted above, the “problem of teacher education” is the label we use for the second thematic cluster in our accountability framework. In analyzing the dominant accountability paradigm, we used the problem cluster to get at how the promoters of major accountability initiatives framed “the problem”

of teacher quality/teacher education, who or what “caused” it, and what would “solve” it. To build our concept of democratic accountability in teacher education, we use the problem cluster, but we ask a slightly different question: If strong democracy and strong equity are our objectives, what is “the problem” with teacher education and what would solve it?

The Dominant Accountability Paradigm Itself as the Problem

As we showed above, the dominant accountability paradigm has consistently framed the problem of teacher education as its failure to produce a competitive workforce due to lack of public confidence and failure to develop and use rigorous data systems. In contrast, if strong democracy and strong equity are our objectives, then one major problem of teacher education is the dominance of the accountability paradigm itself and its negative effect on teaching and teacher preparation.

To capture the general impact of the accountability paradigm on teacher education, we use the word “subtractive,” a phrase developed by Valenzuela (1999) to refer to the structural qualities of schools that “culturally subtracted” from—or, dismissed—the resources Mexican American youth brought to school with them and thus relegated them to academic failure. The dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education has prompted uniformity and compliance, redefined how teacher educators understand their roles, emphasized narrow outcomes, and subtracted from the spaces in the teacher education curriculum for discussion and action related to equity, social justice, and democratic education. To a certain extent, the accountability paradigm has also prompted a technical view of teaching and learning and a linear understanding of the relationships among teacher education, teacher quality, students’ achievement, and economic prosperity. Jenlink (2016) has synthesized these impacts, pointing out that under the influence of the audit culture, teacher education has become “distanced from its public purpose of educating citizens for a democratic society as the culture of accountability imposes new forms of central control” (p. 164).

A second reason the dominant accountability paradigm is “the problem” (or at least one of the central problems) of teacher education is that it has controlled the field despite the fact that there is very little evidence to suggest that it is effective as a way to improve the quality of teacher education programs. We reached this conclusion in a policy brief based on careful analysis of the claims made by advocates and the weight of the available evidence regarding major US accountability initiatives:

There is thin evidence to support the claims proponents make about how the assumed policy mechanisms will actually operate to improve programs. . . . Summative evaluations intended to influence policy decisions generally do not provide usable information for program improvement. The irony here is that while these policies call for teacher education programs and institutions to make decisions

based on evidence, the policies themselves are not evidence-based. Further, there is good reason to question their validity as policy instruments that will have a positive impact on teacher education quality. (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016, p. 3)

If the major accountability initiatives in US teacher education are not organized to provide well-founded, effective, and actionable feedback that guides decision-making, then what is their purpose? All things considered, we believe that the dominant accountability paradigm is largely about accountability for accountability's sake—that is, accountability initiatives that rate, rank, and monitor programs and candidates are put into place primarily for the sake of rating, ranking, and monitoring because these activities appear on the surface to signal that somebody is “finally” holding teacher education accountable.

Democratic Accountability as a Solution

If strong democracy and strong equity are our objectives, and if a major problem with teacher education is the subtractive impact of the dominant accountability paradigm, then the solution, or at least part of the solution, is a democratic—and additive—approach to accountability. Democratic accountability challenges and rejects the assumption that the primary goal of teacher education is preparing teachers who enhance the nation's ability to compete in the global economy. Rather from the perspective of democratic accountability, the goal is preparing teachers who create democratic learning environments that enhance students' academic, social, and emotional learning and also prepare them to participate constructively in a complex, diverse, and divided democratic society.

Clearly there is no way to flip a switch that instantly transforms teacher education accountability from its basis in the ideology of the market and thin equity to a basis in the ideology of strong democracy and strong equity. As we asserted above, accountability should serve democracy. This is very different from accountability for its own sake and also different from the idea that accountability is an objective collection of data and “brute facts” that can be used to make disinterested decisions. The dominant accountability paradigm in teacher education is decidedly not disinterested. Although touted as neutral and data-based, it is actually quite interested in ensuring the place of the United States in the global economy, which benefits primarily the elite, by standardizing teaching and teacher education.

Democratic accountability is not disinterested either. It is passionately interested in creating a more just and democratic society and in holding teacher education programs and institutions accountable for their efforts to do so. House and Howe's (1999) seminal concept of “deliberative democratic evaluation” is helpful here. Their approach to evaluation is not democratic simply because they want all those affected by an evaluation to be included in dialogue and deliberation. This is important, but just as important as that democratic evaluation is based on the premise that “citizens in democracies

are not responsible only for the fulfillment of their own preferences” (House & Howe, 1999, p. 132) but “must be tied to democratic principles argued, debated, and accepted by the evaluation community” (House & Howe, 2000, p. 4). What makes these principles acceptable is deliberation wherein the principles of argument are honored and participants maintain a healthy skepticism about each others’ viewpoints.

We readily admit that democratic accountability in teacher education is based on lofty goals. In order to get any work done along these lines, we need to change the terms of the debate about teacher education accountability. Ayres, Kumashiro, Meiners, Quinn, and Stovall (2017) assert that “setting the frame turns out to be a particularly powerful piece of work—who names the world and who frames the issues matters” (p. 156). Our concept of democratic accountability in teacher education is intended as a call to action for US teacher education—to rename the world of accountability and reframe the issues. This is not a romanticized point of view. Given the increasing polarization of our society and people’s growing inability and unwillingness to engage in deliberative disagreement, a new approach is a dire necessity.

Power Relationships in the Democratic Approach to Teacher Education Accountability

As we have shown, with the dominant accountability paradigm, the source of accountability expectations is external to programs, there are few opportunities for participants to participate, and the content of accountability is primarily teacher effectiveness and program impact, narrowly defined. Democratic accountability turns this approach on its head by replacing external control and internal compliance with intelligent professional responsibility and by replacing narrow definitions of effectiveness with complex ideas about deliberative and critical democratic education.

Intelligent Professional Responsibility

A central part of democratic accountability in teacher education is what we are calling *intelligent professional responsibility* (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018). This is an umbrella term signaling that democratic accountability is grounded in trust of the profession, builds on professionals’ knowledge and collective commitments to local and larger goals, and yields useful and usable information concerning program improvement. To do so, there is balance and equality of power across stakeholders who jointly determine accountability mechanisms, processes, and content through consideration of both individual and common interests. All of this is based on a generative and reciprocal relationship between internal and external accountability.

Our notion of *intelligent professional responsibility* braids together three ideas—intelligent accountability, democratic evaluation based on dialogue

and deliberation, and professional accountability. O'Neill (2002) introduced the idea of "intelligent accountability" as a counterpoint to Britain's intense audit culture; Crooks (2003) developed criteria for intelligent accountability in K-12 education in New Zealand. Applying these ideas to teacher education, we propose that democratic accountability is grounded in trust rather than mistrust of teacher education programs and institutions, it involves the active participation of the professionals who are being held accountable, and it is deliberately organized to yield information that is actually usable for thoughtful program improvement. We add to these ideas about intelligent accountability three principles of deliberative democratic evaluation (House and Howe, 1999, 2000): inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation. House and Howe (2000) argue that all those with legitimate interests in an evaluation should be included in decisions that affect those interests and that there should be a "rough balance and equality of power" (p. 6) so that dialogue and deliberation can happen and choices can be made based on collective consideration of common goods. Applying these ideas about democratic evaluation to teacher education and integrating them with ideas regarding intelligent accountability means that teacher education accountability mechanisms, processes, and content are jointly determined by relevant professional organizations, participants in teacher education programs and institutions, and members of the local communities, schools, and families with whom teacher education programs work. This means that the content of accountability cannot be completely predetermined but rather it integrates local commitments and the goals of particular programs. This also means that school leaders and community members function as coequal teacher educators not simply as the co-occupants of the spaces used to prepare teachers.

Finally, we draw on Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo, and Hargreaves' (2015) argument that the priority for K-12 education policy makers should not be mandating external accountability policies that entice and/or coerce schools to comply. Rather the priority should be creating the conditions for strong professional accountability, defined as "individuals and groups willingly taking on personal, professional, and collective responsibility for continuous improvement and success for all students" (p. 4). We take two key ideas from this. First is the distinction between accountability and responsibility. In today's climate, the term *accountability* connotes obligation and coercion, while the term *responsibility* suggests professional willingness and commitment. Second is the relationship between internal and external accountability. Fullan and colleagues suggest there will always be some sort of external accountability in K-12 education, and we believe this is true—and appropriate—in teacher education as well. But there is an enormous difference between external accountability intended to monitor compliance, on one hand, and external accountability intended to build the capacity for strong internal accountability based on local and larger goals, on the other.

Deliberative and Critical Democratic Education

With democratic accountability in teacher education, what teacher education programs are actually held accountable for and what counts as evidence that they are indeed being accountable for those things again contrasts with these matters in the dominant accountability paradigm. Our argument here is that with a democratic approach, teacher preparation programs are accountable for democratic education itself—that is, the preparation of teachers who have the capacity and commitment to enact deliberative and critical democratic education as demonstrated through multiple measures tailored to local contexts.

To explain this, we unite ideas about deliberative democratic education (Gutmann, 1987, 1990; Hanson & Howe, 2011) with ideas related to the politics of difference (Young, 1990, 1996, 2000). As Gutmann (1987) points out, moral disagreements are inevitable in democratic societies that respect human beings as autonomous agents, which means that deliberative democratic education must be a primary concern of public education. She argues that deliberation is a complex skill that depends on the skills of literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking as well as contextual knowledge, empathic perspective taking, making judgments based on evidence and argument, and genuine respect for the rights of individuals and groups to embrace values different from one's own.

We want to make it very clear that holding teacher education accountable for democratic education is not a matter of preparation programs making a choice between emphasizing “the usual” knowledge and skills for teacher candidates—that is, content and pedagogical knowledge, classroom management, knowledge of learners—or instead, the knowledge and skills required to enact deliberative democratic education. This is a false choice. The capacity to enact deliberative and critical democratic education requires content and pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of learners, and knowing how to construct and maintain positive learning environments as well as deep understanding of what it means to live in a diverse, contentious, and heterogeneous society. Along these lines, Young (1990) offers a positive vision of diversity—the “politics of difference,” which explodes the implicit definition of “difference as deviance in relation to a norm, which freezes some groups into a self-enclosed nature” (p. 171). Young (2000) argues that moving beyond deliberative democratic education requires critical consciousness about the structures that reproduce domination and oppression of minoritized groups.

The goal of democratic accountability in teacher education is not uniformity or compliance with a single norm or universal assessment. Thus democratic accountability does not assume that all teacher education programs should meet exactly the same goals or use the same assessments, but it does assume that all teacher education programs are responsible for preparing teachers to identify and challenge inequities in schools and society

and prepare their students to live and work in a democratic society. As this issue of *TEP* makes clear, over the last decade, some scholars and practitioners in teacher education have engaged in analyses along the lines we have been talking about here: identifying problems with the dominant approach to accountability, clarifying the skills needed to promote democratic education, conceptualizing teacher education outcomes that are consistent with democratic education, and/or developing individual programs or assignments that support a democratic approach (e.g., Au, 2016; Ayres, Kumashiro, Meiners, Quinn, & Stovall, 2016; Cochran-Smith, 2005, 2010; Jenlink, 2016; Krise, 2016; Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Stitzlein, 2010). This is important work, but it is to a certain extent on the margins of teacher education and almost entirely on the margins of teacher education accountability. In fact, the discourses of democratic education, democratic accountability, and democratic evaluation are virtually absent from mainstream discussions about accountability in US teacher education. Even at universities where there are strong graduate programs in areas related to democratic theory and democratic education, these are not teacher preparation programs (Stitzlein, 2010).

No More Than Ever

In the introduction to this article we made it clear that it was a conceptual piece that theorized democratic accountability in teacher education in contrast to the dominant accountability paradigm. It is important to note, however, that like any challenge to the dominant direction of US education policy, conceptualizing democratic accountability in teacher education requires both a challenge to market ideology *and* a description of a democratic alternative *in both theory and practice* (Engel, 2000). Although we do not have the space to do so here, we have explored elsewhere a number of innovative projects, programs, networks, organizations, and policies that suggest promising directions for democratic accountability *in practice* (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018). We refer readers to our discussion of these practices, each of which is in sync with one or more of our dimensions of democratic accountability.

We conclude by reiterating that our intention in conceptualizing democratic accountability in teacher education has not been to reject accountability in teacher education, but to rescue it from market ideology and individualism and to reclaim it for the democratic project. That is, as we noted above, we want accountability to serve democracy, not market capitalism or individual private interests. We believe that this task, which we readily admit is extremely difficult to do, is needed now more than ever.

In the United States, we live in an acutely polarized society where people are animated by deeply dissimilar perspectives, aspirations, and values, some of which revolve around intolerance—even hatred—of conflicting viewpoints and those who hold them. In addition, there have been many developments during

President Trump's first year in office that make it clear he favors neither strong democracy nor strong equity. Rather the Trump administration is presiding over multiple actions in a variety of areas that, taken together, may well constitute a new era of diminished protection of minoritized student groups and a new low in terms of equity agendas (Noguera, 2017). However, many Trump critics have claimed that the biggest day-to-day problem for educators is not the slow but mounting accumulation of small-to-medium-sized policy changes that diminish protections for minoritized groups, but the daily statements and actions of the president himself. The Southern Poverty Law Center, for example, which has tracked hate events and hate crimes since before the presidential election, has documented a dramatic increase in hate violence, harassment, and intimidation immediately after the election with a similar increase in the nation's K-12 schools and universities in nearly every state (Potok, 2017).

Of course these events are not simply a Trump problem, and the underlying issues certainly were not invented by Trump. This is also not simply a US problem. Rather these issues reflect much deeper trends and fault lines that are also present in other developed countries, including growing income inequality and serious gaps between historically privileged and disadvantaged groups in terms of educational opportunities and outcomes (although some countries, of course, have much narrower disparities than the United States). There has also been the emergence of a strong conservative nationalism that has emerged in many places and caused some to wonder if the era of internationalism is over. Across many countries, the polarization of people has increased as has intolerance of viewpoints different from one's own. We see democratic accountability in teacher education *not* as a way to solve all these much larger problems, but as a way to push back against an accountability paradigm in teacher education that does not serve democracy and does not bode well for the next generation.

We thus conclude this article with a call to action. Now more than ever, we need to be accountable for fostering strong democracy and strong equity in teacher education. We need to promote deliberative democratic education, and we need to rally with others to assert that democratic teaching and teacher education are indispensable to the future of our democracy.

References

- Ambrosio, J. (2013). Changing the subject: Neoliberalism and accountability in public education. *Educational Studies*, 49(4), 316–333.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2015). AACTE board resolution on CAEP. [Press release]. Retrieved August 26, 2015 from <https://aacte.org/news-room/press-releases-statements/488-aacteboard-resolution-on-caep>
- Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this? *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4). Retrieved from <https://www.rethinkingschools.org/articles/what-s-a-nice-test-like-you-doing-in-a-place-like-this-edtpa-and-corporate-education-reform>

- Au, W. (2016). Meritocracy 2.0: High-stakes, standardized testing as a racial project of neoliberal multiculturalism. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 39–62.
- Ayers, W., Kumashiro, K., Meiners, E., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2016). *Teaching toward democracy: Educators as agents of change*. London, England: Routledge.
- Ayres, S., Sandford, M., & Coombes, T. (2017). Policy-making “front” and “back” stage: Assessing the implications for effectiveness and democracy. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(4), 861–876.
- Barber, B. R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or for worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34(7), 3–17.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 445–467). New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Stern, R., Sánchez, J. G., Miller, A., Keefe, E. S., Fernández, B., Chang, W.-C., Carney, M., Burton, S., & Baker, M. (2016). *Holding teacher education accountable: A review of claims and evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Baker, M., Burton, S., Carney, M. C., Chang, W.-C., Fernández, M. B., & Stern, R. (2017). Teacher quality and teacher education policy: The U.S. case and its implications. In M. Akiba & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of teacher quality and policy* (pp. 445–462). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Baker, M., Chang, W.-C., Fernández, M. B., & Keefe, E. S. (2017). *Review of “Within our grasp: Achieving higher admissions standards in teacher prep.”* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Burton, S., Carney, M. C., Sánchez, J. G., & Miller, A. F. (2017). *Review of “A new agenda: Research to build a better teacher preparation program.”* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Carney, M., Keefe, E. S., Burton, S., Chang, W. C., Fernández, M. B., Miller, A. F., Sánchez, J. G., & Baker, M. (2018). *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Crooks, T. J. (2003). *Some criteria for intelligent accountability applied to accountability in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. *Educational Researcher*, 27(1), 5–15.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). Can value-added add value to teacher evaluation? *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 132–137.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Rothman, R. (2015). *Teaching in the flat world: Learning from high-performing systems*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, L., Hammerness, K., Low, E., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Marblehead, MA: Wiley & Sons.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

- Doherty, K., & Jacobs, S. (2013). *State of the states 2013 connect the dots: Using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Education Trust. (2008). *Core problems: Out-of-field teaching persists in key academic courses and high-poverty schools*. Washington, DC: Education Trust.
- Engel, M. (2000). *The struggle for control of public education: Market ideology vs. democratic values*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ewell, P. (2013). Report of the data task force to the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/standards/commission-on-standards>
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. London, England: Macmillan.
- Fullan, M., Rincon-Gallardo, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2015). Professional capital as accountability. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(15), 1–22.
- Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M., (Eds.) (2009). *Policy and politics in teacher education: International perspectives*. London, England: Routledge.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (1990). Democratic education in difficult times. *Teachers College Record*, 92(1), 7–20.
- Goodwin, L. (2015, February 3). Duncan's teacher ed proposals miss the mark [Blog post]. *Education Week*. Retrieved from: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/op_education/2015/02/goodwin.html
- Hanson, J., & Howe, K. (2011). The potential for deliberative democratic civic education. *Democracy and Education*, 19(2), 1–9.
- Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution as recognition: A response to Nancy Fraser. In N. Fraser & A. Honneth (Eds.), *Redistribution or recognition: A political-philosophical exchange* (pp. 110–197). London, England.
- House, E., & Howe, K. R. (1999). *Values in evaluation and social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000). Deliberative democratic evaluation in practice. In D. Stufflebeam, T. Kellaghan, & G. Maddaus (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 409–421). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2016). Democracy distracted in an era of accountability: Teacher education against neoliberalism. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 17(3), 163–172.
- Kantor, H., & Lowe, R. (2016). Educationalizing the welfare state and privatizing education: The evolution of social policy since the New Deal. In W. J. Matthis & T. M. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the federal market-based reforms* (pp. 37–9). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- King, J. (2008). Critical and qualitative research in teacher education: A blues epistemology, a reason for knowing for cultural well-being. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (pp. 1094–1135). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.
- Krise, K. (2016). Preparing the standardized teacher: The effects of accountability on teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 31(2), 24–32.
- Lewis, W., & Young, T. (2013). The politics of accountability: Teacher education policy. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 190–216.

- Lipman, P. (2011). Neoliberal education restructuring dangers and opportunities of the present crisis. *Monthly Review*, 63(3), 114–127.
- Lys, D. B., L'Esperance, M., Dobson, E., & Bullock, A. A. (2014). Large-scale implementation of the edTPA: Reflections upon institutional change in action. *Current Issues in Education*, 17(3), 1–11.
- McKinsey & Company. (2007, September). *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top*. Retrieved from http://mckinseyonsociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf
- Mehta, J. (2013). How paradigms create politics: The transformation of American educational policy, 1980–2001. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(2), 285–324
- Michelli, N. M., & Keiser, D. L. (2005). *Teacher education for democracy and social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nasir, N. S., Scott, J., Trujillo, T., & Hernández, L. (2016). The sociopolitical context of teaching. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 349–390). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York, NY: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Noguera, P. (October 18, 2017). The big picture: School of Trump. *Public Books*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicbooks.org/the-big-picture-school-of-trump/>
- Office of Education Cooperation and Development [OECD]. (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris, France: OECD.
- O'Neill, O. (2002). *A question of trust*. BBC Reith Lectures 2002. London, England: BBC.
- Perkins, J. (2004). *Confessions of an economic hit man*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett Koehler Publishers.
- Peske, H., & Haycock, K. (2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality: A report and recommendations by the Education Trust*. Washington, DC: Education Trust.
- Picower, B., & Marshall, A. M. (2016). “Run like hell” to “look before you leap”: Teacher educators' responses to preparing teachers for diversity and social justice in the wake of edTPA. In J. H. Carter & H. A. Lochte (Eds.), *Teacher performance assessment and accountability reforms: The impacts of edTPA on teaching and schools* (pp. 189–212). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Potok, M. (2017). *The Trump effect*. Retrieved from <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2017/trump-effect>
- Powell, G. (2000). *Elections as instruments of democracy: Majoritarian and proportional visions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Romzek, B. (2000). Dynamics of public sector accountability in an era of reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66(1), 21–44.
- Sanders, W. (1998). Value-added assessment. *The School Administrator*, 55(11), 24–27.
- Sanders, W. L., & Horn, S. P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247–256.

- Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (2007). *Facing accountability in education: Democracy and equity at risk*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2009). Teacher education, neoliberalism, and social justice. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn & D. Stovell (Eds.), *The handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 611–624). Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Stitzlein, S. M. (2010). Deliberative democracy in teacher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 6(1), 1–18.
- Stone, D. (2011). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Norton & Company.
- Taubman, P. M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Trow, M. (1996). Trust, markets and accountability in higher education: A comparative perspective. *Higher Education Policy*, 9(4), 309–324.
- Tuck, E., & Gorlewski, J. (2016). Racist ordering, settler colonialism, and edTPA: A participatory policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 197–217.
- Tucker, M. S. (Ed.). (2011). *Surpassing Shanghai: An agenda for American education built on the world's leading systems*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 120–135). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1999). Justice, inclusion, and deliberative democracy. In S. Macedo (Ed.), *Deliberative politics: Essays on democracy and disagreement*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Young, I. M. (2000). Inclusion and democracy. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 122–135.



Marilyn Cochran-Smith holds the Cawthorne Chair in Teacher Education for Urban Schools at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College. Her scholarship over the course of 30 years has focused on teacher education research, policy, and practice nationally and internationally with special attention to diversity, social justice, and practitioner inquiry. She is an award-winning author of 10 books, including Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education and Policy, Practice and Politics in Teacher Education and Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation, published by Teachers College Press. She may be reached via e-mail at cochrans@bc.edu

Molly Cummings Carney is a doctoral student at Boston College studying teacher education and education policy. Her research focuses on innovation in initial teacher education, online teacher preparation, and equity and social justice in urban schools. She is coauthor of Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education. She may be reached via e-mail at: cumminmp@bc.edu

*Elizabeth Stringer Keefe is assistant professor and faculty coordinator of Graduate Studies in Autism at the Graduate School of Education, Lesley University. Her research focuses on teacher education, special education teacher preparation, and teacher preparedness to educate autistic students. She is the president of the Massachusetts Council for Exceptional Children, and the author of *Remixing the Curriculum: The Teacher's Guide to Technology in the Classroom* and coauthor of *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. She may be reached via e-mail at: stringerkeefe@lesley.edu*

*Stephani Burton is senior research associate at TERC (Technical Education Research Centers). Her research explores the impact of education policies and initiatives on teacher education and students from non-dominant backgrounds. She is co-author of *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. She may be reached via e-mail at: stephani.burton@bc.edu*

*Wen-Chia Chang is a postdoctoral fellow at the National Institute of Education, Singapore. Her research focuses on theories and practice of evaluation, measurement of teaching practice for equity, and teacher education for social justice. She is coauthor of *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. She may be reached via e-mail at: changw@bc.edu*

*M. Beatriz Fernández is assistant professor at University of Chile, where she serves as a director of a teacher preparation program. Her research focuses on education policy and social justice in teacher education. Fernández is a founding member of *Alto al Simce*, an activist group working against K-12 standardization in Chile. She is coauthor of *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. She may be reached via e-mail at: mariabeatriz.fernandez@gmail.com*

*Andrew F. Miller is the director of academics for the Archdiocese of Boston Catholic Schools Office. His research has focused on the intersections of teacher education, educational policy/accountability, and the educational reform movement. He is coauthor of *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. He may be reached via e-mail at: millerandrewfrederic@gmail.com*

Juan Gabriel Sánchez is a doctoral candidate at Boston College. He studies teacher education and education reform, with a focus on institutional change at the school and classroom levels and its relationship to the reform environment. His dissertation research examines this relationship at a new graduate school of education that com-

bines innovative structures and progressive pedagogies. He is coauthor of Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education. He may be reached via e-mail at: sanchejs@bc.edu

Megina Baker is a researcher on the Pedagogy of Play project at Harvard Graduate School of Education's Project Zero. She teaches courses on play and child development at Boston University. She is coauthor of Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education. She may be reached via e-mail at: megina.baker@gmail.com

Copyright of Teacher Education & Practice is the property of Scarecrow Press Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.