

ESTUDIOS Y ENSAYOS

Preparing Teachers to Teach Successfully in Schools in Historically Marginalized Communities

Preparar a los profesores para enseñar con éxito en escuelas de comunidades históricamente marginadas

Kenneth Zeichner*

Recibido: 8 de septiembre de 2022 **Aceptado:** 13 de septiembre de 2022 **Publicado:** 30 de septiembre de 2022

To cite this article: Zeichner, K. (2022). Preparing Teachers to Teach Successfully in Schools in Historically Marginalized Communities. *Márgenes, Revista de Educación de la Universidad de Málaga*, 3(3), 83-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24310/mgnmar.v3i3.15343>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24310/mgnmar.v3i3.15343>

RESUMEN

El artículo aborda la formación del profesorado para enseñar con éxito en escuelas de comunidades históricamente marginadas. Para ello, el autor explica, en primer lugar, este concepto y profundiza en la dualidad de la financiación privada y pública en la educación. Para alcanzar el futuro optimista que prevé, la estructura de la financiación debe cambiar. El autor también expone dos vías principales para la formación democrática del profesorado: hacer un mejor trabajo en la preparación de los profesores de fuera de las comunidades históricamente marginadas en la enseñanza de los estudiantes de manera culturalmente sensible y sostenible y hacer un mejor trabajo en la contratación, preparación y retención de los profesores que viven en estas comunidades para que se queden allí y enseñen. Por último, se presenta un esquema de lo que hay que hacer.

Palabras clave: formación democrática del profesorado; comunidades históricamente marginadas; financiación de la educación

ABSTRACT

The article addresses teacher education to teach successfully in schools in Historically Marginalized Communities. In order to do that, the author explains, first of all, this concept and delves into the duality of private and public funding in education. To achieve the optimistic future he foresees, the structure of funding must change. The author also exposes two major pathways to democratic teacher education: doing a better job in preparing teachers from outside historically marginalized communities in teaching students in culturally responsive and sustaining ways and doing a better job of recruiting, preparing, and retaining teachers who live in these communities to stay there and teach. Finally, an outline of what needs to be done is presented.

Keywords: democratic teacher education; historically marginalized communities; funding in education

*Kenneth Zeichner

Universidad de Washington (Estados Unidos)

zeichner@facstaff.wisc.edu

1. THE PROBLEM, THE CONTEXT, AND WHAT IS NEEDED

There are many challenges facing teacher education today internationally, and I will briefly discuss one of them here that has been a major challenge throughout the 47 years that I have been a teacher educator. Although I will discuss this challenge as it has been experienced in the U.S., it is also an issue that has existed in some form in most other countries. This challenge is concerned with the need to recruit and prepare teachers to be successful and stay over time in schools in rural and urban communities that have been highly impacted by poverty. These communities (I will call them historically marginalized communities), are those that “have been impacted by systemic oppression such as marginalization based on race, class, language, or immigration status” (Ishimaru et al., 2019, p. 9). In the U.S., these are also the communities as Barajas-Lopez and Ishimaru (2020) point out that experience “challenges of health care, housing, immigration, transportation, and other underlying dynamics facing schools” (p. 39) as well as communities that suffer from an inequitable distribution of resources such as public education funding and a lack of access to an equitable share of fully prepared and experienced teachers who teach in their areas of expertise and certification (Baker, 2018; Darling-Hammond, 2013). One example that confirms the international scope of this problem is the popularity of the program *Teach for All* that exists through partnerships in many countries including in Spain with *Empieza por Educar*. This program continues to feed underprepared teachers into schools in historically marginalized communities to teach for a short time thereby leaving these communities with schools with high teacher turnover and a lack of access to experienced teachers for their children (Ellis et al., 2016).

In the U.S., the majority of students who attend public schools live in poverty as measured by their qualified status for the federal free or reduced price meal program. In 2017-2018, 52.3 percent of pupils were in this category (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2021). Although 53 percent of students in U.S. public schools were nonwhite in 2018, 72.3 percent of U.S. public school teachers were White at this time (Wilson & Kelly, 2021). Additionally, students of color who attend U.S. public schools are concentrated in high poverty schools in historically marginalized communities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021).

In the U.S. and other countries that have experienced a growth in refugees and immigrants in their populations, teachers who work in the nondominant communities where many Indigenous people, immigrants, refugees and others live in poverty are faced with a situation where they often bring very little personal experience to be able to draw on when trying to connect with their students and their families (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). Very often teachers do not live in or have much experience with the nondominant communities in which they teach, and very few of them have been prepared in their teacher education programs in how to work in culturally respectful ways in their teaching of students with their students' families, and with others in their communities to learn about the expertise and cultural wealth in the communities and how to connect their curriculum and classroom instruction with students' lives outside of the classroom in culturally responsive and sustaining ways (Alim & Paris, 2017; De Brunine et al., 2014; Hong, 2019). Neither are most teachers in schools in nondominant communities provided with professional learning opportunities and encouragement from their school administrators to support their efforts to engage their students' families and learn about their communities (Kirmaci, 2019).

Even when teacher candidates and teachers have opportunities to learn from families and communities however, there is often lack of attention to helping them learn how to incorporate what they learn into culturally responsive and sustaining curriculum, teaching and management practices within their classrooms (Zeichner, 2019). It cannot be assumed, as it is often the case, that teachers can automatically translate knowledge about families and communities into culturally responsive and sustaining pedagogy (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In other words, as Smolcic & Katujnich (2017) have put it, intercultural competence is not the same thing as culturally responsive pedagogy. Teachers need to learn and practice how to integrate community funds of knowledge and cultural wealth into their curriculum and instruction and must be mentored in doing so (Hong, 2019).

It is very clear from decades of research that teachers' abilities to connect in positive ways with their students and their families, and connecting learning within the classroom with their students' lives out of the classroom in positive ways enhances the quality of student learning, and that if teachers are not able to do this student learning will suffer.

When schools are not inclusive of the communities' languages, practices, and knowledge, they tend to alienate students and their families and thus put these students at continued risk for failure in dominant educational settings. (Philip et al., 2013, p. 175)

1.1. Teacher Education Programs have not done a good job

It is widely agreed in the U.S. and internationally among teacher educators, primary and secondary school educators, and people in historically marginalized communities that overall teacher education programs have not been very successful in recruiting and preparing teachers for schools in nondominant communities, teachers who are successful in educating students and continue working in these communities over time. Teacher education programs have mostly prepared teachers from the dominant White majority groups and middle class communities to teach students whose backgrounds are like their own rather than preparing them to teach the diverse students who are actually in the public schools. Also, overall in the U.S. teacher educators are mostly White and lack meaningful experiences in nondominant communities as teachers.

In other countries such as Australia and in Europe, we can also see evidence of the recognition of the inadequacy of teacher preparation programs in preparing teachers for schools in Indigenous, refugee, poor, and historically vulnerable communities and attention to changing the structure and epistemology of teacher preparation programs to better serve these communities (e.g., De Brunine et al., 2014; Gomila, Pascual, & Quincoces, 2018, 2014; Lampert, 2021; & Naidoo & Brace, 2017).

1.2. The Lack of Support for Culturally Responsive Teacher Education

One problem in teacher education's inability to address this challenge is the failure within many countries to provide teacher preparation programs with the contextual conditions that are needed to prepare teachers to teach in culturally responsive and sustaining ways that engage students in nondominant communities in the deeper learning that is routinely available to many

students in more privileged communities. Throughout my career in the U.S., teacher preparation has operated in a relatively hostile context where first, arts and sciences faculties in colleges and universities resisted the incorporation of teacher education programs from single purpose and lower status institutions such as normal schools into colleges and universities and sought to denigrate the academic quality of teacher preparation coursework and clinical experiences (e.g., Koerner, 1963).

Then, beginning in the 1980s, instead of investing in strengthening the preparation of teachers for nondominant communities in college and university programs, the federal government and many state governments promoted the establishment of alternatives to college and university programs that resulted in many underprepared beginning teachers being hired to teach in schools mainly in nondominant communities. In many cases, these underprepared teachers completed their preparation programs as fulltime teachers in historically marginalized communities, and they often taught subjects outside of their areas of expertise and certification (Peske & Haycock, 2006). Teachers are still prepared like this today in “fast track” programs, and they typically leave their schools in historically marginalized communities at a higher rate than fully prepared teachers (Cardishon et al., 2020).

This situation has led to difficulties in providing families in these communities with access to experienced teachers teaching in their areas of expertise and certification. At the same time, as teacher education standards were being relaxed to provide enough teachers to staff schools in nondominant communities, the federal government increased regulations on college and university-based preparation programs and promoted the nonsensical idea of evaluating the quality of these programs based on the standardized tests scores of the pupils of program graduates after they have completed their programs (Zeichner, 2015).

In the last decade, the promotion of alternatives to college and university-based teacher education has accelerated into an aggressive push supported by the federal government, philanthropists, and “social entrepreneurs” to deregulate and “disrupt” the teacher education system in the country that critics argue is broken and needs to be scrapped and replaced (Zeichner & Sandoval, 2016). These same forces for privatizing teacher education have been operating in other counties as well (Furlong et al., 2009; Moon, 2016).¹

The push to privatize teacher education in the U.S. parallels similar efforts to expand the number of privately managed charter schools in public school systems across the country. In fact, several alternative teacher preparation programs have been founded by privately run charter school networks to prepare teachers for their schools and other charter schools (Steitzlein & West, 2014).

While this was going on, state governments across the U.S. substantially reduced their financial support to the public universities that prepared and still continue to prepare the majority of U.S. teachers. (Lyll & Sell, 2006). Teacher education institutions, which were never adequately funded to support high quality clinically-based programs, found themselves in serious difficulty to maintain even the inadequate level of support that existed before the state funding reductions.

¹ The *Teach for All network* is an example of the international nature of these problems. <https://teachforall.org/>

I was the faculty director of teacher education at the University of Washington during the most recent period of large budgets cuts in higher education, and I had to struggle each year to maintain funding to support adequate coaching and mentoring support for teacher candidates and even to maintain the existence of programs. As pressures increased on teacher education faculty to get external grants to support their graduate students, and to initiate any kind of innovation in teacher preparation programs, teacher education program administrators in the U.S. became more and more dependent on hiring less expensive temporary adjuncts rather than fulltime permanent faculty (Besas, 2021). This surge in hiring people to teach particular courses does not typically include money for adjuncts to participate in the kind of programmatic work that builds and maintains program coherence (Flaherty, 2020).

Although some federal and foundation grants were available to fund special initiatives in teacher preparation programs such as school-university partnerships, in many cases, these were developed in a few elite research universities and teacher educators were not able to sustain the funded initiatives beyond the life of their grants. Although there were many efforts to spread these reforms to the large public regional universities that prepare most teachers in the U.S., for the most part these institutions have not had the capacity to implement these reforms in ways that enabled many teacher education partnerships to become more than superficial alliances (Zeichner, 2021).

2. OPTIMISM FOR THE FUTURE

Despite what might seem to some like a pessimistic view of this issue, I believe that is possible to create a situation where teacher education programs are more successful in preparing teachers to teach students in culturally responsive and sustaining ways in historically marginalized communities and stay there over time. I also believe that it is possible to secure and sustain the funding and to create the contextual conditions needed to do so.

Major changes will need to take place though in the funding, structure and curriculum of teacher education programs as well as in the accountability systems for evaluating and encouraging the improvement of programs. First, and most importantly in this transformation process, we need to rethink and redefine who the teacher educators are and whose knowledge is needed to educate teachers for schools in nondominant communities. To put it simply, teacher education, to date, in many countries has been dominated by the role of college and university faculty and staff in designing and implementing preparation programs with educators in the schools playing a largely secondary role, and family and community members most often playing no role (Zeichner, 2018). This situation must change, and the creation, governance, and implementation of teacher preparation programs must become more of a shared responsibility between institutions of higher education, schools, teacher unions, and families and communities.

Various parts of this vision have been attempted in several countries over the years although often the implementation has been superficial. For example, despite the frequent attention to teacher education partnerships, colleges and universities have retained most of the power in making decisions about teacher preparation programs for themselves often leaving school and community partners in a position of “second class” participants who are expected to follow the

lead of the college and university teacher educators. Overall, there has been a failure to establish a “rightful presence” (Barton Calabrese & Tan, 2020) for school and community partners in teacher education partnerships. There is a big difference between asking school and university partners to participate in conceptualizing and designing innovations as opposed to only asking them to react to things already conceptualized by others (Ishimaru, 2020). This situation has often prevented teacher educators and teacher candidates from benefiting from the expertise that good teachers and families and communities have to offer and has contributed to the problem of the underfunding of teacher preparation (Zeichner, 2010).

The result has also been continued failure to prepare teachers who are successful in schools in historically marginalized communities over time except in the relatively few programs where power and knowledge hierarchies have been disrupted and university, school and community expertise have been brought together in synergistic ways. The goal, in my view, is to figure out ways to enable teacher candidates to access the knowledge and expertise of the academic faculty and staff in institutions of higher education, educators who work in primary and secondary schools who host clinical experiences, and the families and community members who send their kids to the schools in historically marginalized communities and support the work of these schools through their advocacy work on a range of issues including education, as individuals and in community organizations. My colleagues and I have referred to this transformation project as one of democratizing teacher education (e.g., Payne & Zeichner, 2017; Zeichner et al., 2015).²

3. PATHWAYS TO DEMOCRATIC TEACHER EDUCATION

I see two major pathways to overcoming the problems with previous forms of partnerships to achieve the goals that I have briefly identified. One is doing a better job in preparing teachers from outside historically marginalized communities in teaching students in culturally responsive and sustaining ways. Teachers who see their work as serving the community as a whole instead of trying to “save” students from their communities³. The second path is to do a better job of recruiting, preparing, and retaining teachers who live in these communities to stay there and teach.

The most important thing that must be done in both cases is to admit that what we have done so far has not worked well, and that we need to think collaboratively with our school and community partners about different ways to approach these goals and be open to creating new

2 Currently in the U.S. family and community members in some communities and sometimes members of hate groups in the area often identify themselves as “culture warriors” and are putting pressure on schools not to teach an accurate history of the U.S. and the role of the U.S. in the world. In some communities, teachers and administrators are being harassed and sometimes fired for teaching about slavery, racism, and anything that the culture warriors consider to show the U.S. in a negative light. (Frenkel, 20210). In one state, Florida, the governor has proposed legislation that would empower anyone to sue teachers for teaching about race (Marcotte, 2021). As I noted above, my work has focused on the nondominant communities that have been marginalized because of race, language, religion, or immigrant status and where the caregivers of students have often lacked a voice in the education of their children in public schools. I have many ideas about how to prepare teachers to teach in the communities where culture warriors live, and how to deal with and resolve the tensions between schools, communities and universities in deliberations about preparing teachers, but they are beyond the scope of this brief paper.

3 See Larry Cuban’s (1969) thoughtful essay on the importance of teachers seeing their work as teaching students within communities and what needs to be done by school systems to support this work.

program structures within which to implement them. We also need to recognize from the beginning that this kind of genuinely collaborative work is necessarily messy and complicated as a result of the power and knowledge hierarchies that have existed in teacher education for a long time (Guillen & Zeichner, 2018). If things seem to be going very smoothly without any tensions and conflicts, we are probably doing something wrong.

In order to reach a place where teacher education programs are more successful over time in preparing teachers for historically marginalized communities, we need to recognize that many teacher educators also lack teaching and other meaningful life experiences in historically marginalized communities and that in order to be able to mobilize the expertise needed, it is necessary to shift the center of gravity in teacher preparation programs from partnerships where colleges and universities run programs teacher education programs with reactions and advice from schools and communities into more inclusive partnerships with schools and organizations and individuals in communities where schools and communities are brought into the transformation process at the very beginning (Zeichner, 2010). College and university teacher educators will have to relinquish some of the power and privileges that they have assumed to be theirs in collaborations with schools and communities if the subjugated knowledge and expertise in schools and communities is to influence and improve programs' responsiveness to the cultural contexts in which the programs operate (Hyland & Meacham, 2004).

These new partnerships in teacher education need to be very different than the superficial partnerships that have dominated teacher education in the last fifty years. In many teacher education partnerships, university or other program staff continue to try to maintain their positions of power and control. Also, unless we see the solution as one of educating both teacher educators and teacher candidates together about the conditions and perspectives of schools and communities, we will not accomplish much.

There are many potential obstacles to bringing the perspectives of teachers, and families and communities to a more central place in teacher preparation programs. For example, there is evidence that teacher candidates often bring deficit perspectives about students and their families who live in nondominant communities to their teaching in these communities (Banks et al., 2005). Many candidates bring a missionary perspective where their goal is to try and rescue their students from their allegedly broken communities rather than to try and build in a positive way on the existing strengths within families and communities. This frequently results in resistance by some candidates to learning from students' families and others living in their communities.

The good news is that there is growing evidence from research on forms of hybrid teacher preparation that there are ways to overcome these deficit perspectives and to help prospective teachers see the value for their teaching in learning from families and communities. For example, one important part of overcoming deficit perspectives is to place community perspectives and expertise at the center of teacher preparation programs in nondominant communities and ensuring that institutions of higher education and the schools are responsive and accountable to marginalized communities in the conduct of their preparation programs (e.g., Clark et al., 2021; Harfitt, 2019). In the community engagement work that my colleagues and I have participated in at the University of Washington, the community-based mentors of teacher candidates were very influential in helping to change candidates' deficit perspectives

and to stimulate a reexamination by teacher candidates of ideas that they had internalized over time about families in nondominant communities (Zeichner et al., 2016).

In recent years, I've learned about examples of programs in several countries that contain pieces of what I have briefly outlined as the two pathways to improving the preparation of teachers for historically marginalized communities. These include new forms of hybrid structures for teacher preparation programs where the programs are funded, governed and implemented by educators and community members from institutions of higher education, primary and secondary schools, and families and community members including leaders of local community advocacy groups.

The teacher residency model in the U.S. is an example of this new kind of hybrid program (Guhya et al., 2016). For example, the Seattle Teacher Residency Program is a program that I helped to develop over several years with several colleagues at the University of Washington, administrators and teachers in the Seattle public schools, leaders of the local teachers union, and community leaders in nondominant communities in and around Seattle.⁴

Some residency programs are based in higher education institutions, some in school districts, and some like the one in Seattle, are based in community organizations. One of the features of these programs that facilitates the ability of teacher educators to develop deeper partnerships with school and community partners is the context specific nature of the residency program preparation (Kapadia & Hammerness, 2014).

I've also learned about other more traditional programs based in institutions of higher education where genuine partnerships have been formed between teacher educators in institutions in higher education, educators in schools, and leaders in community-based organizations and local advocacy groups based in historically marginalized communities. Illinois State University's Chicago Teacher Education Pipeline and a collaboration between Ball State University and an African American community and its schools in Muncie Indiana are two examples of traditional university programs that have managed to fully include school and community partners in all aspects of planning, implementing and evaluating teacher preparation programs and have done so for over a decade (Clark et al., 2021).

There are also successful examples of community-based "Grow Your Own Teachers" programs and Indigenous programs in which communities play a central role in recruiting and preparing teachers from their communities to stay and teach there. Examples of these programs include the Indigenous teacher preparation programs that have existed for some time in Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand, Canada, and more recently in the U.S. (e.g., Haig-Brown et al., 2019). For example, The Indigenous Teacher Education program in British Columbia Canada involves a partnership between the University of British Columbia and the First Nations Educational Council and has been in existence for over 47 years and continues to prepare Indigenous teachers for Indigenous communities in British Columbia. According to Archibald (2015), who directed the program for many years, Indigenous people have been centrally involved in the planning of the program and throughout its ongoing development "the program is an Indian idea, is Indian

⁴ <https://seattleteacherresidency.org/>

controlled, and its philosophy is Indian, although the program falls under the jurisdiction of the University of British Columbia” (p. 15).

Also, a community-based Grow Your Own program was initiated by a local community organization in the Logan Square neighborhood of Chicago, a community composed of mainly Latinx immigrant families. This program, which includes a partnership with the Chicago public schools and several local universities, was designed to help Latinx immigrant women and a few men who were employed as teaching assistants become fully certified teachers in their own community. This program has been genuinely community-driven and was aimed at educating teacher educators about the funds of knowledge and cultural wealth in this community in addition to preparing individuals from the community to stay there and teach (e.g., see Gillette, 2018). There is strong evidence that well designed Grow Your Own Teachers and Indigenous programs have increased teacher retention in the communities that have seen in the past a revolving door of young outsider teachers come and go (Gist, Bianco, & Lynn, 2017).

Many of the programs that I have discovered and studied are relatively new ones except for a handful of programs that have been in operation for a decade or more. As I mentioned earlier, one of the endemic problems in teacher education has been our failure to sustain innovations that have tried to address the challenges that I have discussed here and others as well. I do not have time here to go into details about what I see as necessary to create the conditions to support and sustain the program transformations that I have discussed here, but I will share an outline some of the major pieces of what I think needs to be done.

4. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

First, I believe that we need to recognize the often invisible and underappreciated good work that is currently being done by many teacher educators in preparing teachers for schools in historically marginalized communities and the difficult conditions they face in doing this work in their underfunded institutions of higher education and schools. I prefer incentives (i.e., carrots instead of sticks) as a general method of encouraging transformations in teacher preparation programs although I believe that accountability systems also need to be restructured to support these incentives.

One specific thing that I think should be done is to provide opportunities for programs to receive grants to fund the development of new structures for teacher preparation that are more inclusive of the genuine participation of elementary and secondary school educators and community members. This shared conceptualization and development of new program models and shared responsibility for implementing programs would be a condition of receiving the grant money. Funders of these innovations must be clear about the conditions for disrupting typical forms of hierarchy in these programs and for asking applicants to demonstrate in their proposals a plan to for the collaborating institutions to sustain the costs of innovations beyond the life of the grant.

Additionally program approval processes should specify approval standards that call for program accountability to schools and marginalized communities as a condition for approval. Currently, many state program approval processes in the U.S. specify that programs must gather data from the school administrators who hire graduates from their programs and sometimes

it is also required of programs to show that they have made efforts to respond to criticisms of programs from the schools. Accountability to communities however, particularly to marginalized nondominant communities is mostly absent from government both program approval standards and from national and voluntary program accreditation standards. Here, teacher education programs must do much more than make data on their program publicly available for marginalized communities to supposedly examine. Community accountability in teacher education with regard to marginalized communities must involve face to face dialogue with a variety of community members to listen to what they have to say about the quality of teachers in their children's schools and about the preparation that is provided to them by programs.

When I came to the University of Washington in 2009 as the faculty teacher education director, one of the first things that I was asked to do was to meet with a recently started "study group" of a composed of a few of my colleagues, Indigenous leaders in education in the state and American Indian Studies faculty at my university to discuss the perspectives of Indigenous communities in our state about the quality of our programs for preparing teachers and educational leaders for their communities and the overall responsiveness of our College of Education to the tribal communities in our state. These meetings continued over several years and resulted in the collaborative development of a Native Education certificate program⁵ that educates teacher candidates and teachers throughout Washington about the tribal cultures in our state, about issues related to local Indigenous history, and about the concept of tribal sovereignty. It also has increased efforts to recruit and prepare more Indigenous teachers. Tribal communities and educators played a central role in these efforts, and the program is managed today by an Indigenous faculty member. The study group evolved into a permanent Indigenous education advisory board that monitors the progress of the program. This is the kind of interaction between teacher education program and communities that should become a part of teacher education programs' efforts to become more accountable to marginalized nondominant communities.

5. CONCLUSION

Although I believe that some of the ideas that I have mentioned above are important for restructuring teacher preparation programs to become more accountable and responsive to historically marginalized communities, I want to be clear to also say that I am not suggesting that the preparation of teachers alone will solve the problems of public education in marginalized nondominant communities. It is clear from research over many decades that although good teaching makes a difference out of school factors like poverty play a much greater role in determining school outcomes (Berliner, 2013).

One of the issues that I have been working on in recent years is an examination of the tensions between teacher and teacher educator professionalism and meaningful and influential participation in schooling and teacher education by members of historically marginalized communities. There is a long history of debate about the issue of the question of whether the democratic potential of public education can be realized without undermining the dignity and professionalism of the work of teachers and teacher educators (e.g., Driscoll, 1998).

5 <https://education.uw.edu/programs/necp>

I have come to believe that the idea of preparing teacher educators and teachers as democratic professionals as an alternative to the traditional and managerial forms of professionalism that have dominated teaching and teacher education in recent decades (Anderson & Cohen, 2018). Without getting into the details of this argument here (see Zeichner, 2019, 2021) democratic professionalism is a form of professionalism where educators seek to enhance broader public engagement and deliberation about issues of teaching and teacher education (Anderson & Cohen, 2018). Australian scholar Sachs (2001) has argued that democratic professionalism:

Seeks to demystify professional work and build alliances between teachers and excluded constituencies of students, parents, and members of the community on whose behalf decisions have traditionally been made either by professions or by the state... the core of democratic professionalism is an emphasis on collaborative, cooperative action between teachers and other education stakeholders. (p. 153)

When teachers and their teacher educators give up some of the power that educators have traditionally exercised in schools in nondominant communities and in teacher preparation programs that prepare teachers for teaching in nondominant communities, not only will education and teacher education benefit from the expertise and community wealth in communities, but also teachers and teacher educators will begin to work together with parents and activists in nondominant communities to fight for the resources both inside and outside of schooling that will support high quality education for everyone's children. In the U.S. we have already seen teachers' unions begin to form alliances with community advocacy groups to bargain in teacher contracts for things that communities are fighting for in addition to the traditional focus with salaries and working conditions (Strauss, 2015). It is time for teacher educators to step up as well and join the struggles by historically marginalized communities to secure the resources for affordable housing, access to nutritious food, etc. in addition to their advocacy for a high quality education for their children. These alliances will result as we have seen in some countries like Canada and Mexico in advocates in historically marginalized communities supporting the struggles of teachers and teacher educators for the resources to provide the high quality of teaching and teacher education that all communities deserve.

REFERENCES

- Alim, H. S., & Paris, D. (Eds.). (2017). What is culturally sustaining pedagogy and why does it matter? In D. Paris & H. S. Alim (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning in a changing world*. (pp. 1-24). Teachers College Press.
- Anderson, G. & Cohen, M. (2018). *The new democratic professional in education: Confronting markets, metrics, and managerialism*. Teachers College Press.
- Anyon, J. (2014). *Radical possibilities: Public policy, urban education, and a new social movement*. (2nd edition). Routledge.
- Archibald, J. (April, 2015). *Indigenous teacher education: Struggle and triumph for justice and more*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Barajas-Lopez F. & Ishimaru, A. M. (2020). Darles el lugar: A place for nondominant family knowing in educational equity. *Urban Education*, 55(1), 38-65.

- Baker, B. (2018). *Educational inequality and school finance: Why money matters for America's students*. Harvard Education Press.
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Duffy, H. (2005). Preparing teachers for diversity. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. (pp. 232-274). Jossey-Bass.
- Barton Calabrese, A. & Tan, E. (2020). Beyond equity as inclusion: A framework of "rightful presence" for guiding justice-oriented studies in teaching and learning. *Educational Researcher*, 49(6), 433-440.
- Berliner, D. (2013). Effects of inequality and poverty vs teachers and schooling on American Youth. *Teachers College Record* Volume 115 Number 12, 2013, <https://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 16889, Date Accessed: 8/30/2014.
- Besas, M. (March 15, 2021). Tenured faculty keep being replaced by adjuncts across the U.S. *The College Post*. Retrieved from <https://thecollegepost.com/tenured-faculty-replaced-adjuncts/>.
- Cardichon, J.; Darling-Hammond, L.; Yang, M.; Shields, P.M.; & Burns, D. (2020). *Inequitable opportunity to learn: Student access to certified and experienced teachers*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Clark, P.; Zygmunt, E.; Tancock, S. & Cipollone, K. (2021) (Eds). *The power of community-engaged teacher preparation*. Teachers College Press.
- Cuban, L. (1969). Teacher and community. *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(2), 253-272.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). Inequality in school resources: What will it take to close the opportunity gap? In Prudence L. Carter & Kevin G. Welner (Eds). *Closing the opportunity gap: What every America must do to give every child an even chance?* (pp. 77-97). Oxford University Press.
- deBruine, E.J.; Willemse, T.M.; D'Haem, J.; Griswold, P.; Vloeberghs, L.; van Eyende, S. (2014). Preparing teacher candidates for family-school partnerships. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 409-425.
- Driscoll, M.E. (1998). Professionalism versus community: Themes from recent school catalyst for change in higher education institutions. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(1), 89-127.
- Ellis, V.; Maguire, M.; Zeichner, K.; Are, T.; Yang, X.; & Qui, R. (2016). Teaching other people's children elsewhere for a while. *Journal of Education Policy*, 31(1), 60-80.
- Epstein, J. L. and Sanders, M.G. (2006). Prospects for change: Preparing educators for school, family, and community partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(2), 81-120.
- Flaherty, C. (April 20, 2020). Barely getting by. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/20/new-report-says-many-adjuncts-make-less-3500-course-and-25000-year>.
- Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Policy and politics in teacher education*. Routledge.
- Frenkel, S. (December 14th, 2021). Proud Boys regroup, focusing on school boards and town councils. *New York Times*. Retrieved from [/www.nytimes.com/2021/12/14/us/proud-boys-local-issues.html?campaign_id=2&emc=edit_th_20211215&instance_id=47793&nl=todaysheadlines®i_id=25813486&segment_id=77007&user_id=e89600743ccce6d3b2695d6a64aacdf7&fbclid=IwAROSBgk9dkcRhqleARpcZGARD7ZzhOkMaqctey3f-bioyyCGKIUBwRMjV3M](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/14/us/proud-boys-local-issues.html?campaign_id=2&emc=edit_th_20211215&instance_id=47793&nl=todaysheadlines®i_id=25813486&segment_id=77007&user_id=e89600743ccce6d3b2695d6a64aacdf7&fbclid=IwAROSBgk9dkcRhqleARpcZGARD7ZzhOkMaqctey3f-bioyyCGKIUBwRMjV3M).

- Gillette, Maureen D. (2018). Walking into the community: Community partnerships as a catalyst for change in higher education institutions. In Mark. R., Warren & David. *Goodman Lift us up, Don't push us out: Voices from the front lines of the educational justice movement* (pp. 118-127). Beacon Press.
- Gist, C.D.; Bianco, M. & Lynn, M. (2019). Examining grow your own programs across the development continuum: Mining research on teachers of color and nontraditional educator pipelines. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(1), 13-25.
- Gomila, M. A.; Pascual, B. & Quincoces, M. (2018). Family-school partnership in the Spanish educational system. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(3), 309-320.
- Guhya, R.; Hyler, M.E. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The teacher residency: An innovative model for preparing teachers*. Palo Alto CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-residency>.
- Guillen, L. & Zeichner, K. (2018). A university-community partnership in teacher education from the perspectives of community-based teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(2), 140-153.
- Harfitt, G. (2019). Community-based experiential learning in teacher education. In G.W. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia* (pp. 1-23).
- Haig-Brown, C. & Kawehau Hoskins, T. (2019). *Indigenous teacher education in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.746> on May 23rd, 2019.
- Hong, S. (2019). *Natural allies: Hope and possibility in teacher-family partnerships*. Harvard Education Press.
- Hyland, N. E. & Meacham, S. (2004). Community knowledge-centered teacher education: A paradigm for socially just educational transformation. In J.L. Kincheloe, S. R Steinberg, & A. Bursztyrn (Eds.), *Building a quality school of urban education* (pp. 113-134). Peter Lang.
- Ishimaru, A. (2020). *Just schools: Building equitable collaborations with families and communities*. Teachers College Press.
- Kapadia, K. & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the “urban” in urban teacher education: Making the case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 128-144.
- Kirmaci, M. (2019). Reporting educators’ experiences regarding family-school interactions with implications for best practices. *School Community Journal*, 29(2), 129-156.
- Koerner, J. D. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lampert, J. (2021). A community-engaged framework for the preparation of teachers for high poverty communities. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 48(3), 449-466.
- Lyll, K. C, and K. R. Sell. (2006). The De facto Privatization of American Public higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(1), 6-13.
- Marcotte, A. (December 16, 2021). DeSantis escalates his authoritarian purge: GOP bounty hunters are the next frontier. [Salon.com](https://www.salon.com/2021/12/16/ron-desantis-escalates-his-authoritarian-purge-bounty-hunters-are-the-next-frontier/?fbclid=IwAR2KwG24aHpWbKCIrTqmoTN3FI2Fug9hJwMggJsmA_rH48kGhUK4dsNOPKU). Retrieved from https://www.salon.com/2021/12/16/ron-desantis-escalates-his-authoritarian-purge-bounty-hunters-are-the-next-frontier/?fbclid=IwAR2KwG24aHpWbKCIrTqmoTN3FI2Fug9hJwMggJsmA_rH48kGhUK4dsNOPKU.
- Moon, B. (Ed.). (2016). *Do universities have a role in the education and training of teachers?* Cambridge University Press.

- Naidoo, L. & Brace, E. (2017). The Refugee Action Support Program in Sydney Australia: A bridge between cultures. In L. Hoyt (Ed.), *Regional perspectives on learning by doing: Stories from engaged universities around the world* (pp. 81-102). Michigan State University Press.
- Natanson, H. (December 6, 2021). A white teacher taught white students about white privilege. It cost him his job. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/nation/a-white-teacher-taught-white-students-about-white-privilege-it-cost-him-his-job/?fbclid=IwAR1hH926hJdcf3eQA29tg9AA9971Fs5jgey43ytMtZ4Isa8KToWK8UibVyc>.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2021). The condition of education. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cge> on October 31, 2021.
- Payne, K. & Zeichner, K. (2017). Multiple voices and participants in teacher education. In D.J. Clandinin & J. Husu (Eds.), *The Sage handbook on research in teacher education*. Sage.
- Peske, H. & Haycock, K. (2006). *Teaching inequality: How poor minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality*. Education Trust.
- Philip, T.; Way, W.; Garcia, A.; Schuler-Brown, S. & Navarro, O. (2013). When educators attempt to make “community” a part of classroom learning: The dangers of misappropriating students’ communities into schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 34, 174-183.
- Sachs, J. (2003). *The activist teaching profession*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Skinner, E.; Garreton, M. T. & Schultz, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Grow your own teachers: Grassroots change in teacher education*. Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C. E.; Neal, L. I. & Kumashiro, K. C. (Ed.). (2015). *Diversifying the teacher workforce*. Routledge.
- Smolcic, E. & Katunich, J. (2017). Teachers crossing borders: A review of research into cultural immersion field experiences for teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 62, pp. 47-59.
- Strauss, V. (September 25, 2015). The surprising things Seattle teachers won for students by striking. *Washington Post*. Retrieved on August 1, 2020 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2015/09/25/the-surprising-things-seattle-teachers-won-for-students-by-striking/>.
- Villegas, A. M. & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. State University of New York Press.
- Wilson, S. & Kelley, S. (2021). *Landscapes of teacher preparation programs and teacher candidates*. Washington D.C.: National Academy of Education. Retrieved from <https://naeducation.org/evaluating-and-improving-teacher-preparation-programs-commissioned-paper-series/>.
- Zeichner, K. (2010) Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 89(11), 89-99.
- Zeichner, K. (2015). The disturbing provisions about teacher preparation in No Child Left Behind Rewrite. *Washington Post*, December 5th. Retrieved from <https://www.kenzeichner.com/uploads/6/9/8/7/69877251/2015-op-ed-the-disturbing-provisions-about-teacher-preparation-in-no-child-left-behind-rewrite-the-washington.pdf>.
- Zeichner, K. (2018). *The struggle for the soul of teacher education*. Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2019). Preparing teachers as democratic professionals. *Action in Teacher Education*.

- Zeichner, K. (2021a). Critical unresolved and understudied issues in clinical teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 96(1), 1-7.
- Zeichner, K. (2021b). Tensions Between Teacher Professionalism and Authentic Community Voice in Public Schools Serving Nondominant Communities. In D. Berliner & C. Hermanns (Eds.), *Public education: Defending the cornerstone of American democracy*. Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K.; Payne, K. & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 122-135.
- Zeichner, K. & Sandoval, C. P. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the U.S: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*. 117(5), 1-44.
- Zeichner, K., Bowman, M., Guillen, L., & Napolitan, K. (2016). Engaging and working in solidarity with local communities in preparing the teachers of their children. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(4), 277-290.