



## 5. MAPPING ITE

After analysing the main actors, artefacts and practices of the ITE system within a common framework, we finally map these elements alongside a table which differentiates macro-, meso- and micro-levels on the vertical axis and the dimensions of Who, What and How on the horizontal axis (see also Snoek & Zogla, 2009, Caena, 2014).

The macro-level asks for the systemic structures in which ITE takes place, its “embeddedness”. It mainly covers political actors like governments and ministries, bureaucratic actors like school boards and accreditation agencies, furthermore professional associations and teacher unions. These national, regional or local authorities and their dependencies mainly have been described in more detail in chapter 2. The meso-level refers to the organizational level of the TTC and asks for the way how ITE is implemented, managed and planned. It includes the head or faculty board of the TTC, specific departments of teacher education, regional cooperation partners and the like. The micro-level, finally, comprises all elements, decisions and practices which are in the responsibility of the individual teacher educator. It actually looks at the classroom setting and the interaction of teacher educator and teacher student.

After distinguishing these three levels of the ITE system, we identify the relevant elements and allocate them alongside the levels. A rough classification of Who, What and How helps to order the elements according to their function and meaning. The Who identifies the relevant actors on each level as already described above. The What classifies the most important factors which are necessary for the functioning of ITE, e.g. study programs, teacher qualifications, pre-service training and in-service training. The How identifies the way how the different elements of ITE are being accomplished in terms of structural procedures or pedagogical methods.

Depending on the responsibility for each subject matter, a hierarchical classification into macro, meso and micro is not always easy or clear-cut. An example would be the divided responsibility in designing curricula and defining contents (as it is the case in Austria): Study programs might be within the responsibility of national authorities in terms of designing a

compulsory framework including requirements, objectives and examination targets. At the same time, the study program can be relevant on meso-level when it is up to the ITE providers to operationalize the given framework within a certain degree of freedom. Another example, where levels and responsibilities might be overlapping, are teaching requirements and standards. Not all countries have compulsive teaching standards on national (macro) level. But who, then, is responsible for unified output requirements? Is it the government represented by a ministry or any other agency on federal or regional level? Who formulates the necessary competencies, attitudes, and values for prospective teachers?

Ultimately, mapping – identifying elements of ITE and classifying them according to different levels – is not an easy task. The resulting framework (see Figure 4 as example) provides a broad overview, which needs to stay rather abstract and somewhat imprecise, as in reality, categories and levels often overlap. Nonetheless, applied to each national context, the resulting framework can illustrate valuable insights like

- *the level of centralization or decentralization in the governance of ITE,*
- *relationships of autonomy and control between several levels and actors,*
- *the educational diversity within a country.*

## Comparative Framework of ITE

Levels	Who	What	How
Macro-Level System	Government	Teacher qualification and teaching requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching licenses</li> <li>• Teaching standards</li> <li>• Performance targets</li> </ul>
	Ministries	Educational program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree level and workload</li> <li>• Curricula: basic requirements</li> </ul>
	School boards	Quality Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspection</li> <li>• Requirements of practical training, e.g. in-service training</li> </ul>
	Advisory agencies	Quality assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auditing</li> <li>• Further training and development</li> </ul>
	ITE providers	Study programs of ITE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of curricula</li> <li>• Division of responsibilities</li> </ul>
	Teacher Unions	Salaries and legal matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation in legislative processes</li> </ul>
	Various	National strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action plans, contests, further training</li> </ul>
Meso-Level Organization	Head, Faculty board TTC	Study program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curricula: defining contents</li> <li>• Educational goals, learning outcomes</li> </ul>
	Faculty board TTC	Professionalization of educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Codes of conduct</li> <li>• Further training and development</li> </ul>
	Departments of teacher education	Supervision and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback culture</li> <li>• Quality criteria</li> </ul>
	Schools	Practical training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-service and in-service training</li> </ul>
	Regional partners	Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion, Sponsorship</li> </ul>
Micro-Level Individual	Teacher educators	Teaching practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practical training</li> <li>• Internships</li> <li>• Field experiences</li> </ul>
	Professional communities	Skills and competences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing learning processes</li> <li>• Planning lessons</li> </ul>
	Scientific communities	Subject knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research orientation</li> <li>• Research skills &amp; methods</li> </ul>
	Teacher Candidates, Pupils, Colleagues, Mentors etc.	Feedback and assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer- and self-assessment</li> <li>• Role-taking and role-making</li> </ul>
	Teacher Candidates	Reflexivity in practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperative learning</li> <li>• Learning-portfolio and other instruments</li> </ul>

Figure 4: Comparative Framework of ITE (based on Snoek & Zogla, 2009, p. 13). The Figure presents a general structure, how ITE could be institutionalized and organized across different levels. As this structure varies across countries, the figure at hand exemplifies core elements of the Austrian case.