

ASSEMBLY LINE EDUCATION SCRIPTED CURRICULUM, SILENT TEACHERS, AND THE AUTOMATION OF TEACHING

By Alyssa DeZeeuw
Miami University

WHY AM I HERE? A POSITIONALITY INTRODUCTION

Ten minutes before students were scheduled to arrive, I picked up the testing materials that were needed for the day, including the testing manual, extra pencils, and scrap paper. As I looked at the location and students that I would be working with, my blood began to boil. I knew none of these students, and none of these students knew me. “Familiar tester” was not a formal accommodation written into educational plans; however, it was an unspoken rule the district had tended to follow in previous testing scenarios. I was flustered and frustrated, and then I saw the location, breakout room one, RIC. The RIC stands for Research and Innovation Center, a space designed for students to engage in learning, collaboration, and structured academic work. This specific breakout room had three glass walls and was located at the front of the building, across from the school’s main entrance and office. They chose fishbowl for a testing location, I thought, and was correct. I was floored. The students for whom I was proctoring exams were identified students who had at least one accommodation in common: extended time.

This must be a mistake. How and why would anyone place a group of students who receive services, protected under the FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act), be subjected to forced disclosure and put on display in a highly distracting environment? It was not a mistake, though. It was planned, and for some reason, according to the testing coordinator, “unable to be moved.” Directly across the hall, packages were dropped off, individuals signed in for meetings, district administrators came and went, and students eagerly arrived to start their late arrival day by waiting in the hallways, chatting, scrolling on their phones, and trying to figure out who was in “the tank.”

There was no privacy, no secure testing environment, and no calm teacher. In my three years of working as an Intervention Specialist in this district, I had never felt so defeated. I knew that all of my work to create more inclusive educational spaces and experiences was falling on an audience unwilling to listen. Once students had begun testing, I fired off an email to a professor I had worked with in both my undergraduate and graduate school coursework who had always been a role model of mine and had changed my life and career trajectory. She was an Intervention Specialist before becoming a professor and had taught for a handful of years in public schools before returning to higher education. I took every possible class I could with her. I admired her pedagogy and her approach to challenging the traditional education model for identified students. In my fiery email, I asked if she would be willing to talk with me about her experience leaving the classroom and moving into higher education. It had always been a dream of mine to work with pre-service higher education teachers because I thought that, rather than trying to change the system from within retroactively, why not catch them at the start? I hoped that maybe I could explore how I could reach more teachers and, therefore, more students if I left the K-12 classroom.



Serendipitously, our superintendent arrived at the high school roughly two hours after the testing debacle concluded. He arrived with the district's PR representative and the assistant superintendent with flowers, balloons, and an award: The Impact Award. I had won. I was the first recipient of the award for my work with students—advocating, creating meaningful curricular experiences, and developing accessible opportunities for students to engage with the larger school community that is traditionally segregated from their typical peers. Unbeknownst to me, plans had been underway to acknowledge my work within the school community, even as that same unwilling-to-change faculty and staff were the reason I was looking for an opportunity to leave.

The fiery email sent to my university colleague during testing brought about a phone conversation, a job interview, and a job offer within the next month and a half. And just like that, I left the K-12 sector as an Intervention Specialist and stepped into the world of Higher Education. I view my work and role as a faculty member with the utmost importance. In working with pre-service teachers, I have the opportunity to mentor, guide, and shape future educators in providing high-quality education for K-12 students. I have the ability to empower changemakers at the source and at the inception of their pedagogy. The spaces I currently occupy are those of a former K-12 classroom teacher (specifically an Intervention Specialist), a faculty member at a public Midwestern university, a mom, and a lifelong learner. These titles influence my work, views, and daily interactions with pre-service teachers, colleagues, and administrators, and shape a firm pedagogy: this work matters.

I, too, am a statistic. I left the K-12 sector of public education prior to a decade of service. I left after seven years but not due to burnout, failure, or my students. In my first years in higher education, pre-service teachers would specifically ask me why I left the classroom. They are always surprised to hear my positive demeanor; I did not leave jaded, nor did I leave out of spite. I remain in education to teach future teachers. I found power and privilege in an avenue to support teachers, equip them with the skills to navigate and support K-12 students in diverse working environments, and support their development of a sustainable pedagogy, hopefully decreasing their desire to leave the profession, a work in progress to this day.

The following curricular fragments (Poetter, 2025) are presented as interconnected pieces to illustrate the impacts and consequences of public school districts' implementation of scripted curriculum, which can contribute to high rates of teacher attrition. The selected pieces incorporate aspects of the *currere* method (Pinar, 1994), including regressive, analytical, and progressive fragments that depict the automation of teaching and the intersection of corporate business interests working toward capitalistic control of education as factors contributing to teacher turnover.

CURRICULUM FRAGMENT: STUDENT-TEACHING: CRAFT OR CONTROLLED?

In the fall of 2024, I agreed to supervise three pre-service teachers during their student-teaching experience. All three were Dual Licensure students, pre-service teachers who are working to simultaneously obtain both a Pk-5 general education and a special education license. Two of them were placed together in a co-taught 1st-grade classroom, with one beginning in the role of an Intervention Specialist and the other as the general education teacher. Halfway through the semester, their roles switched to meet the state requirements for a split student-teaching placement, a uniquely beneficial experience for both K-12 students and my pre-service teachers alike. I conducted six observations that semester, three for each teacher. Both teachers planned their first two observations during their reading block in a first-grade classroom. The room had a rocking

chair for story reading and whole group instruction, flexible seating, a wide array of updated classroom technology, and a diverse student population. At first glance, it appeared contemporary and aimed at meeting the needs of all students.

I have a rule that my pre-service teachers submit their lesson plans to me by 7pm the night before the observation so that I can read them, take notes on key points to look for, and afterward, discuss the plans and their implementation, with reflective questions. When I checked my email the night before the first observation, I felt cheated. Not in the sense that I wrote eight-plus-page lesson plans during my student teaching experience and for the EdTPA, but both teachers had submitted the same lesson plan, for different roles, one that they did not create. It was not a case of academic integrity; it was a district-initiated scripted curriculum. A list of to-dos and checking of the boxes, the same routine, day in and day out, no personal touches, no ownership, simply following the plan that they did not create.

During the lessons, I felt a rush back to when I was a student. I was bored—bored watching the lesson, bored sitting for 40 minutes, bored as the same lessons and activities played out over and over across 4 observations, with the additions of a few consonants and vowels. If I struggled to sit through and dreaded the observations (not based on the quality of the teacher candidate, but the less-than-desirable activities where my pre-service teachers went through the motions) how did the students feel? My preservice teachers asked the questions, provided the prompts, and did not deviate. It was not carefully crafted and designed; it was pre-planned, articulated, and laid out for them. Wash, rinse, and repeat. Read, follow, and do. Students will figure it out along the way, or they will fail without the tools and without deviation from the prescribed curriculum.

The lack of creativity and the running through the motions make schools feel dull, leaving students defeated and deflated. Running through the motions and checking off the boxes on the list are not the phrases that should come to mind when thinking about instruction and education. After the lesson, pre-service teachers and their host teachers complete the CCAST (Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching) rubric. Each participant noted areas in which they felt insufficient in providing a score because the pre-service teachers were provided with materials, scripts, structure, organization, and objectives to strictly follow. None of the preparation was completed by the pre-service teachers, their host teachers, or grade-level teams. How can I rate a student on simply following the instructions they have been given? Their scores were not representative of their instruction but of following an organized sequence of events carefully crafted to target instructional sequences, buzzwords, and processes. Instruction did not incorporate Specially Designed Instruction, as outlined in students' IEPs, nor did it capitalize on the unique opportunity to utilize two eager and creative pre-service teachers to support the needs of all students. There was no co-teaching plan, merely a pre-planned, out-of-the-can, whole-class script. Monkey see, monkey do.

AUTOMATION OF EDUCATION

Teacher thinking encompasses the active cognitive processes that support teaching, particularly reflection and metacognition. Through these processes, teachers continually interpret classroom behaviors to gauge student understanding and adapt their instructional practices (Griffith, 2008; Vaughn et al., 2021). School districts are increasingly utilizing prescribed and scripted curricula in their classrooms; often, programs are implemented verbatim, reducing the cognitive tasks and the demand for professional expertise of classroom teachers. The use of

scripted programs can erode decision-making authority, professional competence, effectiveness, and confidence, contributing to the deskilling of teachers (Powell et al., 2017) and, in doing so, reducing the skill set needed to provide instruction.

Scripted programs position teaching as a process that requires little subject knowledge or pedagogical judgment, effectively automating instructional practices. When implemented with strict fidelity, such programs prioritize compliance over professional judgment, creating conditions in which thoughtful, creative, and experienced teaching is devalued, and the role of the teacher is reduced to delivering predetermined content (Powell et al., 2017), thus, resembling a system of mass production.

Following a prescribed lesson or set of lessons does not take professional expertise, subject knowledge, or pedagogy. Scripted curriculum is increasingly automating teaching by having teachers follow step-by-step directions mechanically, mirroring the logic of assembly-line work and diminishing the creativity and intellectual engagement that once characterized curriculum design and robust teaching. When teachers can be easily replaced by another person performing the same scripted tasks, they are no longer positioned as professionals capable of critical thought but rather as interchangeable parts within a larger instructional machine, carrying out isolated steps in the delivery of instruction (Fitz & Nikolaidis, 2020; Powell et al., 2017).

CURRICULUM FRAGMENT: CAPITALISM, CONSONANTS, AND CONTROL

Institutions of higher education are also not without blame in perpetuating poor educational practices. As institutions begin to face, and crumble under, external financial and political pressures, education is affected. In the name of cross-curricular work, business models, strategies, and mindsets can span colleges and seep into studies, with students unaware of the consequences of these covert messages. Specifically, when the business and education worlds intersect, young teachers are caught in the crossfire, unsure where to turn: profit or progress.

At my university, the newly renovated and highly regarded College of Business has developed a video series for students in the College of Education. The business school is world-renowned and highly competitive, so who would not want to partner with them, especially for the sake of interdisciplinary learning? The video series positions students from each of the Colleges as similarly minded individuals seeking to meet a need. The video compares the qualities of entrepreneurs and educators, noting that both are creative thinkers and problem solvers. However, the true message of the series quickly emerges: If or when a career in education fails, you can use your experience to create a business, a product, or curricular materials to profit from. The two subsequent videos highlight examples of two former public school teachers who have created curricular businesses, marketing educational products to classroom teachers. Although not intrinsically wrong—at least in terms of the notion that teachers should be incorporated into policy, curricular, and decision-making arenas—the video series’s messaging implies that education students are not pursuing a successful and substantial career as they begin their educational journey. It offers a backup option, a way out, and the prospect of failure before their careers have even begun, with an option to monetize said failure.

The continued push toward for-profit curricular materials, which frames education as a business, detracts from prioritizing equitable, meaningful, and accessible instruction for all students at the forefront of an educator’s work. This framing of cross-collegiate work is one-sided and runs counter to the message that the many programs in the College of Education strive to

embody. If the videos were meant for cross-curricular and interdisciplinary work and collaboration, where is the series for business students? The series drives students down a one-way street, merely providing examples of top-down, bureaucratically-led learning opportunities guided by the principles that “business is best” and that competition leads to innovation and improvement. The video provides a stark reminder of the capitalistic and neo-liberal ideologies that are entrenched in our society, even in the very place in which democracy should provide opportunities for all children.

Social justice, equity, and inclusion are foundational pillars of many teacher preparation programs. In contrast, the increasing authority of entrepreneurs and influencers, substantiated by a degree and title, in educational decision-making often amplifies the voices of those with limited classroom experience. The authority reinforces a consumer-oriented view of schooling, in which marketable solutions are prioritized over experienced teachers, creating conditions in which profit-driven interests can undermine efforts to advance equitable and inclusive outcomes for students. Moreover, former educators are profiting from the system they originally aimed to serve. Teachers and for-profit educational companies are continuing the cycle of prioritizing capitalistic interests over the quality and intended purpose of education. These influencers, small businesses, and large corporations reinforce the idea that schools are consumers and, rather than utilizing and positioning experience, expertise, and education to guide policy and practice, ultimately harm students in the name of profit.

CORPORATIONS AND CURRICULUM

Entrepreneurs, predominantly young, white, contemporary, business-minded individuals, began pushing market-based educational reforms in the late 20th century, focusing on accountability, choice, and competition (Golann, 2021). Using accountability through high-stakes standardized testing, politicians are purporting that the results of these assessments demonstrate a need for change, specifically following a business-like model that replaces educational institutions with corporations (Pinar, 2019). Berlinger and Glass (2014) reported that Robert Murdoch named public education as the next billion-dollar sector, eagerly anticipating transformation. Naming the public education sector as ripe for the picking insinuates failure. It justifies the false narrative that it needs saving (Berliner & Glass, 2014) while also shifting the focus of education and learning to the development of students’ future employment (Pinar, 2019).

Even with the documented social and environmental consequences of profit-maximizing practices, political leaders consistently present business as a model for educational reform (Pinar, 2019). The push for innovation under the guise of entrepreneurship strips practicing teachers of professional authority and expertise by framing their work as failing to meet expectations, thereby, re-establishing the corporation as the professional authority (Pinar, 2019; Powell et al., 2017). Politicians, economically motivated, claim that teachers are “unable” to meet the demands of current educational practices, thus reform can be mitigated and, through the market, increase revenue, benefiting the economy while stripping teachers of their professional autonomy (Powell et al., 2017). The problematic nature lies in the misguided faith in corporations; according to Powell et al. (2017), “Even more problematic, trusting the corporation to solve what are in reality complex socioeconomic problems can result in the colonization of teachers and an erosion of their professional autonomy” (p. 114). When teachers lose their status as professionals, they are replaced by for-profit goods, and students lose meaningful access to educational experiences



crafted with classroom expertise. In providing an “opportunity” for preservice teachers, an out, or off-ramp, is also being created. Teacher candidates are increasingly aware of high levels of teacher attrition. Setting low expectations and dangling the dollar signs in front of eager and impressionable young adults hoping to enter the field with the idea of a quick, easy, and profitable exit for when their career eventually fizzles out—that is by using the degree to profit off the system you once intended to immerse yourself in—does not sit right with me.

CURRICULUM FRAGMENT: THE CROSSROADS FOR PRESERVICE TEACHERS

In working with pre-service teachers, serving as a student teaching supervisor, teaching methods courses, and observing classrooms during early field observations, I have found that they do not see theory in practice; they see scripts in practice. Pre-service teachers see direct contradictions to what they are learning in the college classroom. In what may be intended as exemplars and high-quality practices in play, they see district adaptations of the new and next curricula package to boost test scores and the state report card.

In a class of sophomores and juniors, situated in a semester of methods courses for early elementary pre-service teachers, I was covering instructional adaptations for students and discussing academic freedom and autonomy as a classroom teacher. Abruptly, one of these pre-service teachers spoke up and confidently stated, “We do not have academic freedom as teachers.” It stopped me in my tracks. When asked to comment further, she stated that, in each field experience she engaged in that semester, all lessons in her third-grade classroom followed scripted curricula, and that the teachers were expected to implement them with absolute fidelity. Others in the class shared similar sentiments about their experiences in the field, specifically their inability to practice and teach intentionally prepared lessons due to the tight, prescribed nature of their host classrooms. After lengthy discussions about their experiences and frustrations in the local school districts, they began to identify environmental factors they could control in their future classrooms. Flexible seating, accessible materials such as text-to-speech assistive technology, brain breaks, and showcasing student work were just a few, but the haunting comment still lingered. As we were packing up at the end of class, I overheard one pre-service teacher say to another, “If this is the norm, when and how will I practice?”

MODELING? I DO, WE DO, YOU DON’T

Pre-service teachers are entering a system in which they are not required to use the skill sets that they are carefully crafting in university settings. Teacher candidates are being exposed to examples of curriculum that teachers are not creating and that often are predesigned to optimize a one-size-fits-all population, asking students to disregard the practices and theories applied in their educator preparation programs (Holt, 2022; Vaughn et al., 2021). As scripted curricula continue to be implemented in K-12 classrooms, preservice teachers will have fewer models and examples of high-quality instructional methods and practices to observe. Not only does the prescribed curriculum affect current K-12 students, but preservice students are also, in turn, becoming products of those curricular decisions. Rather than developing creative, hands-on, and engaging lessons, their field experiences are reduced to observational work due to high demands, structure, and adherence to prepackaged instruction, and teacher candidates become passive in their learning



(Poplin, 1988). Teachers who are not actively developing and practicing their repertoire of instructional techniques will under-develop their professional expertise. Given the lack of high-quality instructional models for students to observe and for preparing students to implement the prescribed curriculum with fidelity, teacher preparation programs are further contributing to a future need for educational reform (Gallagher, 2005).

If the current cycle continues, early and preservice teachers will have engaged only within the system in a tightly controlled, top-down approach that provides a narrow, limited view of educational practices. The longer and further down the explicit and scripted instructional road education travels, the greater the need for current and veteran teachers alike to reorient their future instructional practices to meet student need (Vaughn et al., 2020). The negative implications of a scripted curriculum will affect future generations, as teachers continue to lose autonomy and become mere byproducts of the system.

WE DON'T NEED NO EDUCATION: A GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE

As the bell rings to begin the day, students walk single file into the classroom. They have no backpacks—per school safety policy—only laptops and blank faces. Thirty desks are arranged in rows, all facing the same direction, for whole group instruction with a single digital whiteboard. Students are dressed in uniforms: navy bottoms, plain white or gray button-up tops, white socks, and tennis shoes. No jewelry, hair beads, or accessories are allowed.

As my student teacher nervously turns on the board, I can't help but notice the lack of decorations in the room. Bright fluorescent lights flicker overhead, a small city school district mascot in the corner that has been stitched and patched, and an old Chromebook charging station plastered with faded school logos create the "classroom environment." The space lacks books, color, representations of student artwork, and a sense of community; vague inspirational posters cover all but one plain brick in the wall.

Students take their seats; the principal's live message appears on the board; the camera is on to capture the recitation of the school mission statement and ensure compliance. Students and staff comply; the class receives the daily check; students sit back down and power on their computers. The camera remains on during instructional activities in the classroom. Powered by a prominent large tech company, analysts observe, critique, and document adherence to curricular materials. Reports are shared with district administrators and hold significant value in teacher evaluations. Teachers proctor materials through online learning platforms in unison, aligned with literacy and math standards. Employability skills are also included in the platform. Yearly math and reading scores group students into school and career tracks. Students receiving scores in the 75th-100th percentile engage in STEM and medical, policy, and legal training; those in the 50th-75th percentile are grouped into clerical, business administrative, teaching, and managerial roles; and those in the 25th-50th percentile engage in trade-based activities. Students who score at or below the 25th percentile twice in an academic year are moved out of the local educational agency and placed in a working educational placement. The working placement focuses on factory and assembly-line positions, beginning with on-the-job training and pre-employment skills in middle school.

Students are highly encouraged to progress through the curriculum at a significant pace. As grades are constructed, the amount of material covered is factored into the score, referred to as a productivity score. Work completion is valued equally with accuracy in task completion as

students work through modules. Once a month, a science and social studies lesson is incorporated into the platform. Daily curriculum, lessons, and instructional explanations must be followed. Students are provided with one lunch break, three bathroom breaks, and one computer-charging break during which they read a pre-selected text, aligned with literacy and math standards. For any movement outside the classroom, students must walk in a single-file line, boys on the left and girls on the right. Artificial Intelligence is used to track, sort, and construct student work and responses to daily tasks and assessments. Classroom teachers are allowed to submit professional feedback for consideration, but it is rarely accepted and implemented.

The district's mission statement reads, "Our commitment is to provide an engaging learning environment that empowers all students to develop the knowledge, skills, and character needed to succeed in the world." The mission's hidden message is rooted in preparing the masses for low-autonomy, procedure-based work. Robotic, pre-constructed, and factory-like instruction turning out workers and unengaged citizens is of utmost importance.

The mission statement concludes, and students take their seats. My student teacher reviews the day's schedule, including work times, bathroom and lunch breaks, and student productivity goals. Before students embark on their first literacy task of the day, they follow along with a whole-class read-aloud of the student news program. Upon completion of the whole class reading, students submit responses to fill-in-the-blank, multiple-choice, and open-ended opinion questions to track the development of national pride and patriotism.

Based on the Department of Labor's student teaching requirements, my student teacher earns passing scores on her lesson. She complied, followed prescribed routines, and implemented the curriculum crafted by the curriculum company (CC). She fell in line, had no thought control, and earned a clear mark from CC for her implementation of the curriculum that day. I submit my rubric score to the university, CC, and the Department of Labor, even though it counts for only 10% of the final assessment.

I'm increasingly feeling defeated. Is my work not strong enough? Can I prepare novice teachers to engage and be fierce advocates for change against a system built to suppress the democratic purpose of education and schools? Is education powerful enough to challenge the patriarchy on its own? Teachers are only one piece of the puzzle. Does our inclusive education reach need to be further? Yes. The north star does not end in the classroom; it includes collaborative policy, legal, and advocacy work. The success of public schools and the development of engaged, independent, and thoughtful citizens rely on the intended democratic values of education. Rather than forming mass-produced, working-class citizens who lack critical thought, professionals collaborate across domains to identify and produce democratically minded candidates.

CONTROL AND TEACHER ATTRITION

Pinar (2019) defines the purpose of education as far more than academic achievement or workforce preparation, arguing that:

The point of the curriculum and pedagogy is to become a person, a citizen, a human subject engaged ethically with intelligence and erudition in the problems and pleasures of his or her life, problems and pleasures inevitably intertwined with the problems and pleasures of everyone else. (p. 125)

In contrast, given the impacts of corporate involvement in education, Noguera (2003) argues that education is no longer the goal; rather, custody, control, and compliance take priority.

Strict adherence to subject matter serves as a means of limiting students' intellectual freedom, thereby, capping their ability to develop into citizens capable of critical thinking and critique (Fitz & Nikolaidis, 2020).

Furthermore, scripted curriculum removes individuality in teaching, provides avenues for increased efficiency in surveillance to ensure adherence to implementation, reduces the need for decision making, and can provide cost-saving measures in professional development (Au, 2011; Fitz & Nikolaidis, 2020). When schools are centered around evaluative and curricular staff deemed experts, teachers are relieved of their cognitive responsibilities, and teaching is reduced to the implementation of materials (Giroux, 1988). Highly scripted instructional programs can have significant psychological effects on teachers, sometimes becoming the deciding factor in whether they choose to remain in a profession that undermines their expertise and professional knowledge, leaving them frustrated and humiliated by corporate-driven control (Powell et al., 2017).

Teachers are at a crossroads in their implementation of scripted curriculum; they can acquiesce, contest, or resist. Forms of resistance to the control include refusal to implement the curriculum; however, the more common form of active resistance is leaving the school, district, or field altogether (Griffith, 2008; Powell et al., 2017). The Landscape Analysis of the Teaching Profession conducted by Grossman et al. (2025) identified patterns in teacher attrition and retention rates, including teaching as a local profession, working conditions, pathways to teaching positions, and social and political factors, such as scrutiny and fear-mongering. The landscape analysis provides an overview of the current state of the teaching profession in the United States by integrating research, policy reviews, and stakeholder insights. It identifies major challenges and outlines promising opportunities for strengthening the profession through targeted investments and reforms. Ingersoll (2003) reported high levels of attrition; specifically, half of teachers across the nation left within the first five years of their careers. Additionally, Grossman et al. (2025) reported that for the 2017-2018 school year, the majority of K-12 teachers had one year of experience. As teachers lose respect, their autonomy, and ability to make decisions based on their professional expertise, they are leaving the field, leaving those without the qualifications and experience with the great responsibility of shaping the next generation. This is the playbook designed to move teaching away from a highly regarded and valuable profession toward automation, efficiency, profit, and corporate control.

SO WHAT?

Change is not inherently bad; however, it is something we see frequently in the education field. Unfortunately, in many ways, we also see a lack of change, and I cannot help but feel angry and resentful of the system at large. With decades of research, why, as professionals and experts in our fields, are we subject to the policy and outside workings of the capitalist companies that view education as a money-making scheme rather than a public good? I am disgusted and disappointed that the field of education continues to engage for-profit curriculum companies rather than educational professionals. Rather than working alongside career educators, decision makers prioritize profit over problem-solving and packaged programs over professional practice.

I question whether my one-year-old son's educational experience will be similar to what I currently see in practice. However, I have faith and believe in the power of the public school

district. Even in the current state of political animosity, I believe there are change-makers in my classes, in the field, and in society at large. A highly structured curriculum is a part of the problem, but it does not operate in isolation. It is a product of the problem. Addressing the needs and flaws of the current educational system is multifaceted; in working with pre-service teachers, there is both the power and a strong need to preserve the art and craft of teaching. Educator preparation programs need to continue striving to provide opportunities, models, and examples of quality instructional practices to equip these new teachers for the current and future educational landscapes they may encounter and actively need to change. The system needs educators who see value, purpose, and meaning in their work. Education cannot be reduced to compliance and efficiency; it depends on teachers who are empowered to think critically, teach creatively, and cultivate humanity within their classrooms.

REFERENCES

- Au, W. (2011). Teaching under the new Taylorism: High-stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.521261>
- Berliner, D. C., & Glass, G. V. (2014). *50 myths and lies that threaten America's public schools: The real crisis in education*. Teachers College Press.
- Fitz, J. A., & Nikolaidis, A. C. (2020). A democratic critique of scripted curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 52(2), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1661524>
- Gallagher, D. J. (2005). Searching for something outside of ourselves: The contradiction between technical rationality and the achievement of inclusive pedagogy. In S. L. Gabel (Ed.), *Disability studies in education: readings in theory and method* (pp. 139–154). Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Bergin & Garvey.
- Golann, J. W. (2021). *Scripting the moves: Culture and control in a "no-excuses" charter school*. Princeton University Press.
- Griffith, R. (2008). The impact of a scripted reading program on teachers' professional spirits. *Teaching & Learning*, 22(3), 121–133. <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA186901614&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=08879486&sw=w&p=AONE&userGroupName=anon%7E4770e17e&aty=open-web-entry>
- Grossman, P., Kaul, M., & Schneider, S. (2025). *Landscape analysis of the teaching profession* [Working paper]. University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/ai26-1399_v2.pdf
- Holt, L. (2022). Educational policies requiring scripted reading curriculums limit early childhood pre-service teacher candidates. *Policy Futures in Education*, 20(6), 696–701. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211040315>
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. <https://repository.upenn.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/52d18af6-c6ef-493d-ab95-71194bc0340b/content>
- Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(4), 341–350. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4204_12

- Pinar, W. (1994). *Autobiography, politics, and sexuality: Essays in curriculum theory, 1972-1992*. Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2019). *What is curriculum theory?* (3rd edition). Routledge.
- Poetter, T. (2025). *Curriculum fragments: A currere journey through life processes*. Routledge.
- Poplin, M. S. (1988). The reductionistic fallacy in learning disabilities: Replicating the past by reducing the present. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 21(7), 389–400.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002221948802100702>
- Powell, R., Cantrell, S. C., & Correll, P. (2017). Power and agency in a high poverty elementary school: How teachers experienced a scripted reading program. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 13(1), 93–124. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1141492.pdf>
- Vaughn, M., Parsons, S. A., & Massey, D. (2020). Aligning the science of reading with adaptive teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(1), 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.351>
- Vaughn, M., Parsons, S. A., & Gallagher, M. A. (2021). Challenging scripted curricula with adaptive teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 51(3), 186–96.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211065752>