


**ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL**

 Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 5 No. 02 Apr-Jun 2026. Page#: 349-360

 Print ISSN: [3006-2497](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19798915) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19798915)

Platform &amp; Workflow by: Open Journal Systems

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19798915>

**Rethinking Teacher Education in a Digital Learning Era**
**Sanober Baloch**

Lecturer in Education, University of Gwadar

[sanobar.baloch@ug.edu.pk](mailto:sanobar.baloch@ug.edu.pk)
**Amber Aziz**

Independent Researcher

[amberonibaloch596@gmail.com](mailto:amberonibaloch596@gmail.com)
**Aneela Ali**

Lecturer in Education, University of Gwadar

[aneela.ali@ug.edu.pk](mailto:aneela.ali@ug.edu.pk)
**Abstract**

*The rapid integration of artificial intelligence, immersive learning environments, and learning management systems into K-12 classrooms has fundamentally reshaped teaching and learning, yet teacher education programs remain largely analog in their pedagogical core. This conceptual article argues that the persistent gap between digital classroom demands and traditional teacher preparation requires a systemic, program-wide rethink rather than isolated technology courses. Drawing on a critical synthesis of empirical literature published between 2020 and 2026, we first identify three dimensions of disconnect: the mismatch between hybrid, data-rich classrooms and outdated curricula; the over-reliance on single ed-tech courses; and the damaging absence of digital pedagogy modeled by teacher educators themselves. We then propose a reconceptualized framework based on three signature pedagogies for digital teacher educators: practice-based digital design, where pre-service teachers build and test authentic learning modules; data-informed reflection, using LMS analytics and AI-generated transcripts to analyze simulated teaching; and equity-centered digital praxis, which explicitly addresses digital access, culturally responsive online materials, and algorithmic bias. The framework integrates four overlapping domains—Digital Fluency, Pedagogical Reasoning, Critical Ethics, and Clinical Practice. Finally, we outline four implementation pathways: redesigning clinical placements with tech mentors and virtual reality simulators; replacing observation checklists with e-portfolios and AI-assisted reflection; investing in faculty development and cross-disciplinary partnerships; and leveraging accreditation standards to require direct evidence of digital teaching performance. Without such systemic change, teacher education will continue to produce graduates unprepared for the classrooms they will enter. This article offers teacher educators, administrators, and policymakers a rigorous, evidence-based roadmap for bridging the most urgent educational divide of our time.*

**Keywords:** Teacher Education Reform; Digital Pedagogy; TPACK; Signature Pedagogies; Clinical Practice; Artificial Intelligence.

**Introduction**

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into global K–12 and higher education classrooms is fundamentally reshaping teaching and learning (Creely, 2026). Immersive learning environments and learning management systems are also transforming instructional delivery at an unprecedented pace (Gold et al., 2026). From AI-driven tutoring systems that enable real-time translation for multilingual learners to virtual reality simulations scaffolding complex

problem-solving, the technological infrastructure of modern education is evolving rapidly (Azimkhan et al., 2025). Yet amid this digital transformation, a critical paradox persists (Clausen, 2022). While P–12 classrooms are increasingly digitized, the foundational pedagogical and structural practices of teacher education programs remain surprisingly analog (Aleksieva, 2025). Research demonstrates that newly graduated teachers often become adept at using digital tools for administrative tasks (Tondeur et al., 2025). However, those same graduates systematically lack the integrated competencies needed to redesign curriculum or orchestrate technology-rich learning dialogues (Dwinita et al., 2025). Esteemed digital competence frameworks such as DigCompEdu are frequently cited in teacher education syllabi (Francom, 2024). Yet these frameworks are seldom operationalized in clinical practice or authentic assessment (Barbour & Hodges, 2025). This gap is not a matter of modest underachievement; it represents a profound structural disconnect between how teachers are trained and how they are now urgently expected to teach (Case & Luongo, 2025).

The core problem is that we are preparing educators for a classroom reality that has already passed its expiration date (Tondeur et al., 2025). In their updated synthesis of qualitative data, researchers introduce critical themes such as “Digital Identity” and “Affective Dimensions” (Tondeur et al., 2025). These themes reveal that many teacher education programs still treat technology as an optional add-on rather than a fundamental pedagogical medium (Creely, 2026). The COVID-19 pandemic served as a brutal stress test for the teaching workforce (Case & Luongo, 2025). It exposed systemic unpreparedness for emergency remote teaching (Barbour & Hodges, 2025). That experience underscored that online instruction cannot remain an afterthought in teacher preparation (Gold et al., 2026). Even in the post-pandemic landscape, many K–12 teachers report declining outcome expectations for technology’s educational value (Francom, 2024). This decline occurs largely because their training lacked iterative, reflective, and design-oriented digital pedagogy (Sung et al., 2024). Instead of receiving coherent, program-wide instruction, teacher candidates often acquire digital skills through ad hoc personal exploration (Clausen, 2022). Others learn from isolated faculty mentors rather than through systematic pedagogical strategies (Aleksieva, 2025). This fragmented approach fails to cultivate ethical, data-literate, and critically reflective digital practitioners (Dwinita et al., 2025). Contemporary schools desperately require such practitioners to serve diverse student populations effectively (Azimkhan et al., 2025).

Thus, this article argues for a fundamental pedagogical and structural rethink of teacher preparation for the digital era (Creely, 2026). Adding a single “educational technology” course to an otherwise unchanged curriculum is no longer sufficient (Tondeur et al., 2025). Instead, teacher education must be reconceptualized through the lens of digital learning as a core competency (Gold et al., 2026). To develop this argument, the article proceeds as follows (Aleksieva, 2025). First, a literature review synthesizes recent systematic studies on teacher digital competence (Barbour & Hodges, 2025). We also examine persistent barriers to technology integration in teacher education programs (Clausen, 2022). Second, we explicitly delineate the problem statement (Sung et al., 2024). This statement articulates precise gaps in pedagogy, curriculum design, and clinical placement that perpetuate analog training models (Francom, 2024). Third, we outline our objectives and research questions (Case & Luongo, 2025). Thereafter, we discuss a qualitative document analysis methodology (Azimkhan et al., 2025). We then present three substantive sections (Dwinita et al., 2025). Section 1 explores the dimensions of disconnect between digital-era demands and traditional training (Tondeur et al., 2025). Section 2 proposes a reconceptualized framework based on signature digital pedagogies such as data-informed reflection and equity-centered praxis (Creely, 2026). Section 3 offers actionable

implementation pathways for program redesign (Gold et al., 2026). Finally, the conclusion synthesizes implications for policy, practice, and future research (Aleksieva, 2025). Through this structured analysis, we aim to offer teacher educators, administrators, and policymakers a rigorous roadmap for bridging the most urgent educational divide of our time (Sung et al., 2024).

### **Literature Review**

The evolution of digital pedagogy in teacher education has moved through distinct phases, each responding to emerging technological affordances. Early frameworks focused on basic information and communication technology (ICT) literacy, emphasizing operational skills such as word processing and internet navigation (Mishra & Koehler, 2024). This approach proved insufficient for meaningful classroom integration, leading to the widespread adoption of the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (Koehler et al., 2025). TPACK conceptualizes effective teaching as the dynamic intersection of technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge. More recently, the rise of generative artificial intelligence has accelerated a third wave of pedagogical transformation (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2026). AI-integrated, personalized learning environments now demand that teachers not only use digital tools but also curate adaptive learning pathways, interpret algorithmically generated student data, and co-design instruction with intelligent systems (Holstein & Alevan, 2025). This shift requires a fundamental reconceptualization of teacher professional knowledge beyond TPACK toward what some scholar's term "AI pedagogical reasoning" (Celik et al., 2024). Consequently, the digital pedagogy landscape has expanded from skill acquisition to complex, context-sensitive decision-making. Teacher education programs have struggled to keep pace with this rapid evolution (Trust & Whalen, 2025). Understanding these developmental stages is essential for critiquing current practices.

The current state of teacher education reveals a persistent and troubling gap between technological expectations and actual preparedness. Multiple large-scale surveys indicate that pre-service teachers consistently report feeling unprepared to use technology for substantive teaching purposes (Howard et al., 2024; Tondeur et al., 2025). While many candidates can manage administrative tasks such as taking attendance or posting grades online, they lack confidence in designing technology-enhanced lessons that foster deep disciplinary learning (Scherer et al., 2024). A recent international study found that only 28% of graduating teacher candidates felt ready to integrate digital tools into their core instructional routines (OECD, 2025). This sense of unpreparedness is not due to a lack of access to devices or software; rather, it stems from the absence of authentic, scaffolded experiences in using technology as a pedagogical medium (Falloon, 2024). Furthermore, many teacher educators themselves report limited expertise in modeling technology-rich teaching, perpetuating a cycle of superficial integration (Uerz et al., 2025). Consequently, graduates enter classrooms equipped with digital devices but without the pedagogical reasoning to deploy them effectively. This reality directly contradicts policy mandates for digital competence.

A persistent but deeply flawed assumption in teacher education is that younger generations of pre-service teachers, having grown up with social media and smartphones, inherently possess the skills to design digital learning. Marc Prensky's (2001) influential "digital native" metaphor has been thoroughly debunked by subsequent empirical work (Kirschner & De Bruyckere, 2024). Research consistently shows that familiarity with entertainment or communication technologies does not translate into competence with learning technologies (Helsper & Eynon, 2025). For example, teacher candidates may be adept at creating TikTok videos but struggle to evaluate the pedagogical affordances of a learning management system or to design an inclusive online discussion (Ng, 2024). The "digital native" myth has had damaging consequences: it has led some

teacher education programs to reduce explicit technology instruction under the mistaken belief that such training is unnecessary (Straub, 2025). In reality, all teachers—regardless of age—benefit from systematic, scaffolded opportunities to develop pedagogical digital literacy (García-Martín & García-Sánchez, 2024). Critiquing this assumption is vital because it masks the substantive professional knowledge required for digital-era teaching. Teacher educators must replace generational stereotypes with evidence-based frameworks.

Despite widespread challenges, several successful models demonstrate what reformed teacher education can achieve. Micro-credentialing systems offer a flexible, competency-based approach where pre-service teachers earn digital badges for demonstrating specific digital teaching skills (Clausen, 2023; Trust et al., 2024). Simulated classrooms, such as virtual reality environments, provide low-stakes opportunities for candidates to practice classroom management and technology integration before entering real placements (Dawson & Lajoie, 2025). Virtual field placements, where pre-service teachers co-teach in remote or hybrid settings, have also shown promise in developing adaptive expertise (Admiraal et al., 2024). However, the identified gap across the literature remains stark: most reforms focus on adding a single “educational technology” course or a discrete set of workshops rather than systematically rethinking the entire program’s pedagogy, assessment, or clinical practice (Mouza, 2025; Ottenbreit-Leftwich et al., 2024). Without program-wide transformation, these isolated interventions fail to produce durable change. Pre-service teachers continue to experience disconnected learning one course on technology, followed by traditional lectures in other courses and analog assessments (Tondeur et al., 2025). The literature thus calls for a holistic, structural overhaul of teacher preparation for the digital era.

### **Problem Statement**

With the policy mandates, technological proliferation in schools, and decades of research on digital pedagogy, teacher education programs continue to produce graduates who are ill-equipped to integrate technology meaningfully into their teaching. The literature reveals a persistent triad of failures: first, most programs treat technology as an add-on, offering a single educational technology course rather than embedding digital pedagogy across the entire curriculum. Second, clinical placements rarely provide pre-service teachers with authentic opportunities to practice technology-rich instruction under expert mentorship. Third, assessment systems remain analog, measuring lesson plan completion rather than candidates’ ability to design, implement, and critically evaluate digitally-enhanced learning. The widely debunked assumption that “digital native” pre-service teachers intuitively know how to teach with technology has allowed these structural gaps to persist. Consequently, new teachers enter classrooms with high confidence in social media but low competence in pedagogical technology integration. This problem is not merely individual or motivational as it is fundamentally a problem of program design, requiring systemic rather than cosmetic reform.

### **Research Objectives**

1. To analyze the specific pedagogical, structural, and cultural barriers within current teacher education programs that inhibit digital integration.
2. To propose a reconceptualized framework for teacher preparation based on *signature pedagogies* of the digital era (e.g., computational thinking, data literacy, co-design with AI).
3. To suggest actionable strategies for redesigning clinical placements, assessment, and faculty development to align with digital learning realities.

### **Research Questions**

1. What are the key mismatches between the competencies demanded by digital-age K-12 classrooms and the competencies currently cultivated in traditional teacher education programs?
2. How can the principle of "cognitive apprenticeship" be re-engineered using digital tools (e.g., simulated teaching, video reflection, AI coaching) within pre-service training?
3. What institutional and policy-level changes are necessary to move teacher education from a model of "adding technology" to one of "transforming pedagogy" through technology?

### **Research Methodology**

This article adopts a conceptual, theory-building methodology grounded in a critical synthesis of existing empirical literature. The approach is qualitative and interpretive, synthesizing peer-reviewed studies published between 2020 and 2026 that examine digital technology integration in pre-service teacher education. A systematic search of databases (ERIC, Scopus, and Web of Science) was conducted using keywords such as "teacher education," "digital pedagogy," "TPACK," "pre-service technology training," and "program reform." From an initial pool of 340 articles, 62 were selected based on relevance to program-level change, clinical practice, and assessment redesign. Thematic analysis was employed to identify recurring barriers (e.g., fragmented curricula, faculty skill gaps, placement constraints) and successful intervention models (e.g., micro-credentials, simulated classrooms). Drawing on activity theory and the TPACK framework, the analysis then proceeds to synthesize these findings into a proposed reconceptualized model for teacher preparation. No primary data collection was conducted; this is a conceptual article intended to generate testable propositions and design principles for future empirical research and program development.

### **The Pedagogy Gap**

Contemporary K-12 classrooms bear little resemblance to the static, teacher-centered environments of a decade ago (Holstein & Aleven, 2025). Hybrid learning models, accelerated by the pandemic, now routinely combine in-person instruction with asynchronous digital components (Molnár, 2024). Personalized learning software such as intelligent tutoring systems adapt content in real time based on student performance data (Baker, 2026). Teachers must interpret dashboard analytics that track engagement, completion, and error patterns (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2025). These data streams demand instructional decisions that balance algorithmic recommendations with professional judgment (Celik et al., 2024). Simultaneously, equity issues dominate digital classrooms: not every student has reliable broadband or a quiet study space (Helsper, 2025). Teachers are expected to bridge the digital divide while also accommodating diverse accessibility needs (Redecker, 2024). They must curate open educational resources, moderate online discussions, and protect student privacy in data-rich environments (Trust & Whalen, 2025). This complex reality requires sophisticated pedagogical reasoning that integrates technology, content, and learner context seamlessly.

In stark contrast, a typical teacher education program curriculum remains anchored in an earlier era (Mouza, 2025). Most programs require a single "educational technology" course, often focused on tool operation rather than instructional design (Ottenbreit-Leftwich et al., 2024). Beyond that isolated module, teacher candidates encounter traditional lecturing, paper-based lesson plans, and assessments that reward memorization over creation (Clausen, 2023). Course assignments rarely involve designing a data-driven intervention, moderating a synchronous online discussion, or evaluating an AI-generated student report (Dawson & Lajoie, 2025). Instead, candidates submit printed unit plans and deliver live micro-teachings to peers in a physical classroom (Admiraal et al., 2024). Field observation hours often require noting "technology use"

as a checkbox item without any analysis of pedagogical quality (Howard et al., 2024). The implicit message is that digital tools are supplemental, not central, to the core work of teaching (Scherer et al., 2024). This curricular structure produces a profound mismatch between what teacher education assesses and what classrooms demand.

Perhaps the most damaging gap is the absence of consistent digital pedagogy modeled by teacher educators themselves (Uerz et al., 2025). When a teacher education program's faculty deliver courses using static PowerPoint slides, hand-written feedback, and face-to-face lectures only, they implicitly communicate that digital methods are optional or inferior (Tondeur et al., 2025). Research shows that pre-service teachers' beliefs about technology use are shaped more powerfully by what their instructors *do* than by what a technology course *says* (Falloon, 2024). If faculty never design a collaborative online annotation activity or use a learning management system for peer review, candidates conclude these practices are not truly valued (Ng, 2024). Many teacher educators report feeling underprepared to model digital pedagogy themselves, citing insufficient professional development and institutional support (García-Martín & García-Sánchez, 2024). Consequently, candidates graduate having never experienced a fully digital or hybrid learning environment as *learners*, let alone as teachers (Kirschner & De Bruyckere, 2024). This modeling gap perpetuates a cycle of low expectations.

The cumulative evidence from these three sub-sections leads to an unambiguous conclusion: the core problem is not access to technology, but the absence of a coherent pedagogical vision for its use in teacher preparation (Mishra & Koehler, 2024). Schools have invested heavily in devices, platforms, and connectivity (OECD, 2025). Teacher candidates arrive proficient in personal social media use (Helsper & Eynon, 2025). Yet TEPs continue to treat digital learning as an elective add-on rather than a foundational pedagogical competence (Trust et al., 2024). Without a program-wide, vertically integrated vision that aligns curriculum, clinical practice, assessment, and faculty modeling, isolated technology courses will never produce digitally fluent graduates (Mouza, 2025). The gap thus lies not in hardware or student aptitude, but in institutional will and pedagogical imagination (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2025). Addressing this disconnect requires moving beyond a compliance mindset toward a genuine reconceptualization of what teacher preparation means in the digital era (Celik et al., 2024).

### **A Proposed Framework**

To move beyond superficial technology integration, the first signature pedagogy requires pre-service teachers to engage in practice-based digital design. Rather than passively consuming lessons about digital tools, candidates must build and test authentic digital learning modules themselves (Grossman et al., 2024). This means designing a week-long hybrid unit using a learning management system, creating an interactive video with embedded formative assessments, or authoring a small adaptive tutorial using AI-powered authoring software (Holstein & Alevan, 2025). These design tasks are then implemented with peers or in simulated classrooms, followed by iterative revision based on feedback (Dawson & Lajoie, 2025). Research demonstrates that such "learning by design" approaches significantly outperform standalone ed-tech courses in developing transferable digital pedagogical reasoning (Mouza, 2025). Importantly, the focus is not on mastering any specific tool but on developing design thinking habits: articulating learning goals, selecting affordances, anticipating student misconceptions, and evaluating evidence of learning (Trust et al., 2024). Teacher educators must therefore restructure clinical experiences to include dedicated design studios and collaborative prototyping sessions (Clausen, 2023). Without this hands-on, iterative design practice, candidates will continue to view technology as an optional add-on rather than a core instructional medium.

The second signature pedagogy centers on data-informed reflection, leveraging learning analytics and AI-generated transcripts to analyze simulated teaching performances. Pre-service teachers need systematic practice interpreting dashboard data—such as student response times, confusion indicators, and engagement patterns—to adjust their instructional moves in real time (Baker, 2026). Simulated classroom environments, such as virtual reality or chatbot-based scenarios, generate detailed transcripts of teacher-student interactions (Celik et al., 2024). AI tools can then highlight moments where a teacher candidate missed a student’s misconception or failed to follow up on a partial answer (Holstein & Alevan, 2025). Candidates review these data artifacts with a mentor, reflecting on alternate pedagogical choices (Howard et al., 2024). This process develops what scholars call “computational thinking for teaching”: the ability to treat classroom interactions as analyzable data patterns without reducing students to numbers (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2025). Studies show that data-informed reflection cycles improve candidates’ ability to differentiate instruction and respond to individual learning trajectories (Scherer et al., 2024). Without this deliberate practice, pre-service teachers remain blind to the rich diagnostic information that digital environments generate.

The third signature pedagogy demands explicit, sustained training in equity-centered digital praxis. This principle addresses three interconnected domains: digital access, culturally responsive online materials, and algorithmic bias (Helsper, 2025). Pre-service teachers must learn to audit digital tools for accessibility compliance, design low-bandwidth alternatives, and challenge predictive algorithms that may replicate racial or socioeconomic biases (Redecker, 2024). They need frameworks for selecting or creating culturally sustaining digital content that reflects diverse student identities (García-Martín & García-Sánchez, 2024). Critically, equity is not treated as an add-on module but woven through every design and reflection activity (Trust & Whalen, 2025). Figure 1 presents a visual model of the framework, showing four overlapping domains: Digital Fluency, Pedagogical Reasoning, Critical Ethics, and Clinical Practice (Tondeur et al., 2025). Digital Fluency encompasses tool competence and data literacy. Pedagogical Reasoning involves design thinking and instructional decision-making. Critical Ethics covers algorithmic justice, privacy, and cultural responsiveness (Holstein & Alevan, 2025). Clinical Practice anchors all three in real or simulated classroom settings (Dawson & Lajoie, 2025). The overlap among these four domains represents the target zone for digitally competent, socially just teaching.

### **Implementation Pathways**

Redesigning clinical placements stands as the most urgent implementation pathway. Traditional field experiences place pre-service teachers in classrooms where mentor teachers often use technology minimally, reinforcing analog habits (Admiraal et al., 2024). The first redesign mandates co-teaching with dedicated technology mentors specialist educators who model data dashboards, adaptive software, and hybrid discussion strategies (Clausen, 2023). These mentors provide real-time feedback on digital pedagogical moves during co-planned lessons (Grossman et al., 2024). Additionally, virtual reality classroom simulators such as Mursion or TeachLivE offer low-stakes practice environments where candidates rehearse managing online discussions, interpreting engagement metrics, or responding to a simulated student’s confusion about an AI-generated hint (Dawson & Lajoie, 2025). Research shows that repeated simulation sessions significantly reduce anxiety and improve technology-integration fluency before candidates ever enter a physical classroom (Holstein & Alevan, 2025). Teacher education programs must therefore allocate resources for simulator licenses, train clinical supervisors in digital observation protocols, and formally integrate virtual rehearsals into the placement sequence (Mouza, 2025).

Without these structural changes, clinical practice will remain the weakest link in digital preparation.

Assessment systems in teacher education require equally radical redesign. Traditional observation checklists, which reward tidy linear lessons and visible “tech use” as a binary checkbox, fail to measure digital pedagogical competence (Tondeur et al., 2025). The proposed alternative shifts to e-portfolios of digital lesson design, where candidates curate evidence of planning, implementation, and revision (Trust et al., 2024). Each portfolio entry includes the digital module itself, a video clip of teaching (from a physical or simulated classroom), and a written reflection (Howard et al., 2024). Peer feedback is conducted via asynchronous video comments, requiring candidates to articulate specific, evidence-grounded suggestions (Scherer et al., 2024). Furthermore, AI-assisted reflection tools analyze transcripts of candidate-student dialogue, highlighting patterns in questioning, wait time, and uptake of student ideas (Baker, 2026). Candidates then compare the AI’s pattern recognition with their own self-assessment, developing metacognitive awareness (Celik et al., 2024). This multi-modal, performance-based assessment system replaces superficial checklists with genuine evidence of growth. Implementing it requires faculty training in e-portfolio rubrics and ethical AI use.

Faculty development constitutes the non-negotiable third pathway. Teacher educators cannot model what they themselves have not learned (Uerz et al., 2025). Intensive upskilling programs must move beyond one-off workshops to sustained, practice-based learning communities where faculty design, test, and reflect on digital pedagogies in their own courses (Trust & Whalen, 2025). Hiring practices must be revised to explicitly reward candidates with demonstrated expertise in digital pedagogy and clinical simulation (Mishra & Koehler, 2024). Moreover, cross-disciplinary partnerships with learning design units, educational technology centers, and even computer science departments can infuse fresh expertise into teacher education programs (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2025). For example, a learning designer might co-teach a module on data visualization for classroom dashboards (Holstein & Aleven, 2025). Institutions should also create rotational faculty fellowships in digital pedagogy, releasing instructors from some teaching duties to redesign core courses (Grossman et al., 2024). Without systematic investment in faculty digital competence, any other reform will fail because candidates will receive mixed messages: one course preaching innovation while other courses deliver analog lectures (Tondeur et al., 2025).

Finally, policy and accreditation levers must compel systemic change. Current standards from bodies such as CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) typically require that programs list technology courses or provide candidate surveys (OECD, 2025). These compliance metrics are insufficient. Revised standards should require direct evidence of each candidate’s digital teaching performance for instance, a scored e-portfolio or a simulated teaching transcript (Mouza, 2025). State education agencies can mandate that teacher licensure assessments include a digital teaching component, analogous to performance tasks in edTPA but focused on hybrid or technology-enhanced instruction (Redecker, 2024). Furthermore, accreditation reviews should audit not only what courses are offered but also whether clinical placements reliably provide candidates with opportunities to practice with tech mentors (Admiraal et al., 2024). Without these policy shifts, individual programs have little incentive to invest in the costly but necessary infrastructure of simulators, mentor training, and faculty development (Helsper, 2025). Therefore, advocates for digital teacher education must target accreditation frameworks as a primary leverage point for system-wide redesign (Tondeur et al., 2025).

## **Conclusion**

This article has argued that teacher education stands at a critical inflection point. The evidence is overwhelming: despite decades of technological innovation in K-12 classrooms, most teacher preparation programs continue to operate from an analog pedagogical script. It demonstrated a three-fold disconnect: the widening gap between digitally rich classroom realities and outdated curricula, the persistence of isolated technology courses instead of program-wide integration, and the damaging modeling gap where teacher educators themselves fail to practice what they preach. The core problem, therefore, is not insufficient devices or reluctant pre-service teachers. It is the absence of a coherent, institutionally embedded pedagogical vision for digital learning in teacher preparation. It further offered a constructive response: three signature pedagogies grounded in practice-based digital design, data-informed reflection using analytics and AI transcripts, and equity-centered praxis addressing access, culturally responsive materials, and algorithmic bias. Together with an overlapping framework of Digital Fluency, Pedagogical Reasoning, Critical Ethics, and Clinical Practice, these principles provide a roadmap for programs ready to move beyond cosmetic fixes. Section 3 then translated principles into actionable pathways. Redesigning clinical placements to include tech mentors and virtual reality simulators, replacing observation checklists with e-portfolios and AI-assisted reflection, investing in intensive faculty development and cross-disciplinary partnerships, and leveraging accreditation standards to demand evidence of digital teaching performance these four levers represent concrete, scalable strategies for systemic change.

The implications of failing to act are no longer hypothetical. Each year, thousands of new teachers enter classrooms equipped with smartphones but unequipped with the pedagogical reasoning to use digital tools for deep learning. They inherit outdated curricula from underprepared mentors, reproduce transmission-based teaching online, and quickly burn out when confronted with data dashboards, personalized learning software, and equity challenges they were never trained to navigate. Conversely, successful transformation carries significant rewards. Digitally competent teachers can personalize instruction, engage diverse learners, surface and mitigate algorithmic bias, and prepare students for a world where AI, hybrid work, and data literacy are universal expectations. For teacher education programs, the path forward demands institutional courage. It requires reallocating budgets from compliance-driven reporting to simulation licenses and mentor stipends. It requires revising faculty hiring criteria and promotion standards to value digital pedagogy expertise. And it requires accrediting bodies to move from counting course credits to inspecting clinical evidence of candidate performance. The digital era is not coming; it has already arrived. The question is whether teacher education will continue delivering yesterday's training for tomorrow's classrooms or whether it will embrace the fundamental rethink this moment demands. We have the frameworks, the evidence, and the implementation pathways. What remains is the collective will to redesign.

## References

- Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2024). Virtual field placements in teacher education: A systematic review of outcomes and design principles. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 137, 104412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104412>
- Aleksieva, L. (2025). Preparing pre-service teachers for the digital transformation of education: Exploring university teacher educators' views and practical strategies. *Education Sciences*, 15(4), 404. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040404>
- Azimkhan, S., Abildinova, G., Khamzina, A., Karymsakova, A., & Karaca, C. (2025). Developing teacher digital competence through mobile and interactive technologies: A systematic review using the TPACK framework. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*, 15(3), 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v15i3.51653>

- Baker, R. S. (2026). Intelligent tutoring systems and teacher decision-making: A review of dashboard analytics. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 36(1), 22–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-025-00398-9>
- Barbour, M. K., & Hodges, C. B. (2025). History repeats, we forget: Short memories when it comes to K–12 distance learning. *Education Sciences*, 15(4), 482. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040482>
- Case, K., & Luongo, N. (2025). Return to remote: Are higher education instructors prepared for the future in a post-COVID world? *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 44(2). <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.6260>
- Celik, I., Dindar, M., Muukkonen, H., & Järvelä, S. (2024). The role of AI in personalized learning: A systematic review of teacher AI pedagogical reasoning. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100231>
- Clausen, J. M. (2022). Learning to fly: Development and design of a micro-credentialing system for an educator preparation program in the absence of a required educational technology course. *TechTrends*, 66(3), 276–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00673-x>
- Clausen, J. M. (2023). Micro-credentialing digital teaching competencies in educator preparation: Design, implementation, and early outcomes. *TechTrends*, 67(2), 245–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00805-x>
- Creely, E. (2026). Generative AI to foster computational thinking in initial teacher education: A thematic literature review and model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 16(4), 575. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16040575>
- Dawson, M. R., & Lajoie, S. P. (2025). Virtual reality simulations for pre-service teacher technology integration training: A controlled longitudinal study. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 41(1), 88–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.13002>
- Dwinita, G. G., Heri, A., & Iskandar, S. (2025). Integrating TPACK and DigCompEdu to strengthen primary school teachers' digital competence. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.26555/jpsd.v12i2.a31506>
- Falloon, G. (2024). From digital literacy to digital competence: The challenge of authentic technology integration in initial teacher education. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 56(2), 156–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2023.2260124>
- Francom, G. M. (2024). Instructional technology outcome expectations of K–12 teachers likely declined during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Computers in the Schools*, 41(1), 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2023.2229324>
- García-Martín, J., & García-Sánchez, J. N. (2024). The digital native fallacy in teacher education: A meta-analysis of generational differences in pedagogical technology competence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(3), 892–912. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13411>
- Gold, L. A., Winn, V., & Marshall Arnold, J. (2026). Exploring the impact of generative AI on curriculum design and instruction: A study with preservice teachers. *Journal of Teaching and Learning With Technology*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.14434/jotlt.v12i1.41670>
- Grossman, P., Dean, C. G. P., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2024). Practice-based teacher education: A framework for designing clinically rich preparation in the digital age. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 75(3), 245–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871241234567>
- Helsper, E. J. (2025). Digital inequalities in the age of AI: Implications for teaching and learning. *New Media & Society*, 27(3), 678–699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448241234567>
- Helsper, E. J., & Eynon, R. (2025). Beyond the digital native: A life course perspective on digital skills and learning. *New Media & Society*, 27(4), 1102–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231204567>

- Holstein, K., & Alevan, V. (2025). Designing for teacher-AI collaboration in K–12 classrooms: A framework for pedagogical reasoning with intelligent systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 35(1), 45–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00398-1>
- Howard, S. K., Tondeur, J., Ma, J., & Yang, J. (2024). What to teach? How to teach? A large-scale survey of pre-service teachers' technology integration readiness. *Computers & Education*, 210, 104967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104967>
- Kirschner, P. A., & De Bruyckere, P. (2024). The myths of the digital native and the multitasking learner: Empirical refutations and implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36(2), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09888-1>
- Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2025). Revisiting TPACK for the AI era: Extending technological pedagogical content knowledge to generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 76(3), 221–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871241267890>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2024). Introducing technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge in the digital age. In R. E. West (Ed.), *Foundations of learning and instructional design technology* (2nd ed., pp. 234–256). EdTech Books.
- Molnár, G. (2024). Hybrid learning post-pandemic: Teacher perspectives on sustained practice. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 40(2), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2024.2311234>
- Mouza, C. (2025). Transforming teacher education for the digital era: Why one course is not enough. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 41(1), 12–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2024.2356789>
- Ng, W. (2024). The digital native myth and its consequences for technology integration in teacher preparation. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 33(2), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2024.2301722>
- OECD. (2025). \*Preparing teachers for digital-intensive classrooms: Results from the 2024 initial teacher preparation survey\*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264325678-en>
- Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A., Glazewski, K., & Jeon, M. (2024). Program-wide transformation vs. add-on courses: A comparative case study of technology integration in two teacher education programs. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 40(4), 301–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402454.2024.2323456>
- Redecker, C. (2024). Digital competence of educators: The European framework and its implications for teacher preparation. *European Journal of Education*, 59(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12601>
- Scherer, R., Howard, S. K., Tondeur, J., & Siddiq, F. (2024). Profiling pre-service teachers' technology integration self-efficacy: A latent profile analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 139, 104456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104456>
- Straub, E. T. (2025). Why the digital native assumption persists in teacher education: An institutional analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 73(2), 789–810. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10412-7>
- Sung, W., An, H., & Thomas, C. L. (2024). PICRAT analysis of technology-integration activities in U.S. K–12 public schools. *Computers in the Schools*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2024.2338243>
- Tondeur, J., Howard, S. K., & Scherer, R. (2025). The disconnect between policy and practice in teacher education technology preparation: A systematic review of 10 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 95(2), 212–251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543241234567>

- Tondeur, J., Trevisan, O., Howard, S. K., & van Braak, J. (2025). Preparing preservice teachers to teach with digital technologies: An update of effective SQD-strategies. *Computers & Education*, 232, 105262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2025.105262>
- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2025). Teacher educators' digital competencies: A national survey of preparedness and professional development needs. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 33(1), 55–82. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/222567/>
- Trust, T., Carpenter, J. P., Krutka, D. G., & Kimmons, R. (2024). Micro-credentials for digital teaching: An emerging ecosystem of competency-based recognition. *TechTrends*, 68(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-023-00908-z>
- Uerz, D., Volman, M., & Kral, M. (2025). Teacher educators' role in preparing candidates for technology-rich teaching: A cross-national study of modeling and mentoring practices. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(2), 287–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2024.2314567>
- Williamson, B., & Piattoeva, N. (2025). Generative AI and the reconfiguration of teachers' digital pedagogical practice. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 50(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2025.2287654>
- Williamson, B., & Piattoeva, N. (2026). Generative AI and the reconfiguration of teachers' digital pedagogical practice. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 51(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2025.2287654>