DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 273 SP 002 308

By-Koontz, Elizabeth D.

A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education. The Tenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 69

Note-17p.; Speech given before the annual meeting of The American Assn. of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, Illinois, February 26, 1969.

Available from-The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (free)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*College School Cooperation, Continuous Learning, Educational Research, Educational Sociology, Individualized Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Preservice Education, Professional Continuing Education, *Speeches, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Certification, *Teacher Education, Teacher Educators, Teacher Orientation, Teacher Recruitment, Teacher Role, Youth Leaders

From the point of view of the consumer, there is too much of a consumer-producer dichotomy in teacher education. Four distinct hopes and dreams, all interrelated, constitute selected aspects of this problem. First, teacher education should become a joint endeavor between inservice teachers and teacher educators possibly through the implementation of standards boards to encourage research, testing, and dissemination in the major problem areas of teaching. Second, teacher education should become an educational continuum in selection, initial preparation, induction into the profession, and graduate and continuing education by allowing inservice teachers to control their own continuing education, by encouraging local boards to contract with teacher education institutions for the establishment of new career programs for the disadvantaged, and by a reorganization of the certification process. Third, teacher education should be individualized and should emphasize sensitivity. Fourth, systematic orientation and induction of prospective teachers into teaching should be developed through the study of the sociology of the teaching profession in terms of essential teaching tasks or abilities. The youth of today, better educated, more sensitive, and more concerned, should be involved in the solving of these problems. (SM)

FEBRUARY 26-1969 | THE CONRAD HILTON-CHICAGO | THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

10th CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

A CONSUMER'S HOPES & DREAMS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The First Nine Lectures

1960—The Dimensions of Professional Leadership
Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961—Revolution in Instruction
Lindley P. Stiles

1962—Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education
J. W. Maucker

1963—Africa, Teacher Education, and the United States
Karl W. Bigelow

1964—The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach
James B. Conant

1965—Perspective on Action in Teacher Education
Florence B. Stratemeyer

1966—Leadership for Intellectual Freedom in Higher Education
Willard B. Spalding

1967—Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education
Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J.

1968—Teachers: The Need and the Task
Felix C. Robb

The Lecture Series

The CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURES, given over a period of ten years at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, commencing in 1960, were established by action of the Executive Committee of the Association. The Lecture Series was conceived as a professional tribute to the long years of leadership and service which Dr. Charles W. Hunt has given to teacher education as a teacher, a university dean, a college president, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and a consultant to the Executive Committee of AACTE.

Charles W. Hunt has combined vision with practicality in encouraging voluntary cooperation among higher education institutions for the improvement of teacher education. The AACTE is proud to acknowledge its great respect and appreciation for Dr. Hunt's educational statesmanship, his devotion to teacher education, his insights into human behavior, and his personal friendship.

Charles W. Hunt

A Life Devoted to Education

CHARLES WESLEY HUNT, born in Charlestown, New Hampshire, October 20, 1880, educated at Brown University (A.B. 1904), Columbia University (A.M. 1910, Ph.D. 1922); teacher of English, Vermont Academy, Saxtons River, 1904-06; Moses Brown School, Providence, Rhode Island, 1906-08; teacher, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908-09; supervising principal, Union School, Briar Cliff Manor, New York, 1910-13; supervisor, Children's Aid Society Schools, New York City, 1913-14; assistant secretary, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914-16; vice-principal, Horace Mann School, New York City, 1918-21; director of extramural instruction, University of Pittsburgh, 1921-24; acting dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1923-24; dean, Cleveland School of Education, 1924-28; professor of education and dean, School of Education, Western Reserve University, 1928-33; principal, New York State Normal School, Oneonta, New York, 1933-42; president, New York State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York, 1942-51; secretary-treasurer, American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1928-48; secretary-treasurer, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948-53; consultant to AACTE Executive Committee since 1953.

Elizabeth D. Koontz
Director
Women's Bureau
U. S. Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

ELIZABETH DUNCAN KOONTZ was born June 3, 1919, in Salisbury, N.C., into a family of educators. Both of her parents were teachers, and after she was graduated from Livingstone College in Salisbury, she earned a master's degree in elementary education from Atlanta University to prepare for a teaching career. Next came further graduate work at Columbia and Indiana universities, and then studies in special education for slow learners and disadvantaged children at North Carolina College at Durham.

In addition to active years in educational association work at both the local and state levels, Mrs. Koontz came up through the ranks of the National Association to become president of its Association of Classroom Teachers in 1965. Her many other professional memberships have been with organizations devoted to work in special education. She is a member of NEA's Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for Retarded Children. She was appointed by President Johnson to the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children in 1965 and is a member of the education committee of the National Urban League.

Her travels have taken her to observe the effects of the Berlin Wall as a guest of the German Teachers Association in West Berlin; she also attended conferences of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession in Seoul, Vancouver, and Dublin. Invited by the *Saturday Review,* Mrs. Koontz was one of sixteen Americans requested to visit the Soviet Union in 1964 to discuss ways of improving relations between our countries.

The high regard felt for her leadership in education was reflected in her appointment by President Nixon to head the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor in January 1969.

Mrs. Koontz's new federal assignment, when coupled with her recent term as president of the National Education Association, makes her one of the outstanding women in America.

SBN: 910052-36-0

A CONSUMER'S HOPES AND DREAMS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Elizabeth D. Koontz

The Tenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 26, 1969

Ten years ago, Dr. Laurence Haskew ended the first Charles W. Hunt lecture by saying:

> Inspired by the career of Charles W. Hunt, I have tried to say that what we need is not more social analysis but more leaders, and say it in such fashion that every person here is looking forward to having a lecture series named after him also.

Tonight, ten years later, the need for leadership and not just more social analysis is an imperative if we are to progress toward a free and open society for all.

Teaching is the mother profession. Without teaching there would be no other professions. There is in this room, without doubt, the greatest assembly of leadership in teacher education in the world. And since so much depends upon you, and since you are captives for this fleeting moment in history, my choice is to speak to you from the perspective of a consumer of teacher preparation. Obviously, the ultimate consumers are the children and youth of the society and, in a sense, all citizens are consumers of teacher education. But my remarks are to be construed more as those of a classroom teacher of thirty years. Obviously, such an approach tends to establish a consumer-producer dichotomy. This approach is deliberate because that is exactly what we have too much of—dichotomy, that is! Thus, my first hope and dream is that teacher education should truly become a joint endeavor between the practitioners in the field and the college and university personnel.

It might be held by some that this is now the case. And so it is in a few experimental and special programs. But the large majority of beginning teachers advance through a program in which their relationships with the field are, at best, superficial and, often, largely irrelevant to the real world of the beginning teacher. For

example, by admission of our own leaders, student teaching is a shambles. The following quotation is taken from a nationally constituted joint committee report on student teaching:

> Today, student teaching is entangled in a mass of confusion, unmade decisions, and expediencies. It lacks a comprehensive definition and a clear-cut statement of goals and purposes. Despite the fact that student teaching must be a cooperative endeavor, in many cases the personnel in colleges and universities, public schools, professional organizations, and state departments of education who are most concerned and involved are not working closely enough together. Some colleges and universities develop programs and merely notify the schools of their plans. Others turn the whole enterprise over to the public schools. In both instances, the key people involved in implementing the programs have no part in formulating them. While a few state departments of education are organized to solve problems in student teaching, most states still have no plan or structure.[1]

That such a general condition prevails is not to say that there are no studies, models, and experiments which show the way. Then why has there been no general acceptance of closer ties between teacher preparation institutions and public school personnel? Could it be that our values are somewhat askew? In this materialistic society we reward what we value. In a recent study sponsored by the NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth (sponsored by AACTE), it was discovered that when well-established college professors volunteered in an experiment to teach part-time in high schools, they experienced a decline in their status among their learned colleagues. And, of course, in the case of cooperating teachers, who most often provide the closest links between the schools and teacher education institutions, the responsibility of "having a practice teacher" is usually one added to an already full teaching load. It is rare to find a school district that has established the responsibility for working with student teachers, interns, or beginning teachers as a part of a mature teacher's regular, assigned schedule. What does this say about reward or status? Or for the importance of teacher education? Here we experience the epitome of contradiction.

---

1 Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. *A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1967. p. 2.

To advocate that teacher education should be a joint endeavor does not imply that colleges and universities should abdicate the major responsibility for the initial education of teachers. It implies, rather, that since colleges and universities have major responsibility, they should use their status and power to develop the feedback relationship so vital to the process of educating teachers for greater reality. In this regard, at last year's Hunt lecture, Dr. Felix Robb noted that exhorting college personnel to spend more time in local schools would be, in his words, "wasted effort." He added:

> What *could* make a difference is an organic tie between a school system and an institution teaching teachers, a linkage that supplements and goes beyond the usual arrangements for supervised teaching.

Dr. Robb then proposed that each member institution of AACTE seek to enter into a contract with a school district for the operation of a school "beset by problems," meaning a ghetto or rural slum school. In suggesting this, Dr. Robb conceived a contract providing for "a new kind of relationship of professors to schools, and for the vitalization of teacher preparation." To my knowledge few, if any, such contracts have been established. The status quo is extremely tenacious. And, therefore, we possibly need a third force.

And again we do not lack for suggestions or models. Over two years ago representatives of six key national groups, after two years of study, issued the call for legally established professional standards boards[2] in each state whose responsibilities would include the encouraging of programs, studies, and research designed to improve teacher education. This study recommends a board made up of a balanced representation of the profession and conceived as an adjunct to the state board of education. Several states are seriously considering such standards boards. Such a vehicle could be instrumental in bringing the college and school personnel together in more effective programs for teacher preparation. And such a board might well uncover or develop new leadership. To be sure, the professional associations are going to be pushing the idea.

---

2 National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards.* Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1967.

Surely any action that would promise integration of the forces for improving teacher education is worthy of consideration. The experience of my own region and what the land-grant colleges did for agriculture keep coming to mind. In short, do we dare hope that the universities and colleges could now somehow do the same for public education? Remember, this would require specific research, testing of the findings, and broadly disseminating those findings by means of field work. In the case of agriculture, all three phases were essential. If what had been discovered through research and testing had not been disseminated, we would not be able to produce the abundance of food and fiber we do now. All the research and experimentation in animal and plant husbandry, commercial fertilizer, weed control, crop rotation, contouring, irrigation, flood control, insect control, and all the rest would have come to naught had the farmers not been *taught* to use what was discovered. This was done through a nationally subsidized system which incorporated all the necessary elements for success: experimental stations and a system of county agents could be found in nearly every state. And this may prove the key to the present condition confronting the schools, especially those which serve poor people, who are most often also members of a minority. The studies and social analyses of the plight of children in such schools are known to all. Indeed, so much has been said about the ghetto schools, Appalachia, rural slums, etc., that we are sometimes led to believe that most of the ills of America reside there.

But these problems are only the symptoms of a dangerous social illness running to the very core of our nation and threatening our survival. Indeed, the impact of much of the current research, especially as it is related to lower economic classes and minority groups, is in reality moralistic and condescending. Moreover, the data gathered are often used to support well-established, class-bound prejudgments of those "disadvantaged." And, to put it candidly, much of our current social analysis and study directs attention away from the *residual problem in the total society* which, in turn, tends to keep many a human being in an inferior position.

Frankly, what would have happened to the economically impoverished farmer had society assumed that the ills of agriculture rested with

him, his family, his style of life, his innate inferiority, and his technological ignorance?

In my opinion, we must now exert a national thrust to do for public education what was done for agriculture. True, the parallel is not absolute, but it should stimulate some thinking. In such a thrust, the preparation of educational personnel would be related to institutions because we now know we must bring about change in both institutions and personnel. The Education Professions Development Act, the Teacher Corps, fellowship programs, all are beginnings, but only beginnings. They are only catalytic in nature, and we all know that projects financed by soft money too often do not affect the hard-core system, no matter what the intentions. What is needed is leadership from the base institutions where most of the teachers are prepared. With their help, couldn't a national design be created to move us toward needed reform in both teacher education and education in general? Certainly we must develop leverages for reform.

A second hope I have for teacher education could have been included as a part of the above discussion but, for purposes of emphasis, I've set it apart. In my opinion, teacher education should become an educational continuum whereby the abrupt lines between selection, initial preparation, induction into the profession, and graduate and continuing education tend to disappear. We are told that to keep abreast today requires a complete cycle of retraining once every ten years. But this should be a continuous process. And such retraining and reeducation must include both subject matter and evolving methodologies. From firsthand experience, I can tell you unequivocally that much of the continuing or in-service education for teachers is an insult to them. Not only is much of it irrelevant, it is also *imposed;* and often professional teachers are made to feel that "they just don't know what is best for them." Again let us recognize that there are exceptions to this, but it is generally true that mature teachers are seldom afforded opportunity to be effectively involved in the planning and execution of their own continuing education. Narrowly conceived concepts of credentialing establish the mode; and too often the systems of rewards and punishment demolish any chance for intrinsic motivation based upon the individual program needs of a given teacher. The school system itself, then, often mitigates against adequate con-

tinuing education for teachers. Surely such education must become a part of every teacher's regular teaching assignment. Moreover, teachers are beginning to move vigorously for the right to plan and control their own continuing education programs. Why shouldn't professional teacher groups enter into contract for services of their choice from colleges and universities? It would be in the public interest for the school district or the state, or both, to finance such efforts.

Indeed, there is precedent for local boards of education to contract with teacher preparation institutions, not only for continuing education but also for establishing new career programs so that youngsters of humble origin and limited previous experience can advance through a series of meaningful work-study experiences step by step and eventually become fully qualified teachers. Such a program has other ramifications, but it is moving all too slowly. Evidently it still has not caught the imagination of our leadership.

Such programs should, of course, be only the beginning of the educational continuum, but they could be designed to dovetail with continuing education.

One persistent problem which sometimes inhibits the steady and continuous education of mature teachers is the certification process. The current movement, supported by NCTEPS (and others, I assume), suggests one initial legal license, followed by a process for the appropriate professional specialty group to assume responsibility for advanced credentialing. This is an idea that is consistent with professional self-government. But again, this will probably require some new legal machinery, namely, the professional standards boards mentioned earlier. But surely, if a plan that involved the appropriate specialty groups existed, it would stimulate productive relationship between preparation institutions and practitioners in the field. In fact, such a procedure would require a degree of formalized relationship; and each group could then do its own research and study, and make its recommendations to the state professional standards board, which would be the coordinating agency.

This brings me to a third hope and dream, namely, that teacher education, both initial and continuing, be individualized.[3]

---

3 The Journal of Teacher Education. *"In Situ."* (Editorial) *The Journal of Teacher Education* 19: 4; Winter 1968.

Teachers cannot be effective without having more opportunity to search for authentic existence. Each of us has his values and needs, and these must be developed by discovering for oneself authentic responses to each situation one faces. What we are, can be, and ought to be, is forever changing. And it is precisely here that we are too often failing in teacher education. Each human being is unique; he should not be molded.

If individuals are unique, and they are, then it is hopelessly inefficient to run them all through the same mill at the same time. As to individualized programs, the cry is that "we can't do that because the problem is too massive." Or we say it's not economically feasible. If these clichés stop us, then I invoke more special help from the good Lord for our world, for it is precisely individualized programs for children and youth that must be the basis for educational reform. And this means retraining experienced teachers and initially preparing teachers who can work in a whole series of new relationships with children, other teachers, paraprofessionals, and specialists.

The time is here when the teacher will have his own staff as well as new modalities for teaching. The day of the self-contained classroom as we once knew it is probably passing; but this does *not* mean back to departmentalization, but on to the integration of means and substance. The implications for teacher education are tremendous. There will be individualized programs. We know that students learn at least as much from other students as from their professors. We have only begun to explore the potential of independent study. The new self-teaching devices, the computer, etc., are rendering overdependence on the lecture an anachronism.

Notice I did not say to exclude lectures. However, college students are telling us by every means possible that they want to be educated, not talked at. They want to be involved. And surely, one primary ability all teachers must cultivate and possess is that of dealing with vigorous, and sometimes destructive, dissent. Indeed, teachers must not only have the essential academics; equally important is what we in education call "being sensitive" and you professors call "the affective domain." This is especially true when working with children whose value systems vary from one's own. Teachers should not be judges, but educators and scholars. Children perceive almost instinctively when a teacher treats

them "differently" or subconsciously assumes they can't learn. Although we will probably agree that no teacher should ever contribute to a child's image of self-failure, we all know about the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome. Alienation leads to withdrawal, hostility, and ultimately to violence. This is just another reason for individualized programs for teacher education. Teachers must be better equipped and more sensitive to the difference between being one's brother's keeper and one's brother's brother. Being another's keeper, or being kept, leads to paternalism, condescension, and submission, which, in turn, project an illness of our total society. The power to cure the illness depends first on correctly discerning who is ill.

The fourth hope and dream I have is the last one I'll discuss tonight. It is really stated in the form of a question. How can we develop a systematic orientation and induction of prospective teachers into the actual world of teaching? The problems they have to cope with in the system, where to take hold, how to maintain the precepts of teaching in difficult situations, how to maintain the integrity of self, and the like are issues beyond the pale of course-work per se. Nevertheless, let's face it, these are some of the essentials of successful teaching! The low status of the public school teacher is a problem affecting all teachers, no matter how secure. The new militancy of teachers is very often misunderstood or dismissed as an aberration of behavior. But to do so is to avoid the issue. The study of the sociology of education is respectable. Now the sociology of the teaching profession should become a matter for greater study and concern. What are we dealing with anyway? Why has teaching become the low man on the totem pole, even though it is the mother profession?

We have only begun to study what really constitute the essential teaching tasks or essential abilities a teacher must possess. Possibly we've expected too much of single individuals. Dr. John Macdonald has some choice words on this subject:

> The most serious problem of teacher education is the inability of preparing institutions to validate their programs and the consequent tendency for these programs to become instruments of professional legitimation. There are other problems, however, of almost equal importance, and one in particular seems to me to warrant close inspection. This is the way in which teaching is currently defined in teacher education institutions and elsewhere . . . .

> No other profession in its training practices has married assumptions about the fate of the practitioner so curiously as teaching. On one hand, the practitioner is seen as an individual, with unique, unshared, and frighteningly comprehensive responsibilities, in support of which his personal resources will be severely tried. He is seen, that is, as a heroic figure, and, of course, the hero-practitioner is a recurring theme in the lore of all the professions, from the detection of crime to the healing of the sick. He is also seen, however, as one who will enter a world in which the essential choices that determine the nature of work have already been made, so that he, too, becomes a follower of the single common path, or to use a simple term of similar meaning, a functionary. Such a pair of assumptions are not natural partners, and teacher education institutions will continue to suffer from a paralysis of the will to action so long as the strange juxtaposition continues.[4]

In my opinion we all suffer from time to time a "paralysis of the will." Maybe we are expecting the impossible under the existing conditions. Maybe we need to attack the conditions and not dwell quite as much on symptoms. It will require courageous leadership to attack these conditions in ways that will produce effective reform in teacher education, the school system, and the real world of teaching.

Tonight, I've discussed four distinct hopes and dreams for teacher education. They are all interrelated and obviously constitute selected aspects of the problems of teacher education. An attempt has been made to be constructively critical—since most progress only starts with the positive dissent implicit in "I think it can be done better." I believe it can.

Surely over the years we have made great progress. No one doubts that we're doing better than ever before, but unfortunately we must always consider time and place in any assessment. For time and place, we must accept the fact that in many ways we are not progressing rapidly enough. Indeed, for time and place, we are in trouble. Some would argue that we have a crisis of leadership.

Possibly our great hope is the younger people. The youth preparing for and coming into the teaching profession are wiser, more sensitive, and better educated than any generation before them.

---

4 Macdonald, John. "Teacher Education: Analysis and Recommendations." *The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles.* Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1969. p. 3.

They see the hypocrisy of speaking one way and performing another. They refuse to be hypocrites, and they are being criticized for exposing the distance between projected expectations and performance. When this gap widens, it becomes a credibility gap. The youth of the world sense such a gap. And their favorite word is "relevant." I'm with them on both counts. How many students serve on substantive committees in teacher education institutions? Most often they are kept at arm's length. We are now witnessing a condition where the statistics are improving and the conditions tend to worsen. Aspirations are thwarted, expectations are not met. And this is the stuff that revolution is made of.

Again, ten years ago Dr. Haskew said:

> Show me a profession whose chief means of communication is the exchange of traditional clichés and I will show you one whose leaders are throwing custard pies in an age of nuclear missiles.

If I've used any clichés, I hope they weren't merely traditional. I end, as I started, with an appeal to the leadership in this room to dare to hope and dream and lead accordingly. Surely effective leadership in these days is a high-risk operation. This is a time when *no* action becomes one of the worst kinds of action. My plea is to bring the consumer and the producer together in more effective programs for teachers. The dichotomy must largely disappear if we are to do justice to ourselves, our children, and the world.

Allow me to thank the AACTE for making this opportunity possible. The potential leadership of those assembled here can hardly be overestimated. I hope in a small way I've stimulated a constructive thought or two. But above all, I hope I've moved at least some of you to more vigorous action.

In closing, allow me to reflect the thought that men like Charles W. Hunt have brought us through to this point. They taught us the fine art of dissatisfaction with the status quo and how to lead. And this is the essence of the great democratic experiment. If we are to remain a free and open society, major responsibility rests with the leaders and institutions represented in this room. There is no substitute for adequate education.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION is a national voluntary association of collegiate institutions organized to improve the quality of institutional programs of teacher education. Its present membership includes all types of four-year institutions for higher education: private and church-related liberal arts colleges, state colleges and universities, private and church-related universities, and municipal colleges and universities. Within the varied teacher education programs offered, only one uniform theme dominates the AACTE: the dedication to constantly improving quality in the education of teachers.