DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 297 95 SP 009 824

AUTHOR Bown, Oliver H.; Rutherford, William L.
TITLE Towards Functional Preservice Teacher Education Centers: Human Interactions in Program Development.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Field Experience Programs; Organizational Change; *Preservice Education; *Program Development; *Role Conflict; Role Perception; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Personalized Teacher Education Program

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the preservice teacher education center, particularly on those which encourage the optimal use of college and school personnel and resources in the field-based aspects of teacher education training programs. The paper is organized around five main topics. First, a brief historical view of the teacher center is presented. The second section scans the teacher center literature. The third section discusses emergent themes from the literature important in developing effective teacher education centers including discussion of such topics as: governance; the integration of college and school-based learning experiences; role changes; and teacher training and education renewal. The fourth section presents common problems in developing field-based teacher education. These problems specifically are related to the conventional roles played by the various participants in teacher education and the role conflicts that are experienced when more than structural or cosmetic program changes are attempted. The fifth section offers suggestions for consideration in the development and operation of a functional teacher education center. The suggestions give particular attention to the human factors involved in a teacher education center and the interplay between these and the many organizational features, distribution of responsibility, and procedures that are part of a teacher center. As a brief summary, advantages inherent in successful implementation of a teacher education center are listed. A bibliography is appended developed by the authors from their own readings and from a computer search of the ERIC data base. (MM)

TOWARDS FUNCTIONAL PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS: HUMAN INTERACTIONS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Oliver H. Bown

and

William L. Rutherford

The University of Texas at Austin

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

February 1976

SP 009 824

The Clearinghouse is funded by the National Institute of Education, in cooperation with the following associations:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Harrison County Teacher Education Center, Clarksburg, West Virginia for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Harrison County Teacher Education Center or the National Institute of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Education today exists uneasily at the focal point of intense and critical scrutiny by those outside its institutional confines and by those who live within it. Perhaps there are no real outsiders when one considers that there are few members of our society who are not past, present, or future products of our educational institutions; few in our shrinking and compact world whose quality of life is not deeply influenced by the successes and failures of education; few who will escape payment for their share of the very large cost of education. Education is undoubtedly held responsible for many more of society's ills than it is capable of creating or alleviating on its own. But scapegoating aside, there are reasonable and potentially constructive demands for educational accountability. Education is thus confronted with the necessity of "keeping schools running" in the midst of unparalleled efforts to reform itself, to innovate, to adopt new curricular, organizational, and instructional approaches, and to change. The result, too often, is chaos. Promising innovations are tried, but those involved have little preparation and limited consideration is given to logistics, support, and time required to integrate new elements into a ongoing program. As a result, the innovation sometimes receives lip service from those who feel that it has been forced upon them or it is quickly abandoned on the grounds "that it does not work in our situtation." On the other hand, there are many examples of successful adoption of innovation, but these are perhaps less publicized and less understood than the failures. Both success and failure with the change process appear to increase the pressure for educational reform either to expand the scope of the new approach or to get back to "tried and proven" practices. Educators caught in this pressure are often characterized as being resistant to all change or as flipping from one side of the pendulum swing to the other with every "hair-brained scheme" that comes along.

Teachers, as the principal agents of our educational system, have received their full share of scrutiny and criticism as society looks impatiently to education for solutions to many of its problems. The selection, preservice preparation, and continuing education of teachers are frequently viewed as the chief culprits for our schools being less effective than we would wish. Improvement or enrichment of these processes is regarded as critical if education is to have deeper and broader impact. Accordingly, teacher education is deeply embroiled in the atmosphere of change and reform.

It is hardly necessary to point out that serious efforts to change and improve teacher education have not emerged in just the past decade or in the post-sputnik era. John Dewey remarked in 1904:

> . . . Here we have the explanation in considerable part at least, of the dualism, the unconscious duplicity, which is one of the chief evils of the teaching profession.

> There is an enthusiastic devotion to certain principles of lofty theory in the abstract--principles of self-activity, self-control, intellectual and moral--and there is a school practice taking little heed of the official pedagogic creed. Theory and practice do not grow together out of and into the teacher's personal experience (Dewey, 1904, p. 15).

Through these phrases and much of his writing, Dewey signalled the need for a wedding of theory and practice in the continuing education of teachers. Many educational philosophers, pragmatistis, and practitioners throughout recorded history have set forth conceptions of the teaching-learning process with both direct and indirect implications and arguments for the proper role of the teacher and the necessary preparation in support of this role. But teacher educators are still struggling with easily espoused concepts which continue to escape full implementation. It is true that the momentum of change in this area has increased dramatically in the past decade. The teacher center movement today represents one important approach to the achievement of the goal of more effective and relevant preservice and continuing education of teachers.

Most of the innovations which have found their way into practice in the public schools have had to deal sooner or later with requirements of preparing teachers to install the innovations and to maintain and improve their quality and effectiveness. These efforts have ranged all the way from the attempts to produce "teacher proof" instructional materials to those innovations which focus on early and direct involvement of the teacher in the planning, installation, adaption, monitoring, evaluation, and revision processes.

This paper will focus on one set of ideas, concepts, models, and operations which are generally described in the literature under the rubrics of "teacher centers." This literature has become sufficiently voluminous and available that we will refer to it briefly and selectively for those readers interested in the broader dimensions of the movement. Our particular interest lies with what is commonly called the "teacher education center," or more specifically the "preservice teacher education center."* In this somewhat more restricted domain, we shall focus in particular on those organizational and functional factors which may help to specify the critical human conditions and interactions of both school-based and college-based teacher educators

---

* To save the reader from an over-abundance of terms, "teacher education center" will be used throughout this manuscript to refer to centers designed primarily to address training needs of <u>preservice</u> teachers.

and which may allow an optimally powerful system of field-based preservice teacher education to become a reality. By the particular focus which we have developed, we intend in no way to disparage the important past and present efforts in model building or the many courageous and ambitious programs of model implementation of small or vast geographical and organizational proportions. We are cognizant of those who have given special attention to political, organizational, fiscal, and governance issues which are involved to one degree or another in almost any effective teacher education center. We are indeed indebted to all of those conceptualizers and practitioners, and to both proponents and opponents of the teacher center movement as we attempt to focus on the way in which this movement affects individual human beings who are caught up on the middle of it by either choice or decree.

This paper is prompted in large part by the experience of the authors with the conceptualization, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of the Personalized Teacher Education Program (PTEP). This program was under development for approximately 15 years at The University of Texas at Austin supported through a sequence of grants from the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the U. S. Office of Education. This teacher education system became the major program of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education established at Texas in 1965. The Center was supported initially by the U. S. Office of Education and subsequently by the National Institute of Education, under the auspices of which developmental work of PTEP, a major summative evaluation, and training materials for teacher educators adopting the system were completed. This program and its evaluation have been described elsewhere (Peck 1970, Borich et al. 1974, Fuller et al. 1968, Menaker 1972). Briefly, it is a comprehensive system encompassing all aspects of preservice professional preparation. It is designed to deal systematically with the personal, interpersonal, and professional development of the teacher and is based in part on the concerns theory explicated by Fuller (1969-1973). In its evolving forms of implementation, the program became increasingly field-based and aimed toward maximum integration of college-based academic and professional instruction with intestified and graduated responsibility in public school settings. Its implementation essentially required the development of what has subsequently been called a "preservice education center" for all students enrolled in the more sophisticated and highly developed forms of this program. Concurrently or subsequently, the attention of teacher educators throughout the country was focusing increasingly on the development of enriched field experiences for prospective teachers and the challege of working out more effective collaborative relationships between college-based and school-based teacher educators. Simultaneously, many schools were becoming aware of their responsibility for perservice education and supervision. Meeting this responsibility often provided increasing professional gratification for cooperating

and supervising teachers who were discovering synergistic ways of blending their responsibility for the teaching of youngsters with their increasing responsibility for the preparation of the next generation of teachers. The emergence of teacher education centers--by whatever name they may be called--has occurred in many places in the last decade in support of quite different models of teacher education and simultaneously in support of many different educational innovations introduced to the public schools during the same era. In this sense, much of our experience is shared to some degree by many teacher educators and teachers across the country. We only hope that our experience in working intensively on the problems of effecting mutually supportive collaborative relationships between different faculty groups and different schools will enable us to speak with some perceptiveness about the personal and interpersonal factors which seem to us crucial if school-college collaboration is to move beyond a formal organizational chart, lip service, and new rhetoric.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER--A BRIEF HISTORICAL VIEW

Our present writing will focus on the "teacher education center" as opposed to "teacher centers." Teacher centers, in most instances, are organized around the training and support service needs of in-service teachers. We are using the term "teacher education center" to refer to those organizational and collaborative arrangements which involve functional interaction between college-based and school-based teacher educators. Such centers are usually developed around the training needs of preservice teachers who are involved in the schools in an apprenticeship capacity as an integral part of their college preparatory program. Students may function in a number of roles within the school, usually with graduated responsibility, under a variety of titles such as observer, participant-observer, teacher aide, student teacher, or intern. The collaborative relationship between school and college may serve simultaneously as a vehicle for inservice training for teachers and other educational personnel, which is a desirable evolution since it can provide for career-long education and professional updating based on differentiated training needs of teachers at various points in their experience. It can serve further as an important integrating mechanism for both preservice and inservice teachers when they are called upon to play their respective, but hopefully synergic, roles in new programs and approaches adopted by the school. The reader who wishes to pursue further study in the literature of teacher centers will not find our distinction clearly observed. A number of teacher centers designed initially and primarily for in-service education have developed strong preservice components, and converse cases can also be cited. By whatever name the organization or arrangement may be called, we are principally concered with those which focus on the optimal use of college and school personnel and resources in the field-based aspects of training programs for prospective teachers.

The teacher education center has many historical forerunners. Almost as long as formal programs for the professional preparation of teachers have existed, there have been arrangements of some kind for an apprenticeship-type of experience prior to admission to the ranks of inservice teachers. Sinclair (1975), for example, traces the concept of practice teaching to 1839. For at least the greater part of this century, teachers have engaged in some form of student teaching as a part of their preparation program. The requirement of student teaching, and often prior field-based training experience, are codified in virtually all certification laws and regulations. The Association of Teacher Educators, formerly the Association for Student Teaching, has offered national leadership in the constant effort by teacher educators to increase the comprehensiveness, relevance, and impact of field experiences. The field-based experience provided for students has evolved and changed through the years. In many places, it has been lengthened and intensified. Opportunities for more

diverse experience in different schools, with different pupil populations and with different organizations for instruction, have been offered. Field-based experience has been individualized, personalized, modularized, criterion-referenced, and interaction analyzed. In this context, the teacher education center is not really new. The well-planned and developed center does attempt to organize within an explicated conceptual and operational model those ideas and operations which grow out of decades of efforts to educate novice teachers.

Another generally recognized forerunner of the teacher education center is the laboratory school. Such schools were created under the primary auspices of colleges and universities for the purpose of implementing model, experimental or forward looking educational programs which were then considered ideal training sites for future teachers. Such schools, with an announced commitment to innovative education, were presumably protected from bureaucratic impositions of a large, centralized administrative system and from assumed vested interests in maintaining the educational status quo. Consistent with this organizational strategy, future teachers could then be exposed to, and trained within, emerging educational programs and exemplary practices rather than through the ordinary fare offered by the average school, which was assumed to be lagging behind the ever-pressing need for improvement and renewal.

A second important feature of the laboratory school was its effort to place the training of the next generation of teachers on at least an equal priority level as that given the implementation of model educational programs for children. In this sense, laboratory schools fashioned themselves to some extent on the model of teaching hospitals where an attempt was made to marry the highest standards of professional expertise and patient services with training opportunities for young doctors.

A third aspect of laboratory schools was the effort to replace the dual management of student teaching experiences by the college and its supervisors on the one hand, and the school and its cooperating teachers on the other, with a unitary management system dominated in most cases by the university or college responsible for the education of both teachers and pupils.

For a variety of reasons, laboratory schools have, for the most part, died or faded away. The dual challenge, which they attempted to meet in their own way, of educating both teachers and youngsters, as well as the problems which they faced or attempted to bypass in so doing, have not faded away. Present and emerging teacher education centers may be viewed as a different approach to the same challenge and the same problems.

A more recent effort to bring about the collaboration between colleges and schools required to support field-based teacher education

is seen in the portal school concept or movement (Lutonsky 1975). Both the conceptual and operational models of portal schools are very close cousins to teacher education centers, as we are presently defining them.

Other approaches to the long and generally recognized need to balance and integrate the prospective teacher's general academic education with appropriate foundations in the various theoretical, historical, and pedagogical disciplines of education and with reality-based experience are too numerous to merit detailed mention here. The teaching internship, introduction programs for beginning teachers designed to facilitate the transition from limited preservice involvement to full-time involvement and responsibility, fifth-year programs, five-year programs, community-oriented induction programs, and a number of other approaches and programs, have engaged in different ways in the common search for the most powerful combination of college-based and school-based learning experiences for the future teacher. These efforts continue today and are most commonly encouraged, reported, and analyzed under the general rubrics of the teacher (education) center.

THE TEACHER CENTER LITERATURE--A PASSING NOD

The teacher center is being referred to as a "new concept" by present writers in the field (e.g., Schmieder and Yarger 1970) in spite of its many similarities to the historical forerunners mentioned above. Certainly in its more sophisticated forms, and as a support mechanism for a wide variety of educational innovations and renewal efforts, there is something new about it in comparison with its usually more fragmented and limited predecessors. It is a widely accepted movement in which an estimated one-third of the nation's schools and two-thirds of its universities are actively involved to one degree or another (Yarger and Leonard 1974). Its literature is growing very rapidly. At this writing, the ERIC data base contains well over 100 recent publications (appearing principally between 1973-1975) retrievable through the descriptor "teacher centers". This sample of the emerging literature contains, in turn, bibliographic references to hundreds of additional chapters, articles, reviews, and reports focused on teaching centering. It has been a formidable challenge to the authors to presume to contribute to this burgeoning literature without the risk of enormous redundancy. This difficulty is increased through the phenomenon experienced in many fields when highly similar definitions of critical problems, goals, and attempted solutions emerge at different places concurrently. Our own experience thus has much in common with emerging conceptual literature and implementation reports.

Our immediate purpose is two-fold: first, to offer the reader who is unfamiliar with the teacher center literature a highly selective guide to recent publications which provide an orientation to the background and present ideas and practices which guide the teacher centering movement; second, to point to certain themes apparent in the literature which indicate that our own suggestions for the development of a relatively simple teacher education center may be responsive to needs and problems which are being actively confronted in a great variety of ways across the country.

In the organization of this review, references which describe national or state conceptions, networks, or organizational structures which support the development of local and operational centers are not identified separately. Such articles deal predominantly with overall governance, support, and organizational issues and models which are of great importance to the teacher center movement but which lie outside the central focus of this paper. A sample of such references is included in various categories of the review which follows.

PAPERS WHICH FAVOR CHANGE IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN DIRECTION OF FIELD-BASED, TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER MODELS

Most of the literature in the field is written by proponents of the teacher center movement. Many of them, nevertheless, give

thoughtful attention to particular problems in teacher education which have been persistent for many decades (e.g., the appropriate balance of academic and field-based education, achieving full communication, collaboration and responsibility on the part of all participants in teacher education, the integration of curriculum and program development and personnel development) and the realistic likelihood of teaching centers contributing effectively to the gradual solution of these problems. Representative papers in this area include the following: Crosby 1974; Denemark and Yff 1974; Fibkins 1974; Howey 1974; Maddox and Holt 1974; and Selden 1974.

PAPERS WHICH RAISE QUESTIONS OR ADVISE CAUTION REGARDING THE TEACHER CENTER MOVEMENT

Some authors, including proponents of the movement and those experienced in implementing center programs, warn against the notion that centers are an easy or magical solution to these persistent and difficult problems. An example of this kind of warning merits consideration at an early point in a review of teacher center literature:

> A cogent example of the way in which political considerations permeate decisions in our profession is seen in the current mass movement to substantially increase the field experience portion of preservice teacher education. In spite of the fact that there is no conclusive evidence regarding its potential effectiveness or ineffectiveness, this politically inspired movement goes forward. It is a response to pressures exerted by a lay public attracted by a simplistic solution to the ills of teacher education, as well as the pressures generated by a majority of classroom teachers whose motivation is primarily to gain control of teacher education rather than improve it. In effect, teacher educators have not held foremost questions concerning the effect and effectiveness or increased field experience on the developing skills of a generation of prospective teachers. Neither are they structuring this program modification so that its impact will be measurable. (Cyphert & Zimpher 1975, p. 5).

Other authors who have focused on difficult and resistant problems which must be overcome to make teacher education truly effective include Burns et al. 1973, DeVault 1974, Mallan 1974, and Ruchkin 1974.

PAPERS WHICH DEFINE, CLASSIFY OR ELABORATE VARIOUS MODELS OF TEACHER CENTERS

Most publications in the field provide a brief glimpse at the origins and history of the teacher center and/or field-based teacher

education movements. Such papers very commonly proceed to elaborate on emerging models of teacher centers and their organization, structure, function, and role change requirements. Representative papers in this area which focus primarily on emerging models in the United States include Collins 1974; Dickson 1972; Florida State Department of Education 1974; Howey 1974; Kaplan 1974; Leonard 1974; Marsh 1971; Parson 1972; Pasch and Pozdol 1973; Poliakoff 1972; Schmieder and Yarger 1974, 1974a, 1974b; Yarger 1973; and Yarger et al. 1974.

Additionally, other papers examine the teacher center movement in other countries (principally Great Britain and Japan), noting their influence on, and their similarities and differences with, centers in this country. Such papers include Baily 1971; DeVault 1974a, 1974b; Morgan 1974; Rosen 1972; Selden and Darland 1972; and Smith, E. Brooks, Jr. 1974.

ENRICHED COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR FIELD-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

A portion of the teacher center literature conceptualizes or describes needed or established collaborative relationships between schools and colleges which support field-based teacher education. Such arrangements often approach but do not necessarily result in a fully organized teacher or teacher education center. Descriptions are provided by California (Pa.) State College, School of Education 1974; Capital University, Columbus, Ohio and Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio 1973; Galler and Toney 1974 (Illinois State/Peoria); University of Indiana, Southeast 1973 (University of Indiana, New Albany); Klugman 1974 (Wheelock College/Boston PS); Lutonsky 1973 (National); Miller and Hulsey 1971; Price and Baker 1973 (Portland Community College); Schueler 1974; Sentz and Perry 1973 (Minnesota); Smith, E. B. 1974; University of Utah 1973; and Wisconsin State University 1973.

DESCRIPTIONS OF OPERATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

Of considerable interest to those who are considering either the establishment of a teacher education center or the expansion and enrichment of present field experience opportunities for prospective teachers are fairly numerous descriptions of operating centers around the country. Many of these descriptions touch on the evolutionary process in moving from conventional student teaching arrangements to more fully integrative, collaborative educational centers. Examples of such decriptions and their geographical locations include Bicknell et al. 1974 (Fredonia/Hamburg, N.Y.); Fischer and Goddu 1967 (Harvard); University of Maine, School of Education 1974; and Syracuse University 1974.

DESCRIPTIONS OF OPERATIONAL TEACHER CENTERS

There are a number of similar descriptions of teacher centers which emphasize training and technical assistance for inservice teachers. Some

of these describe preservice components as well, and some readers may be particulary interested in centers organized to respond to the full spectrum of career-long educational needs. The following publications represent this kind of operational description: Campbell County Board of Education 1971 (Northern Kentucky); Devaney and Thorn 1975 (United States); Devault 1974b (Japan, England and United States); Faxon et al. 1974 (Florida); University of Huston, College of Education 1973; Jackson 1973 (Harlingen); LaFavor 1974 (Vancouver); Maddox 1972 (West Virginia); Minneapolis Public Schools, University of Minnesota 1974; and University of Toledo 1973 (Ohio).

At a broader level, there are several surveys which report on the extent of teacher centering in this country. In addition to providing perspective on the extent to which this movement is influencing the ways in which teachers at all levels of experience are being trained (and re-trained), such reports provide lists of exemplary centers of various degrees of complexity and magnitude. Such publications include: Smith, Emmitt D. 1974; and Yarger and Leonard 1974.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION STUDIES OF TEACHER CENTERS

There are few publications reporting any form of research or evaluation evidence regarding the effectiveness of teacher centers. A good many authors (e.g., March 1974) are unhesitant in insisting upon the urgent need for such evidence or that a continuous evaluation component needs to be built into the structure of every center, but relatively few reports of evaluative research are currently available. The great majority of evidence which is reported is based on self-report data, often questionnaires administered to teachers, students, or pupils, and at best represents a formative level of education. Such evidence as is readily accessible may be found in Berty 1973; Bicknell et al. 1974; Burns et al. 1973; Chase 1972; Fischer and Goddu 1967; Galler and Toney 1974; Ruchkin 1974; Stenzel et al. 1974; and Yarger et al. 1974.

Some slightly more sophisticated evaluation evidence, involving a comparison of training effects in a center versus a non-center setting or follow-up studies of later effects of center experience, is found in Earp and Tanner 1974; Evans 1974; University of Maine, Portland-Gorham School of Education 1974; and Quigley 1974 (Chapter IV).

The absence of an impressive array of research and evaluation evidence supporting the efficacy of the substantial effort being made to establish teacher and teacher education centers is not surprising. A great many programs are relatively new and are evolving and changing so rapidly that it would be virtually impossible to get them to hold still long enough for serious evaluation of a definable set of structures and activities. Secondly, a highly integrated field-based program is so complex with its many components and participants that

sophisticated evaluation against hard and significant criteria is far more difficult and expensive than might be assumed. We join in the call for such evidence but recognize the difficulties in getting it.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF TEACHER CENTERS

Finally, certain writers (e.g., Burdin 1974; and Yarger 1974) have speculated on the role of teacher centers in the near and distant future. Whether such speculation has relevance for centers currently being established or refined is left to the judgment of the reader.

The teacher center literature fits reluctantly into even the broad categories sketched above. A great many publications would fit almost as well into one or more other categories as they do in the one to which we have assigned them. At the same time, we believe that some readers will find the rough breakdown helpful in guiding them to particular approaches to teacher centering which fit their own needs and interests.

EMERGENT THEMES FROM THE LITERATURE IMPORTANT IN DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

Much of the available literature is helpful in identifying controversies and issues regarding the appropriate purposes and roles of various forms of the preservice and/or inservice teacher center; their proper place in educational renewal; their optimum form of governance, organization, and functioning; and how they should be evaluated. Some of the literature makes clear that teacher centering has indeed become a major movement with all the attendant political, power, control, organizational, and geographical considerations which such a movement entails. We are interested immediately in these considerations only to the extent that they illuminate important issues which will almost inevitably arise in the development of the simplest and smallest teacher education center. We are reminded, perhaps irreverently, of the story of the man who bragged that his wife and he had completely resolved all conflict over who makes the decisions in their household: he makes all the major ones while the minor ones are delegated to her. When asked for examples, he replied that he decides what the proper policy of the government should be toward developing countries, the oil producing nations, and the chronically unemployed. His wife, on the other hand, decides such minor questions as how they spend their money, where they go on vacations, and where the children to go school.

We are content for the moment to leave the "major" decisions to others while we attempt to address the "minor" ones which we believe are significant determinants of the quality of life for all participants in the teacher education enterprise. From the broader literature, we will extract those issues which pertain to this modest purpose.

GOVERNANCE--WHO SHOULD RUN AND CONTROL TEACHER EDUCATION?

There are those who argue that universities and colleges have long demonstrated their inability to prepare the kinds of teachers vitally needed in today's schools, and that, in spite of massive charges of isolation, irrelevance, and redundancy, they have further demonstrated their unwillingness or inability to change. Therefore, the schools and teachers should take over teacher preparation and certification.

Others argue that if prospective teachers received all of their preservice professional training under the jurisdiction of the public schools, they would be locked into present practices in, at best, a limited number of school situations with high and immediate demands for role performance in support of the status quo. There would be limited opportunity for reflection; creative and methodological self-exploration; or the development of broad, diverse, and penetrating

perspectives on the teaching-learning process and its appropriate contribution to future society.

The majority of writers agree that the greatest promise of quality teacher education lies in maximum and appropriately balanced use of the expertise and training potential resident in both colleges and universities and the public schools. We agree with this position and see the teacher education center as a means of blending these inputs together to assure maximum personal and professional learning and maturation on the part of prospective teachers.

We are concerned with governance more in the informal sense of the hierarchical organization structure--the extent to which college and school participants in the development and operation of the center feel a sense of "ownership" and proactive responsibility--than in the formal sense. We are aware of a number of formally organized teacher centers with excellent representation at a high level from college and school (and often from professional associations, administrative groups, parents and the community at large as well) which look very good on paper but which influence the day-to-day operation of functioning participants in the schools almost not at all.

THE INTEGRATION OF COLLEGE AND SCHOOL-BASED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

The challenge of blending theory and practice or, more broadly, concern about preparing teachers who are well-educated persons as well as effective models and skillful managers of the learning process has been called for in a great variety of educational literature. Again, we see the teacher education center as a viable means of more closely approximating this ideal. This, too, has been an area of controversy closely related to that which has been mentioned in relation to governance. On one side, it is asserted that knowledge alone is sufficient for a teacher if he or she does not have the ability to transmit it and to inspire the learner to value and search for it. Theory about teaching demands implementation and adaptation before youngsters are likely to benefit. On the other side, the dangers of producing teachers who are trained rather than educated, who mechanically perform the most recently approved methods rather than being sensitive, thoughtful decision makers, has been expostulated with equal vigor. Field-based programs are suspect to a number of educational observers on the grounds that they are experience heavy and reflection light: heavy on what works at the moment and light on longer range perspectives.

We are admittedly biased with the belief that theory and practice are highly synergic components of the richest and most impactful kinds of learning experiences. Through many years of implementing field-based programs, we have been struck with the frequency with which young teachers confront their knowledge deficits only when they are called upon to use their knowledge or to explain it to a group of youngsters.

We are impressed with the number of young teachers who discover through early experience in the classroom--often to their own amazement--that they could perform what they have always thought of as "teaching" if they could do it in a room by themselves with no students around to distract them. As we see it, teacher education centers discussed in the literature are basically concerned with creating an environment in which teachers are continually supported in recognizing and acting upon their own learning needs, slighted neither in the search for more knowledge and more powerful theory nor in opportunities for the experience that can generate, affirm, modify, or reject it.

ROLE CHANGES

The literature and our own experience speak loudly and clearly to the conviction that significant role changes on the part of all participants in an evolving teacher education center are crucial to operational efficiency and educational impact. These role changes will be discussed in the next chapter. The operational suggestions which appear in a later section of this paper have been developed, in large part, to provide communication, structural, and functional mechanisms to support the role transitions which are basic in developing an effective center.

In our view, much of the teacher center movement and its literature is motivated at least indirectly by a central concern for increasing the quality, relevance, and impact of time spent in training experiences by both prospective and inservice teachers. If teacher and teacher education centers are to be viable vehicles for achieving this kind of enrichment, we believe it will not be through changes in structure alone. Structural and procedural changes are important only to the extent that they support transformations in the involvement in the kind of experience that really teaches and is shared by all participants in the educational enterprise.

TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION RENEWAL

A large proportion of the teacher center literature makes it abundantly clear that most operational centers have been developed with the promise that significant educational change and renewal is likely to occur only if it is effectively supported by appropriate continuing teacher education. At the simplest level, this may be described as supplying sufficient orientation, training, and support to enable teachers to use new curricular materials or specific organizational or instructional innovations. At a more general level, change of education is regarded as a necessity if education is to play its part in preparing citizens to cope responsibly with the increasing complexity of modern life. Adequate teacher training and support systems are regarded essential in effecting change. Almost all schools are involved to one degree or another in this climate of change, and teachers, with or without

teacher center facilities, are increasingly pressed to incorporate new modes and materials of instruction in their ongoing practice.

A school which is deeply involved in self-renewal can be a particularly rich contributor to the education of preservice teachers. In a collaborative arrangement such as a teacher education center, it can offer students exposure to a school that is alive, in purposive motion, and involved at the cutting edges of educational practice. This kind of school can also pose some difficult problems for those simultaneously engaged in the development of a highly collaborative training endeavor. Teachers who are feeling hard-pressed to keep up with the challenge of adopting and adapting a significant innovation may easily feel that simultaneously engaging in an equally demanding training program is too much to undertake at the same time. Even if ways can be found to blend these two kinds of responsibility into a compatible and manageable whole, additional problems can be encountered when college participants in the center are interested in having their students exposed to innovations other than those which the school is adopting.

The teacher center literature poses this potential dilemma in many ways. Teacher centers are basically designed to provide support through teacher training for vitally needed educational change. Simultaneously, coping constructively with the educational change process and creating increasingly viable and effective teacher education systems can easily create conflict. Some of our suggestions will be addressed to this problem. We believe it is a potential problem which must be faced in the creation of any effecitve teacher education center.

There are undoubtedly many additional issues which could be extracted from the body of literature with which we have been concerned. We believe these are at least representative of some of the major issues which developing teacher education centers and teacher education in general must inevitably confront.

COMMON PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING FIELD-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: NEW ROLES FOR ALL

In this section, we may irritate some readers with the assertion that many teacher education programs today operate with little effective attention given to the extension or enrichment of field experiences or to the integration of college-based and school-based learning experiences for teachers in training. For a starting point, we intend to paint this picture at its worst, recognizing that most institutions have moved beyond the situation which we will describe. And yet, the conversion of a conventional program to an optimal one is much easier said than done, and some readers may find elements of our description roughly comparable to the problem areas that they may be having with their own programs. We ask the reader's indulgence as we identify the problems which we have encountered and have been attempting to overcome for many years in our own program and in others to which we have had access. These problems are addressed in the places where they most frequently reside--in the conventional roles played by the various participants in teacher education and in the role conflicts which are experienced when more than structural, cosmetic changes are attempted.

THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT IN FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES

Most teachers agree that their student teaching experience was the most relevant and important experience in their entire college program in preparing them to assume the role of teacher. Silberman has expressed this same conclusion as follows:

> To the extent to which they value any aspects of their professional education, teachers generally cite practice teaching as the most valuable--sometimes the only valuable--part. Critics of teacher education, too, all agree that whatever else might be dispensable, practice teaching is not (Silberman, 1970, P. 451).

A great many graduates agree privately that this experience was very much like being thrown into deep water and told to swim, with little that had gone on in their previous college education courses serving as any real preparation for it. In our own early studies of prospective teachers (Peck 1960; Bown 1967) and from extensive review of the literature (Fuller & Bown 1975) we found that from the students' perspective they were asked upon entry to student teaching to assume almost overnight the role of teacher when for many years they had known little apart from the role of student. To put it more broadly and bluntly, they were expected suddenly to act as adults after operating almost exclusively as children and adolescents. For many students, the only recourse was to engage in a period of prolonged role paying which was

both anxiety-ridden and phony from their own point of view. Many students in this situation search wildly for the most critical expectations of their supervisors and attempt to conform to these rather than to give real attention to their own developmental and learning needs. The Personalized Teacher Education Program (and others) was designed to recognize the complexity of the developmental process entailed in moving from adolescence to adulthood, from student to teacher, and to build training experiences and support systems to facilitate this process rather than to assume that it would magically occur upon registration in student teaching. As we came to rely increasingly on field experiences from the very beginning of the professional education program, we noted the enormous relief of students as they discovered many ways in which they could be genuinely useful in the schools without having completed a single education course (which presumably would have told them what to do and how to do it right). Experience such as this convinces us of the enormous utility of field-based programs which utilize instruction, supervision, feedback, and support in response to the students' emerging, naturalistic experience in the real world setting. Programs which fail to take the students' experience into account, as idiosyncratic or common as it may be, stand in considerable danger of promoting a form of role enactment which is far more responsive to external evaluative fears than it is to the important needs and capacities of either pupils or their young teachers as they work to live and learn together. In our opinion, such programs may include those which provide a string of conventional and exclusively college-based courses with a short period of student teaching at the end. They may also include some "modern" competency-based programs which substitute a long list of competencies or specific skills for more generalized course expectations, but without taking account of the internalization of such skills so that they can subsequently be employed in a perceptively flexible, discriminating, and authentic manner.

The Students' Divided Loyalty to Campus and School Programs

In the many teacher education programs which still suffer from the lack of full integration of college-based and school-based experiences, students feel very frequently that they are "caught in the middle" of conflicting expectations on the part of their campus versus their school supervisors. Their supervising professor may, with the best of intentions, be promoting a particular educational philosophy, methodology, curriculum or interactional strategy which is antithetical to the approach of the school or a particular cooperating teacher. If the professor prevails and insists that students have an opportunity to try out the techniques which he/she is teaching, school personnel may go along but often with the feeling that the student teaching program is an intrusion upon the school program rather than being synergic and augmenting of it. On the other hand, the student may feel that the professor's responsibility is to work within the ongoing instructional system of the school but at the hazard of a poor evaluation from his/her supervising professor which can have serious consequences with respect to

subsequent employment opportunities. As an example of this bind, we have noted rather frequently in our experience that cooperating teachers often preferred junior level observers to senior level student teachers in their classroom. In searching out the reasons for this, we discovered that the teachers felt far greater freedom in utilizing the neophyte observers in ways which were functionally useful to them, whereas they felt that student teachers were essentially captives of their campus supervisors' expectations which required the teachers to "step aside" while the student fulfilled them. In some situations, campus supervisors have felt that their intrusion is imperative to protect the student from being exploited as "slave labor" which may have little learning or developmental value for the student as a prospective teacher. We have noted, however, that many of the junior observers referred to above, by virtue of their inclusion in the ongoing mainstream of life in the classroom and the school, have gradually developed a richer array of learning opportunities, including substantial instructional responsibility, than many student teachers in conventional programs. It goes without saying that the field-based program which we recommend is designed to eliminate this source of conflict rather than to move in one direction or the other.

Inherent in the expectation conflict in which student teachers find themselves is the sometimes pervasive disagreement between education professors and school teachers regarding how schools should be run and how teachers should teach. Education professors are predisposed by training, position, and expectation to hold strong and presumably exemplary views on such matters. When schools and colleges have not worked out their respective responsibilities in the preparation of teachers, an unfortunate by-product of these strong views is overt or covert criticism of the school and its present approaches and practices. In this kind of atmosphere, teachers are likely to view the college professors as being idealistic or blindly caught up in their own narrow specialty or simply out of touch with schools as they are today. Under conditions in which the college and school are working together, such disparate views, aired with openness and tolerance, can create a very rich educational mix for the ultimate learning benefit of both groups. In the form of perpetuated silent warfare, however, the student can find himself used by each side in its own defense. It is evident that these and other similar conflicts are strong deterrents to the emergence and meeting of the real learning needs of student teachers.

Role Changes as Experienced by the Student

As programs approach implementation of the teacher education center model, we believe that the student's role--perception of place, responsibility and range and nature of his/her activities--changes markedly in comparison with more traditional student teaching arrangements. These role changes are sometimes subtle and often occur gradually, but their effects are important, sometimes dramatic, and usually positive for all participants in the school/training community including the pupils.

The role changes have been reflected vividly for us through systematic interviews with graduates of well-coordinated field-based programs (employing a partial or complete teacher education center model) and contrasting statements made by graduates of conventional programs in which there has been little articulation between campus-based and field-based training components. A very brief and generalized sketch of our contrasting impressions follows.

Teacher Education Center Programs

1. Students feel that they are welcome, needed, and valued in the school setting.

2. Students feel responsible for an increasing number of instructional functions within the classroom which are clearly related to the mutually developed expectations of their school and college supervisors and their self-identified or acknowledged learning/experiential needs.

3. While remaining aware of differences in experience, expertise, and working style, the student feels that he/she makes a unique contribution to the team operation.

4. Students become increasingly self-critical and actively self-correcting when they fail to reach children in the ways which they intend.

5. Upon completion of the program students feel "experienced" as a teacher and anticipate employment as a teacher with a sense of relish and challenge.

Conventional Programs

1. Students feel that they are tolerated in the schools through prior administrative arrangements; they sense a strong obligation to "stay in their place" as a student, to interfere as little as possible with the ongoing routine or operations and to refrain from asking too many questions.

2. Students spend a considerable period of time in passive observation, in peripheral or non-instructional activity, and in limited direct contact with pupils; later participation which is more active is initiated through specific direction of the college or school supervisor with no apparent graduation of responsibility or task complexity and with little apparent relationship between the assignments and expectations of the two supervisors.

3. The student feels that he plays a carefully delineated role under the constant scrutiny of his/her supervision teacher with occasional and sometimes conflicting reviews by the college supervisor.

4. Students remain concerned about "looking good" to their supervisors and cover up, rationalize, or avoid involvement which would display weakness or inadequacy.

5. Upon program completion, students wonder what "real teaching" will be like and often feel apprehensive about being prepared for it.

This is admittedly a very brief and simplified sketch of prospective teacher reactions at their best and at their worst. Granting some exaggeration, we are convinced that these contrasting feelings about field experience do exist in reality and have substantial effect on the level of qualification of graduating teachers.

RESPONSIBILITY CONFLICTS IN MEETING LEARNING NEEDS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND PUPILS SIMULTANEOUSLY

Before discussing traditional and emergent roles for college- and school-based teacher educators, it is appropriate to discuss an issue which can block or complicate those transitions which are essential to a fully integrated center. Dedicated school personnel are strongly and appropriately convinced that their first responsibility is to the learning needs of children. Dedicated college supervisors feel similarly that their first responsibility is to the learning needs of prospective teachers. Every reader is probably familiar with some collaborative relationships in which these primary responsibilities blend and create little or no conflict. He/she is also likely to be aware of other situations in which many different kinds of functional conflict have resulted from these different foci of responsibility. It is rather easy in words to depict these two kinds of responsibility as being mutually compatible and enhancing, but, in practice, there are scores of ways in which the two can come into conflict. It is ironic that some of the most expert and effective teachers we have known--those who would make superb role models for prospective teachers--have been extremely reluctant to accept student teachers. We discovered that many of them are reluctant to risk diluting the educational experience they work very hard to provide the children for whom they are responsible by allowing a novice to "practice" on them. One can explain away such reluctance by resorting to such terms as possessiveness or a concept of indispensability, but our experience with many such teachers convince us this is simply not the case. The learning needs of the children come first, and when a preservice training program is poorly geared to contribute to the learning of children, the classroom teacher avoids participation in it. A good many of the apparent rigidities and constrictions which student teachers often feel are imposed upon them to the detriment of their opportunity to learn stem from similar, valid concerns about pupil learning. In the meantime, conscientious student teaching supervisors often feel called upon to fight for the learning rights of their students. This kind of conflict, in its myriad forms, arises paradoxically

out of the best of motives and often the best of practices. Later in this paper, will attempt to describe procedures which have been effective in enabling these two critical responsibilities to work together rather than tugging in opposite directions. We are aware of no easy or automatic solution, but we believe that these two kinds of responsibility can promote a potent and healthy tension out of which highly creative decisions and solution can evolve.

Role Changes for College-Based Teacher Educators

The college-based teacher educator is likely to find him/herself moving his/her primary site of operation from the well-contained college classroom to the public school settings in which the students are serving as apprentices. Even though he/she may continue to teach in his/her accustomed content area, the teacher educator is likely to find that the nature of instructional interaction with students has changed rather drastically. Students who are being confronted daily with the diversity of problems and the richness of the challenges of responsible participation in the school program are likely to react to almost any content with more questions and a stronger press to grasp its implications for their ongoing enactment of the instructional role. Professors, including the present writers, have been somewhat amazed at the very sharp differences in instructional interaction which this simple change in the instructional setting precipitates. It appears that when students receive the bulk of their professional education on the college campus, even when they are simultaneously engaged in a field experience, they have a strong tendency to "turn off" their ongoing experience in the field as they return to their accustomed role of student in the campus setting. Even when the professor is making conscientious efforts to relate his/her instruction to potential practice in the school, the connection in the minds of students seems to remain somewhat theoretical, remote, or intellectual. When the same professor moves to the school campus where students are experiencing an increasing sense of functional responsibility, the professor seems to enter a domain which is owned partly by the students. This sense of responsibility and the press for instructional interaction which will be relevant to and helpful with day-to-day concerns of the students can provide powerful motivation for learning if it is not too threatening to the professor. Students in this setting have the nasty habit of asking questions which are extremely difficult to answer, whereas it is somehow easier in the college classroom for the professor to entertain only those questions that he/she was really hoping the students would ask.

A second transition which is difficult for many professors accustomed to their own course taught in their self-contained college classroom occurs as the professor becomes a member of an instructional/supervisory team in a functioning center. At both the planning and

operational levels, there is the evident need for much greater interaction among team members in the delegation of responsibility for various aspects of the total professional learning experience for students for a given semester or year. The sanctity of particular courses is likely to break down. Accustomed sequences of learning activities are more likely to be arranged in accordance with the learning needs and concerns which are generated by the student's ongoing experience. Instruction and supervision are likely to become more public and their effects are likely to be more immediately apparent to other team members. The assumption that some other professor or the cooperating teacher is discharging responsibility for those parts of the student's experience to which a given professor does not attend is likely to be confirmed or rejected on a daily basis rather than once a semester or year.

Finally, often the relative isolation of professors and even student teaching supervisors from the school situation is not desired by those individuals but may exist due to heavy demands on professors' time and energies on campus or a disinclination to be perceived as a meddler or critic with respect to the school's policies and practices. The teacher education center can be a happy solution to this problem of isolation by providing a kind of "home base" in the school for personnel who previously were almost exclusively campus-bound.

Role Changes for School-Based Teacher Educators

Many teachers, including those who have served for many years as cooperating or supervising teachers, have retained and acted on the premise that it is the college or university which is basically responsible for the education of preservice teachers. Through arrangements consumated between the college and school administration, it falls to the teachers periodically to share their classroom with a student teacher who will be observing and practicing various educational tasks and maneuvers under the primary direction of the college. This premise undoubtedly reflects only the formal or legalistic side of the college-school relationship, but it often has, nevertheless, constricting efforts on the potentially powerful instructional and identity-forming relationships between cooperating and student teachers. On the other side of it, students are usually deeply concerned about the kind of cooperating teacher they will be assigned, recognizing that the quality and scope of experience that will be possible in this critical preparatory experience will be heavily dependent upon the cooperating teacher's acceptance, guidance, and support. The student teacher lives and works with a cooperating teacher for a large part of the day, and the nature and extent of their collaboration in working with children becomes the primary channel for experiential learning. Graduates of teacher education programs are usually very clear about the basic impact which this relationship has had upon them with respect to their subsequent desire to teach and to the kind of teacher they hope to become--or to avoid becoming.

A well-functioning teacher education center acknowledges publicly, structurally, and functionally the critical importance of the cooperating teacher in the preparation of the next generation of teachers. Briefly, it acknowledges and supports his/her role as teacher educator rather than as a "laboratory assistant" in the college's training program. For many teachers, this constitutes a significant role change. It involves new responsibility and new authority without diminishing their role or responsibility as a continuing teacher. This is not necessarily as overwhelming as it sounds since it is often little more than full acknowledgement of what the teacher is already doing. On the other hand, that acknowledgement is often very meaningful to the teacher and provides freedom and opportunity for teachers to vastly increase their personal and collective contributions to the shaping and operation of the center.

Role Changes for School Administrators

A similar role change is experienced by school administrators as they play their crucial role in moving from a traditional student teaching arrangement to a functional teacher education center. Their capacity to accept the concept that their school can be a first-class educational system for both pupils and prospective teachers is critical. Their support and assistance, both attitudinally and substantively, in the implementation of this concept is even more demanding and salient. Our experience is that the personal and professional satisfaction which accrue to administrators who are successful in this transition are at least equal to the increased responsibility they are called upon to assume.

ROLE CHANGES ARE NOT EASY

The changes in the direction of more systematic and complete integration of college and school experience for the prospective teacher which we and a great many of our teacher educator colleagues in colleges and schools across the nation are advocating sound fine on paper. Our experience indicates that they are far more difficult to achieve in reality. We are deeply convinced that this is not due to laziness or addiction to the status quo or generalized, blind resistance to change. We risk repeating our conviction. The changes we advocate require significant role changes for those involved from both the college and the school side. Various groups may clamor for the right to control teacher education, certification and, career advancement, but the problems and challenges are not likely to disappear by a simple reaffirmation or a shift of who is in charge. The role changes which appear critical to us are simple to state in words. Without diluting his/her role as teacher, we believe the teacher must come to see him/herself as a teacher educator. These two roles must not be a schizophrenic split or a frantic effort to do two things at

the same time but must become rather a harmoniously integrated single role. On the other side, we see the necessity of the collegiate teacher educator moving out of his/her protected lecture hall and office into significant immersion in the same real world in which his/her students are learning to function. We believe the student must become more proactive in identifying his/her own learning and experiential needs and intelligently and considerately utilizing the freedom available to pursue and satisfy them. Such changes take time. They are not easy. They are bound to seem at times antithetical to the motivations which have led individuals to choose and pursue a particular career within education. At the same time, we are convinced that this kind of role expansion proves to be highly gratifying for a great many individuals who have risked the transition. We believe that the highest quality of teacher education requires this kind of shift. Our guidelines will address some of the processes and procedures and requirements which we believe are commonly experienced in one form or another by individuals engaged in this transition.

CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF A FUNCTIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

For those who are sincerely interested in making the transition from the traditional student teaching program to a teacher education center, we offer the following considerations which are formed from many years of experience in a variety of field-based programs.

Perhaps it is presumptuous to propose yet another set of suggestions for the development and operation of a teacher center when the literature is replete with helpful suggestions (Marsh 1974, Morgan 1974, Schmieder and Yarger 1974, Parsons 1972, Poliakoff 1974, Howey 1974, and Mallan 1974). We feel justified in presenting these considerations for two reasons. First, we attempt to address the developmental process that occurs in the establishment of teacher education centers. This process we see as beginning with the traditional student teaching program. In such a program, student teaching may be the only field experience students have, and this experience is regarded as the culminating experience for all previous education courses. As a result, there is a rather distinct separation between theory and practice as well as a limited period of field experience.

As a program advances on this developmental continuum, field experiences will be required in at least one semester prior to student teaching. Also, there will be a balancing of theory and practice as on-campus coursework and field experiences are tied together in meaningful ways. At this state, an integration of program activities and personnel across the two or more semesters may still be missing.

There is a more sophisticated level which represents the ideal teacher education center as we perceive it. In this type of center much on-campus course work moves out into the field, thus establishing a thorough and highly meaningful fusion of theory and practice. College-based and school-based teacher educators function as a closely knit team. Furthermore, thinking in terms of separate courses or even semesters gives way to an integrated program effort over a period of a year or longer.

A second reason that we offer these suggestions is to focus on an important issue that we feel is ignored or treated lightly in other sets of guidelines. We refer to the feelings, beliefs, expectations, and interactions of those human beings who are involved in the development of a center. Therefore, the suggestions that follow will give particular attention to the human factors involved in a

teacher education center and the interplay between these and the many organizational features, distribution of responsibility, and procedures that are a part of the center.

A brief outline of this section is presented here for the convenience of the reader:

A. Time Factors

B. Parity

C. Goals

D. Program Design
   1. Program Content
   2. Organization Time, Schedules, Facilities and Finances

E. Program Management
   1. Institutional Support
   2. Communications
   3. Evaluation and Revision

A. TIME FACTORS

Establishment of a teacher education center is a development process that requires months, even years, before it attains maturity. Once a decision is made by school and college to attempt to develop a center, a number of meetings will be necessary to work out the initial details of the program. Since the program we speak of here would be at least two semesters in length, it would require that amount of time to complete one cycle. Obviously, much will be learned during the first year and many changes have to be made. This means that the second year will be a time of refinement. If things go as they should, by the end of the second year the center should be approaching a high level of efficiency and effectiveness.

We stress the time required for developing the program of the center because we believe that we are describing a developmental process for all participants rather than an organization or functional event. It takes teachers and professors time to learn to work as members of a team and to adjust to the new roles they must assume in a teacher education center. This shift is particulary difficult for professors who are used to complete independence in how and what they teach, and it can also be difficult for teachers who have always taught in a completely self-contained classroom and who may be accustomed to the more traditional student teaching program.

Students also need time to adjust to the more demanding program of the teacher education center. A typical response of students to such a program is that it is very demanding but the most valuable, relevant, and maturing educational process they have ever experienced. Once this word filters out across campus, students entering the program will know what to expect and will be more receptive to the program. However, for the first couple of years, many of the students in the program may temporarily feel that the demands are too great and unfair compared to what is asked of students in more traditional programs. Most good things in life require time, and the development of a teacher education center is no exception.

B. PARITY

If there is to be a harmonious, healthy, and productive relationship between school and university, there must be equality of effort, responsibility, and ownership in the center program. Indeed, parity is one of the characteristics that signals a true teacher education center. Establishment of parity is not an event or a point in time or a formalized contract of a governing board, but rather a process that is ongoing throughout the life of a center. It is crucial that the process be started in the initial phases of center development. When a school-college relationship gradually evolves or attemps to evolve from a traditional to an optimal program, parity is often never accomplished. This shortcoming of the process of gradual evolution emphasizes the need for collaborating institutions to recognize the teacher education center as a different approach to teacher preparation and to pursue that approach without equivocation.

Typically, the initial goals and design for the center emanate from the university or college. The process begins when the college, or at least a small faculty group, decides it wants to move toward a more field-based teacher education program and then develops at least a tentative design for such a program. Next, the faculty members or a representative thereof approach a school they feel will be willing to cooperate in this venture. Once the principal is receptive to the idea, he/she likely will arrange for a synopsis of the design to be presented to the entire faculty. In essence, the college promoters attempt to sell their program to the school. If the faculty is willing to pursue the matter, meetings of school and college representatives will be set for the purpose of "joint planning." Perhaps these meetings will deal with the substance of the program and lead to some modification in the initial college design, but, for the most part, the meetings are used to work out the details of the design as presented and to make the necessary arrangements for getting started. Since center development is most frequently an expansion or modification of a student teaching arrangement, it is easy for it to occur in this way.

As a way of beginning a teacher education center, this approach is particularly hazardous for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it causes the teachers to view the program not as a center program or their program, but as the college's program. Under these conditions, teachers will not feel an equal responsibility or obligation to the program. This does not mean that teachers will be indifferent toward the program, but it does mean that they may not be as active in and attentive to program development, evaluation, and redesign. If they look on it is a college program, the teachers may feel that the college should take care of these matters, or even worse, they may feel that it is not their responsibility to suggest significant alterations in the program.

In a sense, this description of center development may be demeaning to teachers as it portrays them as passive and submissive. No degradation is intended, but the fact remains that in many instances, schools "buy" center programs proposed by a college when they have only limited understanding of the purposes of the center and their future role in it. Many times, the reason this situation exists is because the program the college presents is only in rough draft, and only limited information is available to present to teachers. Another reason for this passivity is the fact that, historically, teachers have assumed that colleges are responsible for student teaching and other field-based experiences and that their role is one of accomodating the colleges as they go about their work of training teachers. This situation would not be so grim if it simply marked the point of the beginning of parity in the development and operation of a center program. But all too often, the leadership role remains with the college, whether by design or by default.

There are other reasons why parity is not easily attained. Schools that have long participated in traditional student teaching programs may enter into a center program out of a sense of obligation to help train teachers, but without real commitment to the center concept. Many times, we have seen teachers who have done or not done things because that seem to be the way the college wanted it.

Mallon (1974) has suggested another reason for the failure to establish parity. He thinks teachers may be reluctant to become too involved in the development of the center program because it would open the door for university faculty in turn to become more involved in the development of the school curriculum. By the same token, professors who view the center program as a college program are much less likely to strive for true parity for fear that this would allow teachers too great a voice in the determination of college curriculum and training approaches.

Finally, accepting parity means accepting greater responsibility for the center, its program, and its outcomes. Many teachers do not

want more responsibility for the preparation of teachers and may even be threatened by it. Professors may also be reluctant to accept responsibility for what happens to children as a result of placing students in the school.

When parity does not exist in a field-based program, the consequences can be undesirable. In one program, the students were assigned by the college to teach certain lessons to small groups of children. In most cases, the children were removed from the classroom for the experience, and it was supervised by college personnel. At the conclusion of the semester, one teacher mentioned, almost apologetically, that the she felt she really did not know how effective a teacher her student was since most of the student's teaching had been done outside the classroom. Following the comment of the one teacher, many teachers expressed a similar concern, yet no teacher had mentioned displeasure throughout the semester and apparently none felt they had the right to ask for a change in this practice. A second situation provides another example of what can and does happen when equality between school and college is absent. The program in question required students to spend two semesters in the participating schools. After the first year of operation, it was noted that the teachers were more eager to have first semester students than those in their second semester. After some probing, several reasons were found for this. During the first semester, the students were doing many things to help the teachers in their work, yet the teachers had only minimal supervisory responsibility for those students, as most of their "graded" work was supervised by the professors. In the second semester, the situtation changed and so did the teachers' reaction. As the students assumed more and more teaching duties, teachers were expected to critique student lesson plans and to observe the students when teaching and give feedback on student performance, all based on the training goals of the college.

In a very real sense, the needs of the teachers were being served during the first semester, while the teachers were being called on to serve the needs of students during the second semester. The negative reaction of the teachers toward the second semester was not due to selfishness or lack of professional concern for training prospective teachers. The teachers were never equal partners in the program; they had been "enlisted" to participate in a "college program" without their intended roles ever having been clarified. Without a understanding of and commitment to the overall program, teachers naturally gravitated toward those roles that best served them and attempted to avoid those that served them least. Thus, the full capabilities of the teachers were not utilized.

Professors certainly penalize themselves when they do not strive to establish parity, for virtually all responsibility for supervision

and feedback in field activity will fall to them. Such a burden is unnecessary, since teachers can, if they will, do an equally good, if not better, job, of supervising and giving feedback.

Then there are the students. As "consumers" of teacher education programs, their input is essential if a center is to operate with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

Parity is not a gift that all are anxious to receive. Some will reject it because of the responsibility that accompanies it. As long as there is even one person who is unwilling to become an equal partner in a program, it will be handicapped to a certain degree. Thus, it behooves teachers and professors to accept parity.

C. GOALS

Although goals of the center program should not be finalized until due consideration has been given to the overall program design, a tentative set of goals should be identified as one of the first steps in its development.

The process of goal setting and, particularly, the human interactions required to determine an acceptable set can be likened to planning for a family vacation. There are always many exciting places to go, so the problem becomes one of selecting from many good options the destination(s) that is best for the family. What is best for the family will be dependent upon the expectations or desires of the various family members. Should all members wish to go to the mountains, it is a simple matter of deciding which mountains. If one member wants to try the mountains, another the seacoast, and another wants to visit friends in Chicago, planning becomes much more difficult. Probably the expectations of everyone cannot be completely met, and a compromise will be necessary. Effecting a satisfactory compromise will require a number of family discussions where everyone has an opportunity to express his/her preferences and fair consideration is given to those preferences. Failure to settle in advance on a destination that is satisfactory to all is sure to result in later problems. The dissatisfied person or persons very likely will ruin the entire vacation for the rest of the family.

Center goals must be responsive to and representative of the goals and needs of the teachers, students, and professors who serve in the center. The goals of these three groups, influenced as they are by their respective needs, will not be similar in all respects. In fact, the goals of the three groups may, at some points, be at cross purposes. To be sure, the desires of one group will have consequences for the other groups.

The most salient goals and concerns of the teachers usually focus on the teaching of children in a way that is personally and professionally satisfying to them. From the center, they will expect assistance that will make their work easier and more effective. In addition, if teachers are involved in the development or implementation of a new program or curriculum (and frequently they are), they may be seeking support and assistance in this endeavor.

On the other hand, the students have a somewhat different set of expectations. From the research of Fuller, we know that these individuals are initially concerned about self and will be pondering such questions as, What is teaching all about?, Will the children like me?, How will I get along with others?, and Do I really want to be a teacher? When the student is able to resolve these self concerns, his/her next concerns will be with task--that is, What am I supposed to do?, How do I develop a lesson?, How do I teach reading?, and What is my next assignment? It will only be very late in the student's program, if at all, that the student demonstrates any real and sincere concern about the impact of his/her efforts on the learning of children. Of course, the student will talk about children and their learning throughout the program, but he/she will not be able to direct any significant energies or attention to this until self and task concerns are reduced. So, we have students who enter into the center with self concerns and expectations who, as they are learning to become a teacher, expect to be helped all along the way. These students come face to face with teachers who have their hands full with their responsibilities for teaching children and are hoping for assistance in meeting those responsibilities. Consequently, the students become helpless instead of being helped, and they are called on to focus on the task concerns of teachers rather than their own concerns.

College personnel in the center usually have as their principal goal that of preparing teachers for the teaching profession. They have preconceived notions about the learning experiences students must have in order to become effective teachers, and they are interested in seeing that students have the opportunity to participate in these necessary experiences. In fact, as a part of their role, they accept the responsibility for ensuring that the conditions within the center are such that students may have the experiences that they need. College persons are concerned with matters of task and impact, as are teachers, but they are focused in a different direction. The concerns of teachers are related to the children in their class, while the professors' concerns are with their students.

Children probably have no identified goals for the center operation, but they are certainly not unaware of the impact of the center and not without expectations, especially after the center has been in operation for a while. To be sure, they are sensitive

to what happens to them. For example, Chase (1972) surveyed the children in a teacher center to determine how they felt about the program. He found that children felt they had received much more individualized instruction and that the preservice teachers had been responsible for bringing more resources (materials, activities, etc.) into the learning environment. The children clearly favored the continuation of center operation.

What then are the implications of the goals of one group for the other groups? An example can best illustrate this. The two schools collaborating with the college in one center were to initiate an Individually Guided Education (IGE) program in the fall. As the teachers considered all the work this new program would require of them, they became increasingly excited about the prospect of having students available to assist them. Professors were pleased with the prospect that students would participate in the experience of implementing a new program. Students were unaware of what was in store for them.

Shortly after school opened, problems began to erupt that were directly attributable to the goal differences of the three groups. Teachers found the IGE program to be even more demanding than they had anticipated. Consequently, they pressed students into service in a wide variety of ways to "put out a fire" here and soothe a problem there. Usually this was done without explaining to the student what or why this was happening and with no feedback on how they performed. Clearly, students were being used by teachers to attain the teacher's goal, which was survival during this initial period of trauma.

Students were both uncomfortable and unhappy. Their self concerns were heightened when they were asked to perform tasks which they did not understand and for which they were totally unprepared. The lack of feedback was seen as a negative response to their work. Furthermore, the students were unable to fit the pieces of the day into a whole that they could understand. They viewed the situation as chaotic and certainly not representative of what they thought teaching was all about. Because teachers were so busy, they had little or no time to help the students.

As students expressed their frustrations to their professors, the professors became distressed. Their goal of a school environment where students could learn and progress toward effective teaching was not being met. Besides, they did not fully understand and did not know exactly how to be helpful in the situtaion. Eventually, there was a partial resolution of this situation, but for an extended period the needs of the teachers dominated the center program to the detriment of the students and frustration of the professors.

Professors are also guilty of imposing their goals on center programs, as is seen in another case. The college was especially interested in arranging for a setting where they could develop and test a new Competency-Based Teacher Education (CBTE) program for which they had a grant. Because of their intense focus on this need, they attempted to make this the top priority of the center, virtually ignoring the needs of the teachers and students. The professors wanted the students to demonstrate their competencies at many grade levels and with many types of children and groups of differing size, which meant the students had little consistent contact with any group of students. At first, subtle, and eventually open conflict developed between teachers and professors, for the teachers could see no benefits to themselves or their children. Students were also distressed, for they were unable to see how all these individual competencies were to fit together to form a complete training program responsive to their learning needs. For example, their frequent movement from room to room and group to group prevented them from establishing a real relationship with any group of children. As a result, they did not receive the positive feedback from children that told them they were liked and competent. The students were being forced to focus on task concerns before resolving self concerns.

At this point, one might ask if it is possible to agree on a set of goals that will be acceptable to all the groups involved in a teacher education center. Certainly, working toward the agreement must start with an open acknowledgement of the differences in goals and an acceptance of the fact that they stem from personal feelings and needs and are not stances arbitrarily taken. Also, it is necessary for both school and college to be willing to compromise.

Resolution of the problems in the case with the CBTE program was arrived at through compromise. After a series of intense meetings where feelings and expectations were openly discussed for the first time, a satisfactory compromise was reached. The teachers agreed to allow the college to continue its CBTE program, and the college agreed to allow the students to demonstrate the competencies in settings compatible to the needs of children and the regular classroom routine. Students were then able to establish a meaningful relationship with a group of children. Also, they were given additional information by the professors so that they could better understand how the parts of the program were to form a whole. An interesting sidelight of this situation was that the CBTE program seemed to work much better after the compromise than before.

The above case suggests another factor to be considered in goal setting. Be sure the goals chosen are harmonious--that is, pursuit of

one goal must not interfere with attainment of another goal. In their efforts to develop a new type of teacher education program the college had required students to perform such a variety of tasks in so many settings that students were unable to adjust completely to any setting and were following a schedule that was maddening for everyone. The students in that semester simply did not receive the best possible preparation for teaching. Neither did the college get a useful trial of its CBTE program. The two goals--new program development and preparation of effective teachers--were both worthwile, but in this case they worked against each other.

Once a tentative set of goals has been agreed upon, the next step in the development process is designing the program. It is often only when attention is directed to the design of a program that the participants get a clear picture of what a goal actually means to them personally in terms of demands and benefits. Participants in one center had agreed on a goal of curriculum development for the school with emphasis on the reading program. This was fine until it became evident that the college intended to do this by having the students introduce into the classroom a variety of reading programs and/or approaches. The school, on the other hand, had in mind that the students would spend most of their time making games and other materials to supplement the current reading program. Reconsideration of that goal became necessary at that point.

D. PROGRAM DESIGN

Goals may be, and frequently are, stated in terms so general that most anyone can agree with them. It is in the process of program design that the specifics of the center program are ironed out. It is also in that phase that some of the most heated controversies about program development occur. People tend to temporarily forget their goals and operate on the basis of their personal/professional beliefs and philosophies. Actually, it is good to have these expressed in the design phase, for in the day-to-day activities of the center these beliefs and philosophies will surely be the single most powerful force guiding the actions of individuals.

Many problems of operating centers appear to be programmatic or organizational in nature when, in fact, they are human problems stemming from conflicting beliefs and expectations. Many of these problems can be avoided or minimized if careful attention is given to program design. An effective way to develop the program design is to take each goal that has been tentatively agreed upon and make the following decisions regarding it:

1. Decide on the types of experiences that will be required to meet each goal, who will be responsible

for those experiences, and who and how the experiences are to be evaluated.

2. Decide how these experiences will be incorporated into the program plan, giving due consideration to factors such as scheduling, time, facilities, and finances.

These steps are appropriate for designing new programs or redesigning existing programs.

This design procedure implies that teachers, professors, and even students should be involved. It is especially important that students be involved in any redesign efforts, for views drawn from their experiences should be especially valuable. Involvement of all parties is necessary so that all views will be acknowledged and also so that all parties accept responsibility for the program.

Program Content

One of the principle reasons for establishing a teacher education center is to develop a more effective program than the existing one. It is advisable, therefore, to first consider those experiences that are deemed necessary for a quality program rather than beginning with those factors that might limit the program (usually those inhibiting the existing programs). Suppose the college has not had students involved in schools prior to student teaching because there was no provision for scheduling students into large time blocks so that they might spend time as a group in the schools. In this situation, it should be decided how much time will be needed for the desired program and how it should be blocked, and a proposal should be made requesting such an arrangement. Planning should not be limited by what is, but should look at what needs to be. When a group of school and college persons becomes enthusiastic about and committed to a purpose, they have a way of overcoming what seem to be insurmountable barriers.

When the determination of experiences focuses on "what we need" rather than on "what we are allowed to do," participants are much freer in their expression of true feelings about the program and their perceived role in it. Indeed, it is during this phase of program design that the real educational beliefs and philosophies of the participants will and should be expressed and tested.

When identifying the experiences to be included in the center program, it is wise to be as specific as possible, for the little things often create the greatest problems. It is not the purpose of this document to describe all the experiences that should or might be included in a center program. We do offer, however, a set of six situations drawn from the experiences of other centers. Using these

as examples, we propose to address some of the problems involved in (a) deciding on appropriate experiences to meet certain goals and (b) accomodating the expectations of the involved parties.

The specific goal that spawned the first two experiences was: "Upon graduation, students should have participated in as many experiences common to teaching as possible and they should do this by progressing from the very easy to the more difficult experiences."

1. Students were assigned to sit in a classroom for one full week and observe what went on. On paper, this may have appeared to be a logical activity, but in practice it was not. In the first place, the students did not really know what they were to look for or how to interpret what they saw. Secondly, by the end of the second day, they felt they had learned all they could by observing and they were eager to get involved. Professors expected that the teachers would provide the students with explanations of what was going on and why. Teachers were dissatisfied because they felt the students could be doing things to help them. Besides, the teachers found that having someone observe their every move without knowing their thoughts was a bit threatening.

   In this case, the experience made little or no contribution to the program goal and neither did it fulfill the expectations of students, teachers, or professors. Discussion of and attention to the expectations of the parties in a design phase could have prevented this problem. The problem was satisfactorily resolved when the professors agreed to allow the students to assist the teacher during the week in lieu of some observation time, and teachers agreed to sit down and talk with their students about the things they had observed. Furthermore, teachers and professors developed a manual to direct and focus the observations of the students.

2. In relation to the above-stated goal, in another center, it was agreed that during the first few weeks of the first semester, students would serve as teacher aides. Teachers had students spending all their time making and running dittos, cutting and pasting, and grading papers. Much of this work took them out of the classroom and away from contact with children. Teachers were pleased with this arrangement for it provided them with assistance they needed. Students were disgruntled, however, for they felt cut off from what they considered

the real world of teaching. Professors were dissatisfied for they felt the students were not being exposed to enough aspects of the life of a teacher. A redesign of this experience placed students back in the classroom for some of their work and also allowed them to provide some direct assistance to children. This fulfilled the expectations of students and professors while continuing to meet the needs of teachers.

A goal that is common to most centers is to have students learn how to manage children. This was a goal of the center we refer to in this example.

3. It was decided that students should have some responsibility early in their experience for managing children. Accordingly, students were asked to line the children up and to move them quietly to and from the lunchroom and to and from the gym. This was an unfortunate choice of experiences. In the first place, these are two of the most difficult times to control pupil behavior. Secondly, being new on the school scene, the students had had no time for developing rapport with the children or for establishing any kind of authority. Nor had the students received any instruction on pupil management skills and, as a consequence, the students had difficulty accomplishing this task. This experience was displeasing to all parties and was quickly abandoned in favor of more appropriate management activities preceded by some specific instruction.

The experience in this example was designed to fit the goal of providing teachers with instructional assistance, especially in reading.

4. To the teachers, teaching reading meant adherence to the basal reader and workbook, and faithful compliance with the suggestions provided in the teacher edition. To the professors, teaching reading meant determining the specific needs of the children and then using whatever methods would be most appropriate to meet those needs. Students were caught in the middle, for the professors were asking them to use one approach and the teachers were requiring that they use a different one. After due consultation, the problem was solved by allowing students to teach the basal

reader, but also having another time when the students worked with a small group in a manner suitable to the professors. This arrangement did not completely fit the beliefs and philosophy of any group, but it was a compromise that was enthusiastically accepted by everyone.

Being able to plan effectively for future teaching responsibilities was deemed an important goal for students in one center.

5. An experience related to this goal was to have students prepare detailed, written lesson plans in advance of any teaching act. The format to be followed was determined by the professors, and, in many cases, so were the lessons that the students were to teach. It was expected, however, that the teachers would check the plans to be sure they were adequate. Teachers found they did not have the time to check all the plans; besides, they did not know what standards to check them against or what to do if they failed to measure up. Students felt that the time spent writing plans to fit a specific format was wasted since no one was looking at the plans or giving them any feedback on them. This experience was satisfactorily revised by reducing the details required in the plans, dividing the responsibility for the plans more equally between teachers and professors, and arranging for students to assume more responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of their plans.

A collaborating school in one center felt the need for an improved math curriculum. Thus, it was decided that the students should assist in the development or selection of an improved curriculum.

6. What appeared to be a worthwile goal ended up with students making all kinds of materials to supplement and enrich the existing curriculum. Students felt they were being used as clerks and became very frustrated since they had no opportunity to actually use the materials with children. Furthermore, they were unable to see how the materials would be used in in the program or how the whole program fit together because the teachers were not using the materials. Professors became unhappy when they realized students were not really involved in a true curriculum development/selection process and were not applying their experiences in instruction of children.

Again, a compromise was necessary to bring about an acceptable resolution to the problem. Students continued to make materials, but the time they spent doing so was greatly reduced. They were allowed to use the materials with children, writing up a brief evaluation of the materials afterward. During the math methods class the students were taking in the program, professors set aside time to discuss the materials and their relation to the overall math program.

Hopefully, these examples are sufficient to emphasize the fact that the single most important factor to be considered when designing a center program is the people who will be involved and their particular beliefs and expectations. In the above cases, the original goals and the basic experiences were usually workable once they were adjusted to the needs and expectations of all participants.

Reflected to some extent in these examples, particularly 1 and 5, is the supervision/evaluation problem. Who and how will students be supervised? Because supervision and feedback are so vital to a teacher education center and because these activities require so much time, the who and how must be settled in advance. When there is parity in the center, the effort is appropriately divided according to the differing kinds of expertise and time availablility of the respective participants. Even so, agreement on the frequency of observation and feedback, the criteria for evaluating, and the procedures for applying the criteria must be established in advance. The need for this is vividly illustrated in the predicament that occurred in the center.

During the first semester of a program, the students were required to conduct within the classroom a number of mini-teaching episodes that were assigned and evaluated by a professor. These tasks consumed only a portion of the students' time, and in the remaining time they were to assist a teacher and become acquainted with the various teacher responsibilities. A sequenced list of activities the student might pursue was available during this time, but, for the most part, the teachers decided what the students would do and supervised their work. This arrangement was satisfactory until the time came to evaluate the performance of the students. In a number of cases, the professors were less than pleased with the teaching performance of a student, but the teacher was exuberant in praise of the student's performance of tasks performed under his/her guidance, many of them being non-teaching tasks such as making bulletin boards and teaching materials and grading papers. The program design had failed

to identify the who and how of student evaluation in advance, so there was confusion as to how to evaluate students for purposes of a grade.

Another matter that should be considered in program design is so sensitive that it is rarely discussed openly among center participants. It has, however, a significant influence on the smoothness and effectiveness of operations. This is the matter of who knows best about what. Many professors feel they know better than teachers what kind of classroom environment and instructional program is best for children. Furthermore, they propose to teach their students what is "best." On the other hand, there are numerous teachers who feel they know best what students must do and learn if they are going to become effective teachers. This conflict is typified in the above example (#4) of how professors thought students should teach reading in one way and teachers thought it best that they teach it in another way.

Many professor complain that they cannot properly train teachers because there are so few good teacher models for the students to emulate. Teachers, on the other hand, frequently voice concern over professors' lack of knowledge and understanding of the "real world" of the schools and their efforts to fill students' minds with unrealistic methods for teaching.

For a center to function effectively, it is neither necessary nor desirable to decide or discuss who knows most about what. It is essential, however, that participants discuss openly and frankly their basic beliefs about teaching children and preparing teachers as a means for arriving at a common understanding and acceptance for those experiences that are to constitute the program. When the participants believe in the value of a set of experiences, they will support them with their best efforts without regard to whose idea it was or who knows most about that area. Without belief in and commitment to an experience, participant support of it will be half-hearted at best and may even be negative and sabotaging.

It seems that teacher education centers which grow out of the traditional school-college collaborative arrangement for student teaching are more susceptible to difficulties due to poor program design than are newly formed centers. This is especially true when the movement from a student teaching collaboration (STP) to a center concept (TEC) is viewed as an additive process--adding of time and activities--rather than as a different concept of teacher education requiring a new kind of relationship between school and college. For example, the college in one student teaching arrangement had long assumed responsibility for program, feedback, and evaluation of student teachers. Teachers were the "nice guys" who usually assumed the role of friend and encouraged and supported the students. When the program was expanded to two semesters and included many more courses and schools-based requirements for students, things began to change in

unplanned ways. Professors began to devote more time to methods courses and practicum experiences during the first semester and less time to student teaching. Apparently, the professors assumed and expected that the teachers would accept most of the responsibility for student teaching. This meant teachers would have to modify their traditional stance of friend and supporter and accept also the role of critic and evaluator of students.

With no one recognizing the problem, pressures gradually mounted among the teachers and finally there was a minor explosion of feelings. This led to a thorough reconsideration of the center program. Personal feelings and beliefs about the center program and educational philosophies in general were the first order of business in this rethinking process. Following this, other program design activities that should have preceded the move to the center concept were considered.

Obviously, a forward looking center will be ever changing, so it will never be possible to establish a final set of experiences. However, a framework that recognizes the desires and needs of all participants can and should be established so that experiences can be introduced and/or modified with minimal personal conflicts or program disruptions.

Organizing Time, Schedules, Facilities, and Finances

In the second step of program design, there will be a real testing of institutional commitment as well as of personal commitment of time and energy. If the program of the preservice education center is to be better than programs without a strong fieldbase, it will require more from the people involved and more from the institutions. Professors will have to "relocate" from their campus domicile to the schools. Teachers will have to adjust their daily schedule to permit interaction with students and professors. Both parties will have to devote time to the joint planning, evaluation, and policy making that is essential in a collaborative venture.

To begin with, it is characteristic to expect students to spend more time and do more work as a part of their training with the expectation that they will be better prepared to teach. Much of the students' time will be spent in a school where they will be expected to learn and demonstrate those skills deemed necessary for good teaching. From this beginning, there is an ever-widening ripple effect that touches on scheduling, time requirements, facilities, and financing.

Matters of Time. Involvement in a teacher education center will require more time from everyone, including students. As a minimum, students will probably need to spend the equivalent of at least one-half

day, five days a week in the schools. In many cases, especially during the final semester, it will probably be necessary for students to be in the field most of every day five days a week. This is, of course, much more time in the field than is required of students in traditional education courses.

Because students are assigned in large time segments, professors will have to be similarly assigned, and this can be even more trying than student scheduling. The problem is not so great if the field-based program is handled by one or more professor who has his/her entire teaching load in the center. Usually this is not the case. It is more likely that a professor will have a three, six, nine, hour load in the center and the remainder outside. In colleges that operate in several preservice education centers, a professor may work in more than one center. Whatever the manner for assigning professors, it is critical that their schedules allow them the time needed to fulfill their responsibilities in the field-based program--responsibilities that are far more time-consuming than those of a traditional program.

How much time professors can and do devote to the field-based program is critical if the center is to avoid the oft-heard complaint from students that they do not receive enough supervision and feedback. More time and effort is required of students than in traditional programs, and much of that time is spent in practicum activities. It follows, then, that more time will be required of both teachers and professors to observe and assist students with their practicum responsibilities.

To have a properly functioning teacher education center, teachers and professors must work as a team. Actually, there will be three teams--a teacher team, professor team, and combined team of teachers and professors. Working as a team member will demand additional time, but the team effort is essential to having an integrated and coordinated center program. There will be times when teacher and professor teams meet separately to plan and coordinate their respective efforts. At other times, the two groups must work together in planning, evaluating, and policy making. There is also the need for time to confer with students, reflecting on their current performance and helping them plan for future efforts.

A brief comment about teacher/professor conferences is in order here. Professors should not expect that they can drop into a school and have a conference with a teacher at any time during the school day. Brief and casual interchanges need no scheduling, but formal conferences should be arranged in advance. Teachers are busy all day and should not be expected to stop what they are doing to have an unscheduled conference with a professor.

Lack of time to do all that should be done is a common plague in centers. We have discovered no immunity to this infirmity, but its

effects are greatly reduced when time-related problems are clearly identified, resolved to the degree that they can be, and, beyond that, simply accepted as a necessary part of quality field-based teacher education.

Matters of Scheduling. The ideal schedule for a center will involve students all day (say 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.), five days a week for two semesters. This amount of time is necessary if the essential goals of a teacher education center are to be accomplished. During the first semester, as much as half of this time might be devoted to classroom activities and the remainder to college course work, but not the typical college courses. These courses will be taught in the school setting and will prepare the students for their classroom through experience such as tutoring, conducting cases studies, developing materials, and planning for immediately forthcoming and future teaching responsibilities. Time should be set aside during the day for students to study and work on assignments.

During the second semester (the time of student teaching), the bulk of student time will be spent in teaching activities. Usually no more than one-fourth of the time should be devoted to course work, and this should be course work that supports and enriches the practicum experience. During this semester, students will have to spend more time working on tasks at home--approximating what the life of a teacher is like.

Unless students are present all day, it is difficult for them to grasp the full impact of what it means to be a teacher. Teachers may even perform differently when students are in the room half-day. One teacher who had students in the morning commented that there were some things "she swept under the rug" until afternoon when the students were gone.

Once the schedule has been established, how the time will be used becomes an issue of import. In one center, it was decided that during the first half of the first semester students would spend four days a week in college course work (taught in the schools and practium-related) and one day a week observing in the classrooms where they would work a quarter amount of time later in the semester. For the college, the schedule worked fine; it was not so for the school children, who viewed the students as "weekly visitors," and there was much vying for the students' attention. To avoid this disruption, a new schedule had to be arranged, one that was less convenient for the college staff but more appropriate for all other participants.

In one center, students spent all morning in classrooms and all afternoon in college course work. Not only did this have the previously mentioned disadvantage of the half-day schedule, but professors

found it very difficult to motivate the students who would rather have been back in the classroom. A schedule change allowed for full days in the classroom and included contact with children in the college course work.

In addition to the daily/weekly schedule, attention should be given to the semester schedule. Unfortunately, semester schedules are usually based on the college calendar, not the school calendar. This means that most students enter schools after classes have resumed in January, and they leave in the spring before they are over. Consequently, students miss out on important learning experiences. Ask a person who is about to begin his/her first teaching assignment what he/she would most like to know and very likely he/she will respond, "What to do on the first day of school?" Placing students in schools early enough in the fall to experience the beginning process can reduce this concern. In one center, students donned their work clothes and joined the teachers for the three days of classroom preparation before school started, and then stayed in the classroom as observer/helper for the first week before beginning any college course work. Students and teachers alike consistently rated this experience very favorably. This was accomplished through center, professor, and student interest and motivation with no change in the college calendar.

Schedules that remove students from their school before the Christmas and end-of-school-year festivities should be avoided. This may seem trival to professors, but it is quite important to children, students, and teachers, and the schedules should provide for it. Students want and deserve the "caring" children bestow on them at these times; teachers appreciate the assistance of the students; and children want those they like to share happy occasions with them.

Facilities. A teacher education center should be housed in the collaborating school. This means that the number of adults in the school will be increased by the number of students and professors involved in the center. Hopefully, the students and professors will be accepted as co-professionals, and all facilities will be graciously shared with them. Even so, careful planning along with some tolerance on the part of everyone are necessary if this many people are to be comfortably accommodated.

A first and critical need is for at least one classroom or space of equivalent size to be set aside for the center. This space is needed for college class meetings, as a location for books and other materials students need, as a place where small groups of children might be instructed on occasion, and as a place where students can study and work on assignments. This must be available to the center program at all times. Auditoriums, lunch rooms, multipurpose rooms, and other spaces that have to be shared might be tolerated for a brief

time, but are totally unacceptable as a permanent base. Portable buildings have been used in many centers when space in the building has been unavailable.

When these additional adults take up residence in a school, the teachers' lounge, soft drink machines, restrooms and even the lunch room can quickly become overtaxed if plans are not made to avoid this. No matter how sincere teachers are in their intentions to treat students as co-professionals, teachers will become irritated if students crowd them out of their lounge and restrooms. The center should provide a lounge area where students can be comfortable, have soft drinks, smoke and even eat lunch, thus equalizing the demands on school facilities. A good deal of important professional interchange normally takes place in such a setting. When the space allocated to the college has adjoining restrooms, this takes care of another potentially difficult problem. Work and preparation space should also be made available. If total center space is sufficient, an instructional area is also helpful in meeting small groups of children for specialized instructional/training purposes, although this needs to be carefully balanced with regular classroom participation. Students should be responsible for the general appearance of the center.

When students must share a restroom and/or cold drink machine with teachers, arrangements should be made so that students do not converge on these facilities at certain times each day as a large group. The same is true for the lunch room. Usually, food can be prepared to feed all students, but space is sometimes a problem. Going to lunch at intervals or having students take their trays back to the center can minimize the space problem.

The school library or instructional resources center is another area students are likely to use frequently as they check out materials for use with children. Rarely does this create any problems; on the contrary, the librarian or director is usually pleased to see the books and materials in use. As a way of sharing, it is recommended that the professors move their more useful professional books from their offices into the library where teachers as well as students will have access to them. After all, they will be used more there than in the campus office of professors.

Costs. A teacher education center of the type we are describing here may be operated with little or no direct cost. Use of existing facilities in the school, as well as utilities and custodial services, adds no noticeable costs to the school budget. As will be discussed below, there is no need for special personnel to manage or control the center since this can be done by participating members. There are, however, some things that do make for a better program if they are

available. Students should have access to the teacher edition of the books they teach. Ditto masters, mimeograph paper, construction paper, and tag board will also be needed by students. Other types of teaching materials such as workbooks, exercise manuals, and commercial teaching aids are valuable to students as they learn to use a variety of materials in their teaching.

One way to get some or all of the above things is to access students a labor or practicum fee each semester--perhaps $10.00--to use for the purchases. Another way is to have it understood that students must provide the expendable supplies that they need and use for their own purposes. There should be an understanding with the schools that anything students make with school supplies belongs to the school, and things made with supplies purchased by the students belong to the students. Many times publishers will furnish the teacher editions and other teaching materials without charge if a request comes from the center. Out-of-adoption texts stored in bookrooms can be moved into the center where students will have access to them for ideas or actual teaching materials. Each student might be asked to develop one learning game or some type of teaching material to leave with the center. Over a period of semesters, a real storehouse of materials can be accumulated.

Colleges may find it necessary to pay mileage costs for professors if they have to drive too far from campus to the collaborating school. It can be a great help to professors if graduate or undergraduate aides can be assigned to assist them with their supervising responsibilities. Students who have previously been in the program are especially valuable in this role. These things will cost the college money, but it is a pittance that will be returned many times over in program quality. In the same vein, teacher aides can be very helpful in freeing teachers to work more closely with the students.

Lack of additional financing should not be a total deterrent to the development and operation of a good field-based program. Quality education and training does cost money, but, without substantial additional financing, a field-based program that is far superior to the traditional teacher education program can be developed by those who believe in it.

Excellent use can be made of support made available to the center. Provisions for on-site videotape equipment, a well-stocked curriculum library, and additional personnel to assist teachers and professors are just a few of the advantages more money would buy. It should be pointed out, however, that the availability of more money does not necessarily mean a better center. In the state of Texas, for instance, a sum of $50.00 is given to the district for each full-time equivalent student teacher. Supposedly, this money is to be used in the cooperating schools to enrich the program. In one district with which we are

familiar, these monies are used to cover administrative salaries and other costs associated with the student teaching program. Individual schools or centers receive none of these funds.

E. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

A center which has been built on the basis of full parity and with continuing consideration of the needs of all participants will require substantial and continuous coordination. As a field-based program approaches the full scale teacher education center model, there is much to be said for the appointment of a center coordinator on a nearly full-time basis. During the development phase, responsibility for coordination may, of necessity, be shared by two or more of the college-based and school-based teacher educators, in which case, close communication will be necessity.

Program management is important and it must be ongoing, but it should consume only a fraction of the time and effort of teachers and professors. When these concerns require a disproportionate amount of time and effort, it is a clear indication that all is not in order with the program design and particularly with the human factors in that design. Attempts at correcting management problems through program revision are almost certain to be ineffectual if the personal concerns of individuals have not been thoroughly and honestly considered and accomodated.

Several factors become important in establishing and maintaining effective program management or coordination.

Institutional Support

A center with inadequate institutional support is sure to be handicapped in its work. In fact, it is unlikely that a teacher education center of the type we are talking about can even exist without strong support.

When teaching in a center, a professor will usually be one of a team of professors. This increases the demand on his/her time, for the team must meet regularly to develop and sustain a program that is integrated and coordinated rather than a collection of individual courses and professors, each going pretty much their own way. Our experiences suggest that it will take at least two years for a faculity to develop a smooth operating team in which everyone is able to shift from his/her pattern of complete independence to one in which he/she must give priority to a program and its needs.

Professors who do give a full measure to a center program will be giving more of themselves for student benefit than their institution expects, yet they may not be recognized or rewarded for that

effort. In fact, it can even be negative in terms of pay and promotion, although this is gradually becoming generally less true. A professor's writing and research are inevitably curtailed, at least for the first couple of years, and, in institutions where these are considered more important than good teaching, professors may suffer. Even in institutions where good teaching is rewarded, a professor can get in trouble. In one institution, a group of younger professors established a very effective center that soon had students spreading the word about how much better this program was than the traditional one. This was very threatening to a group of older professors with governance power, who had no intention of venturing forth from their campus sanctuaries. Soon, the center professors were being chided for their failure to devote enought time to departmental affairs and to the graduate program.

Teachers, like professors, will also be members of a team that must meet to coordinate and integrate their efforts. Joint meetings of teachers and professors are also required to keep the wheels of the operation well-oiled. Teachers also have to spend time with the students--helping them develop plans for their own teaching, talking to them about their work--and visiting with professors about the work and progress of the individual students. Principals must find ways to provide teachers with released time if teachers are to carry out these duties and still maintain their sanity.

Standing in clear and firm support of those who work in centers is one commitment the institutions must make--rewarding the participants for their efforts and arranging their teaching loads so that it is feasible for them to do the work that needs to be done. Universities (that is, department chairmen), deans, and registrars, must cooperate in arranging course and time schedules so that students can spend the needed time in the field. This seems like a simple request, but real internal struggles have developed in some institutions when attemps were made to change the traditional schedule. Frequently, it seems that schedules are more sacred than quality of programs. There must be enough flexibility in the college schedule to allow students, teachers, and professors the time they need to design and operate a functional program that integrates theory and practice.

Note that the plea here is not for monetary assistance from the institutions, although that would a desirable way of expressing support. What we are asking here is that in visible ways, schools and colleges say to their participants, "You are doing an important job, and it is appreciated. Keep up the good work!"

Assuming good institutional support, management of a center can and should focus on two major areas: (1) maintenance of open and accurate communication among all parties; and (2) evaluation and revision of the effort. Mollifying hurt feelings, constantly putting

out fires attributable to poor planning (or no planning), and uncertainties about where the program is headed can be minimized if effective planning and preparation is carried out in advance of beginning the center. Thus, all energies should be expended in a positive, forward-looking direction rather than a corrective, backward-looking one.

Communication

Managing the center will require that someone be in charge. All this means is that there should be one person with the responsibility for calling teachers and professors together on a regular basis for the purposes of "checking signals," evaluating, revising, and planning ahead. Members of both the college and school teams should be doing this weekly or at least every other week. At least every month, the two groups or their selected representatives should meet together for a general program review.

At the beginning of each semester, the time and place of these joint meetings should be established and one person, teacher or professor, selected to call and chair this meeting. The chairperson can be rotated every so often, if desired. Notes of each meeting should be maintained and copies circulated to everyone following the meeting. Near the close of each semester, several meetings should be set aside for serious program evaluation and planning in preparation for the next semester.

Meeting as separate bodies and as a combined group should provide adequately for the formal communication system. Problems are more likely to arise, however, in the daily, informal communications network. Teachers, professors, and students interact regularly in their daily contacts, and much of the business of the center is conducted in this way. This face-to-face communication process is highly effective when exercised with a bit of caution. When conversing with a single person, it is easy, without realizing it, to make statements that represent policy decisions or even changes. If these statements are not then communicated by the originator to all other parties, the policy will filter from one person to another, probably with slight changes in each transfer. Furthermore, individuals can be offended, and a program disrupted, when they learn that decisions influencing their work have been made without their knowledge. As an example, students in one center were to be tutoring a small group of children in reading. One teacher wanted her student to turor in math instead, and in a weak moment, she persuaded the professor guiding this experience to agree. Quickly, this "policy change" spread to other students and teachers, generating much confusion and some hard feelings before the matter could be settled.

To supplement face-to-face communication, several actions should be taken. A message box for professors should be established adjacent

to the teacher boxes in the school office, and this box should be checked at least twice a day. Teachers and students can easily send messages to professors via this box. There should be an announcement center for students located in a convenient spot. Professors and teachers can post assignments or messages on the board, which should be checked at least twice daily.

Memos must be used for many communication purposes. Memos are good for documenting the history of the center, as well as conveying the same information efficiently to many people. Memos can be initiated by teachers or professors. Overuse of memos should be avoided to prevent memo immunity. To distinguish center memos from other memos in the school, a paper of one color should be used.

A roster containing names, addresses, and phone numbers of students, teachers, and professors can be a very useful document for everyone to have. Many are the times when participants will need to communicate after and before school hours.

In one successful center, a picnic, party, or some type of informal gathering was arranged at the close of each semester for teachers, students, and professors. This did much to cement relations among the groups and to open the doors of communication wider. In another center, several informal "get togethers" were held early in the semester as a means of developing a group cohesiveness and unity of purpose.

Evaluation

Formative evaluation of the center program will almost certainly be ongoing, but there should also be a time near the end of each semester for systematic and in-depth evaluation. To do this, a checklist should be developed that reflects the program areas to be evaluated. Some of those areas would undoubtedly include the following: scheduling--did the students spend enough time in the school classrooms?; experiences--were the things students were asked and allowed to do worthwhile to them, to teachers, to children?; and communication--did everyone feel they knew what was going on and that they were a part of the decision making process? Other possible evaluation areas would be supervision, facilities, materials, management, and program goals and objectives.

Professors, students, and teachers might first consider the checklist independently and then come together as a group to discuss their positions. At all times, the focus should be on the aspects of the program that should be continued because they are good and on changes that should be made to improve the program. Belaboring who or what is wrong with a program without positive suggestions for improvement is a futile expenditure of time. Perfection in the program will never be attained, but progress in that direction should be made each semester.

Formative evaluation, on a regular and systematic basis, is highly important, especially during the first couple of years of center development. When taken seriously in program modification, redesign, and refinement, evaluation offers effective assurance that the views of the various participants are heard and valued. This intensifies the sense of ownership by those responsible for the center's continuation. It is a crucial initial step in making the center increasingly effective with respect to the necessary mix of goals for all participants which it is designed to fulfill.

When centers become established and are functioning with reasonable smoothness, there is a need for increasingly sophisticated summative evaluation. It is one thing to know that a program is working without falling apart at the seams periodically and that the program is functioning to the general satisfaction of the various participants. It is another to be able to establish that the program is producing those specific effects that are congruent with the important educational outcomes required by individuals and their society in achieving their fullest potential.

A FINAL NOTE

At this point it must be clear that the authors strongly favor the teacher education center as a powerful vehicle for increasing the effectiveness of education and training for prospective teachers. Full implementation of the concept requires time and intelligent adaptation to local circumstances and progressive role changes for college and school personnel, as well as for participating students. Results of this effort have been encouraging as we have observed them both first and second hand.

As a brief summary, we offer the following list of advantages inherent in successful implementation of a teacher education center:

1. Centers provide a mechanism for assembling and focusing the full training potential of both college-based and school-based teacher educators on the emergent learning and experiential needs of prospective teachers.
   a. Centers offer recognition of teachers and other school personnel as full-fledged and indispensable members of the teacher education team responsible for both the design and implementation of preservice teacher education.

   b. Centers offer college-based teacher educators direct access to, and involvement in, the reality settings in which their students are learning to function. Relevance is built into the teaching-learning environment rather than being extrapolated from past experience of the instructor and anticipations of the learner.

   c. Centers offer teachers-in-training integrated inputs from the school-college instructional/supervisory team geared to their emerging needs for knowledge, skill, and progressively responsible experience in managing the learning environment for children.

2. Centers permit greater flexibility in the utilization of the expertise resident in college and school-based teacher educators in a sequence and at a pace which is congruent with the stage of development and learning which individual prospective teachers have reached.

3. Centers have the capability of offering a wide variety of field experience responsive to

learning and experiential needs of different prospective teachers.

4. Centers offer rapid and constant feedback on program effectiveness for different students and immediate changes based on that feedback.

5. Centers foster personalized and informal relationships among teacher educators and students which diminish formal and supressive barriers and structures and enhance learning and satisfaction for all participants.

6. Centers can provide significantly enriched educational programs for children through the integrated contributions of expertise and increased educational personnel in the schools.

7. Centers offer schools and colleges open opportunities for the communication of new developments in their respective areas of contact and expertise which facilitate the movement of both inservice and preservice personnel toward the cutting edge of educational change and renewal.

8. Centers which concentrate on preservice education experience a training model which can have powerful effects on the design and conduct of continuing education programs for inservice teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography was developed by the authors both from their own readings and from a computer search of the ERIC data base. The ERIC data base is composed of documents announced in Resources in Education (RIE) and journal articles announced in Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). RIE documents are assigned an ED number, and, unless otherwise noted, are available for study on microfiche at the over 600 locations with an ERIC microfiche collection and for purchase in microfiche (MF) or "hardcopy" (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia. An EDRS order form is included in this publication. Journal articles are only indexed and annotated in CIJE and are not reproduced by ERIC in microfiche or hardcopy. Most CIJE journals, however, are available at college and public libraries.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Teachers' Centers: A British First." Phi Delta Kappan (November 1971): 146-149.

Berty, Ernest. Evaluation Report of the Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia. Charleston: West Virginia State Department of Education, 1973. 57 pp. ED 080 604 MF & HC

Bicknell, J. E., et al. Formative Studies of First Year of the Competency-Based Field Center for Teacher Education at Hamburg, New York. Fredonia, N. Y.: State University of New York, 1974. 222 pp. ED 093 853 MF & HC

Blake, Robert W. "Is Teacher Education Governable?" English Education (February/March 1974): 152-228.

Borich, Gary D., et al. An Evaluation of the Personalized Model of Teacher Training: Final Report. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1974.

Bown, Oliver H. "New Frontiers in Teacher Education." Kappa Delta Pi Record (February 1967): 98-105.

Burdin, Joel L. "Scenario on Teacher Centers in the 1990's." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 40-43.

Burns, W. J., et al. Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Attain Their Learning Goals? Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, November 1973. 37 pp. ED 084 257 MF & HC

California (Pa.) State College, School of Education. Western State College's Teacher Education Center, WES.C.T.E.C. California, Pa.: California State College, School of Education, 1974. 7 pp. ED 098 219 MF & HC

Campbell County Board of Education. Northern Kentucky Inservice Innovation Center. Alexandria, Ken.: Campbell County Board of Education, 1971. 145 pp. ED 080 489 MF & HC

Capital University. The Gahanna Undergraduate Internship Program. Columbus, Ohio: Capital University, 1973. 16 pp. ED 086 648 MF & HC

Chase, Donald J. How About a Teacher Education Center? . . . Ask the Kids. 1972. 12 pp. ED 087 733 MF & HC

Clark, Christopher M. "Now That You Have a Teacher Center, What Are You Going to Put into It?" Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 46-48.

Collins, James F. "The Making of a Teaching Center." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 13-20.

Crosby, J. Michael. "A Teacher Looks at Teaching Centers and Educational Reform." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 31-36.

Cyphert, Frederick R., and Nancy L. Zimpher. "The Increasing Politicalization of Teacher Education." AACTE Bulletin (April 1975): 5.

Denemark, George W., and Joost Yff. Obligation for Reform. The Final Report of the Higher Education Task Force on Improvement and Reform in American Education (Grant-IEG-0-71-1079). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974. 75 pp. ED 087 744 MF & HC

Devaney, Kathleen and Lorraine Thorn. Exploring Teachers' Centers. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975.

DeVault, M. Vere. "Teacher Centers: An International Concept." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 37-39.

DeVault, M. Vere. Teacher Centers in Japan, England and the United States. A Series of Case Studies. 1974. 129 pp. ED 093 856 MF & HC

Dewey, John. "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education." In The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers, Third Yearbook, Part I, National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1904.

Dickson, George E., ed. Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio. Final Report (Grant-OEG-0-71-1089(725)). Toledo: University of Toledo, College of Education, 1972. 73 pp. ED 086 677 MF & HC

DuShane, Judy. "Inservice Programs for Teachers in Northwest Ohio." Journal of Environmental Education 5, no. 3 (1974): 12-14.

Earp, N. Wesley, and Fred W. Tanner. A Follow-Up of the Classroom Professional Attitude Development of NTSU Elementary Graduates in Their First Year of Teaching. Research on Elementary Teacher Preparation Monograph No. 1. Denton, Texas: North Texas State University, 1974. 49 pp. ED 098 173 MF

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade." Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974): 250-52.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The Reform of Education and Teacher Education: A Complex Task." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1972). 117-125.

Elizabeth City State University. Concentration in Environmental Education. Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Elizabeth City State University, 1973. 24 pp. ED 086 714 MF & HC

Ellis, Margaret W. "A Systems Model for Integration of Media into the Teacher Center Concept." Education Technology (July 1974): 45-49.

Evans, Maureen L. "Toward Assessing the Effectiveness of a Teacher Education Center." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). 19 pp. ED 090 280 MF & HC

Fantini, Mario D. "Patterns for Reform in American Teacher Education." Interchange 4, no. 2-3 (1973): 28-39.

Faxon, Donna D., et al. Collaborative Resources for Educational Alternatives for Teacher Education (CREATE). Gainesville: Florida University, Gainesville College of Education, August 1974. 50 pp. ED 096 308 MF & HC

Fibkins, Williams. "The Whys and Hows of Teachers' Centers." Phi Delta Kappan (April 1974): 567-69.

Fischer, Stephen J., and Roland J. B. Goddu. Student Teaching Centers: A Pilot Project. Report Number 3 (Contract-OEC-5-10-239). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Center for Research and Development in Educational Differences, 1967. 29 pp. ED 088 824 MF & HC

Florida State Department of Education. Recommendations of the State Council for Teacher Education Centers. Teacher Education Act of 1973. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education, 1974. 15 pp. ED 096 278 MF & HC

Fuller, Frances F. "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal 6, no. 2 (March 1969): 207-26.

Fuller, Frances F. Concerns of Teachers: Research and Reconceptualization. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1973.

Fuller, Frances F., and Oliver H. Bown. "Becoming a Teacher." Teacher Education, the Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Fuller, Frances F., Oliver H. Bown, and Robert F. Peck. Creating Climates for Growth. Austin: University of Texas, The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1967.

Fuller, Frances F., et al. Effects of Personalized Feedback During Teacher Preparation on Teacher Personality and Teaching Behavior. Final Report, Personality, Teacher Education and Teaching Behavior Research Project. Austin: University of Texas, 1968. 419 pp. ED 028 148 MF & HC

Galler, Wayne H., and Myrna M. Toney. Benefits Accruing for the Teaching Profession via University-Public School Partnership, 1974. 22 pp. ED 088 817 MF & HC

Howey, Kenneth R. "Comprehensive Renewal in the Public Schools: The Context and Potential of Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 26-30.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Teacher Centers--Is There Anything New? Some Tentative Guidelines for Assessing the Nature and Extent of Collaboration and Renewal." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). 8 pp. ED 090 148 MF & HC

Howey, Kenneth R., and Frederick V. Hayen. "The Teacher Center: A Vehicle for Public School/College Collaboration in Comprehensive Renewal." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. (April 1975).

Indiana University Southeast. A Composite Field Based Performance Program with an "Adopt-a-School" Component. New Albany: Indiana University Southeast, 1973. 33 pp. ED 087 717 MF & HC

Irwin, Martha, and Wilma Russell. The Community is the Classroom. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971. ED 082 293 Document Not Available from EDRS.

Jackson, Noel R. An Introduction to the Harlingen Teacher Renewal Center. 1973. 10 pp. ED 091 355 MF & HC

Judson, Madison. "Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 44-45.

Kaplan, Leonard. "Survival Talk for Educators--on Teacher Center." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 49-51.

Klugman, Edgar. Can the Teacher Education Institution Respond Through the Teacher Education Center to the Changing Needs and Expectations in the Field? 1974. 36 pp. ED 093 870 MF & HC

Koch, Mary B. The Learning Center: A Collaborating Model for Educational Development, 1972. 66 pp. ED 080 455 MF & HC

LeFavor, Harold D. "Inservice Training and Professional Development Via a Teacher Centre." Catalyst for Change (Winter 1974): 7-10.

Leonard, Albert J. "Teacher Centers: Where Do They Come from and Why?" Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). 11 pp. ED 090 204 MF & HC

Lindbeck, John R. "Going Metric in Teacher Education." Man/Society/Technology, (September/October 1974): 9-11.

Lutonsky, Linda, ed. Portal Schools. Final Report (Grant-OEG-0-71-3354(716). Washington, D.C.: Council of the Great City Schools, 1973. 77 pp. ED 082 283 MF & HC

Maddox, Kathryn, ed. In West Virginia, It Is Working. One Teacher Education Center in Action, 1972. 64 pp. ED 086 679 MF & HC

Maddox, Kathryn, and Mildred Holt. "Teacher Education Center: School/College Parity." Catalyst for Change (Spring 1974): 19-23

Maine University, School of Education. Teacher Education Learning Centers. Portland-Gorham: Maine University, School of Education. 1974. 7 pp. ED 098 212 MF & HC

Mallan, J. T. "Teaching Centers: Utopia, Eutopia, or Kakotopia?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, February 1974). 13 pp. ED 087 779 MF & HC

Marsch, David. An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites. Monmouth, Oregon: Oregon State System of Higher Education, Teaching Research Division, 1971. 58 pp. ED 086 678 MF & HC

Marsh, David. "Issues Concerning Teacher Centers: Research and Development--Is There a Role?" Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Education Research Association, (Chicago, April 1974). 9 pp. ED 093 834 MF & HC

Menaker, Shirley L. Effects of Personalization in Elementary Teacher Education, Preliminary Results from Reanalysis of Data. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1972.

Merritt, Daniel L., and Evelyn Bell. "The Teaching Education Center Is Alive and Well." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1972): 152-154.

Miller, Starr, and John Hulsey. Which Direction for Schools of Education? 1971. 10 pp. ED 087 763 MF & HC

Minneapolis Public Schools, and University of Minnesota. An Overview of Alternative Education: Implications for a Teacher Center Model. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Public Schools, and University of Minnesota, 1974. 6 pp. ED 088 896

Morgan, G. A. "Teachers' Centers." Urban Review (July 1974): 187-96.

O'Brien, Thomas C. "Some Comments on British Education." Elementary School Journal (October 1974): 42-49.

Parsons, Theodore, W. Developing a Teacher Center. 1972. 19 pp. ED 086 673

Pasch, Marvin, and Marvin Pozdol. "The Development of Field Based Teacher Education Programs at Cleveland State University." Position paper submitted to the College of Education, Cleveland State University, (September 1973). 5 pp. ED 093 860

Peck, Robert F. "Personality Patterns of Prospective Teachers." Journal of Experimental Education(December 1960): 169-175.

Peck, Robert F. Personalized Education, the Program of the R&D Center for Teacher Education. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1970.

Pilcher, Paul S. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan (January 1973): 340-43.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "ERIC: Opening Up the View." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 52-58.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1972. 35 pp. ED 062 302 MF & HC

Price, Shelby L., and John H. Baker. A New Dimension to the Teacher Center Concept: A University Partnership with a Community College, 1973. 10 pp. ED 087 756 MF & HC

Quigley, Lawrence. A Systematic Approach to Renewal of Public Education in Massachusetts. 1974. 32 pp. ED 097 326 MF & HC

Racine Unified School District 1. A Center for Re-Education of Teachers. End of Project Period Report, June 1969 to May of 1970 (Grant-OEF-3-7-703381-3743). Racine, Wis.: Racine Unified School District 1, 1970. 10 pp. ED 080 492 MF & HC

Raskin, Bruce. "Teachers Helping Teachers." Learning (September 1973): 29-30.

Rosner, Benjamin. The British Teacher Center: A Report on its Development, Current Operations, Effects and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U.S. 1972. 34 pp. ED 090 165 MF & HC

Ross, Frank. "Let's Get Teacher Training out of Teacher Training Institutions." English Education (February/March 1974): 145-51.

Ruchkin, Judith P. "Teacher Centers: How Does One-College Collaboration Work." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1974): 170-74.

San Francisco University. Pilot Program: San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development. San Francisco: San Francisco University, 1973. 17 pp. ED 085 386 MF & HC

Schmieder, Allen A., and Sam J. Yarger. "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 5-12.

Schmieder, Allen A., and Sam J. Yarger. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974. ED 098 154 MF & HC

Selden, David. "Teacher Centers: Who Should Pay and Who Should Control?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). 4 pp. ED 090 168 MF & HC

Selden, David, and Darland, David. Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge? 1972. 14 pp. ED 086 674

Sentz, Erma I., and Floyd Perry. Teacher Education Centers: The CMETEC Centers. St. Cloud, Minn.: Central Minnesota Teacher Education Council, 1973. 10 pp. ED 081 720 MF & HC

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, E. B. "Partnership in Teacher Education Revisited." Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974): 253-55.

Smith, E. Brooks, Jr. "Total Professional Development of Teachers: The Teachers' Center Way." Childhood Education (April/May 1974): 330-32.

Smith, Emmitt D. "The State of the States in Teacher Centering." Journal of Teacher Education (Spring 1974): 21-25.

Stenzel, Norman K., et al. "Area Service Centers--Teacher Centers: A Conceptual Comparison." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). 23 pp. ED 090 194 MF

Syracuse University. Redesign. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University, School of Education, 1974. 56 pp. ED 098 216 MF

Tanner, James R., and George W. Denemark. The Focus of the Teacher Center in an Educational Renewal Site. 1972. 13 pp. ED 086 675

Tronsgard, David T., ed. Six Crucial Issues in Education. Denver: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1972. 11 pp. ED 077 072 MF & HC

Twoney, Sister Margaret. "One School System's Approach to Professional and Program Development 1973/74." Orbit (October 1974): 3-4.

University of Houston, College of Education. Restructuring Teacher Education. A Report of the Rationale, Objectives and Activities of the Houston Teacher Center, 1970-1973. Houston, Texas: University of Houston, College of Education, 1973. 312 pp. ED 085 334 MF & HC

University of Toledo, College of Education. Partners for Educational Reform and Renewal. Toledo: University of Toledo, College of Education, 1973. 50 pp. ED 087 716 MF & HC

Utah University, Graduate School of Education. STEP and HIP, Humanistic Programs for Problem Secondary Students. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Graduate School of Education, 1973. 30 pp. ED 085 380 MF & HC

West Virginia State Department of Education. Teacher Education Center Survey. Region V, West Central West Virginia. Charleston: West Virginia State Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 1973. 39 pp. ED 083 253 MF & HC

Windham, Robert L., Jr., and Keith D. Savage. "The Teacher Education Center: Dallas Model." Catalyst for Change (Fall 1973): 18-21. EJ 085 937

Wisconsin State University. University of Wisconsin-River Falls Renewal Program. River Falls: Wisconsin State University, 1973. 8 pp. ED 085 375 MF & HC

Woods, Ronald G. "Recurrent Education in Practice." Studies in Adult Education (April 1974): 16-27.

Yarger, Sam J. A Tool for the Analysis of Teacher Centers in American Education--A Working Paper. 1973. 21 pp. ED 086 676 MF & HC

Yarger, Sam J. "The Future--Do Teacher Centers Have One?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (Chicago, April 1974). 9 pp. ED 090 219 MF & HC

Yarger, Sam J., and Albert J. Leonard. A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education (Contract-OEC-0-71-3353(715)). Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, School of Education, 1974. 173 pp. ED 098 159 MF & HC