DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 046 SP 015 890

AUTHOR Giles, Frederic T.
TITLE Schools of Education: An Investment in the Present and Future.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 20p.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (31st, Chicago, IL, February 27, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Influences; *Educational Needs; Educational Responsibility; Institutional Cooperation; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Relevance (Education); *School Role; *Schools of Education; *Social Change; Social Influences; Student Educational Objectives

ABSTRACT

A professional educator discusses the roles that schools of education have played in modern American society, and considers ways in which those roles must change to meet needs in the future. Objectives are set for professional preservice teacher education institutions, and responses are made to criticisms of present institutional and educational organization. Contributions which schools of education can make to the development of a thoughtful and informed future society are delineated, and a plea is made for increased interaction between schools and other segments of the social structure. (LH)

20th Annual
Charles W. Hunt
Lecture

FREDERIC T. GILES

Schools of Education: An Investment in the Present and Future

American Association
of Colleges for Teacher Education

Technical Editor: Ruth Barker

Standard Book Number: 0-89333-015-9

CHARLES W. HUNT
The Lectures and the Man

Through the Charles W. Hunt Lecture, given at each of the Annual Meetings of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education since 1960, AACTE proudly acknowledges its debt to this dedicated educational statesman.

Though he spent most of his professional life as an administrator, Charles Hunt rightly insisted on identifying himself as a teacher. His infectious enthusiasm for life and his championing of the God-given right of every individual, young or old, to develop to maximum potential are qualities which always marked his commitment to the preparation of teachers. His vitality and determination to move ahead in reshaping teacher education, and his skill in firing up others to do so, are in the best tradition of the good teacher.

As champion of the democratic ideal, he counseled grassroots organization and solidarity to accomplish reform. As a true pioneer in teacher education, he was wise enough to view the community not only as a laboratory, but as a source for ideas and support. A teacher, communicator, and an agent for change, he "shook the ideas and structure" of teacher education.

As AACTE Executive Director Edward C. Pomeroy said at the memorial service for Dr. Hunt September 5, 1973: "Without a man of the vision of Charles Hunt and the encouragement he provided, certainly the history of these past 50 years in American education would have been significantly different." Indeed, much of importance in organized teacher education happened in his lifetime.

Born in Charlestown, New Hampshire in 1880, Charles Wesley Hunt was educated at Brown University (B.A. 1904) and Columbia University (M.A. 1910, Ph.D. 1922), all the while teaching English in New England and New York until he began a supervisory career in 1910. In his 18

years as a college president, from 1933 to 1951, he helped to transform an old normal school at Oneonta into the State University of New York at Oneonta, a multipurpose institution within a state system of colleges.

Our Association owes much to Charles Hunt. Serving voluntarily for 25 years as secretary-treasurer (1928-53), he was instrumental in transforming the American Association of Teachers Colleges into the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Until his death, he continued to serve as consultant to the Association's Board of Directors. His inspiration still guides AACTE and its professional men and women who represent their institutions.

The Lecture Series is conceived as a continuing professional tribute to the years of leadership and service which Dr. Hunt gave to education. When this series was begun in 1960, Dr. Hunt advised us to hold fast to "enduring faith in our purposes, faith in our fellow workers, and faith in the democratic tradition and process." Such dedicated commitment is still needed today to lift the quality of education in American society. Charles Hunt has built a model that will serve future professionals well.

FREDERIC T. GILES
Dean
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle

Joining the University of Washington faculty in 1961 as professor of education and coordinator, junior college relations, Giles was named to the deanship in 1967. From 1949-61, he served Everett Junior College, Washington, first as personnel services director, then president for eight years.

His entire teaching career was in Washington state, starting in Albion where he also coached. In Pullman, he taught social sciences, then served as counselor in Kelso and assistant superintendent in Sunnyside.

An AACTE chief institutional representative, he has been active on the Association's Governmental Relations Commission since 1974 and was a liaison representative from the Washington State Association of Colleges for Teacher Education from 1970-71.

Accreditation has long interested him and he represents AACTE on the coordinating board of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). He participated on evaluation teams for the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools and the Western Association of Colleges. Vice chairman of the NCATE Executive Committee in 1975, he was a Council Member for three years.

While at Everett, he was active in American Association of Junior Colleges activities. He held a term on their Board of Directors and chaired their National Council of Universities and Colleges and their administration and Kellogg leadership program committees.

Giles' presidencies and chairmanships are numerous. He is a past president of the Washington Education Association and the

Northwestern Association of Junior Colleges. He was secretary of the Washington College Association and chairman of the American Association of Higher Education's nominating and Western region committees, both in 1971. He devoted three years to the Commission on Education for the Teaching Profession of the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and was on their Executive Committee.

His bachelor of arts degree was earned at Eastern Washington State College and he was named their 1972 Distinguished Alumnus. Both his master of arts and doctor of education degrees were conferred by Washington State University.

Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University, coauthored with Clifford D. Foster, was published in 1972 as part of AACTE's performance-based teacher education series. Since 1962, he has written innumerable reports, proceedings, occasional papers, book reviews, and introductions on a wide range of educational subjects.

SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION: AN INVESTMENT IN THE PRESENT AND FUTURE

FREDERIC T. GILES

THE 20TH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the 31st Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Chicago, Illinois, February 27, 1979

My special purpose is to indicate the important roles that schools of education have played, are playing, and must play in the future if education is to respond to the needs of our society.

These ideas and remarks are my own, a conglomerate of ideas, beliefs, and biases taken from many sources and attributed directly to none. If you find an idea which you claim as yours, be flattered even though I have not given you credit.

In this paper, "school of education" is used to represent all organized schools, colleges, and departments of education, as well as any organized program for preparing professional education personnel.

My belief is that schools of education have raised teaching from apprenticeship to professional status. They have developed training programs

for teachers and other school personnel that provide more than just immediate skills, and they are integrated into the academic climate of colleges and universities and the society at large. Schools of education have contributed to knowledge about learning and teaching and have provided trained personnel who have been able to respond to new and emerging needs in the schools.

Schools of education have been responders to many publics and have become the integrated switchboard between these many publics. While the responses may not have been as forceful or as timely as they might have been, an essential service to education has been rendered. They have provided a means of consumer protection for society in developing and administering programs of training which are publicly analyzed and evaluated by external bodies for approval and accreditation. Schools of education have provided for the study of the implications and impact of educational policies established or being considered. They have provided research into the factors that promote or inhibit learning. They have thus performed the essential functions of a third-party interested in but neither the user of nor the promotional organization for the product.

Criticisms and Responses

As one reads the papers, professional journals, and books, one gets the impression that no one says anything good about schools and colleges of education and that it would be professional suicide to do so. Topics such as "Twenty-Three Reasons Why Universities Cannot Train Teachers," "Colleges of Education Should Be Closed," "Universities Should Get Out of Teacher Education," "Teachers Should be Trained by Teachers in the Schools," "Teacher Centers to Replace Schools of Education," "No New Teachers Needed—Close Schools of Education," and many, many more. If one believed all that is written, one would end up feeling like the social director on the Titanic.

I am sure that there are many things wrong with schools of education, things that are easy to isolate and write about; but I am just as sure that there are many things right about schools of education and that they have an essential place in higher education and in the future of public education.

Schools of education frequently contribute to the plausibility of the critics by assuming the worst characteristics of the survival syndrome. Instead of being reflective and objective, they blindly strike back at what they assume is malevolent criticism. They respond from pure emotion rather than from objective analysis of the issues. Frequently they end up separating and fighting among themselves regarding the applicability of the criticism. All too often they jump on the reactionary band wagon rather than being concerned with the potential consequences. They may also become like the institutions or agencies which they deplore, assuming their worst characteristics and taking

even more deplorable action. It is always important to remember that ideas which are the property of groups are hard to come by and slow to change, but ideas which are the property of individuals are easy to come by and free to change.

Schools of education, unlike many other university and college schools or departments, must continuously demonstrate commitment to the educational enterprise. This commitment, however, must not be as an insider but as a cooperative resource. Some believe that the only purpose of a school of education is to act as a service station for schools, and teachers become critical when there is not an immediate response to every call.

Schools of education should be responsive to and involved with the education enterprise of the state and nation, not only to meet needs and developments, but to anticipate and predict them.

Schools of education, particularly in larger institutions, are first concerned with internal pressures and second with those external pressures which they carefully choose as the ones to which they can successfully respond. Because the schools do not, cannot, and should not respond to every inservice need or request, they have become the whipping boys of the educational enterprise. A school of education must use good judgment and be truthful in indicating what resources it has that will contribute successfully to inservice and professional development. Pursuit of popularity will merely gain public tolerance, while candor will earn public approval and respect.

In addition to these reactions, schools of education may suffer from the consequences of responding to and overemphasizing one aspect or one function to the detriment of other functions and thereby lose sight of the holistic perception, which is essential. Through their actions, they may unknowingly emphasize what others perceive. The quality of their students and programs may be suspect, their value to the institution may be demeaned, and their value to the profession may be questioned at the same time that their value to the academic community may be of concern.

Just because one can identify something which is suspect does not necessarily mean that everything else is suspect, nor does a weakness in one school mean it is automatically to be found in all schools. As logical as this seems, schools of education are most often referred to and written about as though they are all identical, with the same characteristics, goals, objectives, programs, and degrees. In 1976, there were 1,367 schools of education with one or more state-approved programs of teacher education. These units differed so greatly, on any characteristic that one might choose, that there is no way to describe them so they are *identifiable as a group.*

The successful school of education must acknowledge several legitimate "publics," each of which deserves thoughtful attention. This does not mean, however, that the school must or can react to the pressure brought to bear by these publics; indeed, the interests of the publics often conflict. It does mean that the school must choose its activities and emphasis with great care lest it

fail those whom it seeks to aid. Furthermore, the schools must state the precise reasons for action and be prepared, as well, to account for inaction. Thus, the characteristics of any given school are the accumulation of decisions, made or not made, responses to the various publics, and factors that are in conflict between or among the different publics.

Schools of education are much better off asserting their own goals and individuality rather than being goaded into responding to each critic or going for whatever is "trendy."

Sorting out the true from the false is an extremely demanding endeavor. It is even more difficult to identify the halftruths of critics or pressure groups. No matter how difficult or demanding, however, this is a responsibility of schools of education if they are to have the respect they deserve.

Most disquieting is the fact that much criticism of teacher education and schools of education comes from persons who have succeeded at, and have been rewarded by, the very system they deplore. Such criticism is suspect for the critics are the beneficiaries of that very system. One frequently gets the feeling that they have a stronger need to publish than a firm conviction of a need for change.

There are many factors outside the school that impinge on the perceptions held about the school. For example, higher education in general is suffering from a manpower model that was used to justify the need for expansion of higher education opportunities and resources. This very same model is now being used to provide data to reverse opportunities and resources. Professional schools, such as education, are the first to be questioned and affected. Another factor is the idea that has become too generally accepted: the belief that the purpose of a college is purely vocational and, therefore, the college should be evaluated on the number of its graduates who obtain immediate employment. Schools of education have been quickly singled out as overproducers.

The struggle over the control of schools and teacher education has focused undue attention on schools of education. The desire, and perhaps the need, to control entry into teacher training, the concern over a relevant and practice-oriented curriculum, the control of entry into the profession as well as the professional organizations, and other similar concerns have created ferment about the role, and even the need, for schools of education. This lack of unity within the education profession has significant implications since a school of education must deal with and be responsive to all segments.

In addition, there has developed an overconcern with accountability, costs, and numerical units to measure efficiency and effectiveness. Professional schools, whose modes of instruction are and should be different from traditional classroom instruction, are the first to be criticized. These ideas, and many more, have put a strain on higher education that shows up most clearly in professional schools like education.

External forces such as these encourage some of the faculty and students to call for total reform and rethinking of professional roles, while other faculty

and students call for a tightening of professional boundaries and a concern with basic purpose, concepts, and skills. In order to gain backing, the tendency is to spend much time and effort refuting the opponents rather than building a rationale for one's own ideas and positions. The irony is that all may be responding to the same legitimate concern: how to design professional education and early career socialization in order to prepare persons for tomorrow, not yesterday.

My concern is that the simplistic solutions undermine the complexity of the system they seek to correct. Change activism, at its worst, is focusing on a target which is manifestly in need of substantial change and then making counter proposals that are so weak that even the status quo looks good by comparison.

In spite of all these concerns, no other society has expected so much of professional schools, and none was ever served so well by its schools of education.

Schools of education have been affected by their evolution from normal schools that provided minimal skills to potential teachers to comprehensive schools that have responsibilities far beyond that original purpose. As the expectations for schools of education have broadened and increased, so has the potential for criticism—both from greater public expectations and from the different images that colleges have assumed. In addition to these increased expectations, schools of education have taken on many responsibilities—some imposed by themselves, some built in from being a unit on a campus, some as a result of location, and others mistakenly assumed by those either inside or outside the school.

While schools of education have problems, they have many accomplishments and great potential.

Schools of education have been, and are, advocates for professional education for teachers and school personnel. They have assisted in changing training from an over-the-shoulder observation, apprentice-type, to a professional education mold. There is a vast difference between knowing how to teach, which tends to provide short-term success and repetition, thereafter, of the successful formula, and being a student of education, which means being continuously involved in a reappraisal of one's actions, values, and purposes.

Rather than bombard the school of education with constant condemnation; it is time to identify needs for professional training and support the colleges in providing them.

As we declare what is right, we must also realistically confront the problems. Schools of education must be vigilant to the expectations of the enterprise that are either inconsistent with their mission or too ambitious for any school to meet.

It is not surprising that schools of education are criticized because they do not prepare a student to be an immediately competent practitioner in any setting or situation. The job of the school of education is not to provide trained

teachers, but to screen, select, educate, and recommend persons who have the potential to become professional teachers. Students become competent professionals on the job, rather than in a training program. It is necessary that teacher education continue day after day in every classroom. If a teacher does not remain a continuous student of education throughout his career, the work of training programs becomes virtually useless.

The school of education has provided the setting for investigating programs of training and for proposing and developing different modes for more effective results. A school of education has been a place where ideas can be tested and subjected to objective analysis, and it provides the means for bringing the benefits of the academic community to the training of school personnel.

Thus, schools of education should be very clear about the role they play, and the outcomes that can be expected.

Schools of education are required to be concerned with internal demands of the institutions as well as external pressures from the educational enterprise and, frequently, to carry on a balancing act between them. It is much more important to be responsive to ideas than to be responding to persons, whether internal or external.

What are some implications of these forces as schools of education look and plan for their role in the future?

Governance—Control or Accountability

Recent developments have tended to confuse programmatic, management, and political aspects of teacher education. The real issue is what the training program for teachers should be, rather than who controls the program. Changes of control do not resolve substantive issues. An important concern is how to organize to gain meaningful input and influences from all those areas which must be considered in the training of teachers. Input and influence are not the same as control.

Neither the authoritarian who insists on calling all the signals (regardless of who she or he is), nor the easy Joe or Jill who shares and involves until no one can be held accountable, will help resolve the substantive problems of teacher education.

Teacher education needs leadership in a delicately balanced approach that involves many in deliberation but, so that there can be accountability, keeps the authority for decision making obvious.

Once this type of involved leadership is recognized, the role of each participating person or group in governing, planning, and evaluating programs will be gauged in terms of potential contributions and direct applicability to the concern or issue. The standard for any group's participation in governance should be determined by the extent to which the program can be meaningfully influenced by the participation.

Rather than devoting an inordinate amount of talent and energy affecting equal functioning agencies in all phases and stages of a teacher education

program, concentration should be on those things which appear to have promise in affecting desired changes. Whole interagency equality may be appealing, but it is sufficiently fraught with difficulties to give pause to those seeking changes. The parity question can be an intricate procedural diversion that deflects energy from the exceedingly complex, substantive task of designing, developing, and revising of desirable professional teacher education programs. Allocation of spheres of influence and resolution of jurisdictional conflicts to assure parity seem to be more appropriately the concerns of a political agency, interested more in power than in product.

Colleges and universities must somehow find better ways to use the experiences and understandings of the people who man the schools. No other profession has such a need to develop a means of acquiring the insights and solutions that the practitioners possess.

However, most discussions and control proposals have been in support of symbiotic rather than synergistic relationships among the various elements of control and development of teacher education.

Symbiotic relationships are best seen as close relationships between two or more elements or groups that may be, but are not necessarily, of benefit to each other or the issue or concern. *Synergistic* relationships are best seen as those resulting from the amalgamation of two or more elements or agencies which have the potential to achieve an effect or result that each element or agency is individually incapable of achieving. Whether synergistic effects will be observed, identified, defined, and tested in the control and development of teacher education, only time will tell.

It is folly to think that in the preparaton of teachers inroads can be made by edict, law, change of control, or other authoritarian or manipulative action without also paying attention to the strategies and procedures needed to evoke personal change and modification in organizational frameworks of all the agencies interested in teacher education.

The suggestion that colleges and universities be eliminated from the governance of teacher education, as a reaction to purported neglect of other partners, cannot be condoned as a responsible answer to the concerns of teacher education.

Although fundamental changes will need to be made in the governance and training program for teachers, to substitute school system or teacher organization control for higher education control is likely to worsen rather than improve the situation.

The concern should be with those responsibilities for teacher education best conducted by various agencies: colleges, school districts, professional organizations, etc., whether separately, jointly, or cooperatively.

The job of the college is to recruit, educate, and recommend persons who have the potential to become professional teachers. The job of the school is to provide the setting, encouragement, and motivation for the new teachers to become, and be judged, outstanding. The professional organizations must supply the teachers with motivation to become professionals.

Schools of education should assume primary leadership responsibility for development and administration of preservice programs. School organizations should assume primary leadership responsibilities for "professionalizing" teaching and the teacher. And the teacher should assume primary responsibility for his or her own professional development. None can go it alone. Each, when not in a primary role, must assume responsibility for a participating, cooperating role.

Professional Education

The American decision to base teacher education in the college and university was intentional, based upon both the expectations for colleges and universities and the conceptions of what professional education should be.

The development of teacher education in this country has been guided by three basic ideas: (a) that teachers need special professional preparation for teaching, (b) that the study and development of teacher education is a matter of public concern, and (c) that the study of this field is properly in the colleges and universities.

Colleges and universities were established and have been maintained to provide opportunities for individuals to develop themselves, as well as to provide opportunities to prepare for the occupational needs of society.

Professional development is something one does to improve one's professional competency, while inservice development refers to something that a person does while on the job. Professional development implies that there is not only a practice, but a theory of practice, and that if one continues to grow and adjust, it will be from one's utilization of new ideas and values.

Professionalism means elevating practice above the status of an art. Professionals have acquired a body of knowledge about the practice that surpasses their own experience, have delved to an advanced level into the academic area they are to use and have developed an inquiring spirit about what they know and how they practice. In addition, a professional possesses a sound general education that enables him/her to comprehend current great issues.

Professional teachers develop the necessary intellectual base for their academic studies. They develop insights into why they are teaching, what they are teaching, and why they need these insights.

In a manner akin to the scientific testing of hypotheses, professionals continuously develop and refine their level of learning. They observe a practice; have hunches regarding applicability to their own situation; test it against their theory of operation; develop principles growing out of theory; and then practice, evaluate, and recycle.

This is in contrast to the lowest level of learning, which is to observe or read about a practice and then adopt that practice without serious reflection.

Professionals develop an understanding of the process of growth and development; of the nature of the mind, thought, and learning. They know how they learn and how others learn. They acquire the ability to assist students in finding their own unique learning methods. They develop the programs and necessary techniques for alternative methods of teaching and learning and acquire the necessary overview and theoretical understanding so as to select consciously the most appropriate teaching methods. (Studies show that teachers are more apt to teach as did their public school instructors, rather than as did their college instructors.)

Historically, professionals have learned how to deal with the system without submitting to it and how to develop a base for continuous, life-long education and improvement.

For these and other similar reasons, education in the professions has become increasingly linked with, and a more integral unit of, colleges and universities. Teacher education is no exception. The critics—those who seemingly have had ready answers—have not dealt with the problem.

Professions such as teacher education need a setting that can be a center of study about the field, a place where new ideas are generated, where research and study can be conducted, and where results can be disseminated without interfering with the main job of the practicing profession. A school of education can play this role, in addition to training professionals, since it has the resources of the total institution to bring to bear on these activities.

It is in the college and university, with its commitment to the creation of new knowledge in all endeavors of human activity, that education for the professions can thrive.

The Future

What should the school of education be like as we approach the 21st century? This is a legitimate question and one which should command the best thinking of all concerned. The term, "school of education," stimulates an automatic response from many who are involved in the education profession, a response that results from personal experiences, from experiences of others, from expectations, from educational needs, and from other such stimuli. Few people have, or take, the opportunity to analyze their concept of a "school of education" in relation to its total role or to its many publics.

The school of education must be a recognized educational leader on campus as well as off campus. Its role, objectives, programs, and expected outcomes must be consistent with and intertwined in the role of the college or university. The school receives strength from the college or university as a whole and, in return, adds to the resources of the other segments of the university. If strength to both were not possible or forthcoming, it would be wiser to develop separate colleges of education.

Diversity of role and purpose among institutions of higher education suggests that the school in any given institution need not and should not be an exact duplicate of schools of education in other institutions. It is just as evident that they should be complementary and interrelated so that together they respond to the educational needs of the state and nation.

It is essential that the school of education be responsible to and involved with the educational programs of the state and nation—not just to meet needs as they arise, but to anticipate and predict future developments. Always present is the qualitative challenge of deciding what needs and demands can best be met by the college with its resources and within its setting.

It is well to be reminded that factors considered as positives can also carry negative connotations for the various publics with which a strong school of education must relate. The school of education has many publics, some of them in direct conflict with one another. The job is to develop the relationships with each public in such a manner and to such an extent that a strong, unresolved conflict with another public is not created. A valuable technique, when considering a changed relationship with one of the publics, is to use an analysis that will indicate both the present relationship and the factors, both positive and negative, that maintain the relationship; that will detail the kinds of actions that are necessary to change the relationship; and that will provide data about the potential impact that each action has on the other publics within the relationship. For example, a school might respond to more kinds of practice-oriented activities in order to increase involvement and improve relationships with teachers; but, if the activities are not related to the goals, resources, and standards of the college or university, the relationship with the public will deteriorate. The assessment of the school of education by each of the publics will depend on how much they believe the school is helping them meet their own needs and goals.

There are at least seven major publics that are continuously watching and evaluating the importance and value of the school of education. These are: education faculty, university academic community, university administration, state administrators, public schools, professional organizations, and teachers. A school of education cannot base its existence on its own idea of importance, but must develop an attitude and a perception of its value to each of these publics and their several goals. It is likewise true that the school that bases its programs and activities primarily on any one of the publics will find itself at great odds with the others.

For example, when the major effort by the schools of education was providing minimum skills for potential teachers, the acceptance by the academic community was minimal. The basic critics were the professors of academic subjects; and the teachers and schools were the defenders. Schools that responded to those critics now find that the teachers and professional organizations are the critics and the academics the defenders. Thus, a school of education for the future must be comprehensive enough to be able to respond to its various publics, as well as wise enough to have good reasons for

not responding to requests and expectations not compatible with a balanced effort.

The school of education must provide programs of excellence for preparing leaders for our schools. It must accept and promote these programs as an institutional concern and develop them cooperatively with the appropriate divisions of the institution. There must always be experimentation for the improvement of preparatory programs and for the development of new, more effective models. In addition to the basic preparation programs for teachers, administrators, and support personnel, the school of education has a special role to play in preparing teachers of teachers.

The school of education should be a center where study and research are conducted on problems, concerns, and policies related to educaton. Movement should be toward more extensive and sophisticated use of the social and behavioral sciences and the humanities in order to analyze the purposes and procedures of education and, thus, provide a clearer rationale for pedagogy and sounder criteria for curriculum development.

The school must be more than classrooms and instructors carrying on course work in a traditional sense. It must be a center of educational laboratories where ideas and programs are developed, tested, refined, and made operational. For some activities and programs, the community and its schools should become the educational laboratory.

A vibrant school cannot limit itself to preparing professionals and conducting studies and research. It must become intimately involved in cooperative and coordinated service and research activities for, and with, the educational enterprise. Included should be suitable programs for teachers in service, for specialists in related subject fields and curriculum development, and for administrators. There should be assistance through meaningful consultative relationships with schools and school systems. These relationships may range from occasional conversations between professors and school staff members to more formal contractual agreements.

The school of education can do all these things and still not make the greatest contribution it is best equipped to make. The school must assume some of the characteristics of a modern "think-factory" to assist in the broader areas of policy formulation as well as with new and creative methods and procedures for accomplishing the goals of education. At its best, it will become recognized as a place where new ideas are generated for the improvement of education.

It is less difficult to construct such tasks for the school of education than to select the specific kinds and extent of the programs to be undertaken. Because of its location and potential resources, the school will be expected to do more than it can or should. In responding to the various publics, the school must develop a blueprint that provides guidelines for determining the quantitative and qualitative judgments necessary for making decisions.

An outstanding school of education is one that is consistent with the role of the university or college, complements other institutions, and is responsive

to the needs of the educational enterprise. Its primary objectives should be to provide programs of excellence for preparation of educational leaders, to be a center where study and research are conducted on educational problems and policies, to be a center of educational laboratories, to provide cooperative and coordinated service and research activities, and most important, to be a center recognized as a place where ideas are generated.

Through the process of achieving these goals, the school will establish an essential role for itself as well as an acceptance as an investment in the future.

The Hunt Lectures

1960
The Dimensions of Professional Leadership
Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961
Revolution in Instruction
Lindley P. Stiles

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

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

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

1965
Perspective on Action in Teacher Education
Florence B. Stratemeyer

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

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

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

1969
A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education
Elizabeth D. Koontz

1970
Realignments for Teacher Education
Fred. T. Wilhelms

1971
The Impossible Imperatives: Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education
Evan R. Collins

1972
Beyond the Upheaval
Edward C. Pomeroy

1973
Time for Decision in Teacher Education
Lord James of Rusholme

1974
Ferment and Momentum in Teacher Education
Margaret Lindsey

1975
Drumbeats and Dissonance: Variations on a Theme for Teachers
Calvin Gross

1976
Now you shall be REAL TO EVERYONE
Robert B. Howsam

1977
The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future
David L. Clark

1978
The Education of the Educating Professions
Lawrence A. Cremin

1979
Schools of Education: An Investment in the Present and Future
Frederic T. Giles