DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 311 SP 025 589

AUTHOR Jones, Linda Bunnell
TITLE Teacher Education: An All-University Responsibility.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 23p.; Seminar paper presented at a Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (San Francisco, CA, October 22-23, 1984). For related documents, see SP 025 564-595.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Cooperation; *Educational Responsibility; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Liberal Arts; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

As the public expresses concern over teachers' qualifications to teach academic subjects and as arts and sciences faculty show renewed attention to the public schools, the responsibility for teacher education is being interpreted as one belonging to the entire university. One approach to this interpretation--based on the assumption that what one teaches and how one teaches are fundamentally related--stresses the integration of arts and sciences with professional teacher education. A joint university committee could provide common intellectual experiences as well as concentration in particular subjects together with professional teacher education. Other suggestions for improvement are: (1) integration of professional teacher education with undergraduate preparation; (2) collaboration between professional teacher education faculty and arts and sciences faculty for the evaluation of students for admission to teacher education programs; (3) incentives, social and fiscal, to attract and reward those faculty members who exert efforts to integrate these programs; and (4) a broader concept of the role of the school of education's dean or director. (DG)

Teacher Education: An All-University Responsibility

Paper Prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education
San Francisco, California
October 22-23, 1984

Dr. Linda Bunnell Jones
The California State University

I am pleased to have the opportunity to explore the concept of teacher education as an all-university responsibility. It is a concept in which I believe deeply and one which I fear we in the university lose sight of from time to time.

Although my academic credentials and teaching and administrative experience differ from those who have addressed the commission, I nonetheless consider myself as a teacher educator. I have corrected a great many freshman essays written by students who went on to become teachers and introduced the outlines of literary history and the fundamental methods of literary criticism to many high school English teachers. I advised a great many students who were preparing to become teachers and served on committees concerned with the general education of all students including prospective teachers as well as the campus committee governing the multiple subject major required of prospective elementary teachers.

Before we explore teacher education as an all-university responsibility, I want to pose a more fundamental question, "Is teacher education a university responsibility at all?"

States, of course, have the legal responsibility for teacher certification and until very recently they have largely given this responsibility over to the university. But in terms of the more than 300-year history of teacher credentialing in America, the formal link between the university teacher education and state certification is not very old. Not until 1920 did most states rely either on presentation of university course credits to qualify for state licenses or permit universities to certify teachers directly or indirectly through the program approval, -- a process by which university programs are approved by a state commission if they meet certain standards set by the state.[1] Up until the 1820's the decision about who could teach had rested with local school boards. About 1825 that decision was shifted to the county.[2] In the 1860s it moved to the state.[3] States used examinations until the time the university credits and/or program approval process was introduced.

This formal link between university education and teacher certification has remained pretty much intact from the 1920s until the 1980s. A few states, like California, offered an examination alternative to taking courses in the

subject preparation but few students took advantage of it. Most preferred to attend a university with an approved program as a means of earning a credential.

But events of the past several years may be shifting the legal responsibility for teacher education away from the university. The basic skills tests for certification which were introduced a few years ago and now are used in a majority of states may herald at least a partial return to the state examination approach. Indeed in California such an examination is a requirement for those who wish to be admitted to teacher education programs that are approved by the state. Thus even traditional university prerogatives about admission requirements to particular programs have been preempted. Should support for expanded testing grow and assessment by the state become the sole basis for credentialing, then certification will be centralized at the state level, no longer linked directly to the university.

The motivation for the basic skills tests is clear. There are serious questions about the university's selection process of entrants to teacher preparation programs, about the quality of education in the arts and sciences, and about the effectiveness of approved programs in professional education.

Another pressure is moving the responsibility for teacher education away from the university toward the public school. This move reflects the interest in and influence of the teaching profession itself on educating teachers. In California this trend may be said to have begun in 1970 when law establishing the state licensing agency -- required that 4 of 15 members of the board be classroom teachers or practicing administrators. Universities are currently represented only in ex-officio capacity.[4] A current proposal for reorganizing governance of teacher credentialing in California makes no mention of university involvement.

Recent changes in credential legislation in California suggest still further movement in this direction. The same weight is now given to in-service education provided by the school district as to that provided in university courses as a means to credential renewal.

Most significantly, legislation has created an alternative to earning a credential through an approved program in which professional education is entirely based in the schools.

The Teacher-Trainee Program established by the Hughes-Hart School Reform Act of 1983 permits a person who has a baccalaureate degree and can pass the state basic skills examination to earn a permanent credential entirely through a program developed by a school district and supervised by public school personnel. And so the approved program concept is simply extended outside the university to a district although fewer restrictions exist for the school district than for universities.

In many ways, these shifts or proposals for them in the locus of legal responsibility for education and credentialing from the university to the schools makes formal what has been occurring for a long time in teacher education. Universities have relied on the schools and on classroom teachers to provide teacher education through programs of practice teaching. And experienced teachers have always continued the education of beginning teachers in countless ways. What is new is the effort to have practitioners take part in the formal education of entrants as a step toward making teaching more a profession.

Such trends pushed to their logical conclusion suggest that soon teacher education may not be a responsibility of the

university at all, at least in the sense of its offering an approved program as a means to certification. But examinations do not build competence or capacity; they seek only to determine it. And even if the states chose to take back their responsibility to determine who can teach from the university and to base it on performance on examinations, most people who become teachers will have a university education. And the people who will educate candidates for those examinations will reside in the university and the effectiveness with which they give prospective teachers the command of subjects and the fundamental grasp of the methods of inquiry in particular disciplines will have tremendous influence on learning in the schools.

The school-sponsored certification approach also relies on the university to be responsible for the education of teachers. The university must still provide prospective teachers with the command not only of subjects and the fundamental grasp of methods of inquiry, but also the foundations for the professional teacher education they are to apply in the schools.

It remains to be seen how many persons will choose the school-based programs or how many school districts will want to offer them. In California only a few districts have teacher trainee programs, and few students appear to be taking advantage of them. Most prospective teachers appear to want the formal study of the social and psychology forces that affect the learning of children and youth and their application to teaching found in courses in professional education. Most are no more anxious to stand in front of a classroom of 30 or so 13 year-olds with a wide spectrum of intellectual ability, motivation, and socio-economic background with no formal preparation to teach than they would be to perform brain surgery after having been operated on themselves or having watched someone else do it.

And so it may be that the trend away from formal, legal university responsibility will heighten the informal, ethical responsibility of the university faculty -- those who teach general education courses, advanced courses in the arts and sciences as well as those in the professional teacher education courses - to see that the instruction provided prospective teachers is of the highest quality. Indeed it may be that the perceived lack of relationship between the professional education curriculum and the arts

and sciences curriculum contributed to the drift away from the states giving the university legal responsibility for certification.

Let me now consider teacher education as an all-university responsiblity in the context of the history of teacher education. Indeed the phrase has a familiar ring to it. James Bryant Conant, a former president of Harvard, made that a theme of his 1963 Carnegie Report, The Education of American Teachers. Conant assigned the locus of responsibility for teacher education to all members of the university faculty, not just those who taught courses in professional education. In doing so he sought to moderate the quarrel between the arts and sciences faculty and the professional education faculty.

On the one hand, he observed that arts and sciences faculty had exhibited little concern for the public schools and even less for the preparation of teachers, actually resenting state requirements that led students to take courses in professional education as the basis for earning a credential. Having not had formal preparation to teach themselves and not seeing the difference between knowing chemistry and teaching it to high school students, they saw

such courses as worthless. On the other hand, he noted professional teacher educators who had spent their careers exploring the science and art of teaching and creating a literature around it believed deeply in the need for formal preparation for teachers and had worked closely with state certification agencies to see that it was required.[5]

Conant sought to bring the warring factions together through action by both administrators and trustees. He called for the president on behalf of the entire faculty to certify that the prospective teacher is adequately prepared to teach in a specific field. He urged that trustees insist on continuing, effective all-university or interdepartmental approaches to the education of teachers, and that degree requirements for future teachers be justified in terms of breadth of exposure in key academic subjects.[6]

Historians of teacher education attribute swings of the pendulum toward or away from the all-university emphasis in teacher education to the nature of the prevailing public attitude toward the schools and toward the percieved shortcomings of teachers. Writing in 1975 Paul Woodring observed that when the public believes that the failure to educate children and youth can be traced to the teacher's

lack of knowledge of the subjects taught, then stress is placed on preparation in the arts and sciences and the tendency to expand the preparation period. When the public believes that the failure of the schools to educate children and youth can be traced to their lack of skill in teaching, as it did in the 1960s (John Holt was the leading spokesperson) then stress is placed on preparation in pedagogy.[7]

The concerns over academic preparation of teachers that give rise to Conant's recommendations began first in the post-war malaise of the early 1950s and were of course intensified by the U.S. response to Sputnik. Looking back, Woodring detects a renewed sense of common purpose in the preparation of teachers among the faculty of the university in the late 1950s and early 1960s that grew out of first public concern, then concern of arts and sciences faculty about teacher preparation. Some key conferences brought arts and sciences faculty together with professional teacher educators with the result that there was general agreement that the preparation period should be extended to five years. But this sense of common purpose, Woodring argues, was again lost during the late 1960s and early 1970s as the demand for teachers declined. Arts and sciences faculty, he notes, began to lose interest in teacher preparation.

Others cite more practical reasons for the fading of the sense of common purpose between arts and science and professional education faculty. Reporting on the Ford Foundation's grants for innovations in teacher education, Breakthrough in Teacher Education awarded during the 1960s, Jim Stone found that at the Carnegie Institute of Technology arts and sciences faculty became very interested in teacher education courses, but found demands on their time more than they could reasonably contribute.[8] Feelings about propriety as well were at times an obstacle, John Goodlad reported. From his experience in a project at UCLA he concluded that university faculty as a whole were skeptical that involvement of arts and science faculties both with prospective teachers and with the precollege curriculum was appropriate for university faculty. Refusing to reward its faculty for such expenditures of energy, the university's efforts to work with the school, if still continued, he observed, were shifted to the periphery.[9]

This historical context convinces me that our discussion of teacher education as an all-university responsibility is a timely one. Indeed I think one could safely or perhaps cynically conclude that once again the pendulum has swung.

There is clearly public concern over the qualifications of teachers to teach academic subjects. And there is renewed attention from the arts and sciences faculty to the public schools and growing interest in the university's responsibility as a whole for the education of teachers. At least in California, interest in teacher education here has heightened with the concern over the poor preparation of entering students for college. It was an historic event for California when in 1983 the faculties of the 9 campuses of the University of California, the 19 campuses of the California State University and the 106 Community Colleges joined together to define the competencies necessary to succeed in college in writing and mathematics. They are working to define others. Increasing numbers of university faculty are devoting time to improving the schools through academic partnership programs supported in large measure up until recently by the universities' own funds.

And increasingly the responsibility for teacher education is being interpreted as one of the entire university. A 1983 report in the CSU, Excellence in Professional Education, reaffirmed longtime policy of the CSU Board of Trustees that teacher education is an all-university responsibility and urged that campus decision-making processes about the over-all teacher education reflect this orientation.[10]

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Excellence in Professional Education in a soon-to-be-released report went further. They recommended that each President convene a university-wide council on Teacher Education whose responsibility it is to foster a greater sense of common purpose about teacher education among faculty. The recent Education Review in the University of California chaired by John Goodlad contains recommendations for integrating the diverse but essential components of teacher education and of rewarding a faculty member -- in whatever discipline -- who devotes time creatively "to teacher education and to school improvement."[12]

The approach to the growing recognition about the entire university's responsibility for teacher education appears to me to be taking two forms. The one, emphasizing the responsibility of the university, calls for clear separation of the academic preparation of teachers in order to make arts and sciences faculties more accountable. The second - the one implicit in Conant's proposals - calls for closer integration of preparation through cooperation of arts and sciences faculty professional education faculty and for learning experiences in the major field of study to be concurrent with their beginning professional teacher education.

Hendrik Gideonse, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Cincinnati, is a spokesman for the first approach to the all-university responsibility. He argues for "a clearer line between the liberal/content area responsiblities of preparing teachers and the professional component of their training "as a means of making arts and sciences faculty more accountable" and reversing the erosion he finds in their definition, design, and curricular standards in the baccalaureate. Such arrangement he observes also has the advantage of permitting greater depth and breadth in professional education.[13] Although Dean Gideonse does not speak much to issues of administrative organization, his allusion to the evolution of medical schools as demonstration of the revolution teacher education is about to undergo hints at his vision of the future of teacher education on the campus. The model for the school of education he appears to have in mind is the medical school or law school in which the baccalaureate degree is at once a sequence of courses leading to professional education and as a screening device for students seeking admission.

The second or integrative vision of teacher education is implicit in Conant's recommendations. It is based on the internal logic of teacher preparation, as I perceive it. Stated simply, what one teaches and how one teaches are

fundamentally related. The subjects taught to prospective teachers by the arts and sciences faculty are more than the foundation, more than building blocks for professional education. The courses about human learning and the social and psychological forces that affect it and those in methods of teaching and their appropriateness for particular age groups and particular types of learners co-exist in a special way with those in subjects to be taught in the schools in the education of teachers. To use Conant's example, the study of chemistry and teaching chemistry to high school students are fundamentally related. If there is no attempt to integrate the courses in subjects taught in the schools and study in professional education, then the relationship between the various aspects of preparation of a teacher is lost.

How can such integration of arts and sciences and professional teacher education be achieved? Probably only by the acceptance of the arts and sciences faculty and the professional teacher education faculty of their mutual responsibility. Elaborate curricular structures won't work if faculty themselves are not committed to such a concept of teacher education. But can that commitment be brought about?

Spokesmen for the concept of the all-university responsibility for teacher education have identified some avenues to it. Paul Woodring has told presidents of state universities and colleges to use their presidencies as Theodore Roosevelt did his, as "bully pulpits" from which to proclaim the need for attention to teacher education.[14] And university presidents are beginning to do just that. But is exhortation enough? Probably not.

University leadership will need to challenge openly the widely held view in the university that elementary and secondary school teaching is a second-rate profession only for second rate students. It will have to take the lead in encouraging faculty to advise good students to enter teaching. University leadership will need to find structural means to integrate the arts and sciences with professional education and to increase, as Dean Bernard Gifford at Berkely has proposed, the interaction of the two so that the entire university is the locus for studies in education.[15]

Conant's structural tool was a joint university committee.[16] Now many universities have such committees - most established long ago. Some are dormant and largely

ceremonial. In some others, they are so active that they choke effective progress in professional teacher education. In these extreme cases, the dean or director of the school or program of teacher education answers to a committee representing faculty from throughout the university who may or may not place the interests of teacher education above parochial departmental concerns.

Now any honest university faculty member who ever belonged to a committee with responsibility for a program will tell you that in the end the program became a creature of the competing, often contradictory aims of the various members of the committee and that as membership changed over time, the program changed, but with little real development. The failure of the committee approach to program planning and administration has been most apparent in the creation of so-called interdisciplinary majors which seem more often to be sum of their separate parts rather than any cohesive whole despite avowals of the inter-relatedness of knowldege.

Still, a faculty committee--if it is one with people who value teacher education, who are opinion leaders, who bring perspectives from the departments whose job it is to provide common intellectual experiences as well as

concentration in particular subjects together with professional teacher educators--is healthy and valuable in keeping focus on teacher education as an all-university responsibility, but the likelihood of its success fully managing a program is not great.

More will be needed to integrate professional teacher education with undergraduate preparation and to keep the responsiblity for teacher education in the minds of the faculty. First, might be an attempt at consensus - among professional teacher educators and arts and sciences faculty about the common body of skills and knowledge needed for success as a teacher. Faculties need to explore the relationship between general education, concentration in a field of study, certain sequential courses in the social sciences which should be prerequisites to professional education and teacher education courses. Once relationships are defined and responsibilities assigned, program review processes should be structured to evaluate effectiveness, not just of sequential preparation, but of integration.

Second, collaboration between professional teacher education faculty and arts and sciences faculty must occur in the evaluation of students for admission to teacher education.

Professional teacher education faculty must demand that arts and sciences faculty evaluate the extent to which such students share common intellectual experiences, have a command of the subject, and have the ability to communicate knowledge of it. And professional teacher education faculty must be willing to reject students judged not to meet this criteria.

Third, social and fiscal incentives within the university must be created to attract and reward those arts and science faculty and those teacher education faculty who work to integrate these programs. Universities may need to create a teacher education faculty composed both of persons from the arts and sciences and professional teacher education with appropriate expertise and background much as a graduate faculty is appointed from among the general faculty for doctoral programs at many universities. The members of this faculty would have special teaching responsibilities, perhaps teaching adjunct courses within the major that relate the university subjects to subjects taught to children and youth or teaching sections of courses for prospective teachers. They might be designated as advisors of potential teachers in selection of general education courses or courses in the major. Workload assignments

should be adjusted to reflect these extra demands on faculty. Another approach, though not necessarily mutually exclusive of this, is simultaneous appointment to the arts and sciences faculty and to the professional teacher education faculty with the requirement for frequent participation in teaching both curricula.

Finally, making teacher education an all-university responsibility will require a broader concept of the role of Dean or Director of the School of Education. He or she should be seen not just as presiding over the professional education faculty, but as responsible for integrating the arts and sciences faculty and the teacher education faculty. With such responsiblity must go the power to provide incentives, to make decisions about who among the arts and sciences faculty will participate directly in teacher education and who will not. Given the heavy responsibility for contact with local schools already placed on Deans and Directors of Education, senior administrators must recognize the need for additional support positions to provide liaison with the public schools.

In conclusion, the public concern over academic achievement of students and the ability of teachers has perhaps produced

a flux in teacher education that will serve the university and the public well. Indeed, this new call for excellence in education should be viewed as an opportunity, and I would hope that we in the university would not be defensive in the face of the current, and sometimes critical, attention. The atmosphere created by public questioning has led us to be introspective, and for the most part this self-examination has kindled renewed interest and commitment on the part of all faculty to the education of prospective teachers.

The challenge to channel this interest so that substantial improvements in integrating the purpose and content of teacher education into an all university responsibility of excellent education exists. There are significant indications that faculty from education, arts and sciences, and academic leaders are seeking ways to remold this role of the university for teacher education into an enduring one. In twenty or thirty years when teacher education is revisited and reexamined, and it will be, just as general education is periodically revisited, we must not find ourselves just where we are today.

Thank you.

Footnotes

[1]Robert N. Bush and Peter Enemark, "Control and Responsibility in Teacher Education" in Teacher Education Yearbook II (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1975). pp. 282.

[2]Lucian B. Kinney, Certification in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1964) p. 35-65.

[3]Timothy Stinnett, "Teacher Education, Certification and Accreditation", Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900, ed. Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969), p. 391.

[4]Bush and Enemark, pp. 282-283.

[5]James Bryant Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963). pp. 1-13.

[6]Conant, pp. 110-111.

[7]Paul Woodring, "The Development of Teacher Education" Teacher Education, 1975, pp. 16-24.

[8](San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1968), p. 166

[9]"The Academician, Friend or Foe", Teacher Education (Vancouver: University of British Columbia), (March, 1965) 41-42.

[10](Long Beach, Ca.: Trustees of the California State University, 1983), p. 110

[11]Unpublished manuscript.

[12]John Goodlad, Education Review

[13]Hendrick D. Gideonse, "The Necesary Revolution in Teacher Education", Phi Delta Kappan, Sept 1982, pp. 15-18.

[14]Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1984.

[15]Transmittal Letter to The Good School of Education (Berkeley, Ca.: U.C. Berkeley School of Education, 1984).

[16]Conant, p.2