DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 315 SP 025 593

AUTHOR Carlson, Ken
TITLE The Teacher Certification Struggle in New Jersey.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 72p.; For appendices, see SP 025 594. For other related documents, see SP 025 564-595.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational Legislation; Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Relevance (Education); *Required Courses; *State Legislation; *State Standards; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ; *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This paper presents information on the development and adoption of a proposal for changes in teacher certification requirements in New Jersey. The proposal "permits the exclusion of college level professional preparation" for certification of elementary and secondary school teachers. Sections of this report discuss: (1) factors leading to the proposal; (2) reactions to the proposal's announcement; (3) teacher educators' response to the proposal; (4) formation of "opposing camps" for and against the proposal; (5) attempts to refute arguments supporting the proposal; (6) the "Thornburn" study of a teacher's experience at a New Jersey college; (7) the Boyer panel and its two-day meeting to define knowledge needed by beginning teachers; (8) related problems college education programs were having; (9) the Jaroslaw Commission, which worked on a framework for the knowledge identified by the panel; (10) the Lacatena Initiative, a booklet reviewing the year's events, with a cover letter containing suggestions for action; (11) changes made to the proposal; (12) a conference at which teacher preparation was discussed in general terms and in the context of recent developments; and (13) adoption of the proposal. (CB)

THE TEACHER CERTIFICATION STRUGGLE IN NEW JERSEY

Paper Prepared for the
National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education

Ken Carlson
Rutgers University

PREFACE

During the course of most of the events reported herein, the author served as associate dean for teacher education and certification officer at Rutgers - The State University of New Jersey. This position caused him to become actively involved in the issue that is the topic of this paper. His involvement was that of an opponent to the certification proposal of New Jersey's Governor and Education Commissioner. Thus, the paper is written from the perspective of the opposition; however, it was circulated to several knowledgeable people throughout the state to insure factual accuracy. Those people are thanked for the time they found in their busy schedules to review the paper. Any mistakes that still exist are the author's responsibility and not theirs.

CONTENTS

THE PROPOSAL

In September of 1983, New Jersey's Governor and his Education Commissioner presented a proposal for the preparation of teachers. (Appendix A) The proposal established the following "route" by which someone could qualify for a New Jersey teaching license:

1. possess a bachelor's degree with at least a minor in the field to be taught, with any liberal arts minor being acceptable for elementary and special education*;
2. pass a test of subject mastery in the secondary field to be taught or a general knowledge test for elementary and special education;
3. complete a one-year internship as a regular classroom teacher in a local school district. The internship would commence with a five-day orientation to the district and to all the important information about teaching. During the course of the year, three professional days could be devoted to learning more about teaching.

Because the proposal meant that someone could become a teacher with no college level professional preparation, it became the focus of an intense struggle that would be waged in the press, before the State Legislature and the State Board of Education, on college and university campuses, among business and professional leaders, and among nationally known education experts outside New Jersey. It is a struggle that reached a culmination on September 5, 1984, when the State Board of Education adopted unanimously

*In time, special education was dropped from the proposal because of protests by advocacy groups that its inclusion defied reason. Early childhood education was added explicitly to the proposal a year later, after being treated implicitly as though it was indistinguishable from elementary education.

a final form of the proposal which still permits the exclusion of college level professional preparation. The proposal is scheduled for implementation in September 1985, and college education faculty will keep the issue warm by conducting effectiveness studies of the implementation.

FIRST SIGNS

The New Jersey Education Commissioner, Saul Cooperman, has said repeatedly that it all began in June of 1982 when he was directed by the State Board of Education to take action against abuses of the state's emergency teacher certification procedure. (For a written version of the Commissioner's assertion, see Cooperman, September 5, 1984.) The procedure allowed people to be hired in emergency situations even though they were lacking the requirements for standard certification. The abuses were that people had been hired to teach in fields where there was no demonstrated shortage of fully certified teachers and, once hired, these people did nothing toward meeting the requirements for regular certification. The Commissioner has never made clear what the relationship is between correcting the abuses of the emergency procedure and devising a whole new procedure for standard certification. The abuses of the emergency procedure were permitted by local school district and State Education Department personnel - the people to whom the Commissioner has sought to give more authority - not by college education faculty - the people who bear the brunt of the Commissioner's displeasure.

It may be that the reform intention was moderate at first, focused only on the abuses in the emergency system. After all, the New Jersey college education programs leading to regular certification had just become the recipients of a whole new set of standards developed over a four-year period and mandated by both the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education. If indeed the new reform initiative was limited initially, the abrupt and drastic determination to broaden it into an

attack on an entire system that had just been reformed might have been fueled by national developments. There were the national commission reports on education, beginning with the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, released on April 26, 1983. The Governor of New Jersey served on one of the national commissions - the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth - which could only have increased his resolve to be an "education governor." Both the NCEE and the Task Force reports recommend more rigorous standards for teacher preparation. Never mind that the quality of the analyses done by the national commissions has been challenged seriously in the dialectic that inevitably attends such blockbusters (Smith and Stedman, 1983), and forget that more recent data fail to support the apocalyptic conclusions of the commissions (Gallup, 1984; Lapointe, 1984); public attention had been drawn to education and politicians had to do something. A year after the release of the NCEE report, the U.S. Department of Education could announce that 19 states were considering changes in teacher education and certification, and 28 states had enacted or approved such changes. (USDE, 1984) New Jersey was in both categories: it had just approved and was enacting a new set of standards, and it was denying the effectiveness of these standards before they had been enacted.

At any rate, the first inkling that something dramatic might be in the works came in an May 1983 front page story in a Sunday edition of the Newark Star-Ledger, New Jersey's largest newspaper. The story, complete with photographs of the "victim," sought to portray a brilliant woman who wanted desperately to teach and was capable of making a splendid contribution but was being prevented from doing so by certification

requirements. The requirements that were impeding the woman's career and thwarting her development of American youth were college education courses. "I just refuse to take the reading courses and the human relations course - very important for high school science teachers, no doubt," the woman said. "If I could find a professor in one of these state colleges who could add something to the training I've already received, I might consider it." The newly appointed Director of Teacher Education for the State Education Department responded to the woman's situation by saying, "Someone who is obviously talented and wants to work with children should be given the chance." (Braun, May 29, 1983, p. 39) What this amounted to was the person in charge of teacher certification for the state of New Jersey endorsing the woman's self-assessment of what she needed, and did not need, to be a teacher. The reporter who wrote the story is the education editor of the Star-Ledger, and he has acknowledged being apprised early on of the Commissioner's campaign to change teacher education.

In July and August, when college faculty are typically away, there appeared a series of front page articles in the Star-Ledger. These outlined the Commissioner's proposal in pretty complete detail, an easy enough accomplishment since the original proposal does not contain many details. By the time of the third article it had become obvious that trial balloons were not being floated; in fact, the proposal was scheduled for announcement by the Governor to a rare joint session of the New Jersey Legislature, after which the Commissioner would hold a major press conference to present the details and rationale.

This rush to judgment caused the author to send a letter of concern

(Appendix B) to each member of the State Board of Education. The State Board President replied (Appendix C) to the effect that people should not rely on newspaper accounts, and he intimated that the information in the Star-Ledger reports might in some way have been pilfered.

The failure to consult with or even inform the teacher education community about the proposal that was being formulated has been justified by the Commissioner on the basis that he had been told by the Governor to develop the proposal in-house and keep it secret until its formal announcement. (Cooperman, January 24, 1984) However, in the days preceding the presentment, leaders of many New Jersey organizations met with the Commissioner, at his invitation, to discuss the proposal. Several of these leaders subsequently endorsed the proposal upon its official issuance, so the Commissioner's efforts to line up political support were fruitful. Albeit, this strategy caused the Commissioner to exclude college education faculty and deans from any involvement whatsoever, probably because their support was not likely to be forthcoming and forewarning them would have been to forearm them. The vehemence of their response to the proposal when it was offically released was in part conditioned by the fact that their expertise had been treated as a disqualification for participation in the policymaking. They were alleged to be too self-interested for objectivity. Indeed, a major part of the Commissioner's strategy has been to paint college education faculty and deans as physicians who are unable or unwilling to heal themselves, who cannot be cured by his ministrations, and who therefore must be confronted with a competing system for teacher preparation.

There was another significant group whose advice went unsolicited by the Commissioner. That was the State Board of Examiners. This group consists of the Commissioner himself (ex officio), an assistant commissioner, two state college presidents, one county superintendent, two district superintendents, a high school principal, an elementary school principal, a librarian, and four teachers. Its composition was designed to make it a broadly representative group, and it traditionally has served as a recommending body for changes in certification requirements. Its disregard by the Commissioner offended some of the members, but since their appointments are by recommendation of the Commissioner the insulted parties are not well positioned for protest unless they are prepared to forego reappointment.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT

On September 6, 1983, the Governor presented his "blueprint for educational reform" to the joint session of the Legislature. The blueprint included the new certification plan, but that got overshadowed by the lure that was to be used to attract candidates to the plan: a beginning teacher salary of $18,500. The cost of this lure has been projected as it would percolate up the salary scales of New Jersey school districts and the total cost is enormous, roughly $34,000,000 in the first year of implementation and climbing to approximately $57,000,000 after five years. (NJEA, June 20, 1984) The Governor's intention is to transfer all of the cost to local districts over a four-year period, something that not all districts will be able or willing to sustain. At a press conference after his speech, the Governor used the certification plan as a justification for the higher starting salary on the premise that the plan would produce better teachers who would be worth more money. (Braun, September 7, 1983)

The next day the Governor introduced the Commissioner at a press conference in the auditorium of the State Museum, where the Commissioner would explain the certification plan more fully. A large contingent of the New Jersey press corps was seated in the first several rows, and almost all of the seats behind them were occupied by the supporters and opponents of the proposal. Among the silent supporters were State Education Department staff who had been trotted out for the occasion. The Commissioner used very simple overhead transparencies and lots of homely examples to make his case. At one point he even tried teaching a demonstra-

tion lesson in pedagogy by having the press play the role of students. There was confusion among the press as to what the Commissioner wanted and disagreement about the conclusion to which the Commissioner thought the lesson had led. One of the transparencies used by the Commissioner listed reasons why teaching is not an attractive career. The Commissioner acknowledged that there are low salaries, difficult working conditions, and more attractive career options, especially new ones for women. Nevertheless, the Commissioner insisted that a determining deterrent to people who would otherwise become teachers was the requirement that they complete college education courses. He also made statements that could easily be construed as denigrative of the college education programs:

> We will move from a system that will certify people of limited ability to a system that will deny those people admittance to the profession.
>
> We will move from a system that systematically discourages talented people to a system that will make it possible for them to teach.

To support his contention that talented people were not being graduated from the college education programs, the Commissioner used the SAT scores of high school students who had indicated at the time they took the Scholastic Aptitude Test that they intended to major in "education" when and if they got to college. This misleading use of SAT scores did not originate with the Commissioner nor did it stop with him. The same data are used by Darling-Hammond (1984) in her recent report for the Rand Corporation, and by Weaver in a Phi Delta Kappan article (1984). Much more relevant data are the SAT scores of students who graduate from teacher education programs as compared with the SAT scores of other grad-

uates from the same colleges. Such data were assembled for several of the colleges in New Jersey. At Rutgers University, the SAT scores of the actual graduates of the teacher education program are markedly higher than the scores used by the Commissioner. (Appendix D, p. 10) But even here, care must be taken to include all the graduates of the teacher education program and not just those who "majored" in education. In many institutions, prospective secondary teachers major in the subject to be taught, and only the prospective elementary and special education teachers major in education. At Rutgers, no one has been allowed to major in education during the last ten years. A variation on this nettlesome issue of SAT scores is to be found in the recent report from the National Center for Education Information. (Feistritzer, 1984) The author of this report bemoans the fact that students are admitted to teacher education programs without a check of their SAT scores. However, admission to teacher education programs obviously follows upon admission to college, and at colleges which have a high SAT admission requirement a second check is not necessary.

The Commissioner also lamented the lack of uniformity across the college education programs, noting the numerous different course titles as though different titles meant different content, and also remarking on the varying student teacher evaluation forms.

The Commissioner went on to inform his audience that there was no demonstrated relationship between education courses and effective teaching. He failed to note the lack of a relationship between liberal arts courses, of which he spoke with some reverence, and effective teaching. To compound this discrimination, the Commissioner talked about the unreliable

grades given by education professors and the whimsical performance measures they used, concluding that the time and costs involved in taking education courses were too much to pay for the uncertain benefits received.

In defense of his own proposal, the Commissioner contended that it would be rational because an attempt would be made to determine what the essential knowledge was that someone should get in the five-day orientation to teaching. There was to be no extraneous information; everything would be practical and applicable to the teaching situation in which the beginner was placed. Moreover, this essential knowledge would be uniform throughout the state, although local districts could impart the knowledge with variations appropriate to their settings. The Commissioner left two things to the audience's imagination: how he was able to tell before the essential knowledge had been determined that it would take only five days to impart this knowledge, and how 500 local district variations of the knowledge would yield greater uniformity than was to be found across the 26 colleges that were preparing teachers under specific state standards.

Finally, the Commissioner invoked two words that have wide appeal in America. First, he said that his route to certification would provide competition for the college teacher preparation programs, and then he said that because his route was utterly uncluttered it would be economical. He conveyed no awareness that because his route had been made so smooth it might provide unfair competition for the college programs which were still constrained by an array of state requirements under his control.

UNEVEN ODDS

A major lesson to be learned (or relearned) from the initial events in New Jersey is the power of words. The Commissioner used such crowd appeal words as "competition" and "economical," but he leaned most heavily on one of the most incantatory of all words: "reform." To reform is

> to amend or improve by change of form or removal of faults or abuses; to put or change into an improved form or condition; to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action; to induce or cause to abandon evil ways; to become changed for the better. (Webster's, 1977)

Couched this way, "reform" begins with a preemptive obviation of opposition. Who but the perverse and the egregiously self-interested can be against making the world a better place? Who would not wish to have his or her name emblazoned on the honor roll of reform?

The Governor and the Commissioner presented their case as one of reform, and before the teacher education community had a chance to register its reservations people of power began lining up on the side of "reform." To step out of line would make them appear to have been impulsive or naive or both, and thus the opposition was put in the position of attacking people's self-images as well as the Commissioner's proposal.

In addition to being cast as anti-reform and having to tread gingerly around the egos of the powerful who had prejudged the issue, the teacher educators had two other disadvantages. One was the communication handicap. When the Governor or the Commissioner calls a press conference, reporters show. After all, governors and commissioners don't just utter personal opinions, they announce public policies. Moreover, the reporters

who show know that these particular newsmakers are continuing news sources who can make the job of a reporter much easier by providing a fresh supply of stories and perhaps even some scoops. If news is the lifeblood of reporters, public officials are the biggest donors and to antagonize them is to risk anemia. The education editor of the Newark Star-Ledger had been specially sensitized to this reality. He had been involved in a feud with the previous Commissioner of Education, who tried with some success to deny the editor access to information. What the powerful giveth they can take away. Also to be considered is the leash by which a reporter is restrained if his editor or publisher is a supporter of the incumbent governor. Thus it was that the new Commissioner's proposal was touted in so many of the papers that reported it. As mentioned above, the Star-Ledger had even conducted a softening up campaign to prepare the public for the announcement. If there was no skepticism on the news pages of the state's newspapers, the editorial pages absolutely reeked with rhapsodies to the reform rhetoric. Teacher educators were truly on the defensive: their credibility had been undermined by the accusations of self-interest; their objections were necessarily more technical than the simplicities of the proposal, and therefore less newsworthy; and they were dull and infrequent news sources who could not command the attention of the press.

The second disadvantage under which the teacher educators labored was the fact that they had replaced teachers as the scapegoats for student failure. Teachers had acquired a recent exoneration by virtue of their low-paid, low-prestige, high-aggravation jobs. It was becoming unfashion-

able to castigate a class of victims (teachers) for the plight of another class (students). It could also be risky, given the number and organizational strength of teachers. But if politicians and pundits were no longer willing to pillory teachers, and if the politicians had a keen sense of how short they could go actually to help teachers, then another whipping boy had to be found. Teacher educators were extremely vulnerable. They are held in low esteem by their liberal arts colleagues, who take the value of their own work on faith born of habit, and teacher educators are frequently the objects of scorn from their own students, who assume the superiority of liberal arts on faith bred of intellectual immaturity. The very demarcation made between liberal arts and professional education, as though ne'er the twain shall meet let alone o'erlap, is an entrenched myth which functions to the detriment of teacher education.

Unfortunately, there is enough bad practice in teacher education to provoke popular disdain. Those of whom little is expected often live down to the expectation. Probably everyone in teacher education can compile a compendium of horror stories about colleagues, and perhaps about himself or herself. Lately there has been a fresh inducement to shoddiness. If, given their salaries and working conditions, it is unreasonable to demand a lot from teachers, then, given the career prospects of teacher education students, it may be unreasonable for <u>their</u> teachers to demand a lot from them. Startling evidence of the sloppiness of which schools of education are capable was revealed on the front pages of New Jersey's papers little more than a year earlier. The Governor's original designee as State Edu-

cation Commissioner was found to have plagiarized at least half of his dissertation, and in a way that would cause suspicion with even a cursory reading. Alas, his dissertation committee had not detected this and he had been able to flaunt a doctoral degree for more than ten years as he rose in the ranks of New Jersey and Pennsylvania officialdom. All of this caused teacher educators in New Jersey to have trouble commanding the attention and respect required for a fair hearing of their side of the story.

TAKING SIDES

Supporters of Sorts

After the Governor's address and the Commissioner's press conference, opposing camps began to form. In support of the Commissioner were the editors of the state's major newspapers, the Chancellor of Higher Education, the president and the executive director of the New Jersey School Boards Association, the president and executive director of the Principals and Supervisors Association, and several suburban school superintendents from whose ranks the Commissioner had been drawn. The Chancellor's support for a scheme that would bypass his domain of higher education was probably due to the fact that he too is a gubernatorial appointee. His support was not unqualified, however. He was concerned about the rigor of the subject mastery and general knowledge tests and the passing scores that would be established, and it was he who had prevailed upon the Commissioner to convoke a panel of national experts to outline the essential knowledge needed by a beginning teacher. (Hollander, October 3, 1983) As for the leadership of the School Boards Association and the Principals and Supervisors Association, the extent to which they had consulted with their respective constituencies or even with their headquarters staffs was not clear, but the timing did not allow much opportunity for consultation and many constituents would later be heard grumbling about people who had presumed to speak for them. And, of course, there were public defections at the local level. For example, the Essex County and the Somerset County chapters of the Principals and Supervisors Association were overwhelmingly opposed to the Commissioner's proposal.

As the fall wore on, the Commissioner would garner the support of other notables, mainly some state college presidents and the president of Rutgers, the state university. Rumors abounded as to the motivation of the higher education presidents. For instance, there was a lot of speculation that the Commissioner had a reward to dangle. The reward was a proposed Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Management, and the Commissioner just might locate it at an institution of higher education and that institution just might be the one headed by the president who was making the endorsement. For the president of the state university, there was a tangible coincidence. He announced his support of the Governor and Commissioner's proposal at a morning press conference (Braun, January 13, 1984), and in the afternoon he attended a press conference at which the Governor announced a special $3,000,000 appropriation to upgrade the football facilities of the state university (Remington, 1984). Some wags suggested that the president should have held out for a nuclear reactor.

It was also suggested that the presidents were prepared to support a plan that would reduce the need for education faculty and thereby justify the diversion of faculty lines from education to new high demand disciplines such as accounting and computer science. In New Jersey's zero sum higher education economy, adding faculty lines to a given discipline could only be done by subtracting lines from some other discipline. The state colleges, having been converted from teacher's colleges to liberal arts colleges in the late 1960's, still have large and largely tenured education faculties who stand as roadblocks to the development of other disciplines. Moreover, education faculty are not considered to be

indispensable ingredients of a liberal arts college so they can have more students and still less security than the philosophy faculty. This rumor was confirmed by the Commissioner himself a year later when he got into a spat with the Chancellor and accused the Chancellor of being motivated by a determination to reduce the number of education professors in New Jersey. (Appendix E) The Chancellor's staff acknowledge that cutting back on the faculty lines in education has been a goal of the Chancellor. (Braun, October 2, 1984)

An interesting aspect of almost all of the endorsements is that they were, in fact, qualified and tentative. In some cases they amounted to nothing more than an endorsement of the Commissioner's presumed good intentions and a willingness to await developments. Unfortunately, the headlines never said "Big Shot Endorses Cooperman Proposal With Reservations." The last two words were always missing. These words were even missing in the stories below the headlines, since the reporters were more interested in tallying the political points to date than in discussing the substance of the issue. The president of the state university gave his own twist to this kind of misrepresentation. He had requested the advice of his University Council on Teacher Education, a group dominated by liberal arts faculty. They presented him with a general endorsement of the effort to attract more talented people to teaching along with a list of specific objections to the Commissioner's proposal. The president then proceeded to characterize both his position and their advice as a "ringing endorsement." (Braun, January 13, 1984) That happened in the winter of 1984. In the summer of 1984, the president would send a letter to

the Commissioner in which he would effectively withdraw his endorsement and describe the Commissioner's initiative as a "grave mistake." (Appendix F) What precipitated the change of mind is unknown, but the president did not broadcast his reversal as he had his endorsement. Moreover, when the letter became public, the president denied that it was a reversal; he said he still endorsed the Commissioner's plan but could not support the implementation of it. (Braun, August 24, 1984)

On December 9, 1983, the Commissioner's proposal received the endorsement of President Reagan. In a speech, Reagan said:

> In New Jersey, Governor Tom Kean has a proposal that deserves wide support. Under his plan, the New Jersey Board of Education would allow successful mathematicians, scientists, linguists, and journalists to pass a competency test in their subjects, then go into the classroom as paid teaching interns. If they performed well, they would be issued permanent teaching certificates. ("President Praises State Licensing Plan")

The Great Communicator had issued a misleading statement, but the message was clear to officials in New Jersey: the Commissioner's proposal was being blessed with the President's popularity. The fact that the proposal could be summarized in 42 words must have appealed to Reagan's penchant for pungent simplicity.

Opponents

The New Jersey Education Association, the New Jersey Federation of Teachers, and the New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher Education comprised the major opposition to the Commissioner's proposal. The NJEA called the proposal a "sham and a delusion." (Braun, August 28, 1983) The proposal would have the obvious effect of putting on school district

payrolls people who were not fully certified and who would therefore either be ineligible for or reluctant to seek NJEA membership. Moreover, the training of these tyros would be controlled by district administrators who could be expected to try inculcating management attitudes. The NJEA is a well oiled political machine whose favor is curried by politicians, so it promised to be the greatest impediment to the Commissioner's proposal.

The New Jersey Federation of Teachers had a separate interest in the issue. It represents the faculty at New Jersey's state colleges, many of whom are education faculty. Since the Commissioner's route to certification does not include college education courses, it would have the effect of reducing the enrollments in these courses, conceivably to a point at which colleges could no longer afford to offer the courses. The discontinuation of the courses would entail a justification for terminating the faculty who taught them, so the most fundamental concern of collective bargaining associations - job security - was at issue for the New Jersey Federation of Teachers. As an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers and thus of the AFL-CIO, the NJFT, while not nearly as powerful as the NJEA, had some special clout of its own.

The New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is composed of institutional representatives from the 26 colleges with teacher education programs. The representatives are deans, directors and chairpersons, and while they may be politically astute within their colleges, they are not very conversant with state level politicking and are not well organized to engage therein. As indicated above, they represent units at

their respective institutions that are low on the totem pole, so they can never be sure of how much support (or sympathy) they will be able to muster among the home folks. The singular strength of the NJACTE is its familiarity with teacher education. They are the group that knows the most about the issue. The Commissioner's own training was in educational administration, not teacher education. His Director of Teacher Education is someone who was denied tenure as an education professor at one of the New Jersey colleges and refused appointment at another one, facts which are cited not to cast aspersion on his ability but to indicate that his motivation may be alloyed. Despite their relevant expertise, the members of the NJACTE soon became disabused of their naivete in thinking that the issue really would be the issue. It became apparent quickly that the operative issue was how people could position themselves to maximum personal and organizational advantage around the secondary issue of teacher preparation. All the lofty rhetoric notwithstanding, the issue that seemed to drive most people's behavior was power. And that appearance was true for some education professors and deans who surprised their colleagues with their readiness to compromise on principles they had declared inviolable when the compromise augured career advancement.

In time the NJEA, the NJFT, and the NJACTE formed a loose coalition, but coordination was difficult and consensus on anything more than general principles was never achieved. The two smaller groups - NJFT and NJACTE - were sensitive to the appearance of being dominated by the NJEA, so there were always centrifugal as well as centripetal forces at work, and the former proved more powerful. In addition, the leadership of the Teachers

Federation feared an accommodation to the Commissioner's proposal by the Teachers Association.

For a brief while the three opposition organizations had the active support of the Education Committee and the Higher Education Committee of the New Jersey State Assembly. These committees drafted legislation to scuttle the Commissioner's proposal and they held hearings at which the Commissioner was grilled. The Commissioner was asked questions the answers to which made him look foolish and self-contradicting. For example, he would attempt to assuage one set of critics by saying that his proposal would attract only a very few people so there was no cause for alarm. To another set of critics who wondered why he was spending so much time and taxpayers' money on a project of such limited impact, he would say that his proposal had the potential to attract thousands of people. He was also caught unaware of key developments in the State Education Department, such as the existence of a draft Administrative Code which incorporated his proposal. Despite the hostile questioning and his own imprudent answers, the Commissioner never lost his composure. The Assembly committees did not vote out their bills because there were not enough votes in the full Assembly to override the veto promised by the Governor. Soon the Commissioner forced the legislative committees to back off by appointing the panel of national experts and a state commission to refine and elaborate on his proposal. Ultimately, the two most actively opposed assemblymen would endorse the proposal on the claim that they were granted concessions, which are imperceptible to others and have been denied by the alleged grantor, the Director of Teacher Educa-

tion. (Braun, September 9, 1984) One of the assemblymen had just been trounced in a Congressional bid, and he may have realized how precarious his chances are of being reelected to the Assembly without the Governor's support. It was he, incidentally, who had said that the Commissioner's route to certification, by being an on-the-job training program, would make guinea pigs out of children. (Braun, September 8, 1983)

FIGHTING BACK

As is their wont if not their wisdom, the education professoriate responded to the certification propoal with carefully wrought arguments. A faculty committee at Rutgers Graduate School of Education prepared a 27-page analysis of defects in the procedure under which the Cooperman proposal was developed, e.g., the secrecy and the shunning of expert opinion; defects in the use of test results to justify the proposal, e.g., the use of SAT scores for high school students as predictors of effectiveness for people who will become teachers more than four years later; defects in the use of research sources, e.g., omission of a wealth of sources and distortion of the ones that did get used; defects in the Commissioner's antipathy to theory and to non-classroom focused knowledge, e.g., the notion that there is a single set of simple pedagogical T[illegible]s that can be presented statewide with unanimous assent; and defects in the certification route itself, e.g., subject mastery testing that could well mean a fact recall test with no emphasis on ability to transmit facts or to organize them into larger understandings, a five-day orientation to teaching despite the findings from the National Science Foundation teacher training projects that subject mastery is not enough before being plunged into fulltime teaching (National Science Foundation, 1978, 1979) and the warning from the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study of California's Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing that simplistic prescriptions are to be avoided (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). The Rutgers analysis concluded with an alternative to the Commissioner's proposal that would cause New Jersey to cease being one of the few remaining states that still makes permanent certification synonymous with

initial certification. (See Appendix D for the analysis by the Rutgers faculty.)

Education professors also used the Sunday guest column in the education section of the Newark Star-Ledger to present their points of view. They spoke to civic groups and at professional conferences; they were heard from on television and radio news shows; they testified before the Assembly Education Committees and the Senate Education Committee and the State Board of Education; they held a press conference on the floor of the State Legislature; they requested and received critiques of the Commissioner's proposal from Jere Brophy, co-director of the Institute for Research on Teaching of Michigan State University; Wilma Longstreet, dean of the College of Education at the University of New Orleans; Charles Myers, chairperson of the Department of Teaching and Learning at Vanderbilt University; and David Tyack, Vida Jacks Professor of Education at Stanford University. The NJACTE was accorded a private meeting with a group of State Board members and later with the Commissioner. The NJACTE contacted David Imig, executive director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, who came to New Jersey and provided $5,000 in financial assistance as well as national reportage in AACTE Briefs. The NJEA produced a simple one-page chart contrasting starkly the requirements in the Commissioner's proposal with those in the college programs. This last approach capsulated the most common argument against the Commissioner's proposal: that it constituted a drastic diminution of standards that would have the effect of producing less rather than more qualified teachers. Indeed, the Commissioner's conception of the teaching profession was such that he was recommending a train-

ing period - the five-day orientation - which was considerably shorter than the time required to train a waitress or waiter at most restaurants. He seemed prepared to deprofessionalize teaching on the assumption that once teaching had lost whatever professional status it had, it would somehow be a more attractive career for really bright people and worthy of much greater remuneration.

Toward the end of the calendar year, the education professors were lulled into a temporary silence by the winter recess in academe and by the fact that the panel of national experts would be convening in January to outline the essential knowledge needed by a beginning teacher. The product of the panel would greatly affect the course of events thereafter, and there was not much to do but await the product. One thing that still could be done was to send each of the panelists a set of critiques of the Commissioner's proposal by other national experts as a way of warning the panelists of the ultimate purpose for which they were being used. This was done, and it was later characterized by the Commissioner as a "dirty trick." (Braun, April 29, 1984)

THE "THORBURN" STUDY

In late November of 1983, a media blow was struck against the New Jersey college education programs, thereby giving aid to the Commissoner's cause. The States News Service of Washington, D.C. issued a report of a study that had been done by a pseudonymous William Thorburn. The "study" (Appendix G) describes "Thorburn's" selected personal experiences at one New Jersey college he attended to complete the courses he needed for teacher certification. The reported experiences certainly point to scandalous practices by faculty who taught the courses taken by "Thorburn." These practices fall under the general heading of indefensible indolence. If what "Thorburn" says is true, there are education faculty at a New Jersey college who pay very scant attention to their instructional responsibilities. But even if what "Thorburn" says is true, the timing of the release of the study and the generalizations drawn from the study raise questions of fairness. The study is entitled What's Wrong With Teacher Education; the release to the wire service is entitled "Insider Scores N.J. Teacher Education"; and one newspaper headlined its inclusion of the wire service story as "Study Knocks N.J. Teachers Colleges." (Bedard, November 22, 1983) The clear implication of the study and of the use to which it was put is that one person's experience in one education program at one college is representative of everyone's experience in any education program at all New Jersey colleges. It is to his credit that the education editor of the Newark Star-Ledger refused to run the story. (Braun, December 1983)

As it turned out, the study was done by James LoGerfo, who requested anonymity because he feared that he might be "blackballed" in New Jersey.

(Bedard, December 16, 1983) Since he later used his real name for an article along the same lines in Education Week (Lo Gerfo, 1984), one might infer that he had come to hope that he might be "taken care of" by a Governor and Commissioner whose cause he was aiding. LoGerfo is a former history instructor at Drew University who decided to become a public school teacher - not the usual progression. He had been terminated at Drew because of his failure to complete his doctoral dissertation. (Leavell, 1984) His "study" of teacher education was acquired for publication by Learn, Inc., a conservative organization which lists among its printed "principles" that "School faculties need more liberal-arts graduates with some measure of real learning, and fewer alumni of the warehouses for the semi-competent called 'teacher colleges'." (Appendix G, inside front cover) The president of Learn, Inc. is Lawrence Uzzell, formerly of the National Institute of Education and before that a press secretary to conservative senatorial candidate Jeffrey Bell of New Jersey. Uzzell has advocated the abolition of both the NIE and the Department of Education. He has acknowledged that he released the LoGerfo study to help the Governor and Commissioner of New Jersey in their effort to change teacher preparation. (Bedard, December 16, 1983) In defense of his action in granting LoGerfo pseudonymous authorship, Uzzell claims that the most influential article in the history of Foreign Affairs was written under a pseudonym by George Kennan. (Uzzell, December 27, 1983)

However scurrilous the "study" and the way it was used, once the story made the pages of New Jersey newspapers the purpose was achieved. The college education programs were smeared and people's attention was turned elsewhere when the victims wiped off the mud.

THE BOYER PANEL

On January 10, the panel of national experts who would define the knowledge needed by a beginning teacher began its two-day meeting. (There had been a social and organizational meeting the day before.) The panel was chaired by Ernest L. Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and current president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Panel members were David Berliner, an educational psychologist at the University of Arizona; Frank Brown, dean of education at the University of North Carolina; Edgar Epps, Marshall Field Professor of Urban Education at the University of Chicago; C. Emily Feistritzer, director of the National Center for Education Information; Jay Gottlieb, an educational psychologist at New York University; Lawrence Lezotte of the Administration and Curriculum Department at Michigan State University; Archie Lapointe, executive director of the National Assessment Office at Educational Testing Service; Kathryn Maddox, director of the Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center for the Kanawha County (West Virginia) Schools: and Barak Rosenshine, an educational psychologist at the University of Illinois. Also appointed to the panel was Dwight Allen of Old Dominion University. Allen soon withdrew when the Newark Star-Ledger raised questions about the financial mismanagement that took place at the University of Massachusetts School of Education while Allen was dean. The State Education Department then let it be known that Allen had not been their choice but rather that of an aide to the Governor - an aide who had taken an Ed.D. degree at UMass and had known Allen. The other panelists were selected by the Commissioner upon the advice of his

staff, who knew some of the panelists personally and had others recommended by institutions that provided consultative services to the State Education Department. Only two people declined the invitation to serve on the panel - John Goodlad and ~~Marilyn~~ Madelyn Hunter, both of UCLA and both of whom pleaded the press of prior commitments. (Klagholz, September 12, 1984) Hunter was a particular favorite of the Commissioner since he had used her approach to in-service teacher training in the district where he had been the superintendent and frequently referred to the efficacy of that approach.

There was a subtle bias built into the panel. None of the panelists is a teaching field specialist, e.g., a science education professor, so the panel's conception of the knowledge needed by a beginning teacher was likely to be generic. This played into the Commissioner's own prejudice that there was very little professional knowledge that was needed at all.

The Boyer Panel was charged with answering two main questions: What is essential for beginning teachers to know about the profession? and How do effective teachers teach? There were also two subquestions: What are the differences in essential knowledge and skills among elementary, secondary, and special education teachers? and What areas of knowledge for beginning teachers are best taught in a collegiate setting? The panel was also told that it was "not to evaluate the overall system proposed," and that it "must remain aloof from those who support or oppose one or another approach." (Appendix A to Boyer Panel report attached as Appendix H)

The necessity for the restrictions placed on the panel has never been made clear. Even more perplexing was the panel's willingness to accede to the restrictions. The panel was part of a larger context and process, but

the panelists were asked to remain ignorant of the events which surrounded their work and which could cause their recommendations to be used in ways that they ordinarily would not countenance. It is as though their silence was being purchased beforehand on the pretext that the less they knew the more dispassionately they could carry out their task. Of course, if they agreed not to look there would be no evil for them to see and to speak about. Since all of the panelists are academics who presumably are committed to academic freedom and the untrammeled pursuit of truth, it is odd that they should have agreed to don the Commissioner's blinders. As mentioned earlier, the New Jersey education professoriate sent materials to the panelists to let them know of the purpose to which their work would be put and of the problems with that purpose. Whether the panelists read these materials or cast them aside with a "Begone, Satan!" exclamation is unknown. Even after the recommendations of the Boyer Panel were incorporated into the Commissioner's proposal, no panelist would make public his or her assessment of the overall system, although some were willing to convey their private reservations. Shortly after the panelists had their two-day meeting, one of the panelists, David Berliner, delivered an address at the University of Arizona in which he limned the burgeoning research on teacher education and the legitimate claim this provided for increasing the professional component of teacher preparation. (Berliner, 1984) However, he has not commented publicly on the truncated version of this preparation called for in the final revision of the Commissioner's proposal.

After the panel met and drafted its report, but before the report was issued, some members of the New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher

Education met with the panel chairman, Ernest Boyer, and one of the panel members, Frank Brown. The meeting was arranged by David Imig of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and took place in San Antonio on February 3 during the annual convention of the AACTE. The NJACTE members were in attendance at the convention as the delegated representatives of their institutions, something they do each year. The meeting with Boyer and Brown lasted about 30 minutes and consisted of the NJACTE representatives expressing their concerns about the Commissioner's intentions and the way the panel's report might be manipulated by the Commissioner and the media. The latter concerns were borne out almost immediately: the press portrayed the panel's report as support for the Commissioner's proposal, and the Commissioner subsequently gave a story to the Star-Ledger education editor who wrote that the NJACTE members had followed Boyer all the way to San Antonio to badger him. (Braun, April 29, 1984)

Boyer and Brown responded to the NJACTE concerns with general statements of their own good intentions and with an intimation that the panel's report might come as a pleasant surprise.

The Boyer Panel presented its report on February 28, 1984. To many education professors in New Jersey, it did come as a pleasant surprise compared to the Commissioner's five-day orientation proposal. The Boyer Panel said that a beginning teacher needed to know about curriculum development, teaching strategies, materials selection, human development, assessment of pupils, classroom management, and the sociology of schooling. The panel added that knowledge of the history and the philosophies of education would be desirable but not essential for a beginning teacher to have.

In answer to the question, "How do effective teachers teach?" the panel launched into a discussion of ethics, but then went on to the more conventional wisdom about having clear goals and being well organized.

The panel made explicit its bias toward the generic by saying that there was "no need to differentiate sharply between elementary and secondary education in defining the fundamentals beginning teachers need." (Appendix H, p. 11) This suggests that a beginning mathematics teacher really does not have to know about the debates that are unique to math teaching, or a science teacher about the national curriculum projects in chemistry and physics, or an English teacher about the approaches that are unique to the teaching of language skills, or a social studies teacher about the complicated and contradictory purposes of social studies teaching. Indeed, specialists in these several areas would not be needed at all. Most of the knowledge recommended by the Boyer Panel could be taught by the kind of people who dominated the panel - educational psychologists.

The panel concluded its report by answering the question of how the essential knowledge could best be obtained. " . . . it is the conviction of the panel that teaching will become a profession in this nation only as there is a closer and continuing link between the colleges and the schools." (Appendix H, p. 14)

In their relief that the Boyer Panel had not been seduced by the Commissioner's austerity program for the preparation of teachers and had recommended what sounded very much like a traditional bloc of college education courses, the New Jersey education professoriate did not jump on the weaknesses in the report. They had earlier registered their general approval of the composi-

tion of the Boyer Panel, so their latitude for criticism had been self-circumscribed. Moreover, any criticisms they might have raised would have been dismissed as nitpicking by hacks at the work of the eminent. However, there are weaknesses in the report and these have been detailed at length by Hendrik Gideonse, dean of the College of Education at the University of Cincinnati. (Appendix I, pp. 4-8) Gideonse faults the facile distinction that the Boyer Panel made between essential and desirable knowledge, the panel's inconsistency in discounting philosophy while elevating ethics, the inclusion of tangential ruminations, and the omission of any discussion of the appropriate general education and subject matter preparation for a teacher. Gideonse concludes that the report of the Boyer Panel is "an incomplete, inadequate, and insufficient basis for professional guidance." (Appendix G, p. 8)

One of the great ironies in all of this is the contrast between the Commissioner's transparent contempt for the college education program requirements that have evolved through long and painstaking deliberations by national and state standard-setting agencies and his apparent regard for the results of two days of discussion by ten people.

THE CONTINUING ASSAULT ON THE COLLEGE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

All the while that the Commissioner was trying to promote his own certification proposal as healthy competition for the college education programs, he was subjecting the college education programs to a series of discriminatory reviews. First there was issued a letter, co-signed by the Commissioner himself and the Chancellor of Higher Education (Cooperman and Hollander, December 30, 1983), which said that if a course in the behavioral and social foundations of teaching and learning, e.g., educational psychology, were taught by an education professor, the vita of the professor and the course syllabus had to be submitted to the Departments of Education and Higher Education for review. If the educational psychology course were taught by a professor in the psychology department, that fact alone was sufficient to warrant approval. The Commissioner and the Chancellor finally relented on this demand after the American Association of University Professors sent a protest and when even the president of the state university indicated a refusal to have his institution comply with the demand. However, the letter in which the Commissioner and Chancellor retracted their demand included a substitute that was equally discriminatory. (Cooperman and Hollander, March 9, 1984) Instead of the education professor submitting his or her vita and course syllabus for review, he or she now had to acquire a joint appointment in the counterpart liberal arts department or have the course cross listed with that department. What this means is that the liberal arts departments have veto power over faculty and courses in the educational foundations area. If the liberal arts departments want to increase their own enrollments badly enough, they will find a justification for exercising

this veto against the education faculty. The clear message in all this is that the Commissioner and Chancellor believe that liberal arts faculty can be trusted and education faculty cannot be. This time the president of the state university capitulated even though the principle involved was the same as with the earlier demand.

Another discriminatory device employed by the Commissioner was his interpretation of teacher education standards adopted by the State Board of Education in 1982. These standards call for minima of 60 credits of general education, 30 credits in a liberal arts major, 18 credits in the behavioral and social foundations of teaching and learning, and 30 credits in professional education. (The distinction between the last two categories is certainly elusive and it has proven to be troublesome.) The Commissioner and Chancellor insist on the minima in the general education and major categories but are prepared to permit the credits in the educational foundations and professional education categories to be reduced with impunity as long as the reduction results in an addition to the two liberal arts categories. Whether the State Board of Education which mandated the minima meant for some of the minima to be treated as maxima is a question which they may never have been asked. The obvious message to the interpretation by the Commissioner and Chancellor is that prospective teachers need an indispensable minimum of liberal arts courses but not education courses.

The Chancellor's position in this matter has been even more discriminatory than that of the Commissioner. To begin with, when the State Board of Higher Education adopted the minimum credit standards, they omitted any reference to a minimum in professional education, at the Chancellor's recommen-

dation. The Chancellor persists in arguing that there should be no stated minimum of professional education credit. (Braun, September `, 1984) The difference between the Commissioner and the Chancellor, therefore, is that the former believes there should be a stated minimum of education credits, with that "minimum" being reducible to an indeterminate point, and the latter believing that prospective teachers need a mandatory minimum only of liberal arts courses, which minimum is absolute. It may be a difference between lip service and no service.

During the spring of 1984, sets of forms indicating compliance with the 1982 state standards of the State Boards, as shiftingly interpreted, had to be submitted for each college certification program. The standards include more than the credit hour minima; there are requirements governing the admission and retention of students, the pre-student teaching field experiences, student teaching, and comprehensive testing. The submitted compliance forms were given to a group of out-of-state reviewers. The reviewers then summoned the college education officials to private meetings at which the reviewers attempted to understand more fully what a college was doing and whether it was in compliance with the various standards per the latest interpretation. Given the number of standards that had to be satisfied and the interpretational nuances that could be placed on many of these, the probability that an institution would not be found to be in complete compliance with every standard was pretty high. This situation called for a period of good faith cooperation and negotiation between the college education officials and the staffs of the State Education and Higher Education Departments. Instead, what occurred suddenly was a front page story in the Newark Star-Ledger,

headlined "Teacher Training Fails State Test." The subheading read "21 of 26 Colleges Facing Major Cutback in Programs." The story said that a "massive cutback" was to be announced "soon." "Only five colleges will be allowed to keep their programs completely intact." Even the five colleges that passed the paper review could still be failed after on-site evaluations. (Braun, May 29, 1984, p. 1) The story went on to say that "some public institutions are expected to welcome the state action [in eliminating education programs] because it will free revenue and faculty lines for other programs that are in much greater demand by students." (p. 14) It was not until the last short paragraph of the story that mention was made of the fact that many of the deficiencies noted in the paper review were minor and could be corrected.

The story was so sensational that even college presidents called Trenton to find out what was going on. The only thing that was clear was that the reporter had not fabricated the story out of his febrile imagination. It had been fed to him by officials at the highest level of the state bureaucracy. If the intention had been to discredit totally the college education programs and thereby guarantee adoption of the Commissioner's proposal as the only extant alternative, the outcry that followed the story derailed the tactic. The same day that the story appeared, college education officials were phoned by staff of the State Education Department who repudiated the story and denied that it in any way reflected the position of the Commissioner. The reporter was compelled to run a front page story in the next day's edition of the Star-Ledger. This story was headlined "Colleges Get Time to Fix Teacher Plans." The Commissioner was quoted as saying that several of the 21 colleges that failed t paper review had "minor problems" that could be corrected "within

a few days, perhaps a few hours." Alas, the Commissioner tried to have it both ways by also saying that the first newspaper account had been "entirely accurate." (Braun, May 31, 1984, p. 1) One has to be extremely circumspect in distancing oneself from an ally who causes momentary embarrassment but who has the potential to cause much greater discomfort if disowned too thoroughly.

THE JAROSLAW COMMISSION

The Boyer Panel reported on the knowledge it thought was needed by a beginning teacher. Deciding how this knowledge could be conveyed within the framework of the Commissioner's proposal was left to a State Commission on Alternative Teacher Certification, which was created especially and solely for this purpose. The commission was chaired by Harry Jaroslaw, superintendent of the Tenafly Public Schools. The vice chairperson was Robert Marik, vice president for public affairs at Merck Pharmaceuticals. Members were Jann Azumi, a researcher for the Newark Public Schools; Harold Eickhoff, the president of Trenton State College; Frank Esposito, dean of education at Kean College; Laurie Fitchett, president of the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers; Edithe Fulton, president of the New Jersey Education Association; Bernard Kirshtein, president of the New Jersey School Boards Association; Beth Kitchen, owner of Kitchen & Associates Architectural Services; Marcoantonio Lacatena, president of the New Jersey Federation of Teachers; Clark Leslie, vice president for operations at Ethicon Pharmaceuticals; Monsignor Thomas Leubking, superintendent of the Trenton Diocesan Schools; Allan Markowitz, a supervisor with the Parsippany - Troy Hills Public Schools; Thomas Niland, principal of Pomona Elementary School; Murray Peyton, board secretary to the Dunellen Public Schools; Verdell Roundtree, vice president of the United Negro College Fund; Mark Smith, superintendent of the Chatham Borough Public Schools; James Van Hoven, president of the Independent and Private Schools Association; Helen Walsh, president of Worthington, Walsh & Dryer; William Walsh, treasurer of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; and Edward Watts, president of the New Jersey Principals and

Supervisors Association.

Formal complaints were lodged immediately about the composition of the Jaroslaw Commission. To begin, the organization whose raison d'etre was teacher education - the New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher Education - was not represented. To be sure, one of its members, Frank Esposito, was appointed to the commission, but he was not the president of the NJACTE nor had he been designated by the members. He had, in fact, campaigned for the election of the Governor under whose auspices the Commissioner's proposal was presented, and he had been a member of the Governor's transition team. Moreover, he was a candidate for the vice presidency of one of the state colleges, a position he obtained soon after the conclusion of the commission's work. Thus, while the Commissioner boasted of his even-handedness in appointing the commission, he ignored the very organization whose business was teacher education.

Another organization which found itself without representation on the commission was Schoolwatch, a philanthropically-funded public advocacy organization. Its executive director, Herbert Green, had expressed serious reservations about the Commissioner's proposal.

It is true that the presidents of the New Jersey Education Association and the New Jersey Federation of Teachers were appointed to the commission, but these were two members out of a total of 21. Among the other 19 were at least 12 people who had publicly endorsed the Commissioner's proposal in hearings before the State Board of Education. This gave the Commissioner a vote of at least 6-1 at the outset. Moreover, the official assigned as staff to the commission was Leo Klagholz, the Director of Teacher Education under

the Commissioner and the person who actually drafted the Commissioner's proposal. The large number of people on the commission who had only passing familiarity with teacher education could be expected to turn for answers to Klagholz, hardly an unbiased source. Just how familiar some of the commission members were with the issue they had been appointed to address became apparent when the Commissioner himself complained that some of the members had sent him letters indicating that they had been unaware of how radical his proposal was. (Braun, April 29, 1984)

Among the many things that the Commissioner has never explained during the course of these events is why a special commission was needed. There was already in place the State Board of Examiners (described above on page 7) whose responsibility it was to consider proposed changes in certification requirements and make recommendations to the Commissioner. This Board had much more than a fleeting acquaintance with teacher education.

It is not flippant to say that if there is professional knowledge needed by beginning teachers, this knowledge is also needed by those who would presume to design a delivery system. The Boyer Panel had outlined the knowledge in very broad terms. Unless one knew what was subsumed under each term, there could be no basis for gauging the time needed to convey the information or for determining the best instructional setting. To say, for example, that a beginning teacher should know about teaching strategies is to utter only gobbledygook to someone who has never even heard of various teaching models, such as those cited by Kilgore (1984). In effect, the Jaroslaw Commission members were being asked to fill in the gaps in the Boyer Panel report when most of the members came to the task without any putty. The most

the Jaroslaw Commission members could bring themselves to deviate from the Commissioner was to increase his insultingly low five-day preparation period to a 20-day crash period and to recommend an in-service "seminar."

The Jaroslaw Commission, as had been true for the Boyer Panel, was given a restrictive charge (Jaroslaw, first appendix) to which it acquiesced. It was told that it was to determine how the knowledge prescribed by the Boyer Panel could be communicated to provisional teachers who were doing their experimental teaching year under the Commissioner's proposal. They were "not to debate or comment upon the merits" of the proposal. Thus, if they found that the proposal constituted a Procrustean bed into which the Boyer Panel prescriptions could be crammed only in the most unnatural manner, they were not to point out the infelicity but rather to make a Herculean effort to get into Procrustes' bed. They were also to assume that the Boyer Panel prescriptions had been accepted by the State Board of Education, even though the State Board never discussed the report of the Boyer Panel. (This dismaying revelation was made by John Klagholz, a member of the State Board and the brother of Leo Klagholz, the Director of Teacher Education appointed by the State Board. The disclosure was made at the State Board meeting of May 2.) Finally, the Jaroslaw Commission was reminded that the Commissioner's proposal called for teacher training under the auspices of local school districts which could decide for themselves whether they cared to involve other institutions.

The report of the Jaroslaw Commission (Appendix J) was summarized by this author, along with his concerns, in a one-page outline of remarks made to the New Jersey School Boards Association on May 16, 1984. The outline is

presented below as an economical means of summarizing the commission report and the concerns it raises. The quotations are taken from the report.

Purpose of the Report

" . . . the training programs which will result from this study are intended to replace the so-called 'emergency' system." (p. 1)

But they replace more than that since they will allow the hiring of a provisional teacher over an already fully certified teacher in a non-emergency situation.

Eligibility

" . . . these programs must conform to rigorous standards for professional preparation." (pp. 1-2)

But no 2.5 undergraduate grade point average, as required of people in the college programs.

And no major in the secondary subject field to be taught, as required of people in the college programs. The 30 credits could all be taken at the freshman and sophomore levels. (p. 5)

And even the 30 credits can be waived for someone who has "five years of full-time work experience since the date of the degree in a professional level job related to the subject to be taught," whatever that means. (p. 5)

Moreover, the candidate can be someone for whom the district has no job opening beyond the provisional year, contrary to the qualification in the Commissioner's original proposal.

And it is presumed that district staff will be able to tell through an interview whether a candidate is "ethical." (p. 4)

The State Test

" . . . a rigorous and valid test should be used and cutoff scores should be set high and maintained." (p. 6)

But it has been indicated by officials of the State Education Department that the test will be the National Teacher Examination that the Chancellor of Higher Education has said is too easy.

And the professional education component of this exam will not be used

even though such a test is required of people in the college programs.

Phase I

" . . . the provisional teacher must participate in a [20-30 day] seminar dealing with effective teaching, curriculum, classroom management, and child development." (p. 7)

But college programs require more than a single seminar to cover all these topics.

And "the seminar can be offered by the local district" (p. 7), which suggests that it need not be a college level seminar, unlike the seminars required of people in the college programs.

Phase II

"Learning and skill development should continue in five areas during the Phase II program: [student assessment, learning theory, curriculum, child growth and development, and the school as a social organization]. . . . Learning in the Phase II program will take place through a continuation of the seminar meetings begun in Phase I." (pp. 10-12)

But again, college programs require more than a single seminar to cover all these topics.

And this study could be done through the use of "private sector consultants [and] professional association institutes." (p. 12) These terms are vague and could be an invitation to hucksterism.

Partnerships With Colleges

Local districts should "seek" such partnerships (p. 2), and they "could" involve a college faculty participant (p. 11), and a college faculty member "could be" used to supplement the program (p. 11), and the Support Team "might be" augmented with a college faculty person (p. 12).

But it is not clear that any partnership is required.

The Support and Evaluation Teams

The Support Team "will consist at least of the school administrator, an experienced teacher, the curriculum supervisor, and a college faculty member." (p. 10) The Evaluation Team "will be comprised of two or three members from the Support Team . . . " (p. 14)

Here college faculty participation is made compulsory but not a college partnership, and the number of people involved in the support of a single provisional teacher makes the program a resource-rich one which may not be cost effective.

The Evaluation

"The final evaluation [of the provisional teacher] will be recorded on a standardized form developed by the state." (p. 15)

But standardized forms do not guarantee inter-rater reliability, so there may still be wildly varying ratings of the same provisional teacher and for different provisional teachers of the same demonstrated ability. The problem is more with unreliable assessments than unreliable forms.

State Approval

There will be "peer review of the [district's] written proposal by professionals outside New Jersey." (p. 18)

But this is another high-cost item that threatens the cost-effectiveness of the program, especially if a district has only one provisional teacher.

And yet another high per-unit cost will be the "periodic on-site state assessment." (p. 18)

And it is not clear whether the district proposals will be expected to meet the standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, as is required of the college programs. The NASDTEC standards are used for inter-state reciprocity.

Moreover, it is not even clear whether the district proposals will be expected to incorporate the New Jersey Regulations and Standards for Certification, required of the college programs.

General Conclusions

If the alternative route to teacher certification does not attract a lot of people, it will be cost ineffective for local districts, for institutions that get involved, and for the state of New Jersey.

If the alternative route does attract a lot of people, it will defy effective monitoring.

The Jaroslaw Commission report was presented at a public meeting of the State Board of Education on May 2, 1984. The one dissenting member, Marcoantonio Lacatena, president of the New Jersey Federation of Teachers, attempted to present his minority report after the lengthy majority report by Harry Jaroslaw. Lacatena was told repeatedly by the Board president that the Board would not permit a minority report except as a written appendix to the majority report. Lacatena had to satisfy himself with a hastily arranged press conference outside the meeting room.

Lacatena's dissent was from both the process by which the report was assembled and the substance of the report. As for the process, Lacatena noted the rigged membership of the commission and the unreasonable deadline by which the commission had been directed to complete its work - both matters to which Lacatena had objected in a letter to the Commissioner. The Commission was appointed in early March and scheduled to present its report to the State Board on May 2. As a consequence, the commission met only eight times, between March 8 and April 24, including an organizational meeting and time spent explaining issues to the members who were not conversant with teacher education.

In terms of the substance of the commission's report, Lacatena pointed out a series of problem areas. (Appendix J) These included the 20-30 days during which the beginning teacher would have drummed into his or her head all the knowledge outlined by the Boyer Panel (up 15 days from the Commissioner's five); the vagueness about who would be permitted to do the drumming; the superficial state monitoring that could be expected to occur if more than a handful of districts got into the act; the lack of specific

standards by which the districts are to be guided; the failure even to discuss the difficulty of subject mastery testing let alone make a recommendation regarding appropriate tests and passing scores; the diseconomies of scale if districts crank up training programs for one or two candidates; the contradiction in having district-specific training for a statewide license; and the refusal to require of the district programs standards that are as appropriate and feasible thereto as to the college programs for which they have already been mandated.

Lacatena offered an alternative to the Commissioner's alternative. It requires college participation and college courses before, during, and after the internship year.

Edithe Fulton, the president of the New Jersey Education Association, did not take as strong a position as Lacatena. She issued a separate statement which had a Delphic ambiguity. She said, "I do not yet feel that I can endorse the Commission report," but added that she "did not oppose its transmission in its present form to the Commissioner." (Fulton, April 27, 1984) The vehemence of the NJEA's opposition to the Commissioner's proposal was lacking in its markedly muted reaction to the Jaroslaw Commission report. It was being rumored that the NJEA was prepared to trade its support for the Commissioner's proposal in return for a piece of the action, namely the academic component of the year-long internship. The NJEA has an elaborate institute for the training of in-service teachers and the solvency of this institute would be strengthened if the institute could be used to train the provisional teachers in the district programs. This rumor was belied initially by one of the reasons Fulton gave for withholding her endorsement of

the commission report, which was that she thought the academic component should carry graduate college credit. However, the rumor became rife again after the State Board meeting in September when Fulton issued a statement that did not mention college credit. She still wants more pre-service instruction before a provisional teacher is given full responsibility for a classroom, but she no longer specifies a source for that instruction. (Fulton, September 5, 1984)

After the Jaroslaw Commission was presented formally to the State Board, the Board president announced that there would be two days of public hearings on the report - June 28 and July 11.

THE LACATENA INITIATIVE AND THE GIDEONSE RESPONSE

Marcoantonio Lacatena realized that the opponents of the Commissioner's proposal had been distracted by the passage of time and the patina of legitimacy that had been given to the proposal by the Boyer Panel and the Jaroslaw Commission. Some opponents were intimidated into silence when their college presidents endorsed the proposal, others were wearied into lassitude by the protractedness of the struggle, and still others began to assume an inevitable State Board adoption of the proposal and to calculate ways of capitalizing on their prediction. (The last was done by Montclair State College in a way that would have incorporated Lacatena's suggestions and given their version of the Commissioner's proposal a college base, college credit, and a longer period of preparation for the interns - see Appendix K.) Lacatena decided to take the battle to a national arena.

In May of 1984, the Council of New Jersey State College Locals, a part of the New Jersey Federation of Teachers and Lacatena's base within the federation, published a booklet (Appendix L) which was distributed to 2500 members of the Association for Teacher Education, 735 institutional representatives to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 455 people on the AFT's list of education reporters in the U.S., and all of the members of the Boyer Panel. In addition, the booklet was widely distributed within New Jersey, going to 619 school boards; 510 chief school officers; each member of the State Legislature; all of the state college presidents, faculty and trustees; all of the members of the State Boards of Education and Higher Education; and all the members of the Jaroslaw Commission, among others.

The booklet was entitled Educational Reform: The New Jersey Experience. It contained an overview of the year's events, the Boyer Panel and Jaroslaw Commission reports, newspaper articles, and letters that had been sent between some of the principal parties. A cover letter informed the recipients of the kinds of action they might take if they found the events unfolding in New Jersey to be inauspicious for the teaching profession. Lacatena received written replies from 15 education deans around the country and telephone calls from approximately another 15, all of whom think that New Jersey is marching backwards.

The dean who was most activated by the Lacatena booklet is Hendrik Gideonse of the University of Cincinnati. He was provoked into doing a thorough dissection of the Boyer Panel report and of the Jaroslaw Commission report. (Appendix G) The first is described above on page 34. In regard to the latter, Gideonse notes the underrepresent of both teacher educators and teachers on the Jaroslaw Commission; the fact that the Jaroslaw Commission is prepared to let provisional teachers take full responsibility for a classroom before these beginning teachers have acquired the essential knowledge prescribed by the Boyer Panel; the disparity between the amount of knowledge outlined by the Boyer Panel and the amount of time in which the Jaroslaw Commission expects it to be communicated; the perfunctoriness that would attend the kind of clinical support prescribed by the Jaroslaw Commission; and the naive optimism of the Jaroslaw Commission about the logistical feasibility of their scheme.

During the preparation of his analyses, Gideonse was in constant phone and mail contact with people in New Jersey to ensure that he was not making

misrepresentations. He arranged to provide oral testimony before the State Board of Education on June 28, and when he heard that the Jaroslaw Commission report had effectively been superseded by a 111-page set of changes in the New Jersey Administrative Code, he requested and read a copy of that latest in the parade of documents immediately before coming to New Jersey. After the Commissioner's proposal was adopted by the State Board of Education on September 5, Gideonse began alerting the teacher education officials in Ohio to the desirability of denying certifcation reciprocity to people who had obtained their New Jersey certificates through the Commissioner's alternative route. (Gideonse, 1984)

THE LAST MINUTE SWITCH

Although the June 28 and July 11 State Board hearings had been billed as forums in which the Jaroslaw Commission report could be discussed, and although people who scheduled the allotted five minutes to testify had prepared statements on the commission report, there suddenly emerged documents which superseded the report and rendered somewhat irrelevant the statements about it. The first of these documents was a 102-page set of changes in the New Jersey Administrative Code, which changes were intended to incorporate and modify the developments of the past year, including the reports of the Boyer Panel and the Jaroslaw Commission. This came out on June 6. On June 20 came a 111-page set of changes in the New Jersey Administrative Code that was intended to correct all the errors in the 102-page set. This writer's own testimony to the State Board on June 28 (Appendix M) was restricted to the 111-page set of changes and the problems and errors still contained therein. It was obvious that someone wanted the ultimate document to be noticed publicly at a time that would start the 60-day reaction period just as teachers and teacher educators were leaving on summer vacation. State Board action on this document was scheduled for the September 5 Board meeting, two days after Labor Day.

The 111-page set of changes codified the Jaroslaw Commission recommendations with all that was objectionable about them, plus an add-on that was also objectionable. The commission had recommended that regional consortia of school districts be established to make the teacher training scheme more cost effective. The implication was that interested districts would take responsibility for creating the consortia. The Administrative Code changes

gave this responsibility to the State Education Department. This meant that the Department which touted competition was acquiring a vertical monopoly: it had proposed a competitive alternative to the college education programs; it then established the terms of the competition by requiring lower and fewer standards for the alternative; it would take responsibility for establishing the alternative; and it would ultimately pass controlling judgment on both the college programs and its own self-designed, self-implemented, self-regulated competition to the college programs. The indifference to conflict of interest was amazingly arrogant.

The proposed changes in the Administrative Code included changes that were to be made in the college programs. One way the Commissioner could defuse the charge that the college programs had more rigorous standards than his alternative was to chop away at the college standards - the very standards that were being insisted on before the Commissioner's sudden revelation. It was as though the Commissioner was saying that the way to get the colleges to do a good job was by not requiring that they meet standards. Even Alfred Kahn, who deregulated the airline industry, only abolished the fare structures and not the performance standards. The standards that were wiped out for the college programs had to do with coursework in human and intercultural relations and in the teaching of reading (the very courses that had been objected to by the woman whose cause was headlined a year earlier - see above, page 5), as well as the requirement of a minimum of 30 credits of professional education. It was probably impossible for the Commissioner to reconcile an insistence on this coursework for people in the college pro-programs while dismissing it for people in his personal program.

Even with these omissions, however, the college programs, by virtue of state-mandated compliance with other New Jersey standards and the standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) were meeting many more requirements than were placed upon the Commissioner's path to certification. Of special note are the course distribution requirements for the college programs. New Jersey has made a big fuss about the need for broadly educated teachers, so all the students in the college programs are required to complete coursework in the arts, humanities, mathematics, science, technology, and the social sciences. In addition, students in such comprehensive certification areas as social studies have to meet the NASDTEC requirements for a wide distribution of courses in these areas. For example, a prospective social studies teacher has to complete coursework in history, political science, economics, geography, and sociology or cultural anthropology. (NASDTEC, 1983) None of these distribution requirements is expected of candidates in the Commissioner's program. It is also worth noting that while the candidates in the Commissioner's program are expected to learn about professional education as outlined by the Boyer Panel, candidates in the college programs are expected to learn about it this way as well as the way it is outlined in the NASDTEC standards. And, of course, for those colleges which are also accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), there is yet another set of standards.

THE LAST-DITCH CONFERENCE

Even before the State Board hearings on June 28 and July 11, it had become obvious that New Jersey's policymakers were committed politically to the Commissioner's proposal and were rushing it to adoption as fast as was legally permissible. Something dramatic was needed to capture the attention of the policymakers and cause them to slow down. The leadership of the New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, with prodding and logistical support from Lacatena of the New Jersey Federation of Teachers, scheduled a conference for July 10-11, at which J. Myron Atkin, dean of the School of Education at Stanford University; Robert Egbert, chairman of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education; and Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, would speak. A good deal of the credit for arranging this conference goes to Penelope Earley, the director of governmental relations for the AACTE.

The conference was intended as a forum in which teacher preparation could be discussed in general terms and in the context of New Jersey developments. To insure that the conference would not be an echo chamber for the opponents of the Commissioner's proposal and to guarantee that other perspectives would be represented, the afternoon of the first day was set aside for remarks by members of the Jaroslaw Commission. Several commission members were invited, including Jaroslaw himself, and they acepted the invitation to speak and be heard. Soon after accepting the invitation, they began calling in their regrets that they would not be able to make it after all due to a prior commitment that had been forgotten momentarily. Between the acceptance and the regrets they had occasion to talk with Leo Klagholz, the Commissioner's

Director of Teacher Education. (Marks, 1984) Klagholz knew about the conference because he too had been invited to speak and declined immediately. If the others needed Klagholz to tell them that they would not only speak and be heard but might even be challenged, they are more innocent than their titles suggest. They most assuredly would have been asked hard questions, but if they had faith in the product they had presented to the State Board of Education they should have been willing, indeed eager, to engage in some proselytizing. Instead, they gave the appearance of people who had so little confidence in their ability to defend their handiwork that they could discuss it only when incubated against dissent. The only member of the Jaroslaw Commission who finally did show up at the conference (other than Lacatena, who relished the opportunity to debate the other members in public) was Jann Azumi, a director of research for the Newark Public Schools. She was asked difficult questions, for some of which she did not have answers, but she honored herself and the audience by her courage and forthrightness. She was followed by Lacatena, who detailed the political composition of the Jaroslaw Commission and the haste with which it worked.

As for the main speakers at the morning session, Atkin assailed the notion that teaching can be learned through an apprenticeship in the same way as bricklaying or soldering. Teaching, he said, requires more than imitation of a journeyman or master; it involves the understanding of underlying principles. He echoed a concern that Gideonse had expressed in his testimony to the State Board on June 28 - that neither the Boyer Panel nor the Jaroslaw Commission dealt with the kind of subject matter preparation that would be most appropriate for someone who was to teach the subject at the

high school level. Atkin also noted that the Commissioner's plan for preparing teachers does not call for any discussion of current controversies, such as those surrounding vouchers, merit pay, and school finance equity. He inferred from this omission that the Commissioner's plan was anti-intellectual and would keep teachers from understanding the nature of the profession and the institution in which they would be working. He ended with some reflections on the American traditions of "education school bashing" and education school proliferation.

Shanker began with a pox-on-both-your-houses approach. He said that teacher educators are a bunch of anti-intellectuals who are now under attack by another bunch. He recalled the poor courses he took at Columbia Teachers College. However, he went on to say that the New Jersey plan was a "hare-brained proposal that is absolutely ridiculous." It was, he said, a "political gimmick to get quick headlines." Shanker listed some of the understandings that a teacher education program should include: teaching techniques and when to use them, basic policy issues, materials selection. He ended by advocating the inclusion of teachers among the evaluators of college education programs.

Egbert shared Atkin's sense that there are too many colleges trying to prepare teachers. He said that he has a recurring nightmare that the governor of his state will approve a plan for the training of engineers that is as simple-minded as the New Jersey alternative for training teachers. He too stressed the importance of acquainting prospective teachers with all of the important issues being debated about education. In response to a question, Egbert said that he was "embarrassed that people in education would

advance for the preparation of teachers as sad a proposal as that in New Jersey."

The conference was attended by two of the state assemblymen who had been most vociferous in their opposition to the Commissioner's proposal. However, they came to persuade the teacher educators present that it was time to jump on the Commissioner's bandwagon. They showed a letter from the Director of Teacher Education and claimed that it granted important concessions. The teacher educators who had an opportunity to see the letter read only vague statements of benign intention. The assemblymen left the conference and hurried to Trenton where they joined the Commissioner in a scheduled press conference to announce their conversion. Some of the teacher educators also left for Trenton to present their scheduled testimony before the State Board of Education. The defection of the assemblymen was widely reported in the state's newspapers; the testimony of the teacher educators was ignored. All that remained was for the State Board to go through the formal adoption ritual at its September 5 meeting.

UNRAVELING AND REWEAVING

At the September 5 State Board meeting the Commissioner's proposal was adopted unanimously. However, there was an eleventh hour development that caused the adoption to start unraveling as soon as it was announced. The development did not have to do directly with the Commissioner's proposal but with another part of the Administrative Code in which it was contained. Sometime during the summer, the Commissioner began to realize that there was something wrong about specifying liberal arts credits for students in the college education programs and leaving the professional education credits unspecified. He thus inserted into the Administrative Code new wording whereby the college programs would be required to have "approximately 30 credits" of professional education courses. (The Director of Teacher Education would later explain to the State Board that "approximately" means "no more than," a construction which had probably escaped the Board members theretofore.) This change was brought to the attention of the Chancellor's office for its reaction. When no reaction was registered, the Commissioner assumed that there were no objections. Thus, it was with a great deal of exasperation that the Commissioner learned the day before the State Board meeting that the Chancellor was issuing a letter opposing the change and demanding that the education credits be left unspecified. (Hollander, September 5, 1984) The State Board members shared the Commissioner's annoyance and did not let the Chancellor's letter deter them from adopting the Administrative Code as modified. The Chancellor then claimed that the modification was sufficiently significant to require that the Code be re-noticed and another period for public reaction be commenced. The Chancellor asked the state Attorney-Gen-

eral for a ruling on this. The Commissioner then released a 14-page broadside against the Chancellor (Appendix E, and discussed above on page 18). The Chancellor was accused of dealing in bad faith, of being motivated by a desire to scuttle the college education programs, and of not attending to the deficiencies in the liberal arts programs. An aide to the Governor interceded in this wrangle and a compromise between the Commissioner and Chancellor was worked out for presentation to the State Board of Education. At its October meeting, the Board adopted a resolution which prohibits the colleges from having more than 30 credits of education courses in their certification programs and encourages liberal arts faculty to teach education courses. (State Board of Education, 1984) The Chancellor, who had been claiming that he wanted to recapture education faculty lines to give to disciplines that were attracting large enrollments, was now prepared to give education courses to liberal arts disciplines that were losing enrollments. The attack was not on low enrollment education courses; it was on education faculty.

While the compromise between the Commissioner and Chancellor was being worked out, the Director of Teacher Education sent a letter to all the chief school administrators in New Jersey. (Klagholz, October 1, 1984) The Director told the superintendents that they

> can choose to hire and train a provisional teacher even when there are fully certified candidates available for a position. For example, if you advertise a position and there are 10 certified applicants and one applicant who is not certified, but who has passed the appropriate test, you are free to hire the uncertified person if you believe he/she is the best person for the job. Of course, you then must arrange a program of instruction and supervision as required in the regulations. (pp. 1-2)

Thus, college graduates with no professional preparation can become

fully paid, and fully responsible, teachers immediately upon passing a state test of subject mastery (or general knowledge for elementary and early childhood teaching) and favorably impressing a school administrator somewhere. The college programs which now prepare teachers at the post-baccalaureate level will be hard pressed to compete. Who is likely to choose a training program that charges over one that pays?

School districts which decide to hire provisional teachers need not worry about anything more than the supervision. The State Education Department will operate its own college of education to give the interns their professional knowledge while they are on the job. (p. 2) The staff for this "college" are already being hired. Presumably, the State Education Department will also evaluate its own college of education and ascertain that it is doing a fine job.

CONCLUSION

College teacher education programs in New Jersey were assailed in woeful ignorance and with no prior opportunity for discussion with the assailant, who happens also to be the Education Commissioner in charge of the programs. National reports had made education a hot topic, and politicians had to do something that was dramatic enough for people to know that something was being done. The Commissioner preempted the terms of the discourse; he had the support of a press which seemed unable or unwilling to comprehend the issue in any but the oversimplifications with which he distorted it; and he controlled the timing of events. People who were capable of understanding the issue sided with the Commissioner for reasons unrelated to the issue, i.e., for personal and institutional gain. The latter gain was often in the form of capturing education faculty lines for use in disciplines that were attracting high student enrollments.

The Commissioner may have won a victory he will come to regret. By his disparagement of the college education programs, he held himself up as someone who could do a better job of attracting and preparing teachers. By his creation of an alternative to the college programs, he imposed upon himself the burden of proving that he can do the better job. Even though he has the legal authority for judging what he created against what he disparaged, he must know that his judgment will be scrutinized by others for its fairness. If it is found wanting, the evidence to that effect will be broadcast vigorously. The Commissioner will learn that competition - even rigged competition - cuts two ways. Alas, the better product is not always the better marketed product, and the Commissioner has proven himself adept at marketing.

In the meantime, the college education faculty have an obligation to ensure that they offer programs that prepare the better teachers. We cannot compete with cash lures, but we can offer the inducement of programs that will confer both a sense of professional efficacy and objective evidence of it. In doing so, we must avoid the trap the Commissioner has set for the candidates in his program. He has tried to limit their learning about education to only that which is needed within the classroom. The Boyer Panel broadened this somewhat to include the school setting. Given the Commissioner's original man. erial predilection toward keeping the workers institutionally ignorant, it will be interesting to see how much the students in his "college" are taught about the system in which they labor. Not to teach them this is to deprofessionalize them by depriving them of the knowledge needed to participate in the governance of their institutions and judge the effectiveness of their superiors.

This paper ends on the next page, which consists of a chart contrasting the requirements for the Commissioner's program with the state-imposed requirements for the college programs.

HOW TO GET THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST

College Programs	Cooperman Alternative
1. 60 cr. of general education, to incl. all of the following: arts, humanities, math, science, social science, and technology.	1. Nothing.
2. Demonstrated proficiency in English and math.	2. Nothing.
3. Minimum grade point average of 2.5 (A=4).	3. Nothing.
4. A major of at least 30 cr. in the discipline to be taught (any liberal arts major for elementary and early childhood teaching).	4. 30 cr. but no major requirement.
5. Extensive and progressively developed pre-service field work from sophomore through senior year in college.	5. A 20-day practicum.
6. In a comprehensive field, a distribution of course work. E.g., in social studies, course work in all of the following: world history, American history, political science, economics, geography, sociology or cultural anthropology.	6. Nothing.
7. College-level course work in the professional areas of curriculum, student development and learning, the classroom and the school, and physiology and hygiene - to a maximum of 30 cr.	7. 200 hours of "instruction" in these areas.
8. College-level course work in methods of teaching the particular subject, e.g., techniques of social studies instruction.	8. Nothing.
9. Comprehensive test of subject mastery.	9. Comprehensive test of subject mastery.
10. Comprehensive test of behavioral and social foundations of teaching.	10. Nothing.
11. Full semester of student teaching without pay.	11. One-year internship as regular classroom teacher at $18,500 (to include the 20-day practicum).

REFERENCES

Bedard, Paul. Education group intended NJ study to spark reform. The Trentonian, December 16, 1983.

Bedard, Paul. Study knocks N.J. teachers colleges. The New Brunswick Home News, November 22, 1983, p. E-1.

Berliner, David. Presentation to The Governor's Task Force on Teacher Education, University of Arizona, February 16, 1984. See also Berliner, Making the right changes in preservice teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan. 66(2), 94-96.

Braun, Robert. Bloustein's teacher licensing tactics set back a larger cause. The Newark Star-Ledger, August 24, 1984, p. 23.

Braun, Robert. Bloustein supports teacher license plan. The Newark Star-Ledger, January 13, 1984, pp. 1, 8.

Braun, Robert. Colleges get time to fix teacher plans. The Newark Star-Ledger, May 31, 1984, pp. 1, 16.

Braun, Robert. Education chiefs settle teacher training dispute. The Newark Star-Ledger, October 2, 1984, pp. 1, 34.

Braun, Robert. Higher ed chief cites technicality, blocks reforms in teacher training. The Newark Star-Ledger, September 9, 1984, pp. 1,

Braun, Robert. Kean education 'blueprint' calls for higher teacher pay. The Newark Star-Ledger, September 7, 1983, pp. 1, 25.

Braun, Robert. Kean urges new system for licensing teachers. The Newark Star-Ledger, September 8, 1983, pp. 1, 12.

Braun, Robert. President praises state licensing plan. The Newark Star-Ledger, December 9, 1983, p. 1, 14.

Braun, Robert. NJEA chief blasts Cooperman certification plan. The Newark Star-Ledger, August 28, 1983, p. 8.

Braun, Robert. Schools chief claims foes resort to 'dirty tricks'. The Newark Star-Ledger, April 29, 1984, pp. 1, 26.

Braun, Robert. Science teacher sidelined. The Newark Star-Ledger, May 29, 1983, pp. 1, 39.

Braun, Robert. Teacher training fails state test. The Newark Star-Ledger, May 29, 1984, pp. 1, 14.

Braun, Robert. Telephone conversation in December 1983.

Cooperman, Saul. Reform of teacher preparation and certification in New Jersey. Statement presented to the State Board of Education on September 5, 1984.

Cooperman, Saul. Remarks made at meeting with deans of teacher education on January 24, 1984.

Cooperman, Saul, & Hollander, T. Edward. Letter to presidents of New Jersey colleges, December 30, 1983.

Cooperman, Saul, & Hollander, T. Edward. Letter to presidents of New Jersey colleges, March 9, 1984.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1984.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Wise, Arthur, & Pease, Sara. Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research. 53(3), 285-328.

Feistritzer, Emily. The making of a teacher: A report on teacher education and certification. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 1984.

Fulton, Edithe. Statement to the State Board of Education on September 5, 1984.

Fulton, Edithe. Supplemental report to the report of the Commission on Alternate Teacher Certification.

Gallup, George. The 16th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan. 66(1), 23-38.

Gideonse, Hendrik. Letter to Heads of Teacher Education in State of Ohio, September 29, 1984.

Hollander, T. Edward. Letter to Saul Cooperman, September 5, 1984.

Hollander, T. Edward. Testimony to the Education and Higher Education Committees of the New Jersey State Assembly, October 3, 1984.

Kilgore, Alvah. Models of teaching and teacher education. In R. Egbert & M. Kluender (Eds.). Using research to improve teacher education: The Nebraska Consortium. (Teacher Education Monograph No. 1). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1984.

Klagholz, Leo. Letter to Chief School Administrators in New Jersey, October 1, 1984.

Klagholz, Leo. Telephone interview on September 12, 1984.

Lapointe, Archie. The good news about American education. Phi Delta Kappan. 65(10), 663-667.

Leavell, John (member of Drew University Department of History). Telephone interview on September 6, 1984.

LoGerfo, James. The crisis in education is mainly a crisis in teacher education. Education Week, March 21, 1984, p. 18.

Marks, Peter. Educators see forum as jab at Cooperman. The Record (newspaper of northern New Jersey), July 8, 1984, pp. A-37, A-44.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Standards for state approval of teacher education. Salt Lake City, UT: NASDTEC, 1983.

National Science Foundation. Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics, and social studies education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1978.

National Science Foundation. What are the needs in precollege science, mathematics, and social science education? Views from the field. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1979.

New Jersey Education Association. Position statement on Assembly bills A-634 and A-635, June 20, 1984.

New Jersey State Board of Education resolution of October 3, 1984.

Remington, Richard. The aid team acts for Rutgers football. The Newark Star-Ledger, January 13, 1984, p. 1.

Stedman, Lawrence, & Smith, Marshall. Recent reform proposals for American education. Contemporary Education Review. 2(2), 85-104.

United States Department of Education. The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1984.

Uzzell, Lawrence. Letter to author, December 27, 1983.

Weaver, W. Timothy. Solving the problem of teacher quality, Part 1. Phi Delta Kappan. 66(2), 108-115.