DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 642 SP 032 669

AUTHOR Hawley, Willis D.
TITLE The Prospects for Collaboration between Schools and Universities To Improve American Education.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; School Restructuring; Teacher Attitudes; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Knowledge Base for Teaching; Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

Collaboration between schools and institutions of higher education (IHE) is usually effective only when values are shared and mutual dependencies are recognized. These conditions are uncommon. The foundation upon which such collaboration could be developed requires several building blocks: (1) developing shared goals regarding teacher learning; (2) minimizing the fragmentation of responsibility for teacher learning; (3) developing more effective strategies for evaluating teaching; (4) belief in the scientific bases for the art of teaching; (5) clarification and modification of respective roles; (6) development of new institutional arenas for collaboration; (7) restructuring schools to facilitate teacher learning; (8) creation of markets for quality in teacher preparation and inservice professional development. Forces that might encourage more effective collaboration include: the diminishing mystique of colleges and universities, the diminishing roles of IHEs in the education of teachers, the professionalization of teaching, technology, and increasing interest in content pedagogy. Steps toward increased collaboration may not be taken, however, because of uncertainty about the purposes of teacher preparation, increased capacity of schools to provide for teacher training, limited capacity of IHEs to take on new roles related to teacher education, inadequate modes of funding, the IHE/school status schism, and the need for top level leadership. (36 references) (IAH)

THE PROSPECTS FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES TO IMPROVE AMERICAN EDUCATION

Willis D. Hawley
Peabody College
Vanderbilt University

INTRODUCTION

Central to virtually all general proposals for improving the quality of American education are calls for greater cooperation between schools and institutions of higher education* (IHEs). A search for successful collaboration among IHEs and schools will yield numerous examples of productive relationships. But, if the search is thorough, it will also lead to the discovery of very large numbers of missed opportunities, unconsummated courtships, agreements to live apart, and broken marriages. The relatively small number of school/IHE partnerships should not be surprising; inter-institutional cooperation seems to be an unnatural act.

Social institutions develop their own cultures and the processes and incentives that reflect and sustain those cultures (cf. Schneider, 1990). Genuine cooperation and collaboration among institutions occurs only when the guardians

*Let me note that I have chosen to use the term "higher education" with intent. The factors influencing relationships between community colleges and schools seem qualitatively different from those shaping the relationships between schools and "four-year" colleges and universities. And, as I note subsequently, one of the barriers to collaboration that I will be discussing is the assumption of a hierarchy among educational institutions.

of institutions' central values and technologies perceive mutual interest and interdependence with one another. But, institutional and organizational health usually is fostered by reducing interdependence so as to reduce vulnerability (Thompson, 1966).

To be sure, many relationships are developed in response to external demands for cooperation and collaboration or because one party to a proposed "partnership" needs the other. But, such interactions often provide little more than the appearance of collaboration and may, because they reduce the pressures for more extensive interaction, discourage the development of real interdependence.

Two examples of illusory inter-institutional activity, which Murray Edelman (1964) would call "symbolic politics," are Teacher Education Councils and Adopt-a-School programs. The members of Teacher Education Councils represent different organizational units within universities that are presumably responsible for the education of teachers and their function is to integrate the efforts of these units. In practice, the Councils usually focus on the resolution of claims on the scarce resource of space in the curriculum (credits) through implicit agreements not to challenge organizational autonomy that avoid conflict which might result in change (Hawley, Austin & Goldman, 1988). Adopt-a-School programs involve the presumed integration of the interests of businesses or IHEs and the needs of schools. Even the name of this program bespeaks

an absence of interdependence. The noblesse oblige manifest in such programs is not the basis for collaboration. Neither Teacher Education Councils nor Adopt-a-School programs change the behaviors of a significant number of the personnel in the participating organizations. Moreover, once these linking mechanisms and others like them are established, it is in everyone's interests, including parties external to the relationships, to assert that they are making an important difference.

There are, as noted above, genuine inter-institutional and inter-organizational arrangements among schools and IHEs aimed at improving education (cf. Wilbur, Lambert & Young, 1987). There are many examples of productive activities through which IHEs and schools collaborate that relate to the education of teachers.** But, as Arends (1990) observes, after identifying several such collaborations, even these exemplary activities typically "have not become an integral part of the total fabric of the schools of education within universities where they exist, nor have they been disseminated very widely to other places" (p.134).

School-university collaboration is not limited, of course, to the education of teachers. In recent years, a number of educational research centers have been established at

---

**For example, extraordinary university-wide activities have been put in place by Texas A&M University and numerous school systems. These projects go under the telling name of Commitment to Education.

universities that tend to focus on improving policy and practice (cf. McCarthy, 1990). The role of universities in enriching the curriculum of schools through telecommunications-delivered instruction has grown. The model of support embodied in the agricultural extension program has been adapted in some instances to support school improvement and youth development generally (Irby and Calvert, 1989).

Most of these activities, however, like the innovative collaborations focused on the improvement of teaching, tend to inhabit the outer territories in universities and their effects are felt deeply in very few schools.

TESTING COMMITMENTS TO AND CAPACITY FOR COLLABORATION: THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING IN SCHOOLS

Overview

The test of whether institutions are engaged in genuine collaboration comes not with activities that are marginal to their central functions and needs. Rather, the test is: do the institutions work together in ways that enhance their capacity to accomplish goals they highly value (or that those who support the institutions highly value)? If such mutual dependence can be achieved, the possibilities of collaboration on other matters also are enhanced. Let me stipulate, then, that the fundamental bases for significant increases in on-going collaboration between schools and universities that will improve schools and IHEs are those that focus on the

improvement of teaching. We will know when we have a productive and stable example of collaboration when the activities involved enhance the capabilities of both schools and IHEs.

Do We Have a Problem? There is Less Here than Meets the Eye.

At first glance, there appears to be substantial interdependence among IHEs and schools with respect to both the preservice and inservice education of teachers. The vast majority of IHEs have preservice teacher preparation programs and about one out of five college graduates participate in some way in such programs. Almost all of these programs provide for both "field experiences" and practice-teaching in schools. Almost all career teachers take significant amounts of graduate credit coursework and a majority earn a masters degree. Each year, school systems pay billions of dollars to teachers for pursuing these credits and degrees.

These seemingly extensive interactions, however, contribute much less to teacher learning than they are intended to contribute and may, in many instances, be a source of tension between IHEs and schools--at least from the schools' point of view.

Preservice Collaboration

Elsewhere I have examined the research relating to the efficacy of field experiences and practice teaching (Evertson, Hawley & Zlotnik, 1985; Hawley, 1989). While there are many

examples of such learning opportunities that are designed well, prospective teachers are often confused by the cumulative lessons of their field experiences and spend considerable time learning things that are only marginally connected to their college classroom learning. With respect to practice teaching, there is reasonably good evidence that the lessons prospective teachers learn prior to practice teaching are seldom reinforced by the practice teaching experience and, sometimes, are contradicted (Berliner, 1985; Hawley, 1990). Faced with such inconsistency and with the problem of teaching children on their own, teacher candidates often choose the lessons taught by an experienced teacher supervisor.

Teaching Beginning Teachers to Teach

The problems of genuine collaboration in the preservice education or teachers are minor compared to the problems involved in providing for the continuing professional growth of teachers during their first year of teaching. The trials and tribulations of beginning teachers are well documented (Veenman, 1984). During their first year, most new teachers are required to teach in difficult situations with little support (Little, 1990: 321-323). Not surprisingly, they learn lessons that are different from those they learned in their preservice preparation and have little opportunity to reflect on the contradictions, to seek explanations, or to broaden their repertoire of skills. Instead, like all sensible persons faced with complexity, they seek to simplify both the problems

they confront and to routinize their behavior. This leads many new teachers to abandon research-based teaching strategies they learned about in college.

Not only does the absence of collaboration between IHEs and schools in the first-year professional development of beginning teachers result in the loss of competence, it contributes to a preference among teachers for learning from experience and a certain cynicism about theory and research. Thus, at the time when teachers most need opportunities for professional learning, IHEs are not only absent from the scene, they seem to have given unuseful advice. This, in turn, sets the stage for a career-long perception among many teachers that colleges and universities have little to offer--except, perhaps, course credits that yield higher salaries and degrees that seem to confer higher status (Bacharach, et al., 1986).

The Continuing Education of Teachers

The relationship between IHEs and schools with respect to the on-going professional development of teachers is, at best, something like parallel play. At worst, and in many cases, it is scandalous. Most school systems go about their own inservice education activities with little apparent understanding of how adults learn and with little conviction that inservice training will enhance teachers' effectiveness. How else can one explain the primitive character of most training programs and the limited resources committed to them?

Unlike most other organizations, school systems give major responsibility for training their key workers to organizations that are independent of the system--namely colleges and universities. Colleges and universities are pleased with this arrangement because it yields them resources in the form of tuition and state funding and the opportunity, it seems, "to make a difference." Most teachers participate in this arrangement not because they believe it will make them better teachers, but because it will result in a higher salary, because it is required for recertification in some states, and, in many cases, because it affords them the credentials they will need should they want to become a supervisor or administrator.

There is usually little fit between what experienced teachers learn in their pursuit of further credits and "advanced" degrees and what they do day in and day out. College courses are often organized to meet the goals of professors, not teachers. Sometimes professors' and teachers' goals are congruent but because curricula in colleges are designed by committees and stability is seen as a virtue, fit is problematic. As it is, teachers often dismiss (or forget) what they have been taught because it cannot be applied immediately. Ironically, some college and university faculty who work with career educators bring little to the continuing education of teachers (and administrators) precisely because they are recruited because of their practical experience.

Their experience-based knowledge quickly becomes outdated and is often limited to particular contexts. Further, these career teachers or administrators who become professors find that colleges provide them few opportunities for professional development and, because they feel uncomfortable with theory and research, they offer their students little more insight and knowledge than well-read practitioners can offer one another.

Teachers are required to pursue the post-baccalaureate courses that bring them monetary rewards and opportunities for advancement "on their own time." Therefore, these learning opportunities compete with the responsibilities they have to their students. Recognizing this and (a) wanting to be reasonable or (b) wanting to attract graduate students, many professors make fewer intellectual demands on teachers than they do on their full-time students.

In some sense, all of this adds up to mutually satisfying collaboration in which all the participants benefit. IHEs are assured a stream of quasi-involuntary clients that bring them resources and give them noble work to do. Schools need not invest much in professional development activities and have some basis for increasing salaries that avoids conflict. Teachers get paid for taking courses that typically are not too demanding and provide them opportunities to leave teaching for better paid jobs in their or other school systems. But, these arrangements fall short of being collaborative--as this was defined earlier--in two ways: they do not enhance the

productivity of schools and they do not enhance the capacity of IHEs to improve teaching. Moreover, the relationships between IHEs (not just teacher preparation units) and schools seems to reflect, overall, a sense that it is right to work together but not satisfying or promising. Both IHEs and schools appear to believe that there are more important things to do. The following developments are evidence of the tenuous links between IHEs and schools:

1. The weak response of teachers and their organizations to (a) the establishment of alternative certification programs, (b) legislatively imposed limits on the number of education courses prospective teachers can take, and (c) the implementation of induction programs for new teachers that do not involve IHEs.

2. The endorsement by the teacher-dominated National Board o Professional Teaching Standards of criteria for advanced certification that do not include professional licensure.

3. The willingness of many teachers to pursue "graduate work" in programs that are (to be generous) of dubious quality--the "fly-in, fly-out" programs that have low standards and expectations staffed by part-time faculty and master's degree programs at small colleges with inadequate faculty resources.

4. The absence of concern among organizations representing higher education generally (as distinct from organizations of teacher educators) in federal and state efforts to establish professional development "academies" run by state governments that provide for little, if any roles for IHEs.

5. State funding formulae for higher education, which IHEs play a big role in defining, seldom provide support for collaborative programs of professional development and IHEs usually treat faculty participation in schools as service rather than teaching.

I have drawn a bleak picture. The views it encompasses can readily be countered with examples of productive relationships. The point is that the sorry state of the

professional learning opportunities available to teachers and prospective teachers is rooted deeply in a tangle of values, structures and incentives that must be undone and replaced before we could expect effective school/IHE collaboration to improve teaching to be the rule rather than the exception. I will elaborate on this point and suggest new directions in the next sections of the paper.

BUILDING BLOCKS FOR COLLABORATION

Overview

One need not assess the modal character of school/IHE collaboration as negatively as I just have in order to conclude that collaboration should be much more productive than it is usually. The foundation upon which such collaboration could be more strongly developed requires several building blocks. These include:

1. Developing shared goals regarding teacher learning.
2. Minimizing the fragmentation of responsibility for teacher learning.
3. Developing more effective strategies for evaluating teaching.
4. A belief in the scientific bases for the art of teaching.
5. The clarification and modification of respective roles.
6. The development of new institutional arenas for collaboration.
7. Restructuring schools to facilitate teacher learning.
8. Creation of markets for quality in teacher preparation and inservice professional development.

Shared Goals

Central to the difficulties of improving and integrating the education of teachers through collaboration is the fact

that neither universities--excluding their teacher education units--nor schools typically see the facilitation of teacher learning as a very high priority. The relatively low status of teacher education in universities is well known (Clifford, 1988; Hawley, Austin & Goldman, 1988; Sykes, 1985). And few school systems, if any, organize schools in ways that would facilitate teacher learning (Bacharach, et al. 1986; Hawley, 1988).

I have suggested that collaboration is usually effective only when values are shared and mutual dependencies are recognized. These conditions are uncommon. Articulation--the end-to-end linking of learning experiences--is used as a substitute for collaboration because it does not require continuing interaction. However, requirements for articulation, in themselves, are unlikely to be effective because the ways of holding programs and individuals responsible for the needed integrating behavior are difficult to implement and can be counterproductive because of the rigidities they introduce.

It follows from these conclusions that the most effective way to bring about inter-institutional collaboration to educate teachers would be to develop consensus at the university, community, state and even national levels about effective strategies for facilitating teacher learning, the relationship between public welfare and the quality of schools, and the importance of teachers and teacher education. Mechanisms for

developing such consensus include public discussion, leaders' articulation and support of such goals, coherent and appropriate public policies, and consistent and sensible measures for evaluating institutional and program effectiveness.

One should not be optimistic, however, about the possibility of developing the consensus necessary to bring about genuine collaboration when the education of teachers is distributed over several institutions and organizations. Consider the situation in Japan, where the conditions for consensus-based integration seem to be present. In Japan, education has long been tied to national pride and seen as an essential source of strength. Teachers are held in high regard, there is a national curriculum, essential cultural values are coherent and shared across social institutions, there is a strong central education agency with responsibility for all levels of education, and there is a disposition in the citizenry to believe that the law (including government regulations) should be obeyed.

Despite all of these conditions, teacher education in most Japanese universities (especially the most prestigious ones) has little relationship either to the universities' core liberal arts (or general education) curricula or to schools in which the teachers are to teach. And, universities play little role in the continuing on-the-job education of teachers.

The Japanese case, while discouraging to the advocates of comprehensive inter-institutional integration, does provide some lessons related to factors that impede and facilitate integration. The stand-alone universities of teacher education in Japan, which are similar in structure and function to the now defunct "normal schools" in the United States, often have internally integrated curricula (though not always integrated instructional strategies) and provide their students with practice-oriented skills which seem to facilitate their entry to the profession. The Japanese cultural values of interpersonal cooperation, learning from others, and continuing education seem to support relatively heavy investments by teams of teachers, by local education agencies and by the national government in continuing professional development. Recently, the national government, recognizing the problems beginning teachers have in being successful, has specified that almost half of the first year of teaching should be allocated to inservice education.

However, these examples of integration within higher education and in some aspects of inservice education, exist side-by-side with the virtual absence of collaboration between higher education and the schools in Japan. This is sustained in large part by an elaborate and sophisticated structure for supporting inservice education that is neither tied to universities nor school-based and that undermines one of the potential justifications for collaboration, the development and dissemination of research-based knowledge at the school level.

Minimize Fragmentation of Responsibility

The difficulties in achieving effective collaboration between schools and IHEs is both the cause and consequence of the development of different and organizationally separate mechanisms for educating teachers. In the United States, the proliferation of such entities is proceeding apace driven by motives that range from frustration, to a desire to be innovative, to a perceived need to control what teachers learn and do. One reflection of this reality is the development of bureaucracies at the school system and state levels to attend to the professional development of teachers. These units, separated as they are from the every day learning needs of teachers, probably have little impact on teacher behavior.

This fragmentation of responsibility for teacher learning not only complicates the interactions among IHEs and schools because there are more actors, it makes it difficult to gain consensus about how teachers learn and what types of learning should receive highest priority. It also drives the education of teachers toward either or both (a) the determination of what and how teachers should learn by people who are not teachers or teacher educators and (b) a focus on individual teachers whose learning is not connected to the life and culture of the schools in which they teach. These, of course, mirror the criticisms of much of what IHEs have done with respect to teacher learning and, ironically, makes it difficult for IHEs to change the ways they relate to schools.

Let me note too that this fragmentation of responsibility creates a market for "hot ideas", and an employment program for consultants with magic pills (many of whom are college and university professors). There are a lot of silly and nonproductive ideas being purveyed in teacher training programs which undermine the development of a belief that there is research-based knowledge upon which the improvement of teaching can be built.

Develop More Effective Modes for Evaluating Teaching

If there is to be a market in schools for the knowledge college and universities have to offer related to the improvement of teaching, teachers must know that the effects of their teaching fall short of their goals. Few teachers are likely to describe the feedback they get about their teaching as adequate or valid.

Better strategies for evaluating teaching could, of course, be used to create a demand among professors throughout IHEs for knowledge related to the improvement of teaching. Such demand could be met, at least in part, by expert school teachers. But, for this to happen, and for school teachers to see colleges and universities as important sources of their professional development, it seems essential that there be greater recognition of the "scientific bases for the art of teaching."

Increase Understanding of the Scientific Bases for the Art of Teaching

Almost 15 years ago, Nathaniel Gage (1978), wrote an elegant little book called The Scientific Bases for the Art of Teaching. Since that time, an enormous amount has been learned about learning (see Bransford & Goldman, forthcoming; Resnick, 1987), and effective teaching (see Reynolds, 1989; Wittrock, 1988). And, much of what is now known is not practiced in most schools nor in most IHEs. The fact that research has much less effect on the quality of teaching than it might is, in part, a problem of dissemination (Hawley, 1990). More fundamentally, however, the contributions research can make to the improvement of teaching are constrained by widely held beliefs that teaching is a highly individualistic enterprise, the success of which is largely dependent on how well one knows the subject being taught, the level of commitment to teaching, and intuition (cf. Sykes, 1985). It is often acknowledged that there are methods of teaching to be learned but that these, like the methods of building a house, follow from a few general principles and can best be learned by observation, coaching from master carpenters, and practice. These conceptions of teaching are reflected in the attitudes of many IHE faculty (and the teaching improvement programs on many college campuses), in the move toward and motives for "alternative teacher certification", and in the growing number of professional development centers for career teachers and

administrators that are independent of IHEs.

The view that there is little scientific basis for the art of teaching affects the possibilities for collaboration between IHEs and schools in significant ways. First, if the central role of IHEs include the development, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge, but knowledge is seen as a relatively unimportant source of teaching expertise, this obviously narrows the foundation for collaboration. Second, if IHE faculty do not see teaching as technically complicated, they are not likely to give teaching or teachers much status. This, in turn, creates a status schism which both professors and teachers feel and which teachers (and administrators) resent. Third, if there is little market for scientific knowledge or grounded theory related to teaching in IHEs, the perception in IHEs that there is much to be learned from teachers--most of whom are more knowledgeable about teaching than professors--is not likely to be very great.

A fourth consequence of the absence of a commitment to the scientific basis of teaching is the lack of continuity in the lessons teachers are taught at different stages of their professional development. School systems cannot count on beginning teachers having some common core of knowledge (Cruickshank, 1985; Raths and Ruchkin; 1984) nor can college and university-based teacher educators anticipate what beginning teachers will learn from induction programs (should they be fortunate enough to experience one) or from inservice

training programs.

Efforts to gain some consensus about essential knowledge that teachers should be expected to know at different stages of their professional development have been bedeviled by (a) disbelief that this can or even should be done (b) confusion over the role different institutions can and should play in the education of teachers and (c) a weak understanding of how teachers learn. The last two problems are illustrated by the ambitious effort of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to identify the knowledge base for beginning teachers. This impressive compilation of research-based knowledge (Reynolds, 1989) is so extensive and involves so many contingencies that it is unlikely that anyone, including those who study research on teaching for a living, could begin to understand, much less use, a significant amount of the knowledge this project identifies.

In seeking to understand why there is not more professionally related interaction between colleges and schools, it seems important to remember that the "norm of reciprocity" (cf. Gouldner, 1970, pp. 240-42 ff), is an important determinant of cooperative behavior that is stable and mutually satisfying. In other words, people and organizations seek to avoid relationships in which they are more dependent on their collaborators than their collaborators are on them because such dependency is not only hard on self-esteem, it is a condition of vulnerability. When reciprocity

exists, the possibility of collaboration increases. For example, Stallings (1988) attributes the success of the Houston Teacher Academy to the fact that it met specific needs of both partners, the University of Houston and the Houston Unified Public Schools.

If teaching expertise is seen as context-bound, idiosyncratic and intuitive, the norm of reciprocity is likely to impede the willingness of school systems and teachers to seek self-interested alliances with IHEs and professors.

Several things could be done to strengthen the scientific bases for the act of teaching and to improve understanding of this knowledge in both schools and IHEs.

First, the quality of knowledge about teaching needs to be better monitored and controlled. It is not so much that we need more good research (that, too); it is that we need less bad research and more intolerance of those who misuse, intentionally or naively, what good research and proven practice have to teach. There are far too many places to publish articles about teaching and little incentive to be tough on knowledge abusers. When IHEs seek status by rewarding publication activity by faculty who do not have time, resources, or adequate training in research, they exacerbate the problem. Not all professors need to be researchers but all should be scholars. There is too much emphasis on research and too little on scholarship in most IHEs. When school systems, training institutes, and professional organizations confuse

form and substance and value entertainment over content in their selection of sources of professional development, they add to the noise and confusion.

Second, educators of educators are reaping what they have sown. Few would-be teachers and administrators experience preparation programs that deal much with topics such as the usefulness of theory and research, different modes of analysis, how to learn from experience (experience is a highly over-rated teacher), how to use empirical evidence to solve problems or how to engage efficiently and productively in self-directed learning. The search for immediate relevance and practiceability pushes such concerns out of the curriculum to be addressed here and there by individual faculty. Further, the last learning experiences educators have in their degree programs are how-to-do-it ones that focus attention on learning by doing from persons who are selected as final teachers because of their practical experience. The message is altogether clear. That message, coupled with the weak technical skills most teachers and administrators have to interpret research, contribute to low interest in the scientific bases of effective teaching.

Third, teachers and teacher educators should be more articulate about what it is that they know and do. Good teachers, drawn to their work by their interest in children and/or their subject matter, tend to identify these commitments as the essential sources of their effectiveness. Unlike many

other professionals, many teachers--and their teachers--lack the willingness or the capability to describe the complex dimensions of what they do in ways that convey the depth of their expertise.

Fourth, if evaluation of teaching that linked teacher behavior to student learning was more common in IHEs and schools, incentives to learn what research says about effective teaching would be greater. This is particularly true in IHEs.

Fifth, it seems desirable to develop materials for facilitating teacher learning that explicitly embody research and engage problems that could best be solved by knowing how to use research-based knowledge.

Arends (1990), and others, believe that the increasingly robust knowledge base related to teaching has had little impact on teaching because researchers and teachers conceptualize the process of teaching differently. While this may be part of the problem, research on teaching often comes to conclusions that, if implemented, would require teachers to change their behavior. (This same situation exists in other fields--such as medicine, social welfare administration and corrections.) Further, teachers do not use research because (a) it does not fit with the way they think about teaching (Richardson, 1990), (b) they do not have good ways to secure research findings that are reliable, (Hawley, 1990b), (c) the weak feedback they get about their own teaching provides them little reason to believe that change will improve their effectiveness, and (d) they have

little support for bringing about the changes that research suggests are necessary (Richardson, 1990).

The Clarification of Goals and Modification of Roles

One reason why collaboration between IHEs and schools is not more common and more effective is that the roles each should play in the professional development of teachers are unclear, lack complementarity, and are underdeveloped.

Preservice teacher preparation is less effective than it needs to be because it seeks to do things at which it cannot be successful. The current criticisms of preservice teacher education are old ones (Clifford, 1988). While teacher education faculty and teacher preparation programs, overall, are almost certainly better than ever before, there are fundamental constraints on the impact they can have on teacher performance in the classroom. Elsewhere (Hawley, 1990a), I have spelled out these constraints--which relate to the readiness and capabilities of teachers to learn at different stages of their professional development, problems of securing greater continuity in what is learned, and difficulties of creating conditions and expectations that allow institutions to do what their capabilities and cultures allow them to do better than others.

Such a clarification and realignment of goals and roles would involve fundamental changes for IHEs and schools.

> First, the basic purpose of preservice teacher preparation would be changed from the development of teaching competence to the development of the capabilities and

motivation to learn to teach. Such a change in purpose would be followed by appropriate changes in curriculum and the ways learning was facilitated. This, of course, would be no mean task. It would require that undergraduate education be much more concerned with the development of analytical and problem solving capabilities, that prospective teachers would be taught how to learn and about the numerous influences on learning, that more emphasis would be placed on communication and on collaborative behavior, and, that students would learn about the sources and obstacles to individual and organizational change.

Second, responsibility for the development of teaching competence should be vested in schools rather than in colleges and universities. But, in order to ensure continuity and the infusion of new knowledge relating to best practice, a new institutional mechanism for doing this would be needed that would play the role teaching hospitals play in the education of physicians. The most promising such innovation is the Professional Development School, an innovation that can be found in various forms in a small but growing number of school districts and which I discuss further below.

Third, teacher educators should be bridges between liberal arts and disciplinary education on the one hand and the practice, science, and art of teaching on the other. What would such bridging look like? One of the most significant problems new teachers confront relates to classroom and instructional management. The actions teachers take in resolving these problems involve some of the most fundamental puzzlements and dilemmas of democratic societies. But, it is doubtful that more than a handful of teachers have ever reflected on Rousseau's ideas about social contracts or Coser's ideas about the functions of social conflict when making decisions about the maintenance of order. Similarly, it seems unlikely that many teachers recognize that in making decisions about grouping for instruction they are dealing with issues that have joined reasoned and continuing debates between utilitarian and libertarian philosophers.

Fourth, education in subject matter and liberal arts courses should be changed so that "content pedagogy" (Shulman, 1987) is covered. While the prospects for this proposal seem dim at present, calls for reform in undergraduate education seem to be growing in number and volume and this may provide the opportunity for this change.

Fifth, systems of induction for beginning teachers staffed by school personnel who have ties to universities should be strengthened.

Sixth, the responsibility for staff development on the part of school systems should be increased and the capacity to perform this significant role, using higher education as a resource, should be strengthened.

Seventh, opportunities should be provided for teachers to recurrently return to universities for short periods of time for additional formal education that is primarily focused on theory and research and is not limited to pedagogical or administration-related studies.

Create New Institutions for "Clinical" Training of Teachers

Among the most important constraints on the contributions IHEs can make to effective teaching are the discontinuity and incongruence of both the formal and informal lessons teacher candidates and teachers learn about teaching. The integration with and influence of knowledge on behavior is dependent to some degree on how consistent, with respect to content and values, the lessons to be learned are across learning opportunities and over time. Knowledge which is not seen as interrelated or which seems to reflect conflicting philosophies and priorities is not likely to be learned, much less be reflected in teacher behavior. It follows, then, that the more congruent and continuous both the content of teacher learning and the processes by which teachers learn are across the various contributors to the education of teachers, the more teachers will learn and the more usable and useful will be their learning. This sense that the messages relating to effective teaching are congruent across institutions seems

likely to create a climate that would improve the prospects for the IHE/school collaboration.

In the discussion of what I called the realignment of roles among institutions, I mentioned the need for new institutions that would bridge sources of learning. It will be argued that new types of institutional arrangements are not necessary; what is needed is to improve IHE and school partnerships for practice teaching and beginning teacher induction. To be sure, such improvements would be desirable but they are not likely to be as effective as the new bridges that are being called Professional Development Schools (PDSs). There are different versions of PDSs but their advocates appear to agree that they should:

- be a public school serving a diverse student body.
- be staffed by university faculty and expert teachers with special interest and competence in educating teachers.
- further the development of the candidate's teaching capabilities while serving as the site, or at least the major site, at which preservice practical teaching experience is acquired.
- be limited in number and educate prospective teachers who, in most cases, will teach in other districts.
- play a critical role in gate keeping, determining who should be certified to teach.

This model and the potential additions to it have several advantages over conventional clinical education structures (Stallings, 1990; The Holmes Group 1990). These include increased opportunities to (a) link theory, research and practice in organizational settings where the education of

teachers is a priority, (b) allow beginning teachers to move toward independence according to their readiness to do so, and (c) assess teacher candidates' eligibility for licensure in more depth and in light of performance by persons who are expert in and committed to such assessment. PDSs have two other potential strengths, depending on how they are structured. First, they could play a central role in continuing professional development of career teachers. Second, they could encourage new approaches to IHE/school collaboration because they are very different arenas for professional development from those we have had and this should present new opportunities to practice the norm of reciprocity.

Restructure Schools to Facilitate Teacher Learning

The relevance of most of the lessons about teaching and administration that one can learn from universities, texts, television, or inservice programs offered by states or local district offices are contingent upon local conditions, including differences in classrooms within a particular school. Thus, systematic learning in the context of "their school" is likely to be seen by teachers as more relevant and immediately useful than other types of professional learning. And, because teacher performance occurs in the context of a social system, a teacher's capacity and motivation to learn will be shaped by the norms of the work setting and the teacher's perception of the willingness and capacity of the system to accept and reward

what is learned. All of this means that the same lesson relating to performance usually will be better learned in one's workplace than elsewhere, assuming that the workplace lesson is well developed.

A teacher's world is full of learning opportunities, most of which could tell the teacher something about the efficacy of what he or she is doing to influence student learning. But most of these messages are not received. Contrary to conventional wisdom, most people, on their own, do not learn much new from their personal experiences, especially if the implications are that they should change their behavior (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1983). Moreover, what one learns from experience may be wrong.

Efforts to restructure schools so that teachers' informal opportunities and their motivations to learn are significantly increased and are integral to their everyday work. Efforts to restructure schools to facilitate teacher learning should seek to do one or more of the following: (1) provide information relevant to the differences between goals and goal attainment both for the school as a whole and each individual teacher, (2) provide sources of teacher learning relevant to the learning needs identified, (3) ensure access to learning opportunities, (4) provide resources to implement what has been learned, and (5) reward the learning that has been implemented, both intrinsically and extrinsically (cf. Hawley, 1988).

Support projects that create markets for quality with respect to the hiring of new teachers.

While there is considerable interest in improving the preservice education of teachers, most reforms being implemented have focused on the supply side of the market for talent. There is substantial reason to believe that many school systems pay little attention to evidence of the qualities in teachers that supply side reforms seek to secure. In the absence of a well-defined grass-roots demand for quality, reforms tend to be regulatory and tend to trivialize the process of teacher education. And so, it has come to pass (AACTE, 1990; Bull, 1968). These regulatory "reforms", in turn, complicate genuine inter-institutional collaboration. Further, because differences in teacher candidates' qualities and capabilities do not systematically predict hiring decisions, change-inducing competition among institutions that prepare teachers does not occur, evidence of differences in program quality is scarce, and students in teacher preparation programs have little motivation to excel or to see their university experience as relevant to their career opportunities.

Projects aimed at creating a market for quality could take many forms including the development and publication of measures of program quality and student performance that are valid and readily accessible. States and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education might make

information relevant to program quality available to school systems (and to both boards and administrators). Projects for identifying superior teacher candidates and providing signing bonuses or other incentives might be developed. Assessment centers might be established that are independent of both schools of education and particular school systems.

If there were markets for beginning teacher quality in schools, this might cause IHEs to seek more productive collaboration with schools. But--a caution. If quality is defined in terms of narrow competencies or first-year survival skills, the search for mutually complementary roles such as those discussed earlier is unlikely to occur.

Conclusion

The Prospects for More Productive Collaboration

The building blocks for effective collaboration between IHEs and schools that have just been discussed represent a daunting set of changes. What are the prospects that these changes can be achieved in the foreseeable future? The short answer to this question seems to be: not very good. But, who knows? In 1980, few would have predicted the call for reforms in education that have swept the country in the last decade. Let me try to identify some of the forces that might encourage change and some of those that seem likely to retard it.

Forces that Might Promote Change

The Diminishing Mystique of Colleges and Universities

For various reasons, colleges and universities are receiving more criticism from political and civic leaders than memory records. Among the demands that come from this dissatisfaction are demands for improved teaching and this could lead to greater respect for and dependence on teachers among faculty members in IHEs. But, as noted above, so long as teaching is seen by teachers and professors as a skill to be learned from experience and in context, it is hard to see how professors in IHEs will come to believe that the expertise of school teachers is relevant to their needs.

The Diminishing Role of IHEs in the Education of Teachers

The growth of school district capabilities to conduct inservice teacher training, the growth of alternative certification, caps on education courses, and the development of state agencies that offer (and sometimes require) continuing education courses for teachers, all pose a threat to the role IHEs have played in the education of teachers. It seems likely that as the trends embodied in the threat continue to gain momentum--as it appears likely they will--the outcome will have a significant impact on overall IHE revenues. A concern for the education of teachers may thus be discovered throughout universities, at least in the offices of central administrators.

Thus far, the response to challenges to the role of universities and colleges in the education of teachers has not reached the heart of most IHEs but some schools and departments of education have recognized that their health is in danger. Recognizing that standing still is akin to losing ground, these institutions have developed new approaches to teacher education and many of these have involved collaboration with schools (Arends, 1990; Stallings & Kowalksi, 1990).

The Professionalization of Teaching

There is much talk these days about the professionalization of teaching. In most other professions, it seems that the ties between practitioners and professors are more cordial than is the case in education. One might imagine that the search for professional status could lead teachers to a greater interest in collaboration and in the knowledge base that legitimizes a claim on professional deference.

Technology

The increasing capabilities of IHEs to develop educational opportunities for teachers and administrators that make use of interactive video and telecommunications, and the increasing capability of school systems to access such opportunities, provide IHEs an opportunity to have a greater impact on the enhancement of teaching than they have had. Whether IHEs can beat the private sector and the television industry, including public television, to the market remains to be seen.

Interest in Content Pedagogy

There appears to be a small but growing interest in "content pedagogy". This idea, given life by Lee Shulman (1987), focuses attention on the proposition that to both know and teach a subject well, one must know how specific content is learned, the underlying assumptions of the structure of knowledge, what the enduring questions in the field are and why they persist, and, perhaps, how these questions and ways of knowing relate to other cognate subjects. This still-developing notion is potentially important not only because it brings about awareness of the complexity of knowing (and, therefore, of teaching), but because it promises to improve the teaching of all students and thus to engage the interest of faculty who do not see themselves as being particularly interested in the education of teachers. Further, as this focus of inquiry and curriculum development matures, it could provide a fertile field for collaboration within IHEs and between IHEs and schools.

Why the Steps Toward Increased Collaboration Might Not be Taken

Uncertainty about the Purposes of Teacher Preparation

While there is much agonizing about the role of preservice teacher preparation in the United States, there is little agreement among the stakeholders about what to do. Some states, for example, pass laws that both require an additional year of college-based preparation for certification and

establish alternative certification programs that reduce the need for preservice preparation. The Holmes Group, arguably the most visible organization among IHE's advocating major changes in teacher preparation, is advocating both Professional Development Schools and extended preservice preparation in research universities. The National Education Association has recently endorsed "non-traditional" paths to teacher education aimed at increasing the role of teachers in the preparation of their future colleagues. One could go on. The field is in disarray.

The Increased Capacity of Schools to Provide for Teacher Training

The growing capabilities within school systems to support professional development, and the related trend in state agencies, gives schools an alternative to IHEs, and creates bureaucracies that seek to develop clientele and resources so that they too can grow and prosper. This may mean that the probabilities of institutional collaboration will decline. IHEs, on the whole, have sought to ensure their access to opportunities to teach teachers by hiring to the educational professoriate persons who are career educators. (The same pattern can be found with respect to the education of prospective administrators.) The growth of the knowledge base related to teaching and learning is the product of researchers in a few universities. These realities, coupled with the growth of professional roles and expertise within school

systems and state agencies, have left the majority of IHEs with a diminishing ability to make a contribution to schools that has much more basis than prior experience. To the extent that school systems seek access to research, they seek out researchers. To the extent that they believe that research is not useful because context is all important, they are increasingly likely to turn inward--to rely on their own capacities or to participate in state sponsored activities about which they have little choice--for direction.

The Limited Capacity of IHEs to Take on New Roles Related to the Education of Teachers

I have argued, in effect, that the future role of IHEs in the education of teachers should be derived primarily from their development and understanding of the knowledge base, their capacity to use and teach methods of analysis, their capacity for systematic assessment and prescription, and the degree to which they complement rather than replicate the capabilities of schools. If I am right, it seems clear that most professors who are now responsible for the education of teachers will need time and resources to enhance their capabilities. And, over time, new roles for IHEs will require different strategies and criteria for appointing and professionally advancing professors of education that emphasize both scholarship and teaching. While many states have recognized the importance of staff development for teachers (even though the resources provided to implement this

recognition usually have been inadequate), virtually no public resources have been allocated to the professional development of professors who educate substantial numbers of teachers. Even the will to change does not make a way. And ways to change may make, or at least contribute to, a will to take on new responsibilities.

Inadequate Modes of Funding

Two aspects of the way the continuing education of teachers is funded seem to discourage IHE/school collaboration. State funding formulae for IHEs are tied to course credits generated at public institutions. This implicitly encourages degree-oriented continuing education which typically has little relationship to the learning needs of teachers. And, this procedure does not support study by teachers at private institutions even though doing so would not cost states any more than support for study at public institutions. This, of course constrains the market for learning opportunities and reduces the incentives public institutions have to be responsive to learner needs. There is a darker side to this. Some private institutions compete by lowering quality and standards. What they offer teachers is what many teachers think they need more than new knowledge--credits and degrees that lead to salary increases and the time they would otherwise have spent studying to earn course credits in more rigorous programs of study.

There is an alternative--vouchers for professional development. These could equal the state subsidies per credit hour now provided. To encourage collaboration, some portion of the vouchers could be limited to use the context of professional development plans for teachers that would be approved by principals, school councils or professional development committees made up of teachers. And, because the market for quality is distorted by perverse salary incentives and the burdens of teaching, states might well limit the spending of vouchers to NCATE-approved IHEs. One might argue that if there are to be constraints on the use of vouchers, these should be tied to state-approved programs. But neither states nor regional accrediting agencies have demonstrated much ability or willingness to make tough decisions related to program quality.

Earlier, I asserted that the practice of tying learning to earning results in lots of credits and degrees but not much professional development likely to be reflected in improved teaching. Since this system works in the interests of many parties, if not children, it seems unlikely that its abolition will be politically feasible. But, the negative aspects of the system could be mitigated if (a) it did not apply to study beyond the master's degree that was not part of a career plan developed by the school or school system in which the teacher or administrator works and (b) credits taken generated salary increases only when such credits were earned at IHEs that met

high standards at the graduate level.

The IHE/School Status Schism and the Need for Top Level Leadership

So long as there is considerable inequality in the status of schools and IHEs, and status differences within IHEs which relegate schools and departments of education to the bottom of the status hierarchy, collaboration will seem like a one-way street to both IHEs and schools. Some of the things that might be done to reduce the status schism were discussed above but the prospects of diminishing it substantially are not good. At the heart of the problem is the probability that the nation's belief that the quality of schools is important to its quality of life is not very deep (cf. Thompson, 1966), notwithstanding the torrent of recent rhetoric to the contrary. And, at the head of the problem is the fact that most of those who hold leadership positions in IHEs, appear to assign rather low priority, judging by time and resources committed, to developing the will and the capability of their institutions to collaborate as genuine partners with schools.

Final Thoughts

The good news is that the importance of collaboration between IHEs and schools is receiving more attention than it has since the days of the normal school and one can point to a significant number of such relationships which appear to be founded on the building blocks for enduring and mutually

beneficial interactions that were identified in this paper. The bad news is that there appear to be more obstacles to collaboration than there are facilitating conditions and that some of these obstacles seem deeply rooted in the cultures of both schools and IHEs. As history "shows", the cultural revolutions are the hardest to bring about.

References

Arends, R. (1990). Connecting the university and the school. In B. Joyce (Ed.), ASCD Handbook on Staff Development. Alexandria VA: ASCD.

Bacharach, S. B., Bauer, S. C., & Shedd, J. B. (1986). The learning workplace: The conditions and resources of teaching. Ithaca, NY: Organizational Analysis and Practice.

Berliner, D. C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36:2-8.

Bransford, J. D., Goldman, S. R., & Vye, N. J. (In press). "Making a difference in peoples' abilities to think: Reflections on a decade of work and some hopes for the future." In R. J. Sternberg and L. Okagaki (Eds.), Influences on Children.

Bull, B. (1988). Confronting reform in teacher preparation: One state's experience. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(1), 25-40.

Clifford, G. J. (1988). The Professional School and its Publics. In P. Jackson (Ed.) Contributing to educational change, pp. 1-26. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1985). Models for the Preparation of America's Teachers. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Edelman, Murray (1964). The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press.

Evertson, C. M., Hawley, W. D., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(13), 2-12.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1983). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. In P. Tamer, A. Hofsteen and M. Ben-Peretz, (Eds.), Preservice and Inservice Education for Science Teachers. Philadelphia:

Gage, N. L. (1978). The Scientific Bases for the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University.

Gouldner, Alvin. (1970). The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

Hawley, Willis D. (1990a). New goals and changed roles: A realignment strategy for improving the education of teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Hawley, Willis D. (1990b). Systematic analysis, public policy and teacher education." In R. Houston, (Ed.), The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. New York: Macmillan.

Hawley, Willis D. (1989). New Directions for Teacher Education in the United States. Paris: Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development.

Hawley, W., Austin, A., & Goldman, E. (1988). Changing Teacher Education in the South. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Hawley, Willis D. (1988). "What if there was a school where teacher learning was important?" In Richard Bossone (Ed.), Restructuring the Schools, 84-97. Proceedings of the Ninth Conference of the University/ Urban Schools National Task Force. New York: The City University of New York.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's Schools. East Lansing, MI: School of Education, Michigan State University.

Irby, Jon, & Calvert, Patricia. (1989). Cooperative extension system launches national youth at risk initiative. Youth Policy, 11(7), p. 5.

Johnson, E. (1986). The origin of the Land-Grant Mission. Institutional Public Service: From the Farm to the City. Washington: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. Review of Research on Teaching, 16:297-351.

McCarthy, Martha. (1990). University-based policy centers: New actors in the education policy arena. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Raths, James & Ruchkin, Judith. (1984). Contexts affecting methods instruction in selected teacher education institutions. ERIC document ED 240-081.

Resnick, L. B. (1987). Education and Learning to Think. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). (1989). Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher. Oxford: Pergamon.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. Educational Researcher, 19:18-18.

Schneider, B. (1990). Organizational Climate and Culture. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57:1-22.

Soares, L. M. (1990). Comparisons of student teachers and alternative route candidates. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Stallings, J. (1988). The Houston Teaching Academy: A professional development school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Stallings, J., & Kowalski, T. (1990). Research on professional development schools. In R. Houston, (Ed.), The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, 251-263. New York: Macmillan.

Sykes, G. (1985). Teacher education in the United States. In B. Clark (Ed.) The School and the University: An International Perspective, pp. 264-290. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thompson, J. (1966). Organization in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Education Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Wilbur, F. P., Lambert, L. M., & Young, M. J. (1987). National Directory of School-College Partnerships: Current Models and Practice. Washington: American Association of Higher Education.

Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.). (1988). The Handbook of Research on Teaching, (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.