



CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs: The False Sense of *Techne*

By Gretchen E. Schwarz

Every advance in technical rationality today is surpassed by a decline in common sense and a growing irrationality, the signs of which are everywhere. (Stivers, 2001, p. 201)

As top-down mandates multiply, close supervision from outside the education field increases, and the professionalism of educators shrinks, criticism of neoliberal effects on education in the United States and elsewhere has become more frequent in professional publications. Neoliberalism, put simply, is the political philosophy that privileges free market economics above all else and, in education, advocates high-stakes testing, prepackaged curricula, stringent measures of accountability for schools and educators, and the privatization of public schools. Business efficiency is the governing value, and it is measured in numbers. Neoliberalism among policy makers and politicians may explain a great deal of what passes as school reform at all levels today.

However, in teacher education, where the same growing constraints can be found, one finds very little resistance among teacher educators in the United States, especially as such mandates are now being applied, in detail, to graduate programs. Why? Are teacher educators, college professors, unconcerned about their curricula being decided by others and indifferent to their work being reduced to rubrics and

Gretchen E. Schwarz is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction of the School of Education at Baylor University, Waco, Texas. Gretchen_Schwarz@baylor.edu

CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs

regulations? This article offers another possible explanation for the passive acceptance of high-stakes testing, data-driven accountability measures, and the questionable approach to teaching and learning that characterize much of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), formerly the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), teacher education accreditation process in the United States.

Most recently, as of June 4, 2014, the CAEP Board of Directors has “approved and adopted” the Standards for Advanced Programs, which “mirror the same principles of rigor, evidence and outcomes focus of CAEP Standards” (for initial teacher certification) to *all* graduate programs, according to the CAEP Web site (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP], 2014b). Lack of objection to what is happening in teacher education, in particular in departments of curriculum and teaching, among the participants themselves may have much to do with a culture dominated by *techne*. Ideas about *techne* from French sociologist Jacques Ellul, as well as others, are used to establish the false sense of assurance CAEP offers, in particular through analysis of the Standards for Advanced Programs (CAEP, 2014b) and other CAEP documents.

The Advanced Standards apply to teachers “preparing for a second license at the graduate level in a field different from” their first; teachers seeking “a master’s degree in the field in which they teach”; “programs not tied to licensure,” such as programs in curriculum studies or educational foundations; and “programs for other school professionals,” such as counselors, administrators, and reading specialists. The CAEP Advanced Standards are, in fact, almost identical to those in place for undergraduate or initial certification programs; the chart CAEP offers places the Advanced Standards across from the initial Standards, and the Advanced Standards are simply somewhat shorter. Therefore previous critiques of CAEP or its former incarnation, NCATE, are worth revisiting, although these critiques remain rare in the professional literature.

Allington (2005), past president of the International Reading Association, discussed how NCATE undermined “our efforts to develop thoughtful, autonomous, and effective teachers” (p. 199). Taubman (2009) demonstrated that NCATE created an “audit culture,” in which “professional judgment and wisdom were being replaced by a measurable, defensible, and supposedly neutral process, in which educators and students themselves were reconstructed in terms of quantifiable outcomes” (p. 89). Johnson, Johnson, Farenga, and Ness (2005), in a thorough exposé of NCATE, criticized the lack of research supporting the accreditation system; the potent, costly public relations actions of NCATE in its branding efforts; the burgeoning bureaucracy; and what Allington in the preface called the “fatal flaw”—“the rationalizing of effective teacher preparation into little more than a series of measurable ‘standards’” (p. xvi). Most recently, Bullough (2014b) decried the “rise of neoliberalism, and the loss of teacher educator control of programmes and programme content, and in some respects, the undermining of educational

quality” (p. 474). CAEP (which in 2013 combined NCATE and NCATE’s former alternative, the Teacher Education Accreditation Council) has great reach, although not all colleges and universities submit to CAEP.

Given the high costs and tremendous amount of time now expended on CAEP, the problematic standards presented, and the newly explicit invasion of academia at the graduate level, one might expect more debate. Has neoliberalism won the day? Are teacher educators merely thoughtless materialists or too busy to study the Advanced Standards? Or are other forces at work?

Techne Rules!

Techne, a Greek term much discussed by the ancient Greek philosophers, generally means skills, the knowledge of how to do and make things through rational method. Clearly *techne* in and of itself is not bad; it enables societies to grow and people to survive. Likewise, some of the CAEP program has value. However, the philosophers thought there were other important kinds of knowledge, too, knowledge involving ideas about politics, aesthetics, and ethics, for example. In their examination of the digital university, McCluskey and Winter (2012) traced *techne* to Aristotle, who placed it at a lower status of knowledge: “The physical labor involved for farming or mining was often performed by slaves. The name given to these routine forms of doing was *techne*” (p. 63). A number of scholars have examined the problem of *techne* as the dominant form of knowing and being in contemporary life, including educator and media critic Postman (1992), who termed the problem *Technopoly*. Ellul (1964, p. xxv) explained *techne* in *The Technological Society* as *technique*, “the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency . . . in every field of human activity.” His observations are especially relevant to the state of teacher education, and specifically graduate programs, which may or may not end in certification.

Ellul (1964) offered a history of *technique* and described how it played out in the economy, in the state, in medicine, and in education. Technology, of course, has long existed, but *technique* is not just machines or instruments themselves but rather a worldview in which *techne* rules and serves as the lens through which all of society is seen. Apparent rationality is the most obvious characteristic of *technique*, reflected in, according to Ellul, “systematization, division of labor, creation of standards, production norms and the like” (p. 79). *Technique* works through standardization, mechanization, bureaucracy, and depersonalization. Ellul stated the following about the domination of *technique*:

Technical civilization means that our civilization is constructed by technique (makes a part of civilization only what belongs to technique), for technique (in that everything in civilization must serve a technical end), and is exclusively technique (in that it excludes whatever is not technique or reduces it to technical form). (p. 128)

Technique can be seen at all levels of education today, but university educators, especially teacher educators, once perceived as independent thinkers, have largely failed to address the concern about evaluation processes fraught with *techne*. *Techne* or *technique* proves a powerful force as seen in CAEP.

CAEP as Technique

Few if any scholars would assert that accreditation and/or some meaningful and powerful form of self-study is not needed in colleges and schools of education in all areas and at all levels. Zeichner (2014), for example, has long been a proponent of reform in teacher education. The reluctance and lack of preparation of so many new teachers to teach in difficult, underserved school districts are clearly a problem, for instance. Numbers are not unimportant, including grades and test scores. Many programs still need to strengthen clinical experiences. CAEP also offers pragmatic ideas, such as following up graduates to get their feedback on programs. Conversely, the extent to which CAEP is subject to *techne* or *technique* is demonstrated in the characteristics of self-augmentation, autonomy, and totalitarianism, all of which Ellul (1964) addressed. In addition, and ironically, CAEP's claims to rationality end in "unreason," a result Ellul (1990) examined in *The Technological Bluff*.

Ellul (1964) declared that "*technique*, in its development, poses primarily technical problems which consequently can be resolved only by *technique*" (p. 92). Hope (1996), in his homage to Ellul, gave the example of faith in standardized testing as the primary measure of human achievement, noting that "instead of creating understanding about the limits of standardized testing, addressing critical thinking with technical values simply produces calls for new and improved standardized testing" (p. 38). Ellul (1964) added that *technique* is a "blind force" and that "it is only a form, but everything conforms to it" (p. 94). *Technique* grows itself, expanding rapidly. Indeed, CAEP seeks to augment its own reach by pursuing status as the *only* unified national teacher accreditation system and by taking over the accreditation of educators even outside the university in "districts or alternative organizations" as the definition of "provider" states.

Moreover, CAEP has augmented itself most recently by declaring the methods of approval for university graduate programs in education. In its Strategic Plan, CAEP (2015) stated that it "will build a network of agencies, organizations, institutions, and experts and work with these partners to create and implement a research agenda" and that it "will broaden awareness of quality education preparation providers (EPPs) [those who receive the CAEP seal of approval] and the value of accreditation . . . so that more providers will participate and more states and districts will rely on accreditation for program approval, licensing, and hiring." No new rationale has been added for the inclusion of all education graduate programs, including those "not tied to licensure."

Additionally, CAEP now assumes accreditation of the graduate programs of

school counselors, educational administrators, and reading specialists, as reported in the CAEP (2014b) Standards for Advanced Programs. Such programs may well need reform, but this seems quite a leap from teacher accreditation and is, of course, reflected in the organization's new name—Council for the Accreditation of *Educator* Preparation. The very notion, presented in the Standards for Advanced Programs, that graduate education should proceed under the auspices of CAEP is remarkable, especially given that the standards are the mostly undergraduate or initial licensure standards repeated. No academic, scholarly reason is offered besides “rigor.” No research showing the failures of graduate programs in curricula and teaching (“not tied to licensure”) is cited. CAEP leaders may well consider their motivation ideals of reform, but the organization seeks to augment itself with the support of its organizational members, such as the National Council of Teachers of English, among others. An operation as large and as well served by its public relations strategies as CAEP gains a momentum of its own.

CAEP, like *technique*, is also autonomous, accountable to no outside organizations or forces but its own members, which include subject matter organizations and teacher unions, among others. CAEP seeks partnerships with state and federal governments, increasing its power. University tradition, in which the faculty decide graduate program purposes, application procedures, requirements, and curricula, holds no sway. The traditional role of the university in designing and evaluating its own graduate programs, particularly those that lead students to roles in the university itself, is minimized. Autonomous technique, observed Ellul (1964), “has fashioned an omnivorous world which obeys its laws and which has renounced all tradition” (p. 14). CAEP (2015) promised in the Strategic Plan to be a “model learning organization” that is “responsive to the needs of the educator preparation and educator professions.” But how can that happen? What mechanisms are set out for CAEP self-critique? Who holds CAEP accountable? At the least, CAEP could pilot the Advanced Standards in volunteer institutions before declaring a wholesale mandate. The eternal question—who watches the watchmen?

Finally, in an increasingly complex and pluralistic world, CAEP is totalitarian, as defined in Merriam Webster's dictionary as “centralized control by an autocratic authority.” Ellul (1964) put it this way:

Technique cannot be otherwise than totalitarian. It can be truly efficient and scientific only if it absorbs an enormous number of phenomena and brings into play the maximum of data. . . . But the existence of technique in every area leads to monopoly. . . . Totalitarianism extends to whatever touches it. . . . When technique has fastened upon a method, everything must be subordinated to it. (p. 125)

All five standards offered for the Advanced Programs are attached to what CAEP has defined as success in P-12 schools. For example, Standard 1.4 reads that “advanced program completers demonstrate skills and commitment to creating supportive environments that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-

CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs

and career-ready standards [such as Common Core State Standards].” That other definitions of school success exist and have merit is unacknowledged by CAEP. As Bullough (2014a) contended, “CAEP offers a vision of an ‘ideal system’ of teacher education. . . . Diversity of programs and practices is viewed as a serious weakness, not a strength” (p. 1).

For anyone familiar with graduate education, one might expect a graduate program in curriculum studies, educational philosophy, or English education to encourage students to critique college- and career-ready standards or the Common Core, among other proposals. Debating ideas lies at the heart of graduate education, and encouraging original thinking is a basic goal of any graduate program. Never before has an outside organization in teacher education supplanted the role of the university itself as the place where educational ideas, measures of evidence in the field, and scholarship are studied and debated; CAEP does so. Doneson (2011) described the condition of technique in American education in the following way:

In sum, modern technology is a way of thinking and ultimately a way of being-in-the-world characterized by the disposition to rationally order, predict, and control everything with the aim of mastering nature and subduing Fortuna. Gradually, all alternative principles of experience and choices, be they from piety, morality, aesthetics, custom, or instinct come to be dominated by technical calculation. (pp. 46-47)

Technical calculation is again evident in the “Report Highlights” of “Building an Evidence-Based System for Teacher Preparation” (CAEP, 2014a), prepared by the company Teacher Preparation Analytics for CAEP. Despite phrases in the Standards for Advanced Programs, such as in Standard 3.2, concerning admissions, which mentions “multiple evaluations and sources of evidence,” it seems that “multiple” means other numbers. Of 13 Key Effectiveness Indicators for teacher preparation listed in the report, at least 9 are clearly statistics gathered from tests, numbers and percentages of students, and surveys, including “value-added” statistics, which are discussed later. People need not challenge purposes nor debate ideas if *technique* is all. CAEP would decide the goals and methods as well as the evaluation of university graduate education in the fields of education—totalitarian indeed.

One may well ask, So what is the problem? What if CAEP is self-augmenting, autonomous, and totalitarian, if it is also efficient and rigorous and holds teacher education programs accountable, as it promises to do? If *technique* or *techne* can ensure “quality products,” why should it not govern teaching, schooling, and teacher education? Numerous problems resulting from CAEP and its purely technique approach to education have been discussed. Cochran-Smith (2005), for example, argued that the “focus on outcomes—if narrowly defined or even predominantly in terms of test scores—is a trap for teacher education that ignores the broader purposes of education in a democratic society” (p. 411).

Techne or *technique* does not speak to the moral or civic purposes of schooling, nor to the ethical motivations so many educators bring with them into the field or

the ethical issues they confront in the classroom (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). Furthermore, CAEP does not directly attend to the social problems that plague American schools, especially racism and poverty. Others raise the point that an accreditation system that measures knowledge and ability largely in terms of statistics and evaluates programs in terms of the bottom line of efficiency dehumanizes the educational enterprise. Pinar (2014), who accused CAEP's predecessor, NCATE, of anti-intellectualism, also noted, "This intricate record-keeping system increases the faculty's bureaucratic workload (not to mention that of students) while reducing educational coursework to record keeping" (p. 215). One result of CAEP that has not been widely discussed yet is that CAEP's seemingly logical methods must lead ultimately to unreason.

Technique as Magic

The great appeal of CAEP lies in the claims of methods that assure quality teaching. In fact, the word ensure appears frequently in the CAEP Accreditation Standards (CAEP, 2013a) and the Standards for Advanced Programs (CAEP, 2013a). A list of other favored CAEP terms includes monitor, reliable and valid, quality assurance system, implement, criteria, and outcomes. These terms sound solid, reasonable, and dependable. However, not entirely predictable, controllable, and measurable in numbers are human life, relationships, and learning and teaching. When people confuse what can be managed and mandated with what cannot, reason becomes unreason. Or as several scholars have pointed out, technique becomes indistinguishable from magic.

Ellul (1964) pointed out the relationship of magic and *technique*, noting that magic is the "first expression of technique" (p. 25). Ellul expanded, observing that *technique* and magic have common characteristics—the goal being to gain control of the environment and nature, to serve as protection and defense involving forms and rituals that never vary, and to accomplish all with great efficiency. Ellul argued as follows to the question of why society does not acknowledge the magical aspects:

Because we are obsessed with materialism and do not take magic seriously, it has little interest for us, and we are unaware even today, as we study *technique*—the techniques that relate to men—that we are drawing on the great stream of magical techniques. (p. 25)

Furthermore, anthropologist Gell (1988) maintained,

The propagandists, image-makers, and ideologues of technological culture are its magicians, and if they do not lay claim to supernatural powers, it is only because technology itself has become so powerful that they have no need to do so. And if we no longer recognize magic explicitly, it is because technology and magic, for us, are one and the same. (p. 9)

Stivers (2001) made the case that "technology and magic, while separate and

CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs

distinct categories in some abstract sense, are now related to one another in such a way that each has acquired important characteristics of the other” (p. 1). He added, “Our worship of technology and irrational belief in its omnipotence prevent us from seeing the obvious: the technological system can accomplish none of its mythological goals. It can guarantee us neither happiness and health, nor success and survival” (p. 207). Nor can it guarantee some perfect system of teacher education accreditation or graduate programs in education.

CAEP displays many characteristics of magic. The terms listed earlier and such phrases as “clear, high standards,” “positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development,” and “evidence-based measures of performance” (CAEP, 2013a, 2015), like magical incantations, are repeated over and over and never unpackaged. Such language, one might even say jargon (like “provider” referring to the university or college teacher education program), is left mysteriously vague but at the same time captures the seeming objectivity of technicism or techno-positivism. Van der Laan (2001) referred to these mantras as “plastic words.” Van der Laan stated,

[Plastic words] acquire a scientific veneer that lends them special cache and adds to their importance because science is the realm of human knowledge to which our society and culture accords [*sic*] utmost respect... In the end, however, plastic words are nonspecific, context-autonomous, abstract nouns. As such, they preclude precise expression. They become so general that they can apply to anything, and so apply to nothing. The broader their application, the smaller their actual content. (p. 350)

He added, drawing on Ellul’s work, “Technology reconstitutes the word, recreates it, in its own image” (p. 353). *Values-added modeling* (VAM; CAEP, 2013a, p. 13) might as well be “abracadabra.” Likewise, the emphasis on “ensuring” and certainty reflects the appeal of magic to humans, offering quick ways to control and predict complex human undertakings. A love potion is a direct, sure way to gain love, especially compared to the vicissitudes of actual romantic relationships. A declaration that “the stature of the entire profession” of teacher education will be raised by following the standards of CAEP (CAEP, 2013c) is much quicker and less expensive than examining the history of teaching and teacher education in the United States, critiquing the messages about educators transmitted in the media, challenging a society that remains indifferent to the inequities in schooling, and studying the contexts and work of actual teacher educators today.

Finally, the practice of magic is not available to just anyone. Magic is the realm of magicians or shamans, uncommon experts who have special knowledge, like the CAEP commissioners (only three out of 40 of whom are teacher educators). To take advantage of magic, the ordinary person or teacher educator must seek special incantations or potions, using special objects, numbers, or standards. To be fair, CAEP has declared and has enacted a dedication to involving a variety of stakeholders in its work. However, most members of the CAEP Commission on Standards are deans, college or organization presidents, and heads of think tanks—in short,

administrators or policy makers removed from the daily work of teacher education (CAEP, 2013b). Likewise, the research base for the CAEP Standards (2013a), which the Advanced Standards (CAEP, 2014b) simply mirror, mentions very few teacher educators; most sources are such organizations as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Educational Testing Service, census figures, and business and think tank reports. The vast literature on teacher education the professorate has created is ignored. People outside the realm of day-to-day teacher education must save teacher education. The teacher educator's own experience, knowledge, scholarship and research, or common sense is suspect. Magic is required.

CAEP Magic: Road to the Irrational

Magic, in the form of *technique*, is appealing, as magic has always been. Today we find traditional magic with wands and spells silly. However, *technique* or *techne* as the sole way of approaching the ongoing work of teacher education also becomes irrational, ultimately. The unquestioning commitment to college- and career-ready standards in the Advanced Standards has been mentioned already. The command to adopt a certain ideological stance seems to run counter to the rational ideals of openness and debate that characterize the university at its best, especially at the graduate level. For instance, Standard 3.1 declares that the provider must recruit for diversity—but not for thought. And although more clinical work or fieldwork at any level may be worthwhile, CAEP does not confront the question, If what the schools are doing is not in the best interests of students, what does the teacher education program do? When is fieldwork counterproductive, merely initiating educators into the testing madness? How can doctoral candidates, who will become new professors and leaders in schools, be advocates for change in a time so dominated by top-down policy? Clinical experience can be problematic; it is no panacea.

Most irrational is the demand that measures of “completer” (a graduate student who finishes the degree) “impact on the P-12 learning environment, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon.” The idea that graduates of education graduate programs can *ensure* a direct impact on P-12 schools is the most absurd slogan or mantra of all. Real human students, especially in the contexts of complex social systems such as schools or universities, are subject to many influences, none of which can be controlled by teachers at any level. Neither teachers nor teacher educators can manage poverty and discrimination, the home environment, the individual motivations of each student, the school climate, the resources in schools, the ongoing and unsubstantiated claims of educational crisis, or the boredom of a curriculum reduced to test taking.

Can teachers help children learn? Of course. But guaranteed? In addition, although the notion of VAM is downplayed in the Advanced Standards, it is still there. VAM connects student test scores directly to teacher efforts. Berliner and

CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs

Glass (2014) said, “In short, the VAM-like systems for inferring the quality of teacher training by a new teacher are not sensible” (p. 86). Teaching and learning build on many complex factors, including human relationships—complex, messy, often unpredictable, unscripted, and resistant to engineering. Learners bring a bag of history and attitudes with them to school. To expect linear, predictable, universal, manageable human interactions in diverse contexts is the most irrational faith of all. Simply using bureaucratic language to declare the wonder of the CAEP system, especially for graduate education, reflects magical thinking.

A number of scholars over the years have warned about *technique*. The irrational factory model of education (see Callahan, 1962) woven into CAEP’s expectations for education graduate programs can be addressed in the following:

Teachers do not and cannot determine, and therefore cannot ultimately be held responsible for, the eventual outcomes of their professional activity. They may influence the actions and development of their pupils but do not determine what they eventually do become. For human beings are not material objects or even trainable animals but the initiators of their own actions (Arendt, 1958), agents of their own futures, within the unforeseeable situations into which they are “thrown” (Heidegger, 1927) by circumstance. . . . The mode of practical reasoning appropriate to the guidance of teachers is not *techné* . . . [but requires] the wisdom, imagination and flexibility that results from their own education. (Wringe, 2012, p. 9)

The idea that merely saying something will make it true is the fundamental strategy of America’s largest enterprise—advertising. . . . Word magic is an ancient form of balderdash and is never to be taken lightly. . . . Eichmannism is that form of balderdash which accepts as its starting and ending point official definitions, rules, and regulations without regard for the realities of particular situations. (Postman, 1988, p. 93)

Ultimately, the quality of a teacher education program is a reflection of the state of the hearts and minds of teacher educators and of their desire and ability to imagine their work in new and refreshing ways and then to take concerted action to realize their visions. . . . [In contrast to] a naïve faith in the ability and value of systems to control behavior and to assure quality performance, and narrow conceptions of the nature of teaching and learning to teach. (Bullough, Clark, & Patterson, 2003, p. 50)

Why do so many teacher educators seem to acquiesce to CAEP if the *techné-technique* model runs contrary to their own interests?

What About Fear?

Critiques of neoliberalism emphasize the economy and consumer culture, the values of the corporate world in perpetuating current school “reform” like CAEP. However, in reflecting on my own almost 25 years in teacher education, it seems most teacher educators with whom I have worked are decent, caring professionals

who love learning and students of all ages, and they are not driven by the almighty dollar or even power but rather by service. However, another term is common these days—a *culture of fear*. Fear is hardly new to human life, but in a time of technological change that is so rapid and a time when one can learn about all the world's disasters in a matter of minutes, fear may well have much more effect than rational moderns want to admit. The fear factor looms large in American education. Kuhn (2014), for example, has titled his new book *Fear and Learning in America—Bad Data, Good Teachers, and the Attack on Public Education*. Policy makers often use fear to create and enforce certain political policies.

Even college teachers are subject to fear, especially in a time when the university itself is changing radically. Stivers's (2006) comments seem to apply even more now:

A university that attempts to change itself through bureaucratic reform and public relations only makes things worse. Today, we are being overwhelmed by bureaucratic procedures and accountability measures, like the truly silly idea of value-added education. We spend so much time accounting for what we do that we don't have time to do what we do. (p. 224)

Tenure is under attack in the United States, and many new teacher education professors remain untenured; others are adjuncts or clinical instructors without the possibility of tenure and without being part of graduate programs. The economy remains uneven and uncertain, especially in state schools that receive less and less of their funding from the states. More and more education professors are expected to bring in grants to support graduate programs. The rest of the university remains largely indifferent to or disdainful of teacher education, as do many public school systems driven by standardized testing. Alternative teacher education certification systems are popping up all over, following Teach for America (a representative of which serves on the CAEP Commission). Who wants to rock the boat facing a powerful entity such as CAEP? Safety, security, is a major human need, right after physical basics, according to Maslow. It is not surprising if teacher educators have chosen magical thinking over even academic freedom.

Clearly empirical research should be pursued to discover if fear is in fact a problem in teacher education, although funding or any support for such research might be hard to find. Other causes for the failure of teacher educators to object to CAEP exist as well, including the onslaught of neoliberalism. The problem of CAEP is not simple. However, fear appears to be a major factor.

Conclusion

It would be foolish indeed for anyone to maintain that any teacher education program, undergraduate or graduate, is perfect and needs no change. Ongoing improvement should be the goal of any educational organization. Some CAEP

CAEP Advanced Standards and the Future of Graduate Programs

standards and procedures make sense. Strong discipline knowledge is important (Standard 1), for example, and tests and grades do somewhat reflect that knowledge. Getting feedback from appropriate stakeholders is worthwhile (Standard 5), as are other measures of CAEP achievement. However, the reduction of teaching and teacher education to means and standard deviations (Standard 3.2), modeling technology standards (Standard 1.5), and magically improving P–12 schools (i.e., test scores) will ultimately fail to help teacher education. *Techné–technique* as the only kind of knowledge that matters may seem objective, rational, and sure, but it is actually subjective, irrational, and uncertain, and its appeal rests on fear. Thus CAEP presents a significant danger to education graduate programs.

Education for teachers and other educators at the graduate level, that which is not tied to certification in particular, requires deep study from a variety of fields in addition to curriculum and pedagogy—philosophy, history, sociology, psychology, and language and literacy. Graduate education must explore the emotional, imaginative, intuitive, and spiritual with educators who seek more than recipes and rubrics in their graduate programs. Education in curriculum and teaching, especially at the graduate level, requires the academic freedom to explore all ideas, even those of CAEP itself. Teaching as a vocation and as a serious program of study deserves more than *techné*. Fear must somehow be overcome, or the future for teacher education and teaching looks grim indeed.

References

- Allington, R. L. (2005). Ignoring the policy makers to improve teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 199-204. doi:10.1177/0022487105275845
- Berliner, D. C., & Glass, G. V. (2014). *Myths and lies that threaten America's public schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bullough, R. V. (2014a). Toward reconstructing the narrative of teacher education: A rhetorical analysis of preparing teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(3), 1-10. doi:10.1177/0022487113519131
- Bullough, R. V. (2014b). Recalling 40 years of teacher education in the USA: A personal essay. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(5), 474-491. doi:10.1080/02607476.2014.956537
- Bullough, R. V., Clark, D. C., & Patterson, R. S. (2003). Getting in step: Accountability, accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 29(1), 35-51.
- Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Teacher education and the outcomes trap. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 411-417. doi:10.1177/0022487105282112
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013a). *CAEP Standards for accreditation of educator preparation*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/caep-accreditation-standards/>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013b). *Commissioners list*. Retrieved

Gretchen E. Schwarz

- from <http://caepnet.org/stabdards/caep-commission/commissioners/>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013c). *History*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/about/history/>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2014a). *Report highlights: Building an evidence-based system for teacher preparation*. Retrieved from https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/tpa_report_highlights.pdf
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2014b). *Standards for advanced programs*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/08/caep-standards-for-advanced-program/pdf>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2015). *Mission and strategic plan*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/about/strategicplan/>
- Doneson, D. (2011). On technology and humanity: A bibliographic essay. *The Hedgehog Review*, 13(2), 45-54.
- Ellul, J. (1964). *The technological society*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ellul, J. (1990). *The technological bluff*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Gell, A. (1988). Technology and magic. *Anthropology Today*, 4(2), 6-9.
- Hope, S. (1996). Homage to Jacques Ellul. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 97(5), 38-39.
- Johnson, D. D., Johnson, B., Farenga, S. J., & Ness, D. (2005). *Trivializing teacher education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kuhn, J. (2014). *Fear and learning in America: Bad data, good teachers, and the attack on public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McCluskey, F. B., & Winter, M. L. (2012). *The idea of the digital university*. Washington, DC: Westphalia Press.
- Osguthorpe, R., & Sanger, M. (2013). The moral nature of teacher candidate beliefs about the purposes of schooling and their reasons for choosing teaching as a career. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 88(2), 180-197.
- Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Postman, N. (1988). *Conscientious objections*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Stivers, R. (2001). *Technology as magic*. New York: Continuum.
- Stivers, R. (2006). The need for a "shadow" university. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 26(3), 217-227. doi:10.1177/0270467606288818
- Taubman, P. M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers*. New York: Routledge.
- Van der Laan, J. M. (2001). Plastic words: Words without meaning. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 21(5), 349-353. doi:10.1177/027046760102100503
- Wringe, C. (2012). Learning to teach and becoming a teacher: Techne and phronesis. Paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, New College, Oxford. Retrieved from <http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/uploads/papers2012/Wringe.pdf>
- Zeichner, K. (2014). The struggle for the soul of teaching and teacher education in the USA. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(5), 551-568. doi:10.1080/02607476.2014.956544