

*Are public schools and colleges the two social institutions created for the specific purpose of seeing that change does not take place?*

The only thing harder to move than a college faculty is a cemetery.

**"CHANGE!" "Innovate!"**

These are the current, fashionable "calls to colors" being used by the educational hardware merchants, the teaching strategy-process advocates, the technological experts, the precollegiate curriculum reform enthusiasts, high officials in the Federal Government and private foundations. Their calls are backed with substantial amounts of seed money, and/or political and business acumen and salesmanship.

One wonders, however, how many of these harbingers of the future recognize the nature of the challenge they issue, to the public schools on the one hand, and to teacher educators in the colleges and universities on the other. The current group of reformers are calling for change and innovation by the two social institutions created by the American people for the specific purpose of seeing that change does *not* take place.

Our public schools and our higher educational institutions were created by society for the almost exclusive purpose of passing on the cultural heritage to the on-coming generation. These social institutions are organized to preserve the status quo and are staffed largely by those who are wholly committed to this end. Moreover, they are financed and organized toward this end.

Speaking realistically on this point at

## WHITHER REFORM IN TEACHER EDUCATION?

**JAMES C. STONE**

Director, Teacher Education, School of  
Education, University of California, Berkeley

a recent conference of educators in Honolulu, Norman D. Kurland, Director of the Center on Innovation, in the New York State Department of Education, said:

The several hundred million dollars that are available to us for developing innovations aren't going to make much impact unless they are used to change the way we spend the total of \$40 billion that goes for education each year. . . . They (the reformers) ought to put more effort . . . into training people to do things differently, and also into altering the organizations and institutions of education.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*San Francisco Chronicle*, Saturday, July 8, 1967, p. 2.

Now, at the height of the hue and cry for change and innovation, the planners of this issue of *Educational Leadership* have asked for an assessment of the current status of teacher education in America. How has teacher education responded to the clarion call for change and innovation? What are the chances for major reform in the foreseeable future? The answers to these questions lie in our awareness of recent efforts to change teacher education—efforts that have been promoted in various ways over the past twenty years. Let us examine some of these strategies for reform.

### **The American Council on Education**

In the late 1930s, a major effort to change teacher education was launched by the American Council on Education through the creation of a Commission on Teacher Education. The most tangible result of the Commission's efforts was the publication of a series of monographs which described and analyzed promising new programs and practices in the preservice and in-service education of teachers.<sup>2</sup>

World War II overshadowed the in-

<sup>2</sup> W. Earl Armstrong, Ernest V. Hollis, and Helen E. Davis. *The College and Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

Charles E. Prall and C. Leslie Cushman. *Teacher Education In Service*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

Maurice E. Troyer and C. Robert Pace. *Evaluation in Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

Charles E. Prall. *State Programs for the Improvement of Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1946.

novations advocated and initiated by the Commission as teacher education became immersed with the more immediate and pressing problems caused by the postwar shortage of qualified teacher candidates and personnel to man the schools.

The philosophy "anyone can teach" became popular as state agencies issued "emergency," "provisional," and "temporary" certificates to most anyone willing to be called "teacher." The resulting inadequacies in our educational structure (augmented by other shortages—buildings, money, leadership) unleashed, in due time, a new effort to change by use of another strategy, that of "criticism from without."

### **Criticism from Without**

Among the foremost of these 1950 critics of teacher education were the Bestors, the Rickovers, the Hildebrands, the Koerners, the Hutchinses, and the Council for Basic Education. Teacher education became the whipping boy for Johnnie's failure to read—and for Russia's launching of Sputnik I and II before our own satellites were launched. In fact, the quality of teacher education became, according to public opinion, a major reason for our country's lag in cold war competition.

While educators became defensive and perhaps understandably indignant, the general public, or at least vocal elements among it, became aroused to try their own hand at bringing about reform.

### **Reform by Coercion**

Disenchanted by hopes of major reform from "within the establishment"

(by which was meant departments, divisions, schools, and colleges of education), knowledgeable laymen, spurred by Conant's several investigations, began to take matters into their own hands. The most dramatic example was the effort by the California State Legislature which passed the Certificated Personnel Act of 1961.

The act sought to limit professional education while increasing subject matter preparation and to give a preeminent position to certain collegiate majors by defining them as "academic." The "academic subjects" in which teachers may major are defined as follows:

The "natural sciences" (which) means the biological sciences and the physical sciences. . .

The "social sciences" (which) means anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, sociology. . . .

The "humanities" (which) means the literature and languages (including rhetoric) and the philosophies of great civilizations past and present (except studies in social sciences, natural sciences, mathematics, and fine arts). . .

"Mathematics" (which) means courses in the foundation of mathematics, including number concepts and theory, algebra, geometry, analysis (including calculus), and probability theory. . . .

"Fine arts" (which) means the history, theory, appreciation, and criticism of art, drama, and music, including practices incidental thereto. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Among the nonacademic majors were education, plus all fields which contained elements connected with the application of knowledge, such as agri-

<sup>3</sup> California Administrative Code, Title 5: Education, Group 4. Article 1, Section 6200.

## PHILOSOPHY IN THE CURRICULUM OF THE HIGH SCHOOL

Historical Background  
Feasibility  
Experimental Cases

Special Issue—July 1967

Order from:

EDUCATIONAL THEORY  
276 Education Building  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois 61801

culture, architecture, business, conservation, engineering, forestry, home economics, industrial arts, journalism, law, librarianship, nursing, nutritional sciences, physical education, social welfare, and the like, whether or not these subjects are ones the teacher will teach.

The outlawing of the education major, particularly for elementary candidates, was a serious blow to the eighteen state colleges of California which prepare the vast majority of the state's teachers. Among the immediate results was a critical shortage of elementary teachers and an oversupply of secondary teachers in the "academic" subject fields, and an antipathy between the institutions of teacher education and the State which only time will heal.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> James C. Stone, "Teacher Education by Legislation." *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 1966. p. 291.

Meanwhile, "back at the farm," thoughtful members of "the establishment" were regrouping their forces and beginning to reform from within. The most notable example was the effort of the National Education Association.

### Reform from Within

Amid the rush to assign blame, first to the schools and then to those who educated their teachers, the NEA began, in the 1950s, to launch its own efforts to bring changes in teacher education through its Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission. The Commission's strategy was the "bore from within" technique, of getting key staff members from teacher education within the colleges on the side of reform by involving them in the Commission's monumental efforts to raise state certification standards, to develop a system of teacher reciprocity among states via national accreditation of teacher education, and to educate classroom teachers to the importance of high standards for the profession and each teacher's stake in such an effort.

Among results of the Commission's work are new standards for teacher certification in many states, the formation of local, regional, and state advisory councils and commissions on teacher education, and the creation and successful operation of the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education.

### Venture Capital

Walter Lippmann, surveying the scene in the middle of the 1950s, wrote:

We cannot measure the demands upon our people in the second half of the 20th

Century . . . by what was demanded of them at the beginning of the first half of this century.

We are entering upon an era which will test to the utmost the capacity of our democracy to cope with the gravest problems of modern times. . . . We are entering upon this difficult and dangerous period with what I believe we must call a growing deficit in the quantity and the quality of American education.

We have to make a *breakthrough* to a radically higher and broader conception of what is needed and of what can be done. Our educational effort today, what we think we can afford, what we think we can do, how we feel entitled to treat our schools and our teachers—all of that—is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor.<sup>5</sup>

Adopting Lippmann's term "breakthrough," the Ford Foundation put its resources to work on the problems of promoting change and innovation in education. Its approach was, in part, to apply generous amounts of seed money for school-college teacher education programs which met the Foundation's own criteria:

The most promising new developments in the preparation of teachers have four characteristics. They provide for an extended scholarly knowledge of the subject or subjects to be taught. They provide for the development of insights into child psychology, the learning process, and the meaning and purpose of education, through seminars in which these concerns are brought into relation with the problems experienced by beginning teachers. And they involve arrangements for acquiring the art of teaching through carefully guided apprenticeships or

<sup>5</sup> Walter Lippmann. In: *Teachers for Tomorrow*. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1956. p. 4.

internships on the principle that an art is best acquired by practice under direction and criticism.<sup>6</sup>

Fifteen years and 70 million dollars later, the strategy of the venture capital has accomplished the beginning of a breakthrough in the preparation of secondary school teachers who will teach college preparatory high school students from suburbia. But the "Ford Formula" needs to be tested for its applicability for the preparation of:

. . . secondary school teachers who will instruct non-college-preparatory high school pupils . . .

. . . elementary school teachers . . . teachers of the disadvantaged at all levels.<sup>7</sup>

The venture capital philosophy has been picked up by the Federal Government where the Foundation left off.

### The Federal Government

Even a cursory reading of the various legislative acts creating the several "Title Programs" substantiates the generalization that the U.S. Office of Education is now spending billions to reform teacher education with the same

<sup>6</sup> Paul Woodring. "The Ford Foundation and Teacher Education." *The Teachers College Record* 62 (3): 226; December 1960. (From: *The Fund for the Advancement of Education. Report for 1954-56.* p. 31.)

<sup>7</sup> James C. Stone. "Breakthrough in Teacher Education?" In: *Improving Teacher Education in the United States. 1967 Yearbook.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967.

formula with which Ford, Carnegie, Kettering, and Kellogg spent millions. Now, however, the direction of the current thrust to reform teacher education is via the education of teachers of the disadvantaged, the effort to move teacher education from the campus to the schools and the communities which the schools serve. If the latter movement actually occurs, there is some hope that genuine reform ("changes," "innovation") actually may occur, provided communities are able to free the new curricula and the new "centers" from the traditional hobbles (rules, regulations, standards) which now limit most experiments in public schools and colleges.

As long as teacher education remains fixed in the concrete of college and university traditions, it will remain substantially as it is now (and has been), and reform efforts will continue to come and go without making an appreciable impact on the mainstream of higher education where teacher education has its deepest roots.

Whither reform in teacher education? This now becomes the larger question, whither reform in higher education? Unless and until some new (and now unknown) force makes itself felt on higher education generally, no significant or lasting innovation can be (or should be) expected in teacher education. ❧



Copyright © 1967 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.