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Women—a small set of women in a particular place during a narrow time frame—developed American teacher education as a field of study. These women were extremely sensitive to the effect they were exerting on teacher-education programs offered in schools and colleges of education nationally but were less aware of the pervasive, long-term influence they would exert on the study and structure of teacher education as a field of inquiry.

The knowledge base of their teacher education was not essentially theory, although theoretic constructs were drawn from human development and learning. Neither was it based on experiential knowledge, the craft of classroom teachers, although numerous concepts and principles came from "best practice." Finally, their delimitation of teacher education as a field of inquiry was not developed on the basis of research findings.

If this teacher education drew on only selected concepts from theory, practice, and research but never adopted any of these ways of knowing as its primary and fundamental way of knowing, what was it based on? I contend that teacher education as university study was developed essentially to support an ideology, not a body of knowledge in the traditional university sense, and that this ideology was directed toward a vision of citizenship qualities and personal development considered essential for children and youth.

These related contentions support my argument:
• Any theory of human behavior or development, any set of best practice, and any research findings were accepted or rejected, in whole or in part, on the basis of whether they supported or refuted this ideology and not simply on the normal criteria used in academe.

• Theory, practice, and research, as ways of knowing, were relegated to merely serving as means for achieving these ideological ends.

• In the process of rejecting theoretic constructs, best practices, and research findings as the primary ways of knowing, teacher education developed from principles asserted by these leaders and generally accepted among teacher educators, their assertions became the standards or guidelines that shaped the content accepted by teacher educators and school practitioners. Principles became the appropriate format for connecting the ideology with “right” or “good” things to do.

• That some of these principles were, in some cases, supported by research, theory, or practice, or all three, is largely irrelevant because in other cases they were contradicted by these ways of knowing but were nevertheless retained as necessary for the maintenance of the ideology.

• Although subject-matter specialization (majoring) was deemed necessary and in need of strengthening, their arguments were always stronger for general-liberal studies and for the integration of these studies with subject-matter specialization and professional education.

• Child study, learning, and development was conceived as a multi-disciplinary form of scholarship and was not the purview of only educational psychology.

• Self-understanding, reflection, and self-evaluation by teachers was a cornerstone of preparation and practice.

• It was incumbent on the process of becoming a teacher to demonstrate all its own stated advocacies, thus, the emphasis on interdisciplinary programs, the improvement of college teaching, cooperative student activities, and direct experiences in support of all types of university course work.

• Teacher education should not only advocate but itself be an individual process permitting students to complete differentiated programs and achieve varied learning goals.

• The educational goals for children and youth required the preparation of teachers who were not only scholarly but active citizens as well.

• The overriding goal of American teacher education was to prepare teachers who acted on reasoned beliefs—beliefs supported by theory, practice, and research but more reflective of reasoned commitments to the ideology.

• Finally, the influence of this powerful set of women teacher educators has eroded and has not been replaced by anything with equivalent, overarching appeal. This vacuum cannot be filled by those who are primarily theoreticians, or primarily practitioners, or primarily researchers, or by all three acting together, because these ways of knowing are incompatible on a functional
level in schools and classrooms. Irreconcilable differences, therefore, now place teacher education as a field of inquiry in chaos. The way out of this morass is to redefine an ideology for educating a free people for the 21st century that will use but transcend the limitations of theory, research, and practice.

I use the work of three women to support this argument and its related contentions. Florence Stratemeyer, Margaret Lindsey, and Dorothy McGeoch. These three women worked together—Stratemeyer was Lindsey's and McGeoch's major doctoral adviser, all served in the same university for overlapping periods, and all were former presidents of the Association of Teacher Educators, then known as the Association for Student Teaching.

My motive in constructing this argument is to do more than tell an interesting story. All who define themselves as teacher educators should become more knowledgeable and sensitive to their own origins and to the motivations and commitments of those who established teacher education as a field of study. This review should help us understand the nature of our present conceptual problems. An intellectual history may also provide us with insights on why teacher education is in its present condition and some likely future scenarios. Finally, that these three individuals were women is critically important to understanding their ideology, the nature of their scholarship, the influences they sought to exert and did exert, and the forces they resisted.1 Perhaps in the movements and proposals they resisted we frequently find the clearest vision of their advocacy.

As we review their legacy, we inevitably come to question ourselves more. What do we stand for? What are our agreements about how teachers should be prepared? What do we agree on about what our teachers should be able to do? Do we even have a common starting point for who should and who should not be admitted to teacher education? What do we share as a common vision of effective teaching practice in the schools and in our teacher-education programs? Do we agree on what teachers should accomplish with children and youth? Can we have socially meaningful teacher education without first having a shared vision of what teachers are to accomplish?

The legacy left to us by Stratemeyer, Lindsey, and McGeoch lies beyond my ability to summarize without doing each a grave injustice. What I can do is give a few major themes of their contributions—themes that fit together and provide us with a gestalt of the field of teacher education as they conceived and developed it into an area for scholarly inquiry. I then outline what we have done with their heritage and project the legacy we will be leaving to our successors in teacher education.

---

1Happily, Margaret Lindsey is quite alive and enjoying an active retirement.
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THEMES IN THE LEGACY OF FLORENCE STRATEMEYER

Florence Stratemeyer was a student at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the early 1920s, where she completed bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees in education. From 1930 to 1965, she was a member of the faculty at Teachers College. She was the conceptual daughter of the legendary scholars who set out to rationalize American education by connecting the nature of children and youth with a school curriculum for educating the citizens of a democratic society.

This educational movement saw schooling in the early part of this century as being overly directive, teacher-centered, and limited to the narrow goals of maintaining discipline and teaching basic skills. Curriculum as a field of study was broadened to include the creation of child-centered education rather than the transmission of discrete, segregated school subjects. Teaching was reconceptualized as the means needed “to determine the environment of the child and thus by indirection to direct” (Dewey). The teacher’s day-to-day work was reconceptualized as the indirect control over settings in which individual children and cooperative groups would develop and pursue problem-solving activities (i.e., the activity program). The principal’s role became the study of how democratic leadership might create a school environment amenable to the growth of children, teachers, and parents. In this “outrageous” view of administration, “rational authority is self-eliminating” (Dewey). Because all school rules would be openly determined and mutually agreed upon, they would, in effect, be self-enforcing.

These themes, and related ones, have been completely transformed. Today’s advocacies are for the precise opposites and are in many ways a regression to the situation a century ago. Now, few if any dissenting voices are raised in opposition to the search for a logical curriculum that organizes discrete subjects in terms of scope and sequence, for direct, whole-group instruction so that all will understand what is being taught and be able to learn it, and for school environments managed by strong principals—people whose words carry weight because they are tough, dominating people not predisposed toward such pantywaist notions as the consent of the governed.

From the intellectual ferment of the depression and World War II, Stratemeyer emerged as the dominant translator of these democratic concepts and developmental ideals into programs for preparing teachers—not teachers for children who would be expected only to reach grade level, not teachers for children whose major purpose for being in school was low-level skills, not teachers for children whose only reason for being educated would be narrowed to “get a job and stay out of jail”—but teachers for a free people. Teachers who would be educated by principle and precept to guide their thought and action and never trained to simply follow the prescriptions thought out by others. The cornerstone of her approach was the rational teacher—a professional scholar who acted on reasoned beliefs. She asked of
herself and the teacher educators she prepared scholarly thoroughness. She prepared teacher educators (1) to explore all sides of the critical issues in depth; (2) to reach positions that could be defended by a rationale of theory, research, experience, and personal commitments; (3) to demonstrate what the implications of these positions would mean in practice; and most of all, (4) to justify these positions in terms of their meaning for educating children and youth in a democratic society.

To "act with confidence on the basis of tentatively held beliefs" (Dewey) was also an important part of her credo because always holding ourselves open to change and growth—to deeper insights, greater knowledge, or more meaningful experience—was essential. This approach sounds strange to many of us today. Nowadays, it seems we are dazzled by sincerity to the point of never asking whether the sincerity represents any substance and whether the substance is a rational guide to our behavior. Neither the world nor our society has ever been short of extremely sincere authoritarians committed to wrong purposes. We seem almost childlike in our approach to leaders and leadership, as if we might be rescued from overly complex issues by strong, trustworthy figures with solutions that can be delivered in 30 seconds or less. Leadership does not consist of continuously taking polls and sincerely giving people back their most popular beliefs; it means leading people to demand what is in their own best interest. Many leaders consider this option too risky.

Some have misinterpreted Stratemeyer's devotion to the reasoned approach—to the endless thinking about teaching, thinking about integrating knowledge with the nature of children, and thinking about the preparation needed to educate thoughtful classroom practitioners—as an indication of remoteness or a lack of feeling. Some have thought that she somehow lacked compassion and understanding of the human condition. Nothing could be more incorrect. The more accurate interpretation is that Stratemeyer never separated cognition from affect. She saw whole people. She also felt strong emotional commitments to the ideals she espoused. Using a scholarly, rational process, she arrived at advocacies of the teacher as an independent, self-analytic, feeling, personally involved individual, facing and accepting herself. Similarly, she related these advocacies to the individual differences of those preparing to teach and their personal and social development. She arrived at these concerns for the human condition through a rational process; her search was for the means to make more scholarly teachers who were also people fully committed to and able to function within the democratic ethic. She rationally searched for the achievement of goals that were simultaneously intellectual, ideological, and emotional.

How can university programs cause all these deep-seated personal changes? In the same way, her search for precisely how to educate caring, self-analytic, accepting teachers was, by definition, a rational search for goals that do not readily result from completing traditional university studies. Similarly, she valued the arts, humanities, and all forms of humanistic and
aesthetic expression. She was forever planning and including extracurricular activities and out-of-class experiences as part of the university curriculum for future teachers precisely because she understood better than anyone that the influences she was trying to exert on future teachers dealt, ultimately, with their commitments and that people do not behave in terms of some dispassionate cognition. Admittedly, Stratemeyer's passions were strictly controlled and powerfully directed to her persistent search for a more complete understanding of how to prepare teachers who could ensure the continuation of a democratic society. Defining her as a scholar in love with the next better means for achieving this mission might be the most apt way of describing her. But the importance of her legacy is that she provided teacher educators with a grounding, a foundation, a basis for their studies. Her commitment was to a society of laws, not of men, her dedication was to the needs, rights, opportunities, and responsibilities of a free people. Commitment to this ideology became the crucible on which she taught teacher educators to judge approaches for improving the preparation of teachers.

For me, Stratemeyer's greatest contribution was her grand scheme to organize curriculum at every level—in terms of persistent life problems. In excruciating detail, she composed about 150 pages of charts depicting examples of problems of living we all face from the cradle to the grave. She then categorized the relevant questions that school curriculums should organize to answer in terms of young children, older children, youth, and adults. The greatness of the scheme is that it unified the education of children at all levels with the subsequent education of the teacher. Everyone at all levels was engaged in interdisciplinary studies of the same problems at ever more sophisticated levels. Her developmentally organized questions remain the best example of how to build a curriculum in terms of the learner's needs, if the learner is to live in freedom. Although her model remains largely ignored, it does exist, and to any who gain the insight to see the educational impotence of separate, discrete courses piled on each other, the alternative is there for development and use.

A second important part of her legacy is her conceptual development of professional laboratory experiences in teacher education. Building on the 1904 Dewey model, she extended and deepened the need to integrate future teachers' learning of abstract concepts with their need to practice, experiment, and at times, fail. Here her ideas have become more widely known and accepted, although I would be willing to bet that if I could receive a dollar for every time a teacher educator still raises the issue of having his or her course taught at the same time students are in student teaching so that the students might be able to practice what the faculty member is professing, I could earn enough for a new car each year. Obviously, this idea only remains an advocacy because faculty are unfamiliar with the need to have every aspect of the professional program integrate theory and practice by having all conceptual teaching integrated and supported by direct experience. What we may remem-
ber even less well is Stratemeyer’s commitment to these direct experiences as opportunities for genuine experimentation rather than the demonstration of proficiency from the first day. The reality is the reverse: We create pressure situations for our students in which they are in mortal fear of failing, at anything, anytime.

Besides her persistent life situations and her approach to professional laboratory experiences, she refused to back off her commitment that teacher education prepare individuals. As we busily organize our programs in terms of the need to have measurable, comparable faculty loads and the need to organize students’ time schedules, the conceptual needs of individual future teachers have become the last “things” university faculty use to plan programs of teacher education. We throw up our hands and say, “But we have 500, 1,000, 3,000 students preparing to teach at our university; there’s nothing that can be done about such an idealistic commitment.” This excuse is not any different from classroom teachers who say, “There is nothing to be done to reach individuals if my class has 27,” or “I have five classes per day with 150 students.” If we cannot individually shape future teachers’ development— their knowledge, practice, and most of all, their commitments—then this mass teacher training that we are engaged in, not the schools’ large classes, may be the best explanation of why public education today so rarely discusses children’s individual development. Individual educational plans give pre-service students unique and particular assignments and lead to personal, direct experiences.

**THEMES IN THE LEGACY OF MARGARET LINDSEY**

Margaret Lindsey was one of Stratemeyer’s doctoral students and became her colleague at Teachers College, Columbia University, in an overlapping career from 1950 to 1978. She had one more doctoral student than Stratemeyer, 146. Many of us in academe have difficulty comprehending this level of output. I have been a major doctoral adviser for 21 years and am now working with my sixth student—perhaps because of my lack of ability, effort, or a personality flaw, or perhaps because doctoral students are no longer interested in becoming generalists in teacher education. Whatever the reason, these two women for a period of almost half a century exerted incredible influence on the field by producing 291 teacher educators, most of whom became faculty in teacher-education programs. The list includes some of our most notable and productive writers, researchers, teachers, and administrators.

Several themes that Stratemeyer outlined Lindsey developed more fully: the teacher educator as a college teacher, the use of case method research, and the development of guidelines and principles for college supervisors and cooperating teachers that still shape the work of those who perform in these roles today. Lindsey had the greatest direct effect on university leaders and
education deans of anyone in recent history and became known as "the dean's dean." Her influence far exceeded offering information and advice and extended to creating organizational and national mechanisms for shaping teacher education as a profession. In 1958, Lindsey drafted the first standards for the National Commission on Accreditation in Teacher Education. She consulted with and influenced numerous state departments in developing their certification laws and numerous colleges and universities seeking to improve their programs of teacher education. Her influence even reached the boards of scholarly journals, which sought her advice on selecting editors, and to the federal government as particular agencies sought to flesh out how to administer federal laws related to teacher education. She was, of course, her own woman, but she was also the direct continuation of the grand ideals that Stratemeyer espoused as she staked out teacher education as a field of inquiry.

There are many forms of giftedness. Lindsey's genius transcended her insightful questions, her tough-minded analysis of the issues involved in seemingly intractable problems, or her inexhaustible depth in pursuing ideas to their fullest implications. She was a seminal thinker able to simultaneously contemplate an array of complex ideas and ideals and from them to synthesize principles of action. Many tell us, "Do this." Fewer include a compelling rationale for doing it. Rarer still is the intellectual leader who produces principles for guiding action that are generally true, that are complementary, and that provide a basis for the behavior of an individual practitioner and a total profession. Lindsey is the only educator I know who would be capable of writing a constitution for the teaching profession.

THEMES IN THE LEGACY OF DOROTHY McGEOCH

Against the legacy of these giants, the contributions of Dorothy McGeoch appear more human in size. McGeoch developed, on a continuing basis, an experimental fifth-year teacher-education program that was staffed and evaluated by doctoral students serving apprenticeships as college supervisors. To her fell the almost impossible task of actually carrying out Stratemeyer's and Lindsey's great ideals in a real program with real people. Unfortunately for McGeoch, neither the liberal arts graduates she had as students nor the Harlem schools she had them working in were regarded as typical by teacher educators nationally. (Neither were the private schools serving the affluent that preservice students also worked in.) Although she seldom had more than 25 or 30 preservice students each year, the program she developed could be a model of how to prepare teachers for urban and multicultural schools today. She was 15 years ahead of the National Teacher Corps and 30 years ahead of alternative certification.

McGeoch pioneered the range of direct experiences that might precede student teaching and the sequencing of direct experiences, an issue that still
plagues thoughtful teacher educators today. She assiduously lived up to the seemingly impossible ideal of placing student teachers with cooperating teachers matched on the basis of personality attributes and complementary cognitive styles. She was among the first who offered a course for her own cooperating teachers on how to supervise students while they, in turn, worked with her student teachers. McGeoch actually carried out the apparently idealistic guidelines of individualized teacher education. She even had students learning carpentry skills with hand tools so they could replicate their experiences with children and thus be able to help children engage in the construction activities that were the heart of the activity program pedagogy. Intensive child study, cooperative forms of learning, the structuring of the democratic classroom, the integration of school subjects, the evaluation of children by noncompetitive means, the involvement of parents, the teaming of teachers, and preservice students' exhaustive, endless self-analysis were all standard features of her programs. In a real sense, McGeoch was the loyal and committed soldier out in the schools who demonstrated that the ideology of teacher education was workable, albeit at great cost and with Herculean effort.

In the late 1940s, Lindsey was involved in analyzing and evaluating the Ford Foundation's Arkansas Project, which was intended to revolutionize teacher education by demonstrating that a fifth-year program for liberal arts graduates was the best way to prepare teachers. But neither Lindsey's critical analysis of the Arkansas Project nor the successful demonstration of fifth-year programs at Teachers College in the 1950s and '60s ever seriously influenced the teacher-education literature. The reason is straightforward: Those interested in post-baccalaureate formats have tended to seek quick, cheap ways of training large numbers of teachers, particularly teachers serving low-income children, and to exhibit significantly less interest in ways demonstrating that preparing high-quality teachers would be more work and more expensive and would require college graduates with more general education than is typically the case. Imagine the time, effort, and commitment it takes to actually match each student teacher with each cooperating teacher on the basis of complementary personality attributes and cognitive style. In McGeoch's way, higher standards for fifth-year programs also required the need to exercise some control over the conditions under which future teachers practice in schools, a continuous process for developing the teacher-education program itself, and more cooperative behavior among teacher-education faculty as they work with faculty throughout the university and in the public schools.

Finally, McGeoch's commitment to preparing beginning teachers who would view classroom discipline and the teaching of basic skills as consequences rather than prerequisites of effective teaching all contributed to guaranteeing that her great model would be largely ignored. Teacher educators, many of whom know better, have traditionally knuckled under to student demands for teaching the skills of discipline separate from other skills of teaching. Funding sources decided early on and have remained faithful to the
notion that "new" ways of preparing teachers for the poor and for minorities are best achieved by training more teachers at lower costs for shorter periods.

When we consider her work style and what she expected of herself, McGeoch was a zealot. Imagine endless selection interviews and the checking of credentials and references, as well as all the other labor-intensive activities involved in individually placing students in a range of pre-student-teaching activities as well as in student teaching. Added to these activities were demands for weekly field trips so that preservice students could become familiar with all the out-of-class roles expected of classroom teachers. Field trips and study also related to the newly evolving American Federation of Teachers, an organization that Dewey had indicated a need for as early as 1916. In addition, she held weekly individual conferences with students before or after their teaching, followed by weekly observations of at least two hours because students were learning to teach the activity method and had to be observed over extended periods rather than during half-hour direct-instruction lessons. Observing one student for a full day was not uncommon. McGeoch also had weekly meetings with cooperating teachers as individuals and in their weekly course and took field trips to learn about parents and the community. She read students' logs, unit plans for teaching, child study projects, and other materials. All these requirements were, of course, in addition to the regular course work assignments. The program itself involved a 40-credit master's degree.

In retrospect, I still cannot believe that McGeoch did what she did and expected others to do so as well. My disillusionment with the potency of student teaching stems from McGeoch's and her doctoral students' failure to change many deep-seated attitudes and behaviors of their student teachers despite the intensive effort. But McGeoch herself was never shaken in her total commitment to student teaching and to the other direct experiences as the primary means for realizing the ideology. Her explanation for any lack of influence over selected students was that we failed in some way to provide them with the most meaningful experiences. She was a model of not blaming the victim (i.e., the student teacher) and taking responsibility, as the teacher educator, for offering a more powerful curriculum in a more effective way.

THE IDEOLOGY AND ITS FATE

Principles that ran the gamut from educating young children to educating teachers by using complementary principles unified the ideology. Schools were to teach children and youth integrated subject matters using a pedagogy of activity. Similarly, teachers were to be taught integrated subject matters supported by direct experience. Schooling at all levels took on a congruence in both treatment and purpose. If the mental health of children was important, the mental health of teachers had to be. Conceived and offered as a living process and not as preparation for a subsequent life, the question "Why do we have to study this?" could not arise. What was studied, at any level, was cooperatively determined and agreed on.
There were, however, a few minor problems of implementation. It was never possible to get universities to stop offering discrete courses of disconnected subject matters in which the students, not the faculty, would bear the total responsibility for both integrating and applying knowledge. Even teacher-education curriculums did not recognize the difference between preparing a late adolescent and preparing a mature adult to become a teacher. Also, elementary and high schools continued to become more devoted to the logical organization of subjects and less concerned with their meaningfulness and relevance to children's lives.

Because universities and the public schools were both becoming more divorced from the lives of learners and were supporting each other in the process, the demise of the ideology is understandable. In truth, it existed primarily in the laboratory schools attached to teachers colleges and never to any great extent in the public schools. Between 1935 and 1955, however, at the State Teachers Colleges in Milwaukee and in Troy, Alabama, as well as in numerous other institutions, the ideology became practice. With the demise of laboratory schools, teacher educators devoted to the ideology lost their control over the conditions of practice. Once placed at the mercy of public schools, the education of teachers entered its present phase and became training narrowed to the demands of public education.

The criterion of research production as a basis for evaluating the laboratory schools was a totally irrelevant one. These institutions planned, staffed, and operated as demonstration sites and as sheltered schools that could offer future teachers genuine laboratory experiences. Unfortunately, these schools had unrepresentative populations and could not or would not readjust to the demand for schooling integrated by race and class. Many urban school systems are now creating professional development schools to perform the laboratory school mission in the real world.

The ideology of teacher education then was widely accepted by teacher educators but not by universities or by lower schools. It was never widely demonstrated as feasible beyond the campus laboratory schools. Why does teacher education based on principle and cumulated into an ideology persist against other ways of knowing? Piaget and others with unified, total theories of development have never taken it over, neither have "scientists" with specific findings related to time on task, direct instruction, or behavior modification; neither have those deriving endless lists of competencies from the best practices of classroom teachers.

The women who played such a significant role in developing teacher education created a field of inquiry characterized by the nature of the questions they raised, the issues they considered, and their assertions of principle. Subsequent teacher educators have typically experienced highly specialized doctoral programs and have been prepared not as generalists dealing with the full sweep of issues in teacher education but as ever more narrowly prepared experts. secondary science, middle school language arts, primary reading,
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preschool and child development. As a result, in succeeding decades we have seen teacher educators prepared whose clients and focus of study were only the children in schools. Most of these new teacher educators know literally nothing of developing college curriculums, or adult development, or college teaching, and frequently they care less. The professional concern of many younger teacher-education faculty has become clearly one of knowing more and more about a narrow slice of the child's life, or about testing and evaluation, or about one subject in a school curriculum, and less and less about teaching the whole child as well as changing adults who would be their teachers in meaningful, powerful ways. If I were to sit through a search committee and ask candidates for faculty positions in teacher-education programs the following questions, the questions would be considered hostile, irrelevant, or both.

- To what theory or view of adult development do you subscribe?
- How does this view relate to what you expect to teach future teachers?
- What means will you use in your course to make learning meaningful and relevant to practice?
- Will students be able to finish your class at different rates with different goals?
- How will students be involved in helping to set the goals of your course?
- How will you relate your course to your students' general studies and specializations?

We expect new faculty to learn these things on the job, if at all.

An added complexity is that new faculty in teacher education begin their careers as (1) adherents of a particular theory, (2) conductors of a particular type of research, (3) experienced teachers who want to share their successful methods with beginners, or (4) people who simply want to share what they perceive as interesting and important ideas with college students. These faculty have no common core. Indeed, the diversity continues to widen, and the demands of public schools offering programs and curriculums beyond the experience of any current faculty subgroup compound the problem. The net effect is our current condition. Students proceed through teacher-education programs without common themes, listening to individual faculty in much the same way they would plug coins in a juke box. The tunes are unrelated, but all run about the same amount of time, and when they have heard them all, they have completed the program. The listeners cannot reproduce all the numbers, but that does not matter because in the world outside they will experience other tunes played and sung differently.

THE REVIVAL OF THE IDEOLOGY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The themes that should run through teacher education are a set of common questions, asked endlessly, searched and researched, and for which
guiding principles (tentatively held) emerge. Some of these persistent questions for teacher educators in a free society should include the following:

- How can a program in higher education encourage students to face their own prejudices in ways that they will want to do something about them?
- How can a program in higher education lead students to integrate and apply knowledge that comes to them in the bits and pieces of university course work?
- How can a program in higher education develop a sense of equity and justice so that students are sensitive to structuring educational opportunities for all constituencies?
- How can a program in higher education provide students with the will and the skills of self-analysis and self-appraisal?
- How can a program in higher education encourage cooperative as well as competitive activity?
- How can a program in higher education interest students in considering competing ideas related to complex issues of living in modern society?
- How can a program in higher education lead students to participate as active members of their communities?
- How can a program in higher education encourage students to see the broad issues of education related to the work of the teacher?
- How can a program in higher education prepare students to use various methods of instruction and to seek to refine them as well as to learn others?
- How can a program in higher education interest students in learning a wide range of subject matters that they will continue to study after graduation?
- How can a program in higher education encourage students to become lifelong students of children and their development?
- How can a program in higher education provide students with the commitment and the will to relate with families of children, to learn about them, and to cooperate with them, regardless of race, ethnicity, or class?

These are only a few of the questions. If discrete university courses cannot accomplish these things, then we have an empty legacy to pass on. If we regard these questions as relevant and vital, then we should be prepared to state what new programs might look like and how they would accomplish these results.

Perhaps we can rediscover the thread that runs so true by working backwards and for a moment forget the demands of university life and the chilling effects of the university bureaucracy and its debilitating disorganization. Perhaps we can regain and rebuild a common core of teacher education by holding faculty differences among theory, research, and practice in abeyance. Let's begin by asking what we want for children. If we can agree on even a few goals, we may be able to construct the teacher education that will serve us in the 21st century. If we cannot, then teacher education will continue to occur outside of universities at an increasing rate; 33 states have alternative certification, and the number is growing. In these programs, the specific
demands of the schools and the specific nature of the training are congruent and connected.

The teacher educators we need in America should educate adults to become teachers of a free people. These teachers are bound together by an ideology of what schools are for and why children and youth should be required to attend them. These teachers should hold a set of common beliefs that guide their day-to-day work.

- In a society that would remain free, children cannot go to school to learn all the ways in which they are not good enough.
- In a society that would remain free, children cannot go to school to prepare for their lives later on and have their present lives ignored.
- In a society that would remain free, children cannot be taught only the value of individuals' competitive achievement and ignore the skills of teamwork, cooperation, and mutual assistance.
- In a society that would remain free, schools cannot become fixed on sameness and minimum competencies and ignore the responsibility for enhancing individual talents, abilities, and differences, indeed, for making children more different from one another.
- In a society that would remain free, schools cannot be the place where children are taught to fear or denigrate those who are in any way different from themselves.
- In a society that would remain free, schools cannot support or cooperate with any parents or constituencies that foster racism, sexism, or prejudice or that seek to foist their religious beliefs on others.
- In a society that would remain free, schools must treat each child as our only heir to all our most complex and fragile democratic institutions.
- In a society that would remain free, the only pedagogies used must treat each child as an individual worthy of respect, a person of dignity with unknown and unknowable potentialities.
- In a society that would remain free, schools cannot be the ultimate sorting mechanism for who is labeled capable or incapable, who is tracked up or down or out, and which few deserve the best opportunities.
- In a society that would remain free, those responsible for the education of children (i.e., teachers) cannot be treated as mere bureaucratic functionaries—only somebodies can make somebodies, nobodies don't make somebodies.
- In a society that would remain free, we would lose our ability to predict who will succeed in school before they ever begin by knowing family income or parents' educational level, or race, or sex, or ethnicity, or handicapping condition.
- In a society that would remain free, the children of the poor have equal opportunity, additional effort and resources devoted to them, and most of all, teachers with high expectations for their success.
• In a society that would remain free, what the wisest, best parents want for their children, the entire community must want for all its children.

To carry out these grand goals, I hold myself to certain strict guidelines. I use 18 main criteria in deciding whether to become involved in a particular program of teacher education. They are undergirded by some theory, research, and experience related to how we have developed successful urban teachers in the past. They also represent an ideology that I am pleased to state openly.

1. The people who plan and offer teacher-education programs must themselves be a multicultural, interracial group that is not monolingual.

2. The majority of those engaged in planning and offering a teacher-education program must be currently practicing teachers, not former classroom teachers.

3. The conditions of work for inducting interns and beginning teachers into schools must be feasible and controlled. Teacher education should occur in schools established as professional development centers in which the total school environment has been developed in terms of its potential effect on beginning teachers.

4. Interns and beginning teachers need immediately available mentors who are experienced, successful classroom teachers and who receive some released time and stipends for their mentoring.

5. Parents and community representatives should be involved in planning and offering teacher-education programs.

6. Those selected into teacher-education programs should be required to demonstrate their ability to relate to children as a prerequisite to admission.

7. Completion of discrete university courses is replaced by integrated courses that include direct experience.

8. Participants in teacher-education programs should be expected to complete certification programs at different rates in different time periods.

9. Participants in teacher-education programs should work full days from 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. five days per week, on school, not university calendars.

10. Participants in teacher-education programs should work in community projects in addition to their regular work loads.

11. In place of traditional programs, which place a premium on youth, lack of university degrees, and less work or life experience, the selection of participants into teacher-education programs should give preferential treatment to older students who have completed university degrees and who have more work or life experience.

12. Decisions on who "passes" and becomes fully certified should be made by classroom teachers who have worked directly with the participants. University faculty and school administrators may make recommendations to these teachers.
13. Criteria for evaluating participants for certification must include means of assessing the progress of their children by means other than norm-referenced standardized tests.

14. Participants can be certified only if they have demonstrated success in multicultural classrooms.

15. Participants will demonstrate the ability to use cooperative instruction and specific methods that actively involve learners.

16. Programs are capable of being institutionalized and are not merely experimental, pilot, demonstration, or dependent on temporary funding.

17. Participants have broad backgrounds in general or liberal studies needed for teacher citizens and may demonstrate this background by means that include but are not limited to university course work.

18. Committee meetings planning the program must never take more time than offering it.

These 18 criteria are starters. I have found four programs that meet the criteria and in which I am pleased to be involved. There will be many others for all teacher educators who wish to become involved.

Graduates of teacher-education programs have consistently claimed their programs did not adequately prepare them and have demonstrated these inadequacies by leaving the most difficult situations. Crack babies; abused children; and children in need of food, shelter, and basic health care are, unfortunately, not connected in the public mind with teacher education and its great relevance.

Does teacher education have redeeming social significance, or is it essentially a system devoted to the self-serving purposes of those engaged in it? Teacher educators must answer this question for themselves and for the American people—not for university administrators, not for state certification officers, and not for legislators. At this point, less than 7 percent of Americans even regard “finding good teachers” an educational concern. Most Americans simply do not believe that improving teacher education will solve the problems children and teachers face in schools. Indeed, they tend to believe the reverse: that restructuring schools to meet the challenges they face will be achieved by circumventing traditional ways of preparing teachers.

Teacher educators now face convincing an increasingly dubious society of the benefits of more thorough, more costly forms of university-based teacher education. University-based teacher education, to continue into the 21st century, will have to do more than draw on bits and pieces of theory, research, and practice and glorify this approach as “the knowledge base.” It will have to become committed to an ideology that includes but transcends these ways of knowing—an ideology that meets the educational needs of a modern, urban society. Would it not be better for teacher educators to have an openly stated, basic set of operating principles and commitments that everyone may not fully agree with, than to pretend that preparing teachers is
a value-free activity that can be conducted in isolation from society's most pressing problems?

Does teacher education have redeeming social significance? If it does, the time left for demonstrating that universities can prepare teachers for the real world is quickly running out. In the words of Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar*:

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat,
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.²

²This article is a slightly revised version of the 1990 Distinguished Lecture given by the author at the annual conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, NV, February 1990