

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 718

SP 006 767

TITLE August Document. [The Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers.]

INSTITUTION Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.

PUB DATE Aug 72

NOTE 32p.

AVAILABLE FROM Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 338 Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Course Content; *Educational Programs; *Preservice Education; *Program Content; *Student Teachers; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Presented is a condensation of the research completed by the study commission on the Undergraduate Education of Teachers, University of Nebraska. Recommendations on the Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel (UPEP) are made. Also, some points discussed as obstacles to educational change are a) accreditation, b) federal funding and management roles, c) the education of teachers, and d) future studies and planning in education. (A list of educational acronyms is included.) (JB)

ED 081718

APR 27 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
1201 KENNEDY DRIVE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004
TELEPHONE: 202-854-6000

AUGUST DOCUMENT

(This is a condensation of the arguments of each chapter which incorporates some of the changes requested by members of the Study Commission at its meeting August 22 to 25 at Wingspread at Racine, Wisconsin. It also includes the recommendations proposed by committees working on the various chapters and adopted by the full Commission.)

[Glossary of Education Acronyms is on last page.]

(Footnotes documenting statistics and references to opinions and research of others are included in the complete version of the August Document, now being revised. Copies--or answers to specific questions--can be requested from the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 338 Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.)

P 006 767



AUGUST DOCUMENT

(Summary and New Recommendations approved by
the full Commission at the Wingspread meeting
August 21 - 25, 1972)

Chapter I. The Study Commission: Basis and Purpose

Authorized and funded by Congress through the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Study Commission has a mandate to help change the character of undergraduate education and the education of teachers.

Through UPEP (Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel) and other federal funding agencies, the Study Commission hopes to influence the placing of federal dollars where they will come closest to accomplishing certain goals. One of the goals--a transcendent one--is to create a new sense of community between the educational sector and the rest of society. People should be able to move productively from one segment of living to another, and to do this, they may need a new kind of critical and technical education.

America has time and again rejected totalitarian planning and controls, and this means that individuals and their groups and institutions must continually reappraise their relationships. Though the choices must ultimately be made by each individual or each group, schools must train children and adults alike to at least recognize those aspects of social change which advance the common good.

To help people function in an increasingly complex society, education needs to encourage critical reexaminations of society and of individuals. A growing sense of self, a capability to hold a meaningful job, and a capacity to understand and perhaps control physical and social forces--these will enable a person to cope with and enjoy a world less simplistically divided into good and bad, black and white. Any "educated" person should be able to accept and respect the rights of adversaries. But education must also communicate the skills needed for mutual survival in groups--hopefully but not necessarily decent and humane groups.

To meet these two objectives--individual development and social development--what kind of learning environments should be supported? Recent research suggests that communities which best encourage intellectual and emotional growth tend to be ones where important groups are small. They tend to be groups in which youth and age, work and play, education and vocation, are not neatly separated. Competition in such communities is present but not a dominant characteristic, and no one--young or old--is encouraged to feel that he stands alone. Such a supportive community

seems especially important for children who have been affected by oppression and racism. The school and community to which such children belong and in which they learn must have--as much as possible--authority structures which will not be disrupted by, nor made dependent on, outside authority structures.

The Study Commission believes that such schools and communities exist and that more like them can be encouraged. Consequently, the Study Commission will begin to create networks and coalitions among a wide range of alternative and reforming institutions and programs which are working toward Study Commission goals through education--particularly through education of future teachers. The existing models--imperfect in many ways--will no doubt be in a continual process of change, but they will influence emerging institutions as they grow, much as a teacher who is still learning affects the students he or she works with.

The Study Commission envisions no "finished" product--either in model institutions or in "model" teachers. The teacher truly "educated" to work toward becoming autonomous; psychologically whole and intellectually complete knows he or she will never reach that goal. An institution which turns out teachers who think they have already reached these goals--who believe they are "educated"--has failed.

We assume that future teachers will perform a broad range of human services. They may work in the streets, in jails, in hospitals, in industrial settings. And they will work with various age groups. Thus sites for teacher education must be varied, preferably small, and open to many alternatives. It is essential that these sites include cultural settings outside the mainstream of American life. Moreover, professors and students alike--in liberal arts especially--must realize that every course is a living example of teaching style and methods which greatly influences the future teacher. (The increased awareness--if accomplished--may lead to a rethinking of the division of academic disciplines, in education as well as in the liberal arts).

The Study Commission intends to support alternative schools and programs which are promoting creative new developments in education in order to produce teachers who are effective not only in front of a classroom but also throughout the community.

Recommendations on the UPEP Program:

1. It should distinguish between schooling and education and support those institutions, organizations, and groups offering appropriate education, whether or not they are constituted as formal schools.

2. It should be considered a high risk program that seeks development of significant, alternative means to educate teachers. It should not limit itself to seeking incremental, institutional reform.

2,

3. It should focus on "quality" as opposed to "quantity" and develop its notions of "quality" in terms of a broadened definition of teachers and a well articulated notion of what constitutes a decent, human community.

4. It should be built on the foundation of Study Commission recommendations and make use of Study Commission resources.

5. It should create a monitoring and training system that draws on the continuing action-research of the Study Commission, so program modifications can be responsibly made.

Recommendations on the Study Commission

1. The Study Commission should not limit its efforts solely to the UPEP program but heed Associate Commissioner Smith's mandate to begin a "Zacharias-like project, one that can be expected to reform American education for all children in a profound, but necessary way."

2. The Study Commission should continue to pursue a policy of continuous open dialogue with the UPEP Task Force, as well as other components in the Office of Education and other federal agencies, in order to establish a "confirmatory mechanism," which will continue Study Commission thrusts after the end of the Commission itself.

3. The Study Commission, in seeking to develop strategies for teacher education that significantly relate to and assist in building communities, should avoid undermining Commission ideals by its mode of operation. More specifically, the Study Commission should:

- (a) open up its policy-making mechanisms by aggressively seeking involvement of hitherto excluded groups;
- (b) undertake efforts to reshape the existing management strategies in and among educational agencies that undermine the goals of the Commission;
- (c) assume an advocacy role in relation to funding agencies, pushing for opening up policy and funding processes and for recognizing legitimacy of individuals, groups and institutions presently denied eligibility.

4. The Study Commission should recognize the limitations of its fiscal and human resources and seek to develop relationships with other groups, organizations and individuals who seek goals consonant with those of the Study Commission.

5. The Study Commission should conduct site visits in connection with the UPEP program--before and after UPEP grant awards--and provide technical assistance to UPEP institutions.

Long-Range Recommendations

1. Educational policy-making at all levels should foster development of indigenous authority structures.
2. The federal role should be to help communities develop responsive educational institutions.
3. Rigorous development of paradigms for the educational process should be given primacy in federal agencies and institutions of higher education.
4. Federal agencies should create a coherent, coordinated policy with regard to the education of teachers.
5. Federal agencies should open up the proposal-reviewing procedures. Federal guidelines should be established and published. And the public should have access to these.

Chapter II. Obstacles to Change: How Teachers are Locked Into (or Out of) the Status Quo

Two obstacles to change in education demand attention. The first is the system of mutually supportive accreditation and credentialling mechanisms. The second is the power of professional societies to determine credentialling, accreditation, and reward systems in liberal arts disciplines.

It is not hard to demonstrate that accreditation and credentialling are largely ineffective. Several research studies show that credentialed persons are no better teachers than comparably educated or skilled people without teacher training. College grades and evaluation apparently bear little relation to civic performance or to the teacher's performance as a teacher. Some new programs designed to meet America's developing needs are either not accredited or face loss of accreditation. Many potential teachers who could be of unique value (for example, potential teachers who can speak a child's first language) are being kept from the classroom by present accreditation or credentialling practices.

Where mechanisms set up to assure "quality" do not deliver quality, where they may even be suspected of preventing quality, goals will not be realized. (And since the Justice Department has recently begun to take an interest in the monopoly powers of accrediting associations, reforms may be forthcoming.) In effect, the credentialling and accrediting systems, though designed to insure quality in American education, have often come to hamper education instead--perhaps because teacher training institutions have changed considerably since the agencies were formed.

Many teachers colleges have become "state colleges" and "state universities" with the result that the responsibilities for teacher education are divided between education faculties and liberal arts faculties. And recent curriculum reform movements have given increased emphasis to arts and sciences courses while some education courses were losing favor. In most institutions now, about 80 per cent of the undergraduate education major's time is spent in liberal arts courses, 10 per cent in fundamental education courses, and 10 per cent in actual contact with students.

The demise of the laboratory school, deserved as it may have been, caused another splintering of teacher education. The school system now houses the practice teaching segment, and all the education college has left are the foundations and methods courses, a support role in practice teaching, and a negotiation role in relation to arts and sciences colleges. This fragmentation of teacher training means that the bulk of teacher training is no longer done at mission-oriented institutions which controlled the total system for teacher education. It is no longer done mostly at the sorts of small colleges (under 10,000) which Astin's research shows to be most supportive of the student; and it is no longer done where teaching is the prime activity (research and consulting take precedence in many large institutions).

Partly as a result of these changes, credentialling and accrediting agencies outside the training institutions --state agencies, regional agencies, and national agencies--have become more powerful. Institutions must often satisfy all three levels:

State: State agencies, usually state boards of education, often rely on regional (for example, North Central Association) or national (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education--NCATE) agencies. A few states have their own procedures, but most will not credential teachers from other states unless their programs have been accredited by regional or national agencies. State agencies often have veto power over national accreditation, however, since NCATE will approve no institution not already approved by the state. Thus when the states require (as some do) that regional accreditation be obtained first (before state accreditation), they are deputizing some of their legal power and are placing half of the accrediting system outside the state. Sooner or later such action will probably be successfully challenged in the courts.

Regional: Regional accreditation also must precede NCATE approval, and regional agencies usually require approval of courses in the disciplines (though not the pattern of courses). So the liberal arts component is judged by regional agencies, and good teaching seems to be a minor concern. Instead, fiscal stability, along with federal grants and contracts, seem to be the chief factors in determining quality of institutions. Graduate values tend to be emphasized in the accrediting of large institutions.

National: NCATE and NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification) exercise considerable power at this level. NCATE concentrates on the "education" segment of training--checking libraries, media centers, faculty office facilities, etc., and requiring that the institutions have "an administrative unit which has primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers". NCATE visitation teams (usually short on representation from the academic disciplines, the larger community, minority communities and student groups,) in their site visits, do not examine or evaluate the 80 per cent of teacher education that takes place in the liberal arts sector. This is left to the regional agencies. On the whole, the NCATE accrediting arrangement works against the creation of innovative institutions except where large fiscal resources are in the picture. A new college must first be on a "state approved" list; then it must have regional accreditation; finally it needs national approval. As stated before, some states require regional accreditation before they will give state approval. But the real handicap in this circular route is that it must have graduated students from its program. Obviously, it is difficult to attract students to graduate from a non-accredited school, but the school cannot be approved until it has graduates. The only answer seems to be an alliance with an already-approved college which grants the degrees for the newly-formed institution. Many new colleges have used this method, and Study Commission networks may facilitate this possibility.

The model "state approved" programs developed by NASDTEC, on the other hand, do attempt to treat the whole of the future teacher's education--including the liberal arts component. NASDTEC is not itself an accrediting agency, but it sets standards for state accreditation and, through subjects to be covered, course lists (in most cases really lists and disciplines requirements), helps determine credentialing standards. The rigidity of its lists and its emphasis on graduate-school oriented undergraduate work--perhaps because of its alliances with professional societies--makes NASDTEC work as much an obstacle for alternative institutions as NCATE does.

Some of the best teaching may now be going on at new cluster colleges and other experimenting colleges, yet they are often ignoring and being ignored by colleges of education--and by the outside accrediting agencies. This is not to say that NCATE and NASDTEC oppose innovation and change in education. It is to say that the effect of their structures--combined with those of state and regional agencies, is often to reduce the likelihood of innovative change.

Credentiailling and licensing of teachers is closely tied to the accrediting agencies also, since most states license teachers on the basis of their fulfilling accredited institution's requirements. A few states add local requirements which discourage reciprocity, and there is a movement by some teacher organizations to standardize state requirements (this is also an attempt by teachers to control their own licensing, as some other professions do).

The existing credentiailling-accrediting system appears to have come to be an obstacle to educational improvements needed now. The deleterious effects of the system have been encouraged and reinforced by a second system: that of the professional societies in the disciplines. Some professional societies do their own credentiailling, notably those presiding over music, chemistry, and clinical psychology. Others exert a strong influence over credentiailling, school curriculum, and higher education-approved programs developed by state education departments. They are discipline-oriented organizations. Twenty-one major professional societies have a major effect on undergraduate education. The very existence of professional societies may be an impediment to experimenting with teaching approaches that are not discipline-bound.

It is significant that nowhere in the whole rule structure for accrediting or credentiailling is there a requirement that a teacher ought to speak the first language or dialect of the children he teaches. Instead an estimated six million of American's forty-one million school children face teachers who don't speak their language or dialect.

On the other hand, the credentiailling system excludes personnel who by criteria of competence should be permitted to teach. The superintendent of schools in a school system attended predominantly by Winnebago children refused to allow the teaching of the Winnebago language on the grounds that no credentiailled teacher could be found--that is, one having 30 or more hours of college credit in Winnebago. (No institution in the region offered 30 hours in Plains Indian topics, let alone Winnebago topics.) Yet several people in the area demonstrably knew the Winnebago language and history, and desired to teach it.

The present situation of American education is thus paradoxical in the extreme. At the level of individual teacher training institutions, the mission of quality education has been lost and fragmented in antagonisms between college and school people, between liberal arts and education people. But at the level of the national organizations, educator-controlled organizations and discipline-controlled organizations repeatedly reinforce each other and collectively elaborate self-serving rule systems which insure the fragmentation of the system.

Recommendations on Accreditation and Credentialing

Introduction

The issues which surround eligibility for receiving federal funds, credentialing of educational personnel, and accreditation are enormously complex. We do not believe that the complexities will disappear or that existing processes will collapse on the basis of the Study Commission recommendations. We do believe, however, that a process of significant reform can be started by forceful leadership.

We acknowledge that present practices are not controlled by evil people, that the original purposes of credentialing and accrediting processes were possibly valid, that there is considerable pressure within the public and private agencies which control credentialing and accrediting for reform. While present practices "encourage responsible experimentation," they also tend to support uniformity; while the controlling agencies have acknowledged their failure in meeting the needs of minority people and to contend with the broader issues relating to cultural pluralism, their practices do not suggest they are capable of attending to such concerns in a reasonable period of time; while they contend that their purposes are to promote quality among educational personnel, there remains considerable evidence that the processes for assuring quality keep out of education many persons who could provide quality teaching; while they express growing concern about the interests of consumers, they continue to be more supportive of professional interests.

We could as a Commission encourage existing agencies to reform themselves more rapidly, to involve a broader base of people and interests, to use a less narrow approach to standards. Our proposal, in fact, supports doing just that. But it also calls for the Study Commission to take active leadership in establishing some new, more responsive processes, some alternatives to what exists, some significant support to reform that incorporates the basic hopes and values expressed in the August document. Will our new forms be better than the old? We think so! If nothing else, the processes will be more open, simpler and more understandable.

At present the accreditation of teacher education institutions, their eligibility to receive federal funds and the credentialing of teachers are part of one interlocking set of procedures. The following recommendations (1) make the determination of eligibility for federal funds an independent process related to the financial responsibility of institutions and their open disclosure of programs (2) make the award of credentials independent of national accreditation and (3) call for a redefinition of the functions of existing accreditation bodies.

Eligibility

Federal funds are now channeled to institutions on the basis of decisions by private accrediting agencies. A new policy is needed--one based upon the recognition that the standards appropriate for determining eligibility for Federal funds need not, and should not, be identical with the standards of educational quality applied by accrediting agencies. In brief, the Federal government should be more attentive to a more carefully delimited area. It should be more involved in determining eligibility and less involved in the process of accreditation, per se. We recommend that the Federal government distinguish the function of determining eligibility from the function of accreditation and establish minimum national standards for eligibility. Standards for eligibility should not involve standards of educational quality but a determination that:

1. an institution is financially responsible and thus can be held accountable for investment of student resources and public funds;

2. the recruitment and public information policies of an institution present an honest and accurate picture of its educational programs and performance;
3. an institution makes available a prospectus on its financial and educational status, so students and other interested parties can decide on their own whether the institution meets their needs and interests and is worthy of an investment of time and money.

In supporting the foregoing, we wish to see the question of eligibility separated from credentialling and accreditation, as well as a simplification of existing practices. We recognize that some agency (public interest body) must bear the responsibility for implementing this recommendation. The Study Commission should join the Newman Commission in addressing the question of how such an agency might function and be organized. We also recommend that there be a complete appeals process related to the foregoing recommendation.

Credentialling

The Commission should provide forceful leadership in collaboration with other groups (eg. Union of Experimenting Colleges, Puerto Rican Research Center, Center for Research in Higher Education, Berkeley, National Student Association, Doyle-Ford Task Force, Newman Commission) to prepare model legislation, including alternative mechanisms for credentialling and licensing of teachers. In doing so, we urge the Commission to take leadership in bringing together representatives from state educational agencies, NCATE, and other such interested parties, to examine and evaluate such legislation.

The legislation should provide for:

1. licensing reciprocity among the states which is independent of private accrediting agencies.
2. the delegation of the basic responsibility for credentialling to institutions educating the teacher--i.e., a combination of an institution of higher education and a school that is concerned with the preparation of teachers. Such schools might be public, private, community controlled, etc. We believe the credentialling process should be simple and based on a broadly conceived (beyond behavioral objectives) competency base as demonstrated in a school setting. Institutions should be expected to provide as part of their credentialling process a dossier which includes a statement of the individual's general competencies, information and experience of the teacher, as well as a statement of the teacher's capacity to function in a specific prototypical environment. Moreover the dossier should specify not only matters relating to the teacher's individual performance, but also to his performance of a role in a conceived system of roles; his community building skills, and capacity to act, accountable to a group and in a group. Because we believe that an institution of higher education and a school might not be above parochial interest, we feel that model legislation should determine the eligibility of the foregoing credentialling institutions on the basis of the following:

--information provided by the institution involved;

--information about the institution provided by other evaluators such as students, parents, and professional groups. Such evaluation should include low-income and minority representation;

--such evaluative information be made a matter of public record.

It is clear that the individual states have the legal responsibility for determining who is competent to credential and license. It is our recommendation that that state power be vested in a Public Interest Commission with special attention to its broad public base. Again, care should be taken to provide for open appeals procedures.

3. Alternative mechanisms, such as the Newman Commissions Regional Examining University, to award credentials to those who can demonstrate teaching competence in performance settings regardless of formal academic credentials and their route of preparation.

THE FOREGOING WOULD ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR NATIONAL ACCREDITATION
AS WE KNOW IT

New Role for Accreditation Groups

NCATE and the regional accrediting agencies exist, are recognized, and might provide valuable aid in institutional self-improvement and consumer information until such time as new procedures become fully operational. This would demand, however,

a broader base of membership on its committees including students, liberal arts faculty, individuals from experimental colleges, community representatives, minorities, etc.

standards that promote diversity among institutions in their missions, student composition, structures, and educational philosophies.

open procedures of evaluation and appeal of decisions.

We recommend that the Commission encourage NCATE to reform itself in accordance with the foregoing and to engage in experimentation and action research with the Commission and other groups. The action research might include:

new processes of evaluation

new kinds of evaluators

development of new priorities and criteria

parallel visitation teams (NCATE and Commission appointed) to evaluate selected programs.

The Commission will also investigate the possibility of developing and supporting, in conjunction with other experimenting groups, an alternative accrediting agency.

Legal Question

Throughout our discussion there were continual questions that arose concerning possible legal action in this area of credentialling and accrediting. We recommend that the Commission seek legal assistance to investigate:

1. the relationship of Griggs-Duke power case to question relating to credentialling and accreditation; the question here is the relationship of job "requirements" (e.g. a college degree) to the ability to do a certain job;
2. the non-reciprocity of teaching credentials between states as a possible example of restraint of trade;
3. the lack of legislation concerning monopoly powers of private, non-profit organizations; at present the anti-trust legislation does not apply to non-profit organizations such as accrediting bodies;
4. challenges to compulsory education (follow-up of the Yoder Case).

Reform of Undergraduate Education in the Disciplines

In order for teacher preparation to be carried out in a manner consonant with the values expressed in the August Document as a whole, the entire undergraduate education of prospective teachers needs to be reformed. Unfortunate controls appears to be exercised by some professional accrediting associations on a segment of the course offerings at the liberal arts undergraduate level. Our thrust toward opening up and simplifying requirements in professional education holds for these segments as well as for the "professional education" accrediting groups. Our recommendation is to free the prospective teacher from such artificial constraints imposed by professional or guild groups, as may not actually enhance a teacher-to-be's capacity. To do a job we await the reports of Mike Bowers, William Arrowsmith and Pat Dolan for specific recommendations as to what is functional and what is non-functional in the present discipline-related or professional society-related schemes for valuing, evaluating and legislating how to conduct the education of teachers, in Higher Education or in the schools.

Chapter III. Obstacles to Change in the Federal Funding and Management

Role

The previous chapter argued that the building of significant learning communities among teachers-to-be, teachers, and students and their parents may be impeded by public and private systems legalizing the trivial, ignoring the significant, and discouraging the different. This chapter argues that such a sense of community may also be destroyed by governmental systems. These are the systems for the collection of information concerning education, the agencies which intervene in education at all levels, and the government management systems which allot money and assess how effectively it was spent.

Education, with few exceptions, derives its revenues from what Kenneth Boulding has called "the grants economy," an economy characterized by a one-way, non-reciprocal transfer of funds. In this transfer, the educational institution gains and the grantor (or the taxpayer's individual bankroll) is reduced. In the grants economy, and especially in education, the persons who receive "education" are not usually the people who pay for it. And frequently those who administer the educational enterprise are responsive neither to the people who pay nor to those whom they seek to educate. In developing management tools for education, there is an assumption of immunity. For example, in the information collecting system for higher education, only accredited or nearly-accredited institutions are included.

Moreover, the collecting agencies appear to ignore major new or emerging social priorities as they collect data. When the data are collected, those who participate in resulting management systems are almost always representatives of mainstream educational institutions. In no instance that we have been able to find have data been generated on the basis of needs defined by persons or groups outside the educational system--parents, employers, community action programs, for example.

Another limitation on data now collected is the typical taxonomy used to collect data. At present, for instance, an institution of higher education is apparently defined as one that generates credit hours, confers degrees, has a geographical location to which its students and faculty come, and includes a library. What this means is that institutions working on a contract system instead of a credit hour system (for instance, Evergreen State, New College at Sarasota, Florida, and Minnesota Metropolitan State University) and enterprises such as the University Without Walls and the Campus-Free College are not included, since they either lack the conventional systems or conventional buildings. The taxonomy of collecting data, then, means that data on divergent educational institutions or divergent segments of larger institutions is not collected, at least in usable form, and this encourages an unhealthy homogenization of higher education.

Analysis of benefits of education, or the collection of statistical information, to be meaningful, must have behind it a shared or at least mutually tolerated conception of what is useful or essential, and this is difficult to obtain. It is impossible, in fact, for any individual or single group to create standards for what is meaningful in collecting data, but a process for that creation can be suggested, and it is important to remember that information gathered about educational institutions can only provide indirect indications of "benefits" or "quality" of the institution's services. Only when data gathering has become more representative and reflective of client needs can spending be managed beneficially for the kind of teacher education the Study Commission envisions.

Certainly, no one would argue that money can insure quality education. There is reason to believe, however, that the lack of money can inhibit effective teacher education. The hypotheses with which the Newman Commission began its analysis of the loss of mission in institutions for higher education are germane to this point:

1. The shifting social and financial base for higher education has undermined support for institutions concerned with the particular needs and interests of any one group.
2. The federal government has encouraged many universities to become huge conglomerates, operating laboratories and other projects only tangentially related to teaching and research.
3. State governments have assigned roles to whole classes of institutions in an effort to systemize the provision of higher education throughout the state.
4. The public has assumed that the needs of students for educational choices can be satisfied through comprehensive and complex institutions which offer a range of courses of instruction--without asking whether the institutions themselves have to be diverse before students will have meaningful options. The affluence of higher education in the decades of the 1950's and 1960's eliminated the necessity of institutions to ask themselves tough questions about where they are going and what they do best.

The resultant loss of mission seen by the Newman Commission has been most noticeable in teacher education. The mission to bring education to the common people and literacy to the illiterate was often tied to a clear sense of ethnicity and culture of the groups served. Local graduates of the old "normal schools" were usually locally employed, and they could be educated for that locality.

It has been effectively argued by some members of the Study Commission that we have never had a national sense of mission in teacher education--that the Emporia States of the 20's and 30's were unique, and that teacher education nationally has never been motivated by a clear sense of such requirements for a profession as rigorous recruiting systems and first-rate professional schools. What sense of mission there was existed locally in individual institutions. And that was lost as their individuality was assimilated to state systems. Many now seek to recover some sense of mission. Many appear to be aware--however superficially--that they cannot continue to be racist, culture-closed institutions designed to meet the needs of other times and other places. However, conventional budgeting processes--both inadequate funding and misplaced funding-- may impede their efforts to recover or develop that sense of mission. The problem is illustrated by the fact that more than 50 per cent of teacher education is done at poorly-funded institutions, including state, private, and some land grant colleges. An institution scrambling for survival money is particularly subject to pressures toward homogenization and political-educational conformity. Censure proceedings by the American Association of University Professors fall heavily on such institutions. They are often harshly constrained by the political pressures of state college boards in areas where budgetary pressures, program planning pressures, and political-intellectual pressures meet. Conformity pressures are particularly strong in the multi-campus state systems.

Perhaps the most miserably funded segment of the education program is the technical, or practice teaching, segment. Doing away with the laboratory schools and placing practice teaching in the public schools has created an impossible funding situation. The cooperating teacher, as an employee of the public schools, gets no pay, or almost none, for her extra work of supervising student teachers. The college supervisor is paid to work with the cooperating teacher, but he may have 60 to one hundred teachers to work with, thus seeing each one only two or three times a semester. The budgetary constraints seem to be reflected in professorial attitudes, as Milton Schwebel found when he examined professional tolerance of controversy and dissenting ideas. Institutions which educate teachers, he found, were likely to have professors with lower tolerance for non-conformity, and these same institutions often had more than 70 per cent of the faculty rated as "authoritarian."

What kind of teachers, and teacher trainers, do we need instead, and how can federal funding promote the development of this kind of teacher? We can hypothesize that future teachers need (1) a clear competence in the field or craft they teach; (2) a capacity to think, imagine, and feel alongside the child while leading and being led by the child; (3) enough knowledge and skill with regard to the child's community to fit the educational community to that of the street community. There is some evidence that people who intend to become teachers do not possess these skills, nor do they develop them in college. Many seem to end up in teaching after they find they can't make it as scientists, doctors, or engineers.

If anything can be done about the problems of future teachers, the adequate collection of data and the direction of federal spending must consider the following needs: (1) the development of a good information system with respect to what kinds of teachers are needed and what kinds of teachers we are getting; (2) good entry tests and counselling practices to determine which people should stay in the profession and which should be counselled out; (3) separation of degrees and certification; (4) development of systems relating the experience of future teachers in practice teaching to experience in real schools; and (5) adequate federal communication of precisely what kinds of people are needed in the teaching profession.

The federal government's role in teacher education funding has generally been to develop temporary systems with purchase of services funding or constituency funding. Some of the programs, such as the Career Opportunities Program or the Teachers Corps, have had some institutional effect, but generally they have not been set up to promote permanent systemic change in their colleges.

Future federal funding must provide for (1) effective needs assessments, group by group, neighborhood by neighborhood, culture by culture, by the clients themselves; (2) state and local mission-oriented planning, which might include discouraging some institutions from training teachers and encouraging others to educate more specifically for certain needs; (3) support for "counter-systems" which have clear local and cultural commitment; (4) support for institution-wide "community" change as opposed to constituency or "great name"-centered change; (5) federally-supported scholarships which enable the student to choose his own college, thus promoting student-supported growth; and (6) federal funding which calls attention to, and helps to remedy, state funding patterns for teacher education which are ineffective.

Recommendations:

1. The federal government should expand funding programs for experimental community-run schools and alternative public school systems which can be used as models for new teacher training experiences. If necessary, USOE and HEW should initiate legislation authorizing federal funding of non-accredited public and private universities, public schools, non-profit and community and student corporations, alternative schools, and proprietary institutions.

2. An aggressive policy of disseminating information about new role-models for teachers should be undertaken by HEW.

3. The configuration of associations, groups, and persons consulted with, or invited to participate in, the creation of information collection systems concerning education needs to be altered by (at least) including (1) those educating teachers, (2) persons, groups, and communities who have developed non-conventional formats or institutions that include the education of teachers; (3) those served by institutions of higher education and the schools--students and communities (and particularly minority, non-mainstream cultural communities and groups).

4. Information collection systems such as NCES and NCHEMS should collect and render accessible information sufficiently detailed and multi-dimensional and sufficiently timely to permit sound policy-making and resource allocation at all levels. National information collection systems should collect information of a non-aggregate variety that can be refined and used at regional, state, and local levels.

Further these information systems should be policy-oriented so as to allow generation of data useful in assessing present policies and creation of modifications or new policies as dictated by the data. Such data must go beyond conventional financial and statistical data to include information that enables assessment of policy-benefits and outputs in terms of other recommendations, and goals, and values set forth in this document.

5. The present information systems, particularly HEGIS and ELSEGIS, should be brought into coherent relationship to permit sound educational policy-making across the educational spectrum, and not merely with respect to one segment.

6. NCHEMS should take responsibility for development of a component or program collecting data on elementary and secondary education, and this effort should be consonant with its efforts in higher education.

7. Since it appears that data available at the state level suffers from the same, if not more severe, inadequacies as that collected at the federal level, the National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems should continue to increase its efforts to give special attention to the development, at the state level, of management systems and resource allocation systems promoting mission-oriented, unified institutional programs serving arts and science-education colleges and including clinical schools set in state school systems but getting their resources elsewhere. NCHEMS should seek special federal funding for this purpose with the provision that means are furnished for consumers to participate in planning diversified institutional missions, as well as developing and applying measurements of success.

8. The federal government should offer categorical grants to state higher education planning boards mandated under the recent amendments to the Higher Education Act. These grants would be for the purpose of developing "pilot" or model state plans that focus on the following issues: (1) The reassessment of institutions and systems under pressure from the putative teacher surplus, and in light of that reassessment to phase out teacher education programs where necessary and develop other institutional missions; (2) to create or encourage creation of alternative formats or institutions for the education of teachers; (3) rethinking recruitment selection and credentialing policies; and (4) providing mechanisms for state approval or accreditation for formats or institutions referred to in (2) above.

These grants would be planning grants and would not support transitional efforts. Further, these grants should be made to states where there is potential and pressure for the development of a management system capable of addressing the issues above. California, as a result of the Ryan Bill, and New York, as a result of the Fleischmann Commission's work, appear to be likely places. Consumer groups need to be represented in these processes in the ways or ways similar to those apparently being employed at the University of Cincinnati, Universidad de Atzlan, and other places.

9. HEW and other appropriate agencies should be encouraged to seek statutory authority for the Assistant Secretary for Education to coordinate planning among federal agencies (including at least NSF, NEH, USOE, NIE and the Foundation for Post-Secondary Education) that impinge on, or conduct programs aimed at, the education of teachers.

10. USOE should channel up to 50 per cent of the funds for educating teachers into targeted developmental funding (as opposed to training grants) to create coherent, mission-oriented, holistic cross-system programs for educating teachers. These programs should respond to areas of critical educational need.

11. The Study Commission should (across the next two years) undertake development of specific indices to be used in identifying the "critical educational needs" referred to in this document and necessary to implementation of Recommendation 8.

12. The Study Commission should encourage a federal grants and contracts policy that depends on developmental instead of temporary systems funding for all federal non-scholarship monies going into the education of teachers. This would include: (a) using federal monies to foster long-term institutional planning related to needs; (b) securing commitments to the planning through all governance structures of the institution; (c) receiving from institutional governing bodies a statement of intention to assume support after federal monies are withdrawn; (d) requiring long-term (5 to 8 years) funding. Item (c) would be required only of institutions presently conducting accredited teacher education programs. Specifically, the UPEP program guidelines should establish and provide for monitoring at local institutions a planning process that insures participation by students, communities, schools, colleges of arts and sciences and colleges of education. Sufficient "salary and expense" monies should be made available to enable adequate, responsible monitoring by the USOE staff. Responsibility for local programs should be vested in an academic officer with institution-wide responsibilities. Community needs should be assessed, and product assessment and credentialling should also be jointly undertaken.

13. The Study Commission should request the Assistant Secretary for Education to commission research necessary to some basic resolution of the issue heretofore stated in this document regarding selection of teachers, institutional mission or development, and funding. This research could be independent of existing agencies or could be coordinated through them (see Recommendations 4 through 7 above).

a. The Study Commission should request the Assistant Secretary for Education to commission research in the following specific areas:

- (1) Broad-gauged research on ethnic participation in institutions educating teachers, including research on ethnic representation of

the faculty (especially in decision-making roles), research on who applies to these institutions, and research on each institution's success in recruiting minorities and the success of minorities in graduating.

(2) The development of units and measures that meaningfully portray the inequalities of the teacher-educating institutions as they affect minorities.

(3) A series of intensive studies on institutions training most of the teachers (including one or two of the largest campuses of major state systems of one or two states with the largest school age populations). The purpose of these case studies would be (a) to provide more adequate statistical information that would reveal the models of success which operate on most students in training; and (b) to assess the content of training regarding the aspects of training reinforcing cultural homogenization and assimilation ideologies, and the aspects enculturating teachers into non-pluralistic values and goals; and regarding the accuracy of information provided concerning other cultures and American history.

(4) Studies concerning the accountability and credentialing mechanisms necessary to bring fully-developed cultural pluralism to the schools.

(5) Case studies of selected new schools which attempt to serve ethnic populations (schools such as Routh Rock, Navajo Community College, Malcolm X, Berkeley Experimental Schools, Chad School, etc.) in order to determine their success and the reasons for it, as well as the lessons from failures.

14. The UPEP program should support development of effective recruiting, screening, and counselling techniques to obtain the different, perhaps more competent cadre of prospective teachers described in other sections of this document.

15. The Study Commission should assume responsibility for development of models and strategies required to secure the development of the techniques described in Recommendation 14.

16. The UPEP program and its potential grantees should take cognizance of other federal programs in institutions educating teachers and encourage institutions seeking funding to bring coherence to these programs.

17. NIE should support longitudinal evaluations of UPEP program graduates, with information made available to both the UPEP program and institutions participating in UPEP, to enable policy and program modifications.

18. The Study Commission favors the thrust of some other national recommendations which have been made with respect to the statistics-gathering process. (See, for example, some of the testimony from Hearings before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate, Part 22, December 1, 2, 3, 1971.)

Chapter IV. The Technical and the Critical in the Education of Teachers: The Form of Education for Teachers.

It is, of course, not enough to say that there are obstacles in the way of the creation of good teacher education. One must have some conception of what good teacher education is. The Study Commission, in its Belmont statement, tried to define its conception of the function and process of education, and this statement will be included with UPEP program materials and guidelines. In general, the statement argues that education is a community-building process which ought to be client-controlled as much as possible and certainly client-influenced as far as language, kinesic style, and historical and cultural curricula are concerned. This community-building should include school clients of all ages, preferably in communities of less than 10,000 persons, and efforts should be made to coordinate work and play--or study, work and play--for students, teachers and other members of the community, while teachers are learning their trade.

To learn the craft of teaching is to learn at least two things: to learn to do or know something of value to a group and to learn to convey that something to the appropriate client. Education implies that participants are both part of the system (and can work in it) and also using the system to learn new theories for transforming the system. Thus while the education of teachers is commonly divided into "training" and "education," or into "technical" and "critical," neither of these means what it would if we were speaking of industrial systems or Manpower Training Act work.

The "technical" in teacher education is that part which is set in a subsystem where education is performed. The "critical" is that part which offers the teacher a perspective which might encourage him to change something.

One common learning assumption is that people will learn what they perceive to be in their interest to learn. However, there is some evidence that the American educational system has often been controlled by the affluent and powerful to the disadvantage of the poor, and that staffing, curriculum, teacher training, and disciplinary systems have been shaped accordingly. The poor have troublesomely responded to an institution which did not serve their interests by dropping out, getting "kicked out," or developing passive-aggressive tactics. Class control of the school intrudes itself in hiring, textbook selection, and practices for determining what share parents will have in the school process.

This is not to say that teachers, school authorities, and professional educators are not themselves the descendants of poor people--or of the marginally affluent. It is to say that they tend to be people who "left their class behind" with a special swiftness. Teachers come predominantly from white ethnic populations, upwardly mobile upper-lower or lower-middle class groups. What is at stake is that, by and large, people recruited to public educational leadership roles in colleges of education and in central school administrations are people for whom, subjectively, the "melting pot," upwardly mobile "Alger"

functions of the schools appear to have been fulfilled. Research shows them to have been upwardly mobile, partly at least, because their schools communicated the version of reality allowed by the class and interest groups which controlled them. Students on the Student Committee of the Study Commission have felt with increasing force in their own lives, the pressures of bureaucracy and censorship in the schools. They have come to see school routines as training for bureaucracy. They have stopped believing that schools are benign neutral agents.

Sexist discrimination, on the other hand, is not so much a matter of class as of caste. The student observes that the American elementary school promulgates through its staffing--male principal and female teachers and aides--and through its textbooks the notion that women should be quiet, passive, and interested in "creative" domestic pursuits while men must be hardy and athletic. Gay people are to be laughed at or persecuted.

Analyses of class, caste or sex as the basis of discrimination in American schools almost all admit that race and culture enter into the determination of who is and who is not served by the schools. Thus, rural Scandinavians who were relatively respectable, in cultural style, to controlling school groups apparently "made it" better than did urban Irish and Italians whose difference was marked by accents, appearance, and religion. Eastern European immigrants left schools in droves from 1900 to 1940. And until the 1950's it was hardly worth speaking of Black public education, at least in some sections of the South. When Blacks did come north to urban schools, they left or were forced from schools in about the same proportion as their Eastern European predecessors in Northern city ghettos. Chicanos and Indians who kept a tenacious hold on their non-mainstream language, religion, and culture were hit hardest of all.

It is the Study Commission's hope that through an awareness of America's "cultural pluralism" such educational inequities can be minimized or done away with--partly through education of elements outside the schools and partly through client elements (the community) helping to control the schools. As a theoretical basis, the Study Commission at its Wingspread meeting adopted the following definition of "cultural-social-economic pluralism" devised by the Commission's cultural pluralism committee:

Cultural-social-economic pluralism is the situation in a society where individuals and groups can function successfully in one, two, or more languages and cultural styles; where individuals can abide by and function successfully adhering to different customs and religions, adhering to less crippling class and sexual stereotypes than those accepted today, and where no one race, sex, culture or class is preferred over another.

The Commission realizes that much of the rhetoric acquiescing in the notion of cultural pluralism--particularly on the part of educational institutions--may be fake. There may be a tendency to idolize a segment of past culture to prevent having to deal with realities of present groups demanding power.

Acquisition of power and control--of schools and other institutions--need not depend on an intact traditional culture. Naturally mass communication and technology have watered down Sioux rituals, mythology and governance, just as modern life has altered the culture of Swedish Americans. It should be understood, however, that the claim on behalf of community control depends on the existence of sufficient custom and other traditional cultural "soft" behavior control devices so that the group is not dependent on sheer coercion for its unity. We can reiterate the essential principle stated by the Blueprint for Survival group in England: The higher the entropy or randomness of a social system, the greater must be the need for asystemic controls of which the most extreme kind is a dictator. It is out of such conditions that authoritarian groups like the Birch society and the Klan arise. The commitment to overtly violent social control methods seems to symbolize that the sense of community is gone. The cultural pluralism committee's point that formal control of the schools and of the education of teachers should lie in the hands of previously non-preferred groups, but that education is more than power, is a point well taken. The school is a culture. It creates a community for the child. And that community, in every area which pertains to his growth, should begin where he is and lead out from within. The school should foster the child's home community values even if, and perhaps particularly if, they are non-WASP values.

Critical Education:

It may be argued that some portion of the liberal arts traditions was always elitist, vocationally oriented and culture-specific in Europe and America. There is considerable evidence that the basic function of the medieval universities of Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge, as well as of the Italian universities, was not heuristic (to discover knowledge for its own sake) or therapeutic (to assist the individual to know himself) but vocational (to train clerics for the church and bureaucrats and clerks for the central court). This pattern of higher education continued through the Renaissance and into the 17th Century. With the founding of the Royal Society in the 17th Century, the main challenge came to the traditional curriculum, and a new kind of learning community came into existence.

By the middle of the 19th Century, the ideology of liberal education had changed from a primary concern with training people for a specific vocation to training people to adopt a "questioning attitude" or "research attitude" toward any field. The functions of the university had now become to help people see across from culture to culture and understand human and physical universals and to mediate between folk belief and science. The idea that liberal education should help create cosmopolitan man and bring about progress was widely heralded. The elective system developed as a way of demythologizing culture and letting the student make his own decisions as to how and where this demythologizing should take place.

The Morrill Act and subsequent development of Land Grant colleges reversed this process. The critical intellect was said to need a practical field. Now it was time for the popular university to prove its usefulness to mankind.

Today's liberal education ideology is that it is liberating and disinterested on the one hand, and on the other--and this is the argument presented to legislatures and funders--it has applicative functions which are fulfilled in professional colleges. The student teacher's education, then, beyond the craft level, should help develop the insights, knowledge and behavior which will be needed to make education serve the interests and survival needs of the child's class, culture, and person. In that case, the critical component can hardly be separated from the technical component, especially if the technical education takes place in the types of schools the Study Commission recommends.

Technical Education:

Educators and liberal arts professors have probably always endeavored to find the right balance between theory and practice, and a number of universities are developing an increasing use of videotaping, microteaching analysis and other methods for evaluating the teacher's performance. In general, however, the technical aspects of teacher education appear to be too brief and unanalytical and too encapsulated by the walls of the school and the mind-set of conventional school culture to relate theory to practice effectively. Several different models for remedying this have been proposed by Study Commission members. One model says that the university should do critical educating first, forget about the technical education of teachers, and allow it to be done in community settings analogous to Adams High School in Portland, Oregon (as it was first set up.) Another model--essentially a University Without Walls model--asserts that the student's whole experience should be field experience with theory being brought to bear on it constantly but with special retreats or study sessions provided periodically so the student can comprehend what he has been experiencing. Another model, perhaps a compromise, has suggested experimenting college theoretical training sandwiched with experience in experimenting common schools or free schools. Others have suggested that emphasis be placed on credentialling, through the sort of open university "competency examination" suggested by the Newman Commission and developed at Empire State. What will probably determine which of these models will prevail is the choice of settings where the models will be tried and the intensity with which experience and theory are pressed against each other in each model.

But the technical education--whatever its scope, duration, or relation to the theory--could take place in the type of school whose governance was described by a Study Commission committee at the Wingspread meeting. Such a community school for the technical education of teachers should have some or all of the characteristics listed by Murray Wax:

1. Rather than being isolated and enclosed from the community and larger society, the school would be open and permeable. Participation by students would be voluntary and faculty would be drawn from experts in the community as well as from the university, regardless of credentialling processes.
2. Building upon the particular cultural backgrounds of its pupils, the

school would enlarge its students' understanding of their own cultural heritage, while acquainting them with the culture of the larger society and with cultures elsewhere. This would necessarily include having teachers who speak the child's first language or dialect, and proficiency of students in those and other cultural skills would be emphasized rather than standardized test results.

3. Rather than individualistic performance and the age-grade lockstep, the community school would foster a variety of social and emotional relationships among its pupils--older children working with younger ones, for instance.
4. The school would foster the harmonious physical development of its pupils. This would include free meals, if necessary, and freedom to move about inside and out of the school.
5. Preference would be given to teacher preparation programs in which the teacher is engaged in work within an educational setting (school-based or not).
6. Provisions would be made to prepare teachers to teach people who are involved in work-study programs, or who are engaged in education in addition to other work or activities.
7. The notion of a community school for technical education of future teachers would accept the distinction now being made between education and schooling, in order that federal funds may go to organizations engaged in education which are not necessarily established as formal schools.

Obviously there will be tensions regarding the governance of the community school and its teacher education program. Will the university be in charge--either through the education or liberal arts college or through higher administrators? Will the superintendent of schools have control? Will the parents really provide a powerful voice in decision-making? Will the students and teachers and student teachers? The Study Commission committee working on this chapter at the Wingspread meeting proposed the following governance system:

Considering that the technical in teacher education is set in a subsystem or subsystems where education is performed, and that the critical is that part which offers the teacher a perspective which might encourage him to want to change something, the two might merge--the critical content may well evolve from the technical process--in the teacher's participation in the community school. The technical process would necessarily be determined by the governance structure of the community school for the technical education of teachers. Such a structure must assure parity in decision-making, planning, implementation and evaluation to all participants: community representatives, university administrators, school administrators, parents, school

faculty and university--education and liberal arts--faculty, students, and the teacher-clients of the school.

This process includes the following steps:

Step 1: Each group meets autonomously to carry on a dialogue for the mediating objects selected by that group and to produce a set of expectations to be used as a foundation for goal setting.

Step 2: Each group elects representatives to negotiate these expectations with other groups to formulate goal statements and to set priorities.

Step 3. Programs, courses and evaluation are designed and/or selected.

Step 4. The decisions made in Step 3 are implemented.

Step 5. The load design section in Step 3 is executed.

These steps are continually repeated as an on-going process with Step 5 feeding back into Step 1.

These are the other areas which the committee agreed needed to be strengthened in this chapter: Racism, sexism, cultural oppression and discrimination based on the conditions of poverty and homosexuality. Although all of these topics are mentioned in Chapter IV, they are not clearly spoken to, nor forcefully dealt with. Their role in both the critical and technical undergraduate education of teachers must be stressed if indeed we have the goal of a pluralistic, humane society.

Network of innovative programs and reforming institutions.

The network, if it is seen as a renewing and creative force in the process of creating alternative models for teacher education, needs to be defined both as to its purposes and operation. Several points need to be examined. A primary concern is that the network not become a passive type of information dissemination network.

Secondly, the network should not be a burden to those participating by imposing yet another bureaucratic structure on them. Informal channels of information sharing and exchange must be preserved, yet enough formal structure is needed for individuals to be able to easily tap into the information system. Probably most important in elaborating on the purpose of the network is to explain its more active role as an action resource and a change agent. Finally, the relationship between the community school for the technical education of teachers, the network, UPEP participating institutions, and the broader audience of teacher training institutions needs to be defined. This relationship, if it is pertinent to this chapter, should be an influence on both the technical and critical education of teachers in their undergraduate programs.

With these changes in Chapter IV, the supportive material will form a background for the following recommendations:

Recommendations:

1. The Office of Education should be strongly urged to use whatever means necessary to insure the maintenance of alternative means of the education of children. This effort should include direct funding of client-oriented non-profit organizations which are a viable setting for the technical education of teachers.

2. The UPEP program should select as a demonstration model some non-profit client-oriented organizations. These institutions should be considered as alternative means for producing change in the total undergraduate preparation of teachers.

3. The Study Commission should support as part of its Phase II effort the development of a network of client-oriented non-profit organizations and reforming institutions of teacher education which are responsive to the needs and control of their local communities and cultures. Existing informal networks of information should be encouraged and supported as part of this effort. The network will have the following functions:

- a) be a vehicle for collecting and disseminating information;
- b) be a means of action research for developing new resources, strategies and procedures in the undergraduate preparation of teachers;
- c) be a resource for providing services to participating agencies; and
- d) be an active force in initiating institutional change.

4. The network described in Recommendation 3 should become a model for the UPEP program. A portion of that network of UPEP institutions should participate in the dissemination of information regarding program designs and procedures which meet the goals set in the Belmont Value Statement.

5. The Office of Education should fund in addition to UPEP programs several school-community-based centers for providing technical education in the undergraduate preparation of teachers. Proposals should be sought that develop governance structures and processes suggested in Chapter IV or comparable alternatives achieving the goals of accountability to clients and their maximum participation in the total planning and evaluation process. These centers should be authorized to grant competency credentials along the lines proposed in Chapter II. They should test, where possible, the feasibility of various governance patterns including institutions of higher education, public schools, non-profit community-based schools and consortiums and to determine which patterns provide institutional change based on feedback from competency evaluation.

6. Programs for the recruitment and retraining of administrators and institutions of higher education personnel for UPEP and other federal programs should be developed.

7. Realizing that the UPEP Program serves the undergraduate education of teachers, community schools must serve both preservice and inservice training of teachers, since the undergraduate teachers must have a positive environment in which to learn. The Office of Education should encourage the development of a combined UPEP undergraduate program and inservice training program.

8. The Office of Education should give preference to funding programs which encourage client participation along lines as described in Chapter IV.

9. UPEP undergraduate theoretical and school-community-based programs should be assessed through the use of nonethnocentric assessment devices such as are encouraged in Alfredo Castaneda's "Persisting Ideological Issues in Assimilation in America: Implication for Assessment Practices in Psychology and Education," Education for 1984, pp. 106-121.

10. The Office of Education should be encouraged to develop programs that demonstrate, in cooperation with government and business, if possible, that people of all ages and circumstances have a visible place in the continuing process of education.

11. All procedures used to select and evaluate institutions and organizations funded by the Office of Education should be free of racism, sexism, cultural oppression and discrimination based on a condition of economic status or homosexuality.

12. Regional networks and the national network (if there is one) should include those persons and groups that we have traditionally labelled "arts and sciences" people. It should be made clear that this recommendation refers to "deviant" arts and sciences folk. Further, it is hypothesized that such deviant folk can be found in the following sorts of places:

- a) In some institutions that are more or less staffed by deviants.
- b) Centers, institutes, and other spin-offs of institutions.
- c) "Secret" faculties that are not formally organized.
- d) Caucuses, splinter groups, and new associations.
- e) Colleges or programs in ethnic studies.

13. The NIE should undertake studies aimed at the question of determining whether there is (and if there is, to describe) a "work of teaching."

14. The Study Commission should sponsor, or cause to be sponsored, study of the "work" that goes on in higher education so as to empower the development of strategies to change that work.

15. The Study Commission should sponsor, or cause to be sponsored, study of the "work" presently going on in places that are doing what the Commission recommends. The effort here would be to use what is learned to develop ways for initiating others into this work (i. e. , changing undergraduate and graduate programs).

16. The Study Commission supports and encourages studies that are (1) problem-solving; and (2) client-initiated. Such studies might include women's studies; the anthropology of racism; the anthropology of banking; learning in ordinary circumstances (ordinary learning); the fittages and misfittages between the spontaneous organization of communities and planned organizations (i. e. bureaucracies), etc.

Chapter V: On Future Studies, Planning and Teacher Education:

Any effort to affect teacher education which does not anticipate its effect on the health of the whole community is likely to intensify, not alleviate, the central problems in education. As President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania has said, "Only when we are clear about the kind of society we are trying to build can we design our educational service to serve our goals."

Society and Education

The creation of the school as a special and separate agency for the education of the young has resulted in the school's becoming an instrument whereby work and study, work and recreation, youth and adulthood are separated from each other. The school as an embodiment of a vision of the good society has assumed environmental resources to be limitless, economic expansion to be inherently desirable and endless, technological conquest inevitable, and racial and cultural domination by Western Europe part of the natural order. The proliferation of rules for curriculum, for accreditation and for certification, the control of American education by national educational and professional societies, and the effective control of American schools by the white middle-class majority are part of the fulfillment of that vision. The increasing centralization of the structures governing American life has in the individual experience of American life been accompanied by increasing fragmentation and separation. Coincident with increasing social malaise, recent research indicates that our schools, whatever their differences, are uniformly ineffective. The limits of the old vision have been reached. A new vision with severely different notions of schools and society is necessary.

A recent UNESCO study envisions a healthy human community in this way:

We may here list four important characteristics of established communities as being of particular interest. First, all aspects of life are closely integrated--work, for instance, is not something separate and distinct. Secondly, social "belonging" is automatic. . . . Third, change is slow. . . . And lastly, the important social groupings are small.

The Schools and Society

The UNESCO formulation raises the broad policy question of centralization in educational facilities. In this new context, our schools would have to deal with the limitations of our culture in terms of its disruptions of the ecological and social processes.

Assuming the recommended changes within American society take place (changes which relate children to adults, the school to the community, and the form of community life to ecological and environmental needs), the demand for adults with teaching skills vastly increases. This demand is made

even greater by the information revolution now taking place in our economic structure. All this will require new kinds of teacher-training programs. Work-study programs in the community and its subsystems--health, community action, industry, crafts, shops--would enable the teacher-to-be to provide educational services while he learns the crucial fundamentals for teaching in a variety of systems as well as enable him to learn to know the community where his students must function. One observer has stated the prospect well:

This is what our educational system has to encourage. It has to foster the social goals of living together, and working together, for the common good. It has to prepare our young people to play a dynamic and constructive part in the development of a society in which all members share fairly in the good or bad fortune of the group, and in which progress is measured in terms of human well-being, not prestige buildings, cars, or other such things, whether privately or publicly owned. Our education must therefore inculcate a sense of commitment to the total community, and help the pupils to accept the values appropriate to our kind of future, not those appropriate to our colonial past.

These "values" have implications for "futures" studies and planning.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

Future studies are, because of the authority they carry as "objective professional" documents, social facts with implications for policy making. They are not neutral management mechanisms. They have large influence on the way things will be.

Recommendation 2:

Future policy groups should be encouraged to make explicit how their recommendations relate to the establishment of long-term national goals. USOE should perform the following functions with regard to futures planning:

1. Collation of futures plans and other long range plans as they pertain to education and the education of teachers, including plans which indeed affect the context of school planning, which are not specifically labelled as future studies;
2. Identification of plans with education and teacher education components;
3. Commissioning of various plans to fill gaps in current studies such as:

- a. Those plans without school projections;
The "structure of vocations" plans;
Land use and urban planning policy plans;
Community organizing and community building policy plans.
- b. Those plans which ignore legitimate assumptions, both growth and no growth orientations, client and cultural orientations.

Recommendation 3 :

Clients, whose lives are affected by futures studies which exclude their interests in their execution, should be given the resources to trace out the implications of these studies for them, and the resources to insure more favorable alternatives.

Recommendation 4:

The system proposed in this book should be developed so that the following components are relatively permanent:

1. Management information on the education of teachers: inputs and outputs;
2. Competency-based evaluation of broad-based sort;
3. Total learning communities for the education and reeducation of teachers;
4. Field experience in community schools for the technical education of teachers and adjacent community formats;
5. Competency credentialling in general educational skills and specific credentialling in community-clinical schools specifying competencies in relation to prototypical communities.

In encouraging the development of these components, the Study Commission makes two warnings: It believes that it is important that, in the development of the system, attention be paid (a) to the decentralization of power; and (b) to the avoidance of management and management information practices which centralize power and develop the large scale institution and the large scale community, or encourage their further unrestricted development. The purpose is that groups may utilize the above components readily, avoiding homogenization of themselves.

Recommendation 5:

This resolution is directed to the future restructuring of schools and their position in society.

The Study Commission recommends the opening of workspaces to children in an effort to bridge the present gap between living and learning, but not at the cost of tracking children into particular social roles, nor at the cost of removing "troublesome" children from the classroom. Children need, however, to approach the existing organization of work with as critical a vision as the Study Commission recommends they have vis-a-vis the organization and process of education. Part of their work experience should be creating alternative methods of organization.

This recommendation should be reinforced with the notion that teachers and teachers of teachers should be conceived of as operating in such workspaces as well as in school spaces. Likewise teachers' roles are not frozen: a number of diverse possibilities exist, such as community aids, para-professionals and teacher assistants.

The present notion of what a teacher is, what a classroom is, and what work is should be radically revised along these lines.

Recommendation 6 :

The following long-range principles with respect to futures planning need to be asserted:

1. The context in which teachers should be educated should be the community.
2. The location of institutions educating teachers should be decentralized gradually as other institutions are decentralized.
3. The skills and knowledge expected of teachers should be community-building skills.
4. The ethos developed by the education of teachers and by teachers in the schools should point toward small group values and interactive stances toward nature.
5. The teaching of science and social science should be particularly affected by such an interactive ethos.
6. The interaction between school and community, work and play, industry and school should resemble much more the Parkway plan than that of conventional American schools.
7. Education should emphasize differentiation and complementarity of social role rather than equality in the Coleman Report's sense.

EDUCATION ACRONYMS

AACTE	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ACE	American Council on Education
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
BEPD	Bureau of Education Personnel Development
BHE	Bureau of Higher Education
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
CAE	Council on Anthropology and Education
COMPASS . . .	Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
COP	Career Opportunities Program
EAA	Education Amendments Act (Higher Education Amendments of 1972)
ELSEGIS . . .	Elementary and Secondary General Information System
EPDA	Education Professions Development Act
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
GRE	Graduate Records Examination
HEA	Higher Education Act (1965)
HEGIS	Higher Education General Information System
HEW	Department of Health, Education and Welfare
IHE	Institution of Higher Education
LEA	Local Education Association
MLA	Modern Language Association
NASDTEC . . .	National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
NASULGC . . .	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
NCATE	National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NCHEMS	National Commission on Higher Education Management Systems
NCIES	National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems
NEA	National Education Association or National Endowment for the Arts
NEH	National Endowment for the Humanities
NIE	National Institute for Education
NIH	National Institutes of Health
NSCTL	National Study Commission on Teacher Licensing
NSF	National Science Foundation
NTE	National Teachers Examination
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
OMB	Office of Management and Budgeting
PPBS	Program Planning and Budgeting System
QuEST	Quality Educational Standards in Teaching (consortium for AFT)
TTT	Teachers of the Trainers of Teachers
UPEP	Undergraduate Preparation for the Educational Professions
USOE	United States Office of Education, a segment of HEW
UYA	University Year for ACTION, an agency comprised of VISTA, Peace Corps and other volunteer programs
VEA	Vocational Education Act
VISTA	Volunteers in Service to America, now included in UYA
WICHE	Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education