

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 289

SP 009 382

AUTHOR Pomeroy, Edward C.
 TITLE What's Going on in Teacher Education--The View from Washington.
 PUB DATE 14 Aug 75.
 NOTE 29p.; Speech presented to the Leadership Training Institute of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Annapolis, Maryland, August 14, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Cooperative Planning; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Federal Government; *Governance; *Inservice Teacher Education; Interagency Cooperation; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Professional Continuing Education; State Government; *Teacher Education; Trend Analysis

IDENTIFIERS *American Association Colleges Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Higher education, along with its national voice, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), has reached a critical point in teacher education and must deal with a variety of important issues if collegiate-based teacher education is to continue. The major challenge that higher education faces is that of governance. Many constituencies in the education community, but particularly teacher organizations, are voicing legitimate interests in professional preparation--a matter which until recently was completely under the influence of college-based educators. Accreditation is the second major issue to which higher education and AACTE must respond. Accreditation has developed as a means of quality control in teacher education largely through the efforts of member institutions of AACTE. Currently, however, questions concerning who will set standards and what will be judged are increasing. A third major concern is collaboration. The sharing of governance in teacher education is an idea whose time has come, and collegiate institutions must ensure they are involved. Government relations is another important issue, and higher education must retain its place in teacher education by taking effective action at both state and federal levels to strengthen its power base. AACTE is responding forcefully at both levels. A fifth area of concern is continuing professional development, including supply and demand and governance of inservice education. (PB)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED113289

WHAT'S GOING ON IN TEACHER EDUCATION--
THE VIEW FROM WASHINGTON

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A speech presented to
The Leadership Training Institute
of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Annapolis, Maryland

August 14, 1975

SP009 382

WHAT'S GOING ON IN TEACHER EDUCATION--THE VIEW FROM WASHINGTON

We have all heard the critics who are saying there's nothing going on in teacher education right now; but fundamental issues are being resolved that will chart the course for the next decade and beyond. The problems you are experiencing in your local and regional areas are affected by the views of teachers, the public, legislators, the state of the economy, and all the other factors that interact to influence changes in our field. Your Association finds itself in the middle, working to keep its member institutions in the mainstream of this debate. And I have to tell you, the view from the middle presents a composite picture of our profession which can be enlightening--even startling.

For example: Nolan Estes, the influential general superintendent of the Dallas public schools, proposes that teacher education should be taken out of higher education and put into the schools, where he feels it belongs. His recommendation to revert backward to an apprenticeship system has been received all too calmly by all of us in the teacher education community.

California and Oregon have established teacher-dominated Commissions on Teacher Preparation and Licensing to evaluate college and university teacher

preparation. These commissions also certify teachers, and are presently formulating performance standards which are sure to influence or set nationwide performance criteria. The members of these commissions are mainly teachers--with little or no higher education involvement.

In Washington, the U.S. Commissioner of Education sets criteria for nationally recognizing accrediting agencies as reliable authorities on the quality of collegiate training. The 1952 criteria have been revised twice--in 1969 and 1974. In January 1975, the federal advisory board gave the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) only one-year approval rather than the standard four years, principally because of its level of financial support. Is federal control of accreditation upon us?

These incidents can no longer be seen as isolated, scattered, unrelated. Each one illustrates the critical point higher education has reached in teacher education, and how we deal with these issues today will determine if collegiate-based teacher education prospers five years from now--or even survives.

The crucial question is: Who's in charge? And more specifically: Who's going to be in charge of education personnel development? For a long time, higher education was in the driver's seat and, through its national voice--AACTE, called the tune on accreditation standards, certification, program design, curriculum, and a host other concerns. Now, the voice^s of all the other partners in the

education enterprise rise in disharmonious chorus--the federal government state legislatures, education commissions, state and local education agencies, organized teachers, citizens, even student teachers are each demanding their say--in some cases, majority control. These agencies do have a stake in the process, and there ought to be ways for them to affect what goes on--in proportion to their expertise. But in practice, partnership can prove a cantankerous, difficult beast. We must find ways to harness it before it distracts us all from the ultimate goal--better education. In the meantime--let's face it--we're in the midst of a power struggle. Is higher education prepared to take forceful action--to maintain its initiative? The alternative is to resign ourselves to a service role, performing only when called upon.

The members of AACTE have not retreated from the fray; this meeting and your participation testify to that fact. Higher education has the knowledge and expertise to continue to lead in this vital enterprise. But we can no longer take our position of leadership for granted. We must decide upon unified goals, design plans of action together, and follow through--together. Local and state education agencies know where they are headed, the federal government certainly has power, and the organized profession makes no bones about its goals and the political clout it wields. Unity is the key, for, as Howard K. Smith put it on the ABC

News (in another context): "We've got to deal with the real issues, or we will lose control of the thing we're talking about controlling."

In the next few minutes, let's look at some of the major issues we all face together: governance and accreditation, collaboration, state and federal relations, continuing professional development, and innovative program approaches. Along the way, we'll examine how AACTE is responding to these issues. Then, I'll make some personal suggestions on what we can do to insure a major role in the educational enterprise for higher education.

GOVERNANCE IS OUR BIGGEST CHALLENGE...

The central challenge we face today is the governance of our profession. Governance implies a power structure, an answer to who legitimately decides the goals, methods, and standards of any social group. In teacher education, everything from selection of candidates to final recertification was firmly under the influence of the professional college-based educators--until the late 1960's. Suddenly we are discovering that the traditional hierarchies and roles are no longer acceptable--or for that matter, workable.

Many constituencies in the education community are voicing legitimate interests in professional preparation, but the boldest challenge to higher education's traditional control over teacher education comes from teacher

organizations. After writing model legislation, NEA is using considerable resources to lobby for creation of state Commissions on Teacher Standards and Licensure. These commissions would set and administer standards for accrediting institutions and licensing teachers. They would also define ethics and performance criteria and evaluate teachers. The need for such standards and criteria is not the issue--who sets and administers them is. The original NEA model act called for a 13-member commission, with only two from higher education, the rest being licensed teachers or administrators. Lately, NEA has made efforts to alter this position, asking for only a majority. Still this approach does not adequately recognize the need for higher education's expertise.

The immediacy of this challenge maynot be pressing to those who work in states where traditional relationships between teacher groups and teacher educators still prevail. Yet 27 states have already established standards commissions. In two of these states--Oregon and California--the commissions have all the absolute powers just described; the rest have advisory powers. And the NEA has announced its intention to see these commissions established by law in every state by the end of this decade.

Another problem we face is that universities may be losing control over field experiences. In the Journal of Teacher Education this Fall, Don Kachur and

Duaine Lang present evidence that NEA and AFT locals are negotiating with school boards to control clinical experiences. I quote: "In no instance was there any indication that the university was a third party signatory to the agreement." What will be the consequences for university programs when external decisions determine how many and which student teachers can be placed where, and how much compensation they must pay to cooperating teachers? Kachur and Lang state: "Colleges and universities are at a truly critical point of decision. If (we) want to maintain control of clinical experience programs and still use the public schools" they suggest very few options, the best of which is to "take the initiative in assuming negotiations parity with school boards and teacher associations." The worst alternative is to "abandon the responsibility for clinical preparation of teachers." It is obvious which path we must take.

Other interested power groups are moving to share in, or take control of, professional preparation.

A July news release from NEA proudly states that in California, education students have won the right to participate in evaluating the 62 colleges and universities that prepare teachers, and student NEA members in Iowa are "deeply involved in trying to get their legislature to establish a Professional Standards Board."

Michigan is mandating 10 percent reductions in enrollment across the board, and the Illinois state superintendent is calling for cutbacks in enrollments and so-called marginal programs. In all 50 states, state boards of education have studied CBTE approaches; and 32 states have either adopted some form of mandatory CBTE standards or are encouraging CBTE program approaches as a basis for certifying school personnel. Some states are unilaterally establishing non-negotiable time lines and other requirements--without the financial assistance needed for sound program transitions.

Another challenge is recurring within the university itself--helped by some unlikely allies. In July hearings to reauthorize Teacher Corps for three years, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island brought up the old--rather tired--attack on teacher education. He said that we "are teaching method rather than substance," that today's teacher "has only a limited ability to discuss...subject matter." His solution would be to rechannel Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) funds from teacher education into teaching subject matter. For many years, we have struggled to build mutual respect and cooperation with the arts and sciences faculties, but it appears we're back to the same old arguments. And yet, the same old answers won't do. It's time to build a new program for the preparation of teachers that is defensible.

The examples I've cited on the challenge of governance are not isolated instances, they are national in character, and they require organized national responses.

ACCREDITATION IS A SECOND BIG CHALLENGE...

Accreditation has developed as a major means of quality control in teacher education, largely through the efforts of member institutions of AACTE. Today, challenges to accreditation are growing. Who will set the standards, and will they be voluntary or mandated? Will institutions or programs be judged? Finally, will accreditation be used to stimulate improvement, as it is now, or to indicate a level of institutional acceptability?

As we all know, the balance of representation on the NCATE Council and Coordinating Board was realigned in 1974 after considerable negotiation. This gave the classroom teachers an equal number of votes with AACTE and opened up a new category of Associate memberships. More and more elementary and secondary practitioners are serving on visiting teams and evaluating boards. The impact of the parity move is only now being sensed, and considering the complexity of the evaluation process, it may be too early to judge its results. Not too unexpectedly, teachers make both good and bad members of teams. What seems to

be needed in the future is more adequate training for all evaluators in the NCATE process.

Satisfying the federal criterion for representation of the community of education interests was only one factor in this NCATE realignment. In 1968, U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe declared that "the development and maintenance of educational standards in the responsibility of non-governmental, voluntary accrediting associations." Nevertheless, the mere existence of a federally approved list of accrediting agencies and the criteria for making the list implies a not so subtle control. Congress relies upon accreditation to establish institutional eligibility for federal funds. And now, a study by Harold Orans and George Arnstein recommends that USOE take independent steps to assess quality for the purposes of federal funding. The desire for consumer protection seems to be moving us toward federal control. Yet the record of federal regulatory agencies raises questions about how well they protect consumers.

Whatever we think of its value and scope, national accreditation is by no means universal. According to an ongoing study by David Clark and Egon Guba, there are 1,386 teacher preparing institutions which are accredited by state agencies and regional accrediting groups, but only 543 are accredited by NCATE.

AACTE has responded to the governance issue in many ways, and much more can be done. In the area of accreditation, higher education maintains a voice on the NCATE Council through its eight AACTE representatives. It is important that those we elect each year recognize they represent many people and institutions besides themselves. Through them we have the opportunity to communicate policy positions. For instance, what position shall we take regarding NCATE's interest in accrediting programs rather than institutions? How much do we resist federal efforts to intrude upon voluntary and state accreditation? Already AACTE has protested a plan to provide a federally funded "credential" for preschool workers, by withdrawing membership from the Child Development Associates Consortium, and by publicizing reasons for taking such drastic actions.

It is in arenas such as this that a national organization can best speak for the interests of teacher educators everywhere.

When your Association established its Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching (CEPT) a year ago, it created a potentially major force for defining positions on governance and the direction this profession should take. After much input from teacher education, the work of the Commission will be the heart of next February's Annual Meeting. You and your colleagues there

will determine what will happen to that report. Will it go the way of so many other such reports, which are discussed but never acted on? It is vital that the member institutions of AACTE formulate specific policies on the issues raised by CEPT. Then they must speak out with one voice in the centers of power through their national AACTE. Such unified action is necessary to the redesigning of our profession, especially in the face of the unified efforts of the other powerful and determined vested interests.

COLLABORATION IS A THIRD CRITICAL CONCERN...

What the various interests in teacher education have in common, hopefully, is a laudable concern for improving the quality of education in our society. But higher education, government, or the public schools alone cannot carry on teacher education--much less improve it. All the partners must work together.

For example: the Teacher Corps promotes collaboration as a part of its fundamental design, first by making the agencies plan together in submitting proposals, and second, by providing financial rewards to all parties. (By the way, AACTE has just recognized the accomplishments of Teacher Corps by featuring its tenth anniversary in the summer Journal.)

Independent collaborative arrangements for designing and implementing new field-based programs are proceeding in many of your own localities. The Temple University Portal School Project is an outstanding example. There, the resources of many separate university programs have been combined to impact on four inner-city schools. The university and public schools make joint appointments. Representatives from the university, schools, union, community, and student body work together on advisory boards, reaching agreement by mutual consent. In 1972, AACTE recognized this cooperative project with the Distinguished Achievement Award.

Our Association has recognized the importance of collaboration in its own operation, in its support of NCATE and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

No one can promise that collaboration will be easy, but the early experiences of Teacher Corps and others mean that we don't have to reinvent the wheel.

At our last Annual Meeting Roger Heyns, president of the American Council on Education, warned us:

"The basic scheme (of teacher education) is not so much in question, but rather the sense of partnership that is necessary to make it go has been jeopardized by the intrusion of a power struggle into this complex educational process...Where the professionals begin to quarrel among themselves about who is

going to control an activity of vital interest, the society has a way of settling it, not by choosing among the warring factions, but by assigning to one of its own instrumentalities the effective control. This inevitably means the intrusion of laymen into areas where professional competence is really required; and it is ironic that this is usually the consequence of the failure of professionals to solve the problem themselves."

Those who stand in opposition to sharing control of teacher education seem as likely to succeed as the boy with his finger in the dike. He was a hero, but the dike broke anyway. It is too late to stand aside and cry "no." By whatever name we call it--parity, collaboration, consortia, partnerships--the sharing of governance in teacher education is a notion whose time has come. The only question is, after the furor is over, will higher education be one of the partners?

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ARE A FOURTH CRITICAL ISSUE...

The political struggle today over powers and roles will hopefully give way to more cooperative efforts. But first it is necessary for higher education to retain its important place in teacher education by strengthening its power base. There are two arenas² for action: state and federal. AACTE is responding forcefully in both.

The answer to professional practices legislation is effective action by state Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education. Because your Headquarters Office was in constant touch with NEA, you received early warning of its model legislation plans in 1972. Association leaders also felt the need to respond to conditions in their states. The logical outgrowth was the formation of state AACTE units. Your Board of Directors fostered these units through creation of a State Unit Task Force, discussions at Annual Meetings, and LTI's for state leaders such as this one. They also made it possible for staff to devote time and energy to assisting state leaders.

Success is already apparent. Today, 29 state units have formed, and more are on the way. Through much hard work on the local level, many state units have been actively representing teacher education in their state capitols. For the most recent achievement, congratulations are in order for the Illinois ACTE, which has just defeated a bill to give even greater power to teachers on the State Certification Board. AACTE people worked months buttonholing their state senators and staff, talking with the state superintendent, and getting newspaper support.

Now in response to expressed needs of the members, your national AACTE has quickly adjusted its limited resources to make federal and state government

relations its first priority. Our newly reconstituted Commission on Governmental Relations has held its first meeting, chaired by your President-elect, Ted Cyphert of Ohio State. The seven members will develop and recommend policies and programs. Already AACTE has distributed four monthly issues of a newsletter, Legislative Briefs, which alternates in covering significant events in state problems and federal legislation.

Through these and other dissemination capabilities of your national office, an exchange of information enables state units to learn from each other, react effectively to new situations, and alter undesirable conditions.

Your staff is monitoring and reporting the status of federal legislation of vital interest to you. It is important for you to react to bills and amendments, so that your views will be represented in the halls of Congress and government agencies. And AACTE is listened to. In July, for example, Robert Egbert, from the University of Nebraska--Lincoln, testified for AACTE in support of NIE before the House education subcommittee. Significantly, several groups worked together with us to develop a unified position on NIE: the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR), and the Land-Grant Deans.

. Through your National Office, you have a chance to influence other Washington-based organizations who develop state and

federal legislation. For instance, when the American Council on Education was asked to testify on proposed legislation recently, they asked AACTE to write the section on EPDA to represent your views.

Your staff is your listening post--an early warning system for what the federal government, NCATE, NEA, and other groups are doing, thinking, and planning.

Not only does Congress turn to AACTE for advice and testimony on educational policy, but USOE and the National Advisory Council on EPDA view our organization as a primary national network for dissemination news and ideas on teacher education.

Thus, AACTE's presence in Washington means that many good things happen for teacher education--and some potentially bad ones don't.

What we're doing in governmental activities is only a scratch on the surface of what needs to be done. We must find the resources to advance these efforts.

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS ANOTHER BIG CONCERN...

Now, let's take a look at the issue of continuing professional development. Continuing teacher education has long been needed, but other interested parties have not taken an interest until lately. Many factors are at work here. However, we only have time to look at two: supply and demand, and governance.

Supply and Demand

Teacher education is a profession which must constantly respond to changing conditions. Now we're in the midst of another period requiring adjustments. For in the past several years, as the publicly felt need for additional teachers has decreased, the importance of enhancing programs for continuing professional development is apparent. All AACTE institutions are also faced with the very real question of how to best utilize their rich resources in better serving the schools.

Here are some necessary steps to deal with the present situation which many of you are now examining.

1. We must demand, through state ACTE's, better financing for teacher education. Recent data from the Carnegie Commission study and the National Center for Higher Education Management

Systems verifies what we have long believe to be true--

namely that cost per FTE in education programs is significantly lower than in other professional sequences. If you are not already working for better financing, I hope you will soon make this a top priority.

2. We must eliminate nonproductive programs and courses.
3. We must shift our emphasis to areas of documented shortages, and advise more students into these areas. Dean Corrigan suggests that we prepare more specialized teachers in industrial and vocational education, urban, early childhood, and special education. Others say we should design more certificate programs for counselors, administrators, and paraprofessionals. One move that may help--AACTE is considering support for an AFT-sponsored bill to tie all early childhood legislation to public schools-- and not to commercial day-care centers, or to new groups created to take advantage of the new legislation.
4. We must continue to revise our admission policies. The teaching profession should be more representative of our population. As believers in equal opportunity and multiculturalism, we must practice what we preach.

5. We must prepare instructional personnel for nontraditional, nonschool settings. Leo Shapiro tells us that there were almost 49 million people providing vocational and professional training in nonschool settings in 1970. Compare that with only two and a half million in school teaching, and there is an obvious market for our "products." Let's tell our students these job opportunities exist, and let's justify our programs on the basis of a much wider need.
6. We must demonstrate cost-effectiveness and societal values of our programs.
7. Finally, we must improve our inservice or continuing education programs. The demand is certainly there, and colleges of education have the vital resources--provided imaginative planning takes place. But if we proceed at our present pace, teacher organizations and local school districts will soon outpoint us in designing and controlling inservice programs.

GOVERNANCE OF INSERVICE

The present move toward continuing professional development is one response to the supply/demand situation. But it is also evidence of teachers

and schools moving to control their own programs. Three developments highlight the problem colleges face:

- . Recently, the states of Pennsylvania, Colorado and Maryland have sanctioned the right of local school districts to award academic credit for inservice workshops. Montgomery County, Maryland has set up its own minicollege of education, unrelated to graduate programs at nearby colleges and universities.
- . NEA local affiliates are working in several states to establish more such programs, and
- . Legislation is now being drafted by Senator Mondale to fund a limited number of U.S. teacher centers to be operated by school boards. Then these boards might contract with commercial or other agencies to provide inservice education. Colleges could be involved--but not necessarily.

AACTE has provided national leadership to counteract this move. Your Headquarters Office was instrumental in calling a June meeting of all of interested parties and the Senator's aides. Your AACTE representative argued strongly for legislation that would provide for collegiate involvement and therefore insure that it is professionally sound as well as politically viable.

The result is that AACTE is now acting as the catalyst to synthesize five

association positions into language for an appropriate piece of legislation, on teacher centers. We will continue to monitor and work with this situation closely.

What AACTE must recognize is the exciting possibilities inherent in on-site continuing education for expanding the scope and influence of higher education's expertise. In the 1975 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), Part 2, Morris Cogan tells us that "professors are needed in the school sites to offer instruction in the relationships of theory, research, and practice." Without this, "teachers may adopt a popular practice and continue in it without ever knowing whether their procedures are effective or whether their instruction is improved or damaged."

I have just returned from the ICET Assembly in Berlin, where continuing education was the theme of the conference. In one session, two American teacher educators displayed a long list of their university's newest in-service courses. There was no indication of consultation with teachers or school boards--no evidence of needs assessment. The faculty had simply decided what it wanted to do and handed the list down from on high. I felt compelled to indicate that this was not representative of American teacher education, but honestly I'm not sure that's true.

In 1968, Don Davies called the continuing education of experienced teachers the "ghetto" of American education. It remains so today. The present hodgepodge of institutes, workshops, after-school and summer programs grew much like Topsy. Participation has been more often coerced than voluntary, more to climb the salary and promotion scales or meet imposed advanced degree requirements than to upgrade personal skills and the profession. While many industries invest as much as 10 percent of their budget on research and staff training to improve their employees, education spends less than one percent for re-educating teachers.

What's missing from inservice education, say Roy Edelfelt and Gordon Lawrence, is a fundamental framework such as preservice has. There is no clear concept of inservice purpose, no basic commitments by university or school district; there are weak or nonexistent state approval programs, and skimpy accreditation devices.

Higher education institutions must lead in developing that framework. Of course, teachers know what is needed to update specific teacher skills, since experience teaches them the weak spots in their own preparation. However, knowing what they need and knowing how to design and deliver programs for pro-

Professional upgrading are separate matters. Analyzing needs should be the responsibility of several parties--teachers, school boards, and administrators--aided by teacher educators. The responsibility for designing and delivering continuing education programs belongs to teacher educators, working cooperatively with others.

Some would argue that the struggle for the governance of on-site inservice education is over. It is my position that this issue is still up for grabs. Higher education has too many resources and too much expertise to be counted out. If we believe this, we must fight for our role. This does not mean we oppose collaboration. But collaboration works best when each party comes with well thought-out positions and is thus able to negotiate solutions for a position of strength. AACTE is the logical choice to negotiate for collegiate-based teacher education, since we are its largest and most representative body. In order to direct higher education's involvement in continuing personnel development and to counteract the oversupply effects, we must develop unified policy and programs. Here is where our developing Management Information System (MINFO) can provide interpretative data so vital to rational planning. We can also improve our information and Clearinghouse capabilities to support both local and national efforts. Particularly, we can

urge that models be devised, implemented, and evaluated. Our institutions and AACTE must find the resources to develop the reforms we need to meet the challenges ahead.

OTHER PROGRAM APPROACHES PROVIDE DYNAMIC RESPONSES...

The cries for relevance and improved quality are being met--but not enough and not everywhere. Higher education needs to do more in the area of needs assessment, program design and delivery, research, and evaluation. We as teacher educators have a great history of responding to changing times, but we must continue to nourish our capacity to change.

There's no lack of program approaches needing investigation and experimentation. And fostering the investigation of alternative program approaches is the kind of thing AACTE is equipped to do well. Our Distinguished Achievement Awards program is only one example of ways we have tried to encourage program reform.

Our continuing emphasis on multicultural education is a direct outgrowth of expressed needs of the membership to develop teachers for different linguistic, racial, and ethnic needs. A newly reorganized Commission on Multicultural Education will define needs and establish priorities. In addition,

our government relations staff is monitoring the development of bilingual legislation on the Hill. The new Ethnic Heritage Project is an information gathering center which will hopefully become a major resource for our members and the whole profession, just as the ERIC Clearinghouse is. Similarly, the AACTE/PBTE Project is a professional resource. In all these endeavors, AACTE does not advocate particular programs; it does point out new directions, interpret implications, and disseminate both the prospects and the problems involved. Indeed we would be remiss if we were not involved; for if this Association does not guide these projects, other interests will! In this way, higher education, through AACTE, has a reasoned influence on the direction such movements take.

And it is vital to recognize that most of these projects do not use member dollars, since they are funded by outside sources. In fact, for every one dollar member institutions invest in the Association, they--and the whole profession--receive dividends of three dollars in program service. For instance: federal monies made it possible for AACTE to sponsor the writing of our book called Multicultural Education through Competency-based Teacher Education and distribute a remarkable 27,000 copies.

SOME PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

What we have examined here this morning in the areas of governance, continuing education, and government relations is hardly the whole story. We face many other challenges, but these three seem central to higher education's position in teacher education.

Simply to talk and not to act is unthinkable. Major issues call for strong responses. First, we must strengthen our power base. Our institutions must demand their place in teacher education--on the state level through state ACTE's and on the federal level thru your national AACTE.

What is happening on the local and state levels is vital, and the Association is increasing its capacity to act strongly in those arenas. But at the same time, higher education's interests in teacher education need representation in the national forum. One major function of any Association's national office is to speak for its members, to represent their views wherever collective strength and wisdom can have an impact--to do what individual institutions are not equipped to do. AACTE is the only association of higher education institutions that cares exclusively about teacher education. Without a national AACTE, there would be no voice for your interests. No other would speak with such consistent effect. What your Association does in Washington

has made a difference. What must we do next?

- . We must test our ability to collaborate with the other partners in the education enterprise, on a true parity basis.
- . We must strengthen our government relations. Let us move out into the public arenas with unified positions on governance, inservice, and other issues.
- . Let us lead in negotiations, on the local and national levels.
- . Let us demonstrate our capacity to develop new programs.
- . Let us decide whether to institutionalize the inservice teacher center of the HETFIRE report, and the professional positions of the CEPT-report.
- . But especially, let us guard our mutual interests together.

Teacher education is a diverse and complicated enterprise. To meet new challenges, our priorities must be subject to change. What we need is coherent, unified policy--unified policy without loss of diversity, and with concern for local needs. AACTE's past success tells us we can be effective in the future. Together we can assure this. Let's begin now!