

An Arts and Sciences Dean Looks at the Tripartite Alliance

Judith R. Hughes
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Arts and Humanities

Introduction

The Tripartite Alliance is one of the most interesting activities that I have participated in as a faculty member or dean, and I am pleased to be asked to share my views on how far we have come, the progress still to be made, and obstacles that may impede that progress. I will be reflecting on the articles in this issue of *Educational Perspectives* and correspondence I have had with administrators of some of the colleges of education represented here, plus my own experiences.

I had little contact with the College of Education (COE) or Department of Education (DOE) prior to my joining the Tripartite Alliance, which we refer to at the University of Hawai'i as the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP). I received a secondary certificate from an NCATE accredited college of education in the early 1960s, but I had never taught in secondary schools. I did attend public schools through my PhD, and we sent our children to a private school because of perceived problems that colleagues had told us of in the public schools when we first moved to Hawai'i in 1967.

Thirty years later I was appointed Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities at the University of Hawai'i, one of four colleges under the umbrella of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences (A&S). Randy Hitz had just been hired as Dean of the COE. Prior to his arrival there had been a relatively modest level of interaction between the COE and A&S. When I read in *The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform* that "society has failed its teachers in two senses of the word: it gives teachers failing grades for not producing better results; at the same time it does not help improve the conditions that would make success possible" (Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, & Watson, 1998, p. 2), I was struck by the fact that having, to some extent, done both of those things, I was now in a position to make amends and actually help make the schools bet-

ter than they already are. Through the Tripartite Alliance (HIEP) I had access to the public school system at all levels and as Dean I had some modest control over our curriculum, tenure and promotion criteria, and reward structure. I now represent all four colleges of Arts and Sciences in the HIEP.

Randy Hitz' attitude was one of welcome to Arts and Sciences administrators and faculty. About the same time, Paul LeMahieu was hired as Superintendent of Education. The two shared many of the same values and goals, and were absolutely convinced of the importance of the alliance. Although Dr. LeMahieu has since resigned, the current Superintendent, Patricia Hamamoto, continues that support. Even in large bureaucracies, a few people can make a big difference.

Response to Colleges of Education Articles

Involvement by faculty in arts and sciences at the six universities represented in this publication varies somewhat, and I have highlighted what I found most interesting from an arts and sciences perspective at the University of Hawai'i. What is perhaps most striking is the emphasis in the majority of the articles on changes in college of education programs and the colleges' relationships with district schools through the creation of professional development schools. The role of the colleges of arts and sciences (variously named) in the partnerships is less clear, although all the articles make reference to them to some extent. This bears on the point made below that this is not necessarily a partnership of equals and, more importantly, that it need not be to be successful.

The University of Washington, with only a graduate level program, has several venues for A&S and COE interaction. The subject matter "intensives" or research projects for teachers in the third through fifth years of

teaching, when they start this year, will directly involve arts and sciences faculty in research projects and online study groups. Faculty will receive a stipend for teaching these courses. Arts and sciences faculty also team-teach a summer course in earth sciences with COE and district school faculty.

At the University of Missouri, in contrast, students enter the COE in their freshman year as well as at the graduate level. An e-mail from the Assistant Dean of the College of Education in response to a query from me regarding arts and sciences participation in the partnership indicated that the Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences is a member of the Governing Board for the Partnership. Arts and sciences faculty are also working with COE faculty on an accelerated program at the MA level in science and mathematics.

The Integrated BA/MA program at University of Connecticut clearly is a demanding one with 700–800 pre-education students funneling into 130 openings at the junior year. The article, “Preparing Future Teacher Leaders,” indicates that the next step is to develop a “broader capacity for the engagement of CLAS faculty with Neag School of Education faculty in order to improve the depth of subject matter understanding” of students in the Integrated BA/MA program. The University has just received a Teachers for a New Era Carnegie grant, which will bring college of education and arts and sciences faculty together through joint appointments, curriculum development, research, and teaching opportunities.

“Steady Work,” the article by Linda Darling-Hammond about changes in Stanford’s teacher education program, points to the growing number of areas that prospective teachers have to master in addition to mastering the content they are preparing to teach: diverse learners and learning styles, standards based curriculum and assessment, work with families, social equity and inclusion, technology. All these demands inevitably take time from the content discipline curriculum. Thus, it becomes even more important that students receive a solid grounding from arts and sciences faculty in the subject matter they are going to teach. An e-mail from Dr. Darling-Hammond added that in cooperation with the college of education, the physics

department developed a new major, the BA in physics and general science, and that they are considering having similar programs in earth sciences, chemistry, human biology, and mathematics. Faculty in arts and sciences and education are working together to develop curriculum in support of pedagogical content knowledge from the undergraduate through the masters programs.

In revising their teacher education program, faculty at the University of Vermont have demanded that more time be devoted to the study of arts and sciences disciplines, including a 30 credit major in the liberal arts. An NCATE 10 year visit was the impetus for closer cooperation between arts and sciences and college of education faculty. Now there are two sessions each year gathering content, field, and educational faculty to work on issues of mutual concern. Faculty in English, secondary education, and the professional development schools met six times in one year to work on special methods instruction. Content seminars for teachers are offered; math and elementary education faculty are working together. It should be noted that these initiatives have been supported, by and large, through outside funding.

Finally, at the University of Hawai’i, Teacher Education Committees (TEC) have been established for each specific discipline and provide a forum where members representing all three partner institutions meet throughout the year to discuss content and other matters. A new social studies course required for seniors was created as a result of the actions of the TEC in Social Studies, and it has already resulted in improved PRAXIS scores. For two years we have had “Dine and Discuss” breakfast meetings with faculty from COE, DOE, and A&S. These have been quite successful in identifying problems and assigning faculty and administrators to take responsibility for solving them. They also serve to bring the three groups together so that when issues arise people know whom, in the three large bureaucracies, to contact.

Creating Successful Alliances

After closely reading the literature and thinking about what makes a successful partnership from my perspective as a dean of arts and sciences, I have four observations to make:

The first points to the key role of membership in the National Network for Educational Renewal, the Holmes Partnership, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, and other national groups which mandate their members maintain interaction among the school districts, colleges of education, and colleges of arts and sciences. Membership sanctions the activities of the alliances in the eyes of faculty and administrators in all three systems. This is important because these alliances are not free of costs and because they encourage some faculty to engage in activities they might otherwise actually find counterproductive to their professional careers.

The second observation is related to Goodlad's "Postulate 1" in *Teachers for our Nations Schools* (1990): "Programs for the education of the nation's educators must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution's top leadership" (p. 271). As Randy Hitz points out in his article, when the University of Hawai'i's budget was being cut the COE budget was spared. This kind of action sends a signal to us all that the COE is a high priority. While this might not have been the case were it not for the severe teacher shortage in the state, it is, nonetheless, an indication of support from the top.

Third, my experience has convinced me that serendipity in the form of leadership in the three partners is critical. Having experienced a time when there was not much interaction among the three institutions, I do not think a partnership has a good chance of success without commitment from the leadership of each of the partners. In addition, I think that obtaining the support of Arts and Sciences leadership is the most difficult for the partnership because Arts and Sciences administrators and faculty have the least to gain from the partnership. As dean, if I have little to do with the Department of Education or the College of Education, the vast majority of my fac-

ulty probably will not know or care. While my job description states that 25% of my time is to be spent in fund raising, it says nothing about interaction with the COE and the DOE. Arts and sciences administrators and faculty at other universities have made the same observation. This is significant because the Tripartite Alliances are supposed to be among equal partners. Given the unequal importance of teacher preparation to the three partners, the definition of "equality" may need to be reconsidered.

My fourth observation is that it may make a difference in the participation of arts and sciences faculty and administrators whether a college of education grants only a baccalaureate or only a graduate degree. If students come to the college of education with a baccalaureate degree and their work is entirely at the graduate level and is focused on education courses and teaching experience, there may be less incentive and opportunity for arts and sciences faculty to be involved with the education school students and faculty. However, as we have seen, there is considerable interaction among the faculty of the two schools at University of Washington, which offers only a graduate education degree.

Issues and Ideas for Colleges of Arts and Sciences in the Partnership

In the last part of this article I wish to examine some of the issues that the partnership creates for colleges of arts and sciences, and I offer some thoughts on how to address them. First, and most important, as noted above, working collaboratively with colleges of education and departments of education is generally not part of the central mission of colleges of arts and sciences at most research universities. It should be, but I doubt that many research universities are structured that way. This creates most of the rest of the problems.

Secondly, educating students to become teachers is not always the same as educating students to become arts and sciences majors or to become generally well educated citizens, two of the central missions of colleges of arts and sciences. Elementary teachers need to know such a wide

variety of subjects, in addition to reading and mathematics, that it is difficult to provide an appropriate education in the two years most undergraduate programs allocate to the arts and sciences. It is an almost impossible task to feel comfortable in that short a time with a broad range of natural sciences, social studies, and the arts. In talking with teachers I find that as a group they feel least at ease with the arts, both visual and performing arts, but many also are wary of the sciences. Yet, it is at the elementary level that we have the most chance of success in instilling in children the joys and discipline of excellence in these and other areas.

Education for the prospective high school teacher presents a different set of challenges. Most are required to have a major, e.g., political science, physics, or music. However, when they come to teach in a school classroom, they often find they not only have to teach political science but a combination of economics, sociology, and psychology. Most colleges of arts and sciences are not structured to provide an interdisciplinary major in the social sciences or natural sciences, which is what prospective teachers really need.

In addition, our courses rarely prepare the education students who are taking them to understand how the content they are learning can be taught at the elementary, middle, or high school level. There is a substantial disconnect between what they learn from us, and what and how they will have to teach when they are actually in the classroom. As Goodlad (1990) writes, "Pedagogy is not something appended to subject matters; nor is the reverse the case. They become one in the teaching of, for example, mathematics. The most efficacious time for mathematics and its teaching to become one is when the student is studying mathematics with a view to teaching it" (p.280). I have heard arts and sciences faculty complain that having special sections for pre-education majors would result in "dumbing down" the content. On the contrary, if done well, these should be the most difficult of courses because the students would have to learn both breadth and depth in more areas than students taking traditional general education and major courses.

Thirdly, in-service education presents challenges to colleges of arts and sciences. Ongoing funding for faculty to teach, and teachers to attend, short courses and seminars re-

mains an issue in some places. A more pressing problem for us in Hawai'i is that many, but not all, of the schools have gone to year round schedules and there is no standard time when teachers have a break in which they could take continuing education classes.

Fourthly, there are generally almost no incentives for arts and sciences faculty to participate in the Tripartite Alliance. This is particularly unfortunate for untenured faculty and those who are not full professors because they are often the ones with a great deal of enthusiasm and have children who attend the public schools. While research universities purport to uphold the trinity of research, teaching, and service, service generally gets short shrift, and, despite the work of Goodlad and others, working with education faculty and students is still often considered to be service.

Fifthly, as I alluded to above, arts and sciences deans need time to devote to the alliance and unless this is a part of their job description, it is difficult to justify that time. I could easily spend 25% of my time on our partnership. Last year I requested that the partnership be part of the activities on which I was to be evaluated this year, but I could do that only because I have the support of our faculty and our Chancellor is committed to improving teacher education. Not every arts and sciences dean is so fortunate.

The articles in this issue present many excellent ideas for further development of the Tripartite Alliances. Most seem to me to be transferable to other institutions. I would like to offer some suggestions, from an arts and sciences perspective, for dealing with specific problems that I have encountered either in my own work or in reading about other partnerships. We should have some special sections of introductory arts and sciences courses for students who plan to become elementary school teachers. These should include periodic sessions with faculty from the COE and from the district schools who will give the students insights into how the topics that they are learning in the arts and sciences fields will be of use when they are actually teaching. These should be tough, demanding courses taught by our best faculty.

We should have upper division courses in the social sciences and natural sciences (and probably other areas, too), which integrate and expand what students have learned so

that they go into the classroom, if not knowledgeable about all the areas they are going to teach, at least knowledgeable about how to find the information they will need. The Secretary of Education's 2002 Report (Paige, 2002), has been roundly criticized and in some instances with good cause. However, his call for high standards in the content areas is something I think we can all agree on, and take action on in areas where we are not already doing so.

We need to address the sense of insecurity that too many elementary school teachers feel about teaching the arts well. There are some districts that have specially trained teachers for each or some of the arts in every school, but they are generally the exceptions. At meetings of the International Council of Fine Arts Deans, of which I am a member, it has been pointed out that educators in many states need to accept the fact that for the foreseeable future elementary schools will not have enough arts specialists. In those areas where that is the situation, colleges of education and arts and sciences need to assume the responsibility for preparing all elementary teachers to teach the arts well.

We must change the criteria for tenure and promotion to make creative curriculum development, team taught courses, and research growing out of those activities meet research and teaching standards in arts and sciences departments. Despite more than a decade of discussion, spear-headed by *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), little has been done in this area.

We need to find ways to finance ongoing in-service education in areas in the arts and sciences that are changing rapidly, making use of technology wherever possible. It is not good for science teachers to be teaching what they learned several years ago, particularly as, in too many districts, they are using outdated textbooks. If the University of Hawai'i is successful in obtaining a grant that we have applied for, we will have at least two graduate students in the natural sciences available by e-mail or phone on a regular basis to answer science questions from teachers across the state. The possibilities opening up in the area of distance education need to be pursued vigorously.

Tied to this demand for well-qualified teachers are the requirements of No Child Left Behind. The Report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

found that 23% of secondary teachers did not have even a minor in the main subject they were teaching and the figure was 30% for math teachers (Fullan, et. al., 1998, p. 4). According to the Secretary of Education 2002 Report (Paige, 2002), "In biology and life science, physical science and English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual education classes...between 30 and 40 percent of middle-grade students had teachers who lacked a major, minor, or certification in these subjects" (p. 8). Surely there is an opportunity to help solve this very real problem before "for profit" groups take over.

Finally, money does matter. At research universities there is a growing trend to put scarce resources into those units, often organized research units or the sciences, which will bring in money, particularly federal money. This puts many units in colleges of arts and sciences and colleges of education at a disadvantage, either because there is not significant funding available for some disciplines or because the overhead for training, which colleges of education spend so much time on, is lower than overhead for research. I would urge that the deans of arts and sciences and of education support each other's needs within and outside of the university. We make such important contributions to our societies that we cannot let the priorities of the federal government dictate the wellbeing of our faculty and students. This is not the first time this has happened and it will not be the last, but we are under pressure now and we need to let policy makers at the local, state, and federal levels know the consequences if we are marginalized.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Tripartite Alliance is important for all of the partners. The NNER is one of the best vehicles we have for bringing together and keeping together the three groups primarily responsible for training our teachers. I do not believe we have to be equal in all aspects of the Alliance because the Alliance needs different things from each of us, and we bring different contributions to the partnership. We can honor our differences while maintaining and expanding our partnership to the benefit of all of us.

References

- Boyer, William. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Fullan, M, Galluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Page, Rod. (2002). *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Challenge*. Washington: Report of the Secretary of Education, June 11, 2002.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
-