This monograph reviews the alternative responses to the current teacher supply and demand situation being made by schools, colleges, and departments of education. Some options are identified as eliminating nonproductive programs and courses, emphasizing training in areas where shortages exist, refocusing the orientation of institutions to meet the training needs of nonschool settings, and expanding school service components, particularly inservice and continuing education oriented to the needs and aspirations of teachers in school situations. It is impossible to predict accurately the number of new teachers that will be needed in the future, and additional questions are therefore whether society will be willing to support a teaching force adequate for peak demand periods and whether employment alternatives should be considered. The teacher surplus does not take into account the growing need for new types of learning facilitators in nonschool settings, and these options should be considered as part of a realistic response to preparing multifaceted personnel for all of America's learning institutions. (MEN)
The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to Oklahoma State University for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either Oklahoma State University or the National Institute of Education.
ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews the alternative responses to the current teacher supply and demand situation being made by schools, colleges, and departments of education. Some options are identified as eliminating nonproductive programs and courses, emphasizing training in areas where shortages exist, refocusing the orientation of institutions to meet the training needs of nonschool settings, and expanding school service components, particularly in-service and continuing education oriented to the needs and aspirations of teachers in school situations. It is impossible to predict accurately the number of new teachers who will be needed in the future, and additional questions are therefore whether society will be willing to support a teaching force adequate for peak demand periods and whether employment alternatives should be considered. The teacher surplus does not take into account the growing need for new types of learning facilitators in nonschool settings, and these options should be considered as part of a realistic response to preparing multifaceted personnel for all of America's learning institutions.
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The purpose of this piece is to review the alternative responses to the current teacher supply and demand situation being made by schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs). The seeking of alternative courses of action has received remarkably little attention in the literature on education since the current surplus of school personnel was first highlighted in 1971. Among the few efforts which specifically focus on the manpower problem and the need for alternatives for the future are W. Timothy Weaver's "Teacher Education: A Future of Declining Need--Toward the Redefinition of the Teaching Market" (1974); Evelyn Zerfoss and Leo Shapiro's The Supply and Demand of Teachers and Teaching (1973); and the thematic section of the Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974), entitled "Professionals for our Learning Society."

Haberman and Stinnet (1973) have documented that in the U.S. there are currently some 1,300 institutions of higher education (IHE) which operate state-accredited school personnel preparation programs. This suggests that some 72% of the 1,800 collegiate institutions maintain such programs and that teacher education is conducted in every institutional type found among the total IHE population. Institutional productivity varies considerably across the entire spectrum of institutions of higher education. Clark (1974) has shown that nearly one-third of the IHEs produce fewer than 100 baccalaureate-level teachers each year. While at the other end of the spectrum, some 60 state colleges and universities produce as many as 3,000-4,000 teachers, administrators, and school counselors each year. Data now show that 1969 was the year of greatest productivity with 282,000 students graduated with teaching credentials. Of these, some 196,000 sought teaching jobs. Added to this pool of new graduates were some 50,000 persons who had received training earlier and who sought then to re-enter the teaching profession, bringing the total to about 246,000 applicants. Elbers (1972) indicates, however, that there were only 184,000 openings, thus producing a surplus of about 62,000 applicants. What is remarkable is that this surplus was not fully understood until nearly two years later. The research reports of the National Education Association did not focus on this problem until June 1971, and the first analysis of the surplus by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education did not appear until the winter of 1972. Once these two agencies began to focus on the demand-supply situation, a plethora of articles, research reports, and government documents began to appear on the subject. Among the most significant of these were articles by Bartels (1971), Graybeal (1971), and Lambert (1971); Kotz's research report (1972); and the Elber's report by the U.S. Office of Education (1972). More recently, Carroll (1973) has undertaken a highly detailed study of the demand-supply system for school personnel that merits the attention of those interested in this dimension of school personnel preparation.

While each of these has been important, the one document on this issue which will undoubtedly have the most telling impact upon federal programs of support and, in turn, upon SCDEs is the Comptroller General's report to the Congress (Staats, 1974). Data in that report, it can be predicted, will increasingly be used to support federal actions and decisions. The
major conclusion of the report was that the decade of the 1970s would witness the accentuation of the trend of the late 1960s—a period when for the first time the number of qualified applicants for teaching jobs had exceeded available teaching positions.

Just how bad these surplus conditions will be continues to be widely disputed. Zerfoss and Shapiro (1973) cite Department of Labor Statistics and project an oversupply of 1.7 million teachers by 1980. According to another study (Frookin, 1971), the surplus will be of a magnitude of 610,000 teachers in 1980, while the National Center for Educational Statistics provides an estimate of the teacher surplus equal to 191,000 (Simon, 1971). It was this disparity in projections that stimulated the Rand Study (Carroll, 1974). After examining alternative production, attrition, and demographic factors, Rand concluded that by 1980 the surplus could range anywhere from 17,800 to 2,527,400 teachers. On the basis of these and other projections, it is accurate to conclude that there is a teacher surplus that will have considerable impact upon SCDEs, certainly for the next decade and, probably, for most of the next generation.

RESPONSES TO THE PROBLEM

There are as of now few documented responses to these conditions. While inertia has been, in part, a factor, SCDEs are also confronted with commitments made to faculty (through contracts and tenure) and to students who previously have enrolled in their programs. These conditions have precluded any immediate scaling-down of program size or offering (Riggs, 1974). Some state education authorities are now intervening in the rate at which new school personnel are to be produced (Ward, 1974). The imposition of quotas on entry to teacher education or even the elimination of particular teacher education programs are likely actions by SEAs and will impact upon SCDE faculty and revenues. Analyses of available options for SCDEs are therefore of highest priority. It is assumed that among the options being examined are the following:

1. Eliminating nonproductive programs and courses, as measured by the generation of X number of student credit hours;

2. Giving emphasis to training in areas where documented shortages exist. Corrigan (1974) suggests that there is a continuing need for teachers in special education, mathematics, trade, industrial and vocational education, urban education, and early childhood education, while the Carnegie Commission (Kerr, 1973) concludes that there are inadequately prepared teachers for large urban schools, small rural schools, bilingual-bicultural schools, and wealthy urban school districts. It advocates that university faculties of arts and sciences and education should concentrate more upon training teachers for more specific kinds of school settings—despite the problems of a highly dynamic and mobile society and the likelihood that a teacher could eventually end up in a drastically different setting from that for which he or she was prepared.
3. Refocusing the orientation of SCDEs to meet the training needs of nonschool settings. Zerfoss and Shapiro (1973) have estimated that in 1970 there were 48.7 million persons engaged in providing vocational and professional training outside formal education institutions in 1970, thereby implying that there is a ready market for teachers or training personnel at government agencies, in proprietary training colleges, in company schools, at correspondence schools, in trade centers, and in the armed forces.

4. Expanding school service components, particularly in-service and continuing education oriented to the needs and aspirations of teachers in school situations. To upgrade the unsatisfactory conditions present in many schools through in-service teacher education would certainly necessitate the maintenance of "complete" SCDE facilities. One factor that would certainly stimulate this need would be mandatory recertification of all school personnel at regular intervals. At the present time, in response to such possibilities, IHEs are creating significant numbers of satellite centers for in-service education within communities (University of Houston), within regions (State University of Nebraska, across the U.S. (Northern Colorado) or around the world (University of Southern California) to meet the in-service needs and interests of various clients.

Other variables within the context of the present schooling system that could drastically alter the demand for teachers are (a) the downward expansion of mass education to preprimary levels; (b) an expanded school year that might increase school personnel demand by 20-25%, or lifelong education, using community school concepts; and (c) the retention of a larger percentage of the age cohort for 12 years of schooling (now only 82%). Still another immediate factor that could affect the demand for school personnel preparation is the recent court decision (Lau v. Nichols, 1974) that directs that schools must take affirmative steps to help students whose first language is other than English.

Given the probability, with the exception of court-ordered changes, that none of the above variables will occur in the foreseeable future, it is safe to predict that most SCDEs will experience a declining client population in administrator, counselor, and teacher education. Shapiro (1973) has predicted the decline of graduates in teacher education from colleges and universities from 35% in 1968 to 19.9% in 1976. The decline is already evidenced by the fact that the percentage of undergraduates enrolled in education has fallen from 37.5% in 1968 to 24% in 1974. It is now anticipated that this percentage will go below 20% for the first time in 1976 (Skinner, et al., 1974). This decline in the undergraduate SCDE population will be compounded by a parallel contraction in the number of Ph.D. and Ed.D. candidates in education as there is less demand for collegiate staffing for school personnel development. The loss of revenue from both undergraduate and graduate enrollees in education, as well as the decline of federal program support designed to reduce past teacher shortages, means that SCDEs must either curtail faculty teaching loads, reduce the number of teaching faculty and support staff, or find alternative revenue sources.
In addition to the statistical factors that are affecting school personnel demand, there is the improbability that schools will exist a generation from now identical in shape, substance, or form to those which exist today. This places additional burdens on SCDEs. There is currently much debate about roles and purposes for schools in contemporary American society. Much of this debate has been captured in the futuristic material that has recently appeared relative to school personnel preparation (e.g., Burdin, et al., June 1974).

WHAT KIND OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL FOR THE FUTURE?

Anderson (1973) indicates that schools in contemporary American society currently perform six basic functions: (a) they provide custodial care for all children, but particularly for the children of women in the labor force who have children less than 18 years or age; (b) they have responsibility for forming and inculcating norms or values; (c) they have responsibility for selecting and/or sorting out individuals for the different roles necessary in society; (d) they have responsibility for developing the cognitive abilities within children; (e) they have responsibility for preparing children for the world of work; and (f) they have responsibility for developing various nonoccupational specialities, e.g., the ability to exercise leadership or to organize group activity.

In the last decade, critics of education have attacked both the ability and the necessity of schools performing this array of functions. These critics, as diverse as Carl Bereiter and James Coleman on the one hand, and Paul Goodman, Jonathan Kozol, and Charles Silberman on the other, argue for schools drastically different from those which we are familiar. Some like Coleman (1972) argue that the schools are best equipped to provide for interaction among young people and for the inculcation of values and norms, leaving to other institutions other roles; while theorists like Bereiter (1972) argue that schools can perform best the functions of cognitive formation. There are still others, like Illich (1971), who advocate the deschooling of society and the replacement of schools with learning networks. It seems fair to assume, however, that we will have schools for systematized learning by children for the foreseeable future. Bereiter (1972, p. 406) suggests that the "need for training arises from the incompleteness of normal experience"; while Broudy and Palmer (1965, p. 161) have questioned whether an informal random approach to learning can produce future generations able to cope with social dilemma: "society simply does not dare leave the acquisition of systematized knowledge to concomitant learning."

It is safe to conclude that schools will be different in the future, but how they will be different remains to be seen. Thus, while there is the need for school personnel preparation, there is also the impossibility of predicting accurately the demand for new teachers. This problem is further compounded by the rapidly declining rate of birth and the declining school-age population. Demographers also tell us that we are beginning to experience a problem that will further complicate the orderly prediction of teacher demand. The substantial post-World War II "baby-boom" will have long-ranging effects upon American society, in that we will experience significant
changes in the demand for teachers in response to an absolute population growth surge each generation. The K-8 population of school reached its peak in 1969. It is now expected to bottom-out in 1976 and to start to climb again at a rate at least equal to that of the 1970s, despite the decline in the population growth rate. It is anticipated that the elementary school population will exceed the 1969 levels by 1981, while secondary school student enrollments will peak in 1976 and then start dramatically downward until 1980. By 1984, secondary enrollments will bottom-out and then once again begin to climb (Simon, 1972). Shapiro (1973) has concluded that given current steps to curb surplus conditions, these demographic factors would again create a shortage of teachers by the 1990s. Other than Shapiro, few have focused attention on this unique problem of having in every generation periods of both high and low demand for school personnel. As Shapiro indicates, there is the basic concern of whether society will be willing to support or finance a teaching force adequate to operate at peak demand periods and also at times when demand is less, or whether they will expect, somehow, that teachers will come and go, finding alternative employment in years of low teacher need. If society is unwilling to absorb this burden, then we must begin to consider alternatives or employment options for school personnel.

TRAINING EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

Most universities today are structured along lines derived from a European model of the 13th-16th centuries, and knowledge and learning are organized into compartmentalized units. As such, the university represents the past, not the present or the future. Our current organizational structures in universities and colleges are predicated on the fragmentation of knowledge into specialized disciplines and subdisciplines—a process that has occurred for the last four centuries. Michaud (1972) describes a counter move that he suggests is necessary to overcome the high costs involved in such specialization and to respond to the need for multidisciplinary cooperation to solve the complex molar problems confronting society. Schein (1973) utilizes this multidimensional model to describe a new kind of professional to work in contemporary society—individuals to work in the person-to-person service or human service areas. He specifically stresses the importance of developing personnel in university professional schools who are capable of interacting and/or working collaboratively with practitioners from a variety of professions in providing such services.

In much of the literature, human services are defined as those fields of activity providing necessary person-to-person services, or helping services in the community for which person-to-person skills are necessary to meet client needs. Currently, the U.S. Department of Labor lists some 2,100 job categories and an addition of 9,000 categories by 1980, most of which will focus upon performing human services. The 1970 census revealed that only 35% of the labor force of this country was used to produce and distribute material goods. Therefore, 60% of that labor force was employed in service-related industries, including health and educational services, recreation, social services, accounting, data collecting and processing, and management (Wiggins, 1974).
All these areas need to have teachers. The so-called teacher shortage talks only of surpluses of school personnel and generally fails to recognize that new types of learning facilitators, learning resource managers, and non-school-based educational professionals will be needed to keep abreast of the social demands for learning and to upgrade the quality of learning provided in our society. In this context, Bowen (1974) discusses this phenomenon and cites the possibility of universities and colleges performing a variety of functions, one of which would be to prepare more people for the person-to-person tasks required of a society increasingly oriented to services interests. It can be assumed that SCDEs could be deeply involved in such activities. Recent proposals for massive public service efforts to compensate for substantial unemployment presents still another potential job market (Goldberg, 1972). Schools, colleges, and departments of education must be aware of these kinds of trends and begin now to plan for the preparation of personnel to function in a variety of new learning environments.

This situation calls for the serious attention of planners in both IHEs and SCDEs. One approach calls for planners to examine and then negotiate with communities vis-a-vis schools to become employing agencies for learning resource personnel. These personnel might then perform in a variety of both school and nonschool organizations to meet the learning needs of young people, adolescents, and adults. In times of high teacher demand, they could function in formal school settings; while in periods of low teacher demand, they could move into other person-to-person service areas such as health, recreation, child care, pediatric care, paralegal work, social services, mental health, alternative schools, and in-school education. The recent experience of many SCDEs with urban-based teacher education programs has enabled faculty administrators and students to understand that learning occurs in a variety of institutions and that communities cannot or do not neatly assign responsibility for learning to any particular agency or institution. If communities are the most logical means for providing a synthesis of learning experiences (as Bruner [1971] and others have agreed), then SCDEs can legitimately concern themselves with facilitating the process of community development. One way is to provide broad-based community learning facilitators for all of a community's learning institutions. Zerfoss and Shapiro (1973) have examined this concept and advocate it as one of the most realistic ways of coping with the teacher surplus conditions that confront contemporary American society. Planners, however, are not often assigned such responsibilities and traditionally have little knowledge of the human services dimension beyond teacher education.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

If the various clientele for which SCDEs prepare educational personnel are to be made receptive to these transformations in role and mission, then schools, colleges, and departments of education must also be changed. To do this would require (a) ongoing research to determine societal needs and aspirations relative to learning; (b) the provision of experiences for preservice clients in a variety of community institutions as a part of their professional training; (c) changes in credentialling practices to provide licenses for people who can teach or manage in a
variety of learning environments; (d) an expansion of the scope of responsibilities for placement bureaus within SCDEs who would then have to discover job opportunities and/or positions in a variety of public and private service settings; (e) the development of new kinds of information systems to generate data about human personnel needs, particularly in response to the concept of teachers being attached to communities to serve in a variety of learning facilitator roles; and (f) interorganizational or community systems for salaries, pensions, and retirement programs to permit movement from one training or human service institution to another institution, or from one type of learning facilitator role to that of another.

All of this would necessitate significant reorganization of schools, colleges, and departments of education. Wiggins (1974) has recently discussed the creation of a revitalized college of education at a mythical university, in which part of the program emphasizes certain aspects of home learning and child development that, he suggests, would be of particular utility to all teachers and parents. The program would also extend the breadth of its curricula to other educational and social services in the community, so that graduates would be qualified for numerous career opportunities outside those of formal classroom instruction. Teacher education would become a program to prepare educational personnel for a variety of educational, health, and social service institutions.

There are a few experiments currently underway in a limited number of SCDEs. Denham (1968) has described an interdisciplinary program at Howard University in Washington, D.C. designed to prepare disadvantaged young people for staff positions and service roles in the helping professions of health, education, welfare, and recreation. Another institution that has explored such possibilities is Concordia Teachers College in Seward, Nebraska. In its vocational clarification program, students enrolled in the college of education have the opportunity to investigate career opportunities in a variety of human service programs. Perhaps the most widely publicized efforts, however, are those of the faculty and students at the University of Vermont (Rathbone and Case, 1973).

At Vermont a reconstituted College of Education and Human Services initiated a program in September 1974 designed to prepare a variety of learning specialists for the helping professions. It is premised on the assumption that the planning, development, and delivery of many kinds of human services require common competencies.

Other than in the cited examples, it seems that where schools of education have responsibility for human service preparation or the preparation of learning personnel for alternative settings, it is attributable more often to organizational exigencies than to any policy considerations. At several institutions, home economics (University of West Virginia), health, physical, and recreational education (Washington State University), or military science (Western Michigan University) are, for historic reasons, located within SCDEs. There are few documented efforts
where such institutions make use of this organizational "accident" to prepare general human service personnel theoretically, experientially, or professionally.

There is some indication, as demonstrated in a recent survey of 250 selected IHEs that prepare teachers (Klassen and Imig, 1974), of just how broadly based this diversification has become. Two-thirds of the responding institutions indicated that they were preparing instructional personnel for one of sixteen types of nonschool learning institutions. Being trained were personnel for prison rehabilitation, agricultural extension work, hospital and mental institution rehabilitation, radio and educational TV, and libraries and museums, as well as counselors for government and/or industry, social workers, church education teachers and/or religious counselors, and early childhood personnel and community service personnel. Thirty percent of the responding institutions indicated that they were doing something in at least five or more nonschool personnel preparation programs. Consequently, the expansion of roles and/or functions by SCDEs is occurring, although it is not well documented and merits considerable additional attention.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSION

It should be recognized that if SCDEs move in the directions that have been proposed they will, necessarily, have to cope with a variety of governance problems as well as with those that relate to the development of a profession of education. The present uncertainty as to the desirable relationships between training sites, sanctioning and monitoring agencies, and the organized profession is one manifestation of this problem. This will be compounded by the problem of defining the relationships between and among professionals and subprofessionals in other aspects of human service study and care both within the university as well as outside the university. Undoubtedly, there will be the problems of creating a professional identity and codes of ethics when the clientele is as diffuse as the community. Such a change also comes at a time when SCDEs are reasserting their need for professional autonomy both within the university and in relationship to the community (Howsam, 1972). Consequently, those who seek to create a human service orientation must take into consideration the inevitable tensions that will occur.

SUMMARY

There has long been wide-spread concern that teacher education in the U.S. is monolithic in form, structure, and substance. Perhaps the teacher surplus offers to schools, colleges, and departments of education the unique opportunity to do what they do best. Some may wish to emphasize a professional relationship with the organized teaching profession and have a strong school emphasis, while others may want to stress the importance of preparing human service personnel for a variety of nonschool settings. Those within schools, colleges, and departments of education confronted with declining enrollments would do well to study the options necessitated by the supply-demand problem and arrive at a realistic response to preparing multifaceted personnel for all of America's learning institutions.
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