ABSTRACT
Part of a 1968 commencement address by John W. Gardner is used in this paper as a foundation for explaining the status of teacher education and as a background for proposals on six teacher education issues. In Gardner's speech, an imaginary view of what scholars, living in an authoritarian society of the twenty-third century, will think of twentieth century society, is presented. These "scholars" blamed unrestricted efforts to change societal institutions, for the collapse of twentieth century civilization. The observations of the "scholars" were that twentieth-century institutions were designed to obstruct change and were not capable of continuous renewal, and that they faced a continuous crossfire between uncritical supporters and nonsupportive critics. These points are used to illustrate the problems faced in teacher education, particularly in regard to maintaining inflexible positions on current issues. Six issues are described in which teacher educators are urged to take a proactive position: (1) accreditation of teacher education institutions; (2) competency assessment of teachers; (3) extended 5-year programs; (4) selective admission standards to teacher education programs; (5) teacher supply and demand; and (6) governance and collaboration between the training institutions and the practicing profession. The summary acknowledges the bleak outlook presented in the paper, but stresses the importance of proactive criticism through professional organizations. (FG)
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THE FUTURE OF TEACHER EDUCATION

"IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES, INCREASING NUMBERS OF PEOPLE BEGAN TO BELIEVE THAT MEN COULD DETERMINE THEIR OWN FATE, SHAPE THEIR OWN INSTITUTIONS, AND GAIN COMMAND OF THE SOCIAL FORCES THAT BUFFETED THEM. BEFORE THEN, FROM THE BEGINNING, MEN HAD BELIEVED THAT ALL THE MAJOR FEATURES OF THEIR LIVES WERE DETERMINED BY IMMEMORIAL CUSTOM OR FATE OR THE WILL OF GOD. IT WAS ONE OF THE COPERNICAN TURNS OF HISTORY THAT BROUGHT MAN GRADUALLY OVER TWO OR THREE CENTURIES TO THE FIRM CONVICTION THAT HE COULD HAVE A HAND IN SHAPING HIS INSTITUTIONS.

"NO ONE REALLY KNOWS ALL THE INGREDIENTS THAT WENT INTO THE CHANGE, BUT WE CAN IDENTIFY SOME MAJOR ELEMENTS. ONE WAS THE EMERGENCE WITH THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION OF A WAY OF THINKING THAT SOUGHT OBJECTIVELY IDENTIFIABLE CAUSE-AND-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS. PEOPLE TRAINED IN THAT WAY OF THINKING ABOUT THE PHYSICAL WORLD WERE BOUND TO NOTE THAT THE SOCIAL WORLD, TOO, HAD ITS CAUSES AND EFFECTS. AND WITH THAT DISCOVERY CAME, INEVITABLY, THE IDEA THAT ONE MIGHT MANIPULATE THE CAUSE TO ALTER THE EFFECT.

"AT THE SAME TIME PEOPLE BECAME LESS AND LESS INCLINED TO EXPLAIN THEIR DAILY LIVES AND INSTITUTIONS IN TERMS OF GOD'S WILL. AND THAT TREND HAS CONTINUED TO THIS DAY. LESS AND LESS DO MEN SUPPOSE, EVEN THOSE WHO BELIEVE DEVOUTLY IN A SUPREME BEING, THAT GOD BUSIES HIMSELF WITH THE DAY-TO-DAY ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORLD."
"While all of this was happening, new modes of transportation and communication were breaking down parochial attitudes all over the world. As men discovered that human institutions and customs varied enormously from one society to the next, it became increasingly difficult to think of one's own institutions as unalterable, and increasingly easy to conceive of a society in which men consciously shaped their institutions and customs.

"The result is that today any bright high school student can discourse on social forces and institutional change. A few centuries ago, even for learned men, such matters were 'given,' ordained, not subject to analysis, fixed in the great design of things.

"Up to a point the new views were immensely exhilarating. In the writings of our founding fathers, for example, one encounters a mood approaching exaltation as they proceeded to shape a new nation. But more recently another consequence has become apparent: the new views place an enormous—in some instances, an unbearable—burden on the social structures that man has evolved over the centuries. Those structures have become the sole target and receptacle for all man's hope and hostility. He has replaced his fervent prayer to God with a shrill cry of anger against his own institutions. I claim no special insight into the unknowable Deity, but He must be chuckling."
"Men can tolerate extraordinary hardship if they think it is an unalterable part of life's travail. But an administered frustration—unsanctioned by religion or custom or deeply rooted values—is more than the spirit can bear. So increasingly men rage at their institutions. All kinds of men rage at all kinds of institutions, here and around the world. Most of them have no clear vision of the kind of world they want to build; they only know they don't want the kind of world they have."

I hope you think I authored those brilliant passages I have just read. I did not. They were taken verbatim from a commencement address delivered at Cornell University on June 1, 1968, by John W. Gardner, then Chairman of the Urban Coalition; the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as former President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

I have read that address dozens, if not hundreds, of times in the past years. I have found the passages I have read to you, and others I want yet to share, to be the most insightful and brilliant analysis of man's relationship to his institutions that I have ever read. Dr. Gardner's analysis is particularly relevant to the condition of teacher education today. Therefore, I beg your indulgence while I share more of the address with you as an introduction to my comments on the future of teacher education.

Dr. Gardner told his listeners that he would take them on a 600-year tour of history—300 years into the past and 300 years into the future.
into the future. As a result of his taking a couple of "future pills" invented by a Cornell scientist, Dr. Gardner found himself 300 years in the future looking back on the 20th century. At this point we pick up the address.

The first thing he discovered was that in the last third of the 20th century, the rage to demolish succeeded beyond the fondest dreams of the dismantlers. They brought everything tumbling down. Since the hostility to institutions was a product of modern minds, the demolition was most thorough in the most advanced nations.

Unlike the fall of Rome, the decline was not followed by hundreds of years of darkness—just a couple of hundred years of authoritarianism after which scholars were again allowed to study history. "The effect was electric. To those austere and antiseptic minds, conditioned to the requirements of a technically advanced authoritarianism, the rediscovery of man's history was intoxicating. It generated an intellectual excitement that dominated the whole twenty-third century. Scholars were entranced by the variety of human experience, shocked by the violence and barbarism, saddened by the stupidities, and exalted by the achievements of their forebears. And as they searched that history, excitedly, sadly, lovingly, they returned increasingly to the twentieth century as a moment of curious and critical importance in the long pageant.

"All the evidence available to them indicated that the preceding centuries had seen a vast and impressive movement in the direction
OF INSTITUTIONS THAT WERE RESPONSIVE TO THE WILL OF MEN. THERE
WERE SETBACKS, TO BE SURE, AND TROUBLE AND HYPOCRISY AND FAILURES,
BUT OVER THE YEARS THE TREND WAS UNMISTAKEABLE. WHY THEN IN THE
LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY DID MEN TURN ON THEIR INSTITUTIONS AND
DESTROY THEM IN A FIT OF IMPATIENCE? AS ONE TWENTY-THIRD CENTURY
SCHOLAR PUT IT, "UNTIL WE ANSWER THAT QUESTION WE SHALL NEVER BE
SURE THAT WE ARE NOT PREPARING THE SAME FATE FOR OURSELVES.

"AS THEY STUDIED THE HISTORY OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, THEY
DISCOVERED THAT HUMAN EXPECTATIONS HAD RISEN SHARPLY IN THE MIDDLE
YEARS OF THE CENTURY. THEY OBSERVED THAT MEN CAME TO DEMAND MORE
AND MORE OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS AND TO DEMAND IT WITH GREATER
INTRANSIGENCE; AND THEY NOTED THAT THE DEMANDS FOR INSTANT PERFORMANCE LED TO INSTANT DISILLUSIONMENT, FOR WHILE ASPIRATIONS LEAPT
AHEAD, HUMAN INSTITUTIONS REMAINED SLUGGISH—LESS SLUGGISH, TO BE
SURE, THAN AT ANY PREVIOUS TIME IN HISTORY, BUT STILL INADEQUATELY
RESPONSIVE TO HUMAN NEED.

"TWENTY-THIRD CENTURY SCHOLARS AGREED ON THESE FACTS BUT THEY
DISAGREED AS TO THE IMPLICATIONS. ONE SCHOOL OF THOUGHT SAID THE
BIG MISTAKE HAD BEEN TO LET ASPIRATIONS LOOSE IN THE FIRST PLACE.
HUMAN ASPIRATIONS, THEY SAID, SHOULD BE KEPT UNDER TIGHT CONTROL.
THE OPPOSING SCHOOL OF THOUGHT ARGUED THAT HUMAN ASPIRATIONS WERE A
DYNAMIC FORCE THAT HELD ENORMOUS POTENTIAL FOR GOOD. THEY INSISTED
THAT THE MAIN REQUIREMENT WAS TO MAKE HUMAN INSTITUTIONS LESS
SLUGGISH. THE ONLY ERROR OF THE MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY, THEY SAID,
WAS TO RELEASE ASPIRATIONS WITHOUT DESIGNING INSTITUTIONS RESPONSIVE
ENOUGH TO SATISFY THOSE ASPIRATIONS;
"After years of debate, the two schools of thought began to come together, and a common doctrine began to emerge. The first thing they agreed upon was that human aspirations were capable of contributing enormously to the dynamism of the society and therefore should not be tightly bottled up. But they also agreed that there must be procedural bounds within which the aspirations could express themselves.

"Some were quick to point out that in the mid-twentieth century such procedural bounds did exist and functioned quite well, permitting extraordinary scope and variety of dissent until the last third of the century, when the bounds were increasingly rejected and the dissolution of the society began. Back of the rejection was the impatient hostility that late-twentieth century man felt toward his institutions. Those who consciously sought the destruction of their society were never more than a small minority, but they found it easy to trigger the latent hostility of larger numbers of people. Many, of course, were ignorant of the long, painful evolution of procedures for the expression of dissent, for the protection of individual rights, for the maintenance of that framework of order without which freedom is impossible. Others were not ignorant but very angry. The result was the same.

"The second thing twenty-third-century scholars came to agree upon was that if society is going to release aspirations for institutional change—which is precisely what many twentieth-century
Societies deliberately did—then it had better be sure its institutions are capable of such change. In this respect they found the twentieth century sadly deficient.

"Most institutions were designed to obstruct change rather than facilitate it. And that is not really surprising. The institutions were, after all, designed by human beings, and most men most of the time do not want the institutions in which they themselves have a vested interest to change. Professors were often cited as an interesting example of this tendency, because they clearly favored innovation in other parts of the society but steadfastly refused to make universities into flexible, adaptive, self-renewing institutions."

"Because of their failure to design institutions capable of continuous renewal, twentieth-century societies showed astonishing sclerotic streaks. Even in the United States, which was then the most adaptable of all societies, the departments of the federal government were in grave need of renewal; state government was in most places an old attic full of outworn relics; in most cities municipal government was a waxwork of stiffly preserved anachronisms; the system of taxation was a tangle of dysfunctional measures; the courts were crippled by archaic organizational arrangements; the unions, the professions, the universities, the corporations—each had spun its own impenetrable web of vested interests."
"Such a society could not respond to challenge. And it did not. But as one twenty-third-century scholar put it, 'The reformers couldn't have been less interested in the basic adaptability of the society. That posed tough and complex tasks of institutional redesign that bored them to death. They preferred the joys of combat, of villain hunting. As for the rest of society, it was dozing off in front of the television set.'

"The twenty-third-century scholars made another exceptionally interesting observation. They pointed out that twentieth-century institutions were caught in a savage crossfire between uncritical lovers and unloving critics. On the one side, those who loved their institutions tended to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from life-giving criticism. On the other side, there arose a breed of critics without love, skilled in demolition but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish. Between the two, the institutions perished.

"The twenty-third-century scholars understood that where human institutions were concerned, love without criticism brings stagnation, and criticism without love brings destruction. And they emphasized that the swifter the pace of change, the more lovingly men had to care for and criticize their institutions to keep them intact through the turbulent passages."
If I had to explain to you today why teacher education is the recipient of society's hostility—why teacher education has become the whipping boy and the scapegoat for an educational system that many believe to be less than adequate—I would use John Gardner's rationale that societal aspirations for education and the profession of teaching have far outstripped our institutional ability to produce the desired results. I would suggest as he suggested that we in teacher education clearly favor innovation (as long as it occurs in other parts of society) but we have steadfastly refused to make our own areas into flexible, adaptive, self-renewing programs. That we, too, have our own waxworks of stiffly preserved anachronisms, and that we, too, have spun our own web of vested interests.

Have we indeed become uncritical lovers, smothering our institutions in an embrace of death, loving our rigidities more than our promise, shielding our programs from life-giving criticism? Yes, to a very great extent, I believe we have become uncritical lovers. As a probable result, we are now confronted with unloving critics, many of whom write for *Time* Magazine, *Newsweek*, The *Wall Street Journal*, The *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and even The *Ladies' Home Journal*. Despite the large and apparently increasing numbers of unloving critics, their obvious anger, hostility, and skills in demolition, teacher educators are not justified in playing the role of uncritical lovers. Nor can we withdraw from the confrontation in self-righteous silence. We must become proactive in every sense of the word. We must be willing to use loving criticism where needed and we must propose reform where reform is needed.
In order to look at the future of teacher education, I have identified six issues in search of resolution. I will briefly analyze the background of each issue and will suggest what I believe to be a logical position for teacher educators to support. The issues are: (1) accreditation, (2) competency assessment of teachers, (3) extended programs and quality of programs, (4) the talent pool, (5) the teacher shortage, and (6) governance/collaboration.

1. Accreditation of Teacher Education

In 1980, I chaired a committee to examine accreditation of teacher education. In the process of developing a report, the committee surveyed the chief institutional representatives of 100 institutions to determine their reaction to national accreditation and their suggestions for improving the process. Although reactions were varied, three major messages came through:

1. Accreditation costs too much, both in money and in time.

2. Accreditation at both state and national levels is unnecessarily duplicative if not redundant.

3. Although representatives generally supported voluntary national accreditation, they were not really assured that the process significantly improves programs or that weak programs were eliminated. Moreover, they were not certain that
NATIONAL ACCREDITATION HAD A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WHEN VIEWED IN THE REALITY OF STATE APPROVALS, STATE RECIPROCITY, AND INTERSTATE COMPACTS.

As a result of the survey and the candid reactions, the committee made an innovative proposal, perhaps even a courageous proposal. They proposed:

1. The adoption of common national standards and processes for accreditation by the several states;

2. State accreditation visits to institutions preparing educational personnel to assess the extent and degree to which the national standards are implemented;

3. State accreditation teams composed of knowledgeable professionals and lay people who represent state and national constituencies of professional-educational personnel preparation programs; and

4. National accreditation by a non-governmental body that has responsibility for:

   A. The development, continuing review, and revision of the national standards for accreditation
D. Monitoring and reporting the extent to which states enforce compliance with the standards for accreditation among the institutions preparing professional educational personnel.

C. Monitoring and reporting the processes used by the various states in the conduct of site visits and subsequent accreditation actions.

D. Effecting agreements among the various states for reciprocity of certification and licensure, penalties assessed for non-compliance, and other agreements necessary for an effective national system of accreditation.

Of course, nothing has changed as a result of the report except that discussion continues and proposals to change accreditation practices grow in number. Although we in teacher education support voluntary accreditation of institutions, our critics do not. They expect us to police the profession and to assure them, through mandatory accreditation, that weak institutions do not prepare teachers.

2. Competency Assessment of Teachers

As of this date, 33 states have taken some action to mandate teacher competency assessment for admission to teacher education programs or for certification. Several others have studies under way.
THE MINIMAL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS MOVEMENT WAS PREDICTABLE AND PROBABLY INEVITABLE. IF THE PUBLIC, ALARMED BY REPORTS OF BARELY LITERATE STUDENTS GRADUATING FROM HIGH SCHOOLS BY THE THOUSANDS, INSTITUTED SOME SORT OF MANDATED MINIMAL COMPETENCY TESTS FOR STUDENTS, WHY SHOULD THEY NOT DO THE SAME FOR TEACHERS, MANY OF WHOM THEY BELIEVE TO BE BARELY LITERATE THEMSELVES?

In an editorial in the December 1979 Phil Delta Kappan, editor Robert Cole wrote:

"Should teachers be required to pass a state examination to prove their knowledge in the subjects they will teach when hired? Can we no longer trust teacher preparatory institutions--approved by state, regional, and national accrediting agencies--to weed out weak teachers? Can we not rely on the screening that takes place when a district hires teachers? Should teachers be retested every few years to see if they are keeping up to date? In the most recent Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools, 85% of those polled said yes, teachers should be required to pass a state exam in their subject areas and they should be continually retested."

The public's call for accountability has been issued: first for demonstrable knowledge and skills of students and now for evidence of the intellectual and professional skills expected in their teachers.
Twelve states have passed legislation for competency assessment of teachers and 12 have issued state department of education mandates. Of these states, 12 specify admissions standards and 17 specify assessment for certification. Eighteen require testing in basic skills, 12 in professional skills, 10 in academic skills, and 6 will require on-the-job performance assessment.

Why has the public turned on teacher education institutions? Because they don't believe that we have done our job in three areas: (1) admissions, (2) program quality control, and (3) product evaluation. They do not believe that we can or will change the system.

In an effort to alert the teacher education community to the impetus and strength of the teacher assessment movement, as well as to suggest that it was a movement deserving support, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education passed two significant resolutions at the Annual Meeting in Dallas in February, 1980. These resolutions were:

1. In recognition of the need for quality teacher education, AACTE supports a test of basic skills as a criterion for entry or continuance in teacher education programs.
2. **In recognition of the need for quality teacher education, AACTE supports a program of assessment of professional skills as an exit requirement for teacher preparation programs. This assessment should include:** (A) communication skills; (B) human relations skills; (C) generic teaching skills, and (D) subject matter proficiency.

I propose that we join the public in support of teacher competency assessment. I propose that we endorse rigid admission requirements in terms of competency in basic skills. I propose that we encourage qualitative measures of professional and academic skills prior to certification. But, you ask, “won’t that greatly exacerbate the coming teacher shortage?” Of course it will. But what the hell, I’m ready to help create a teacher shortage if that’s necessary to awaken the public to the plight of teacher education, to our lack of financial support, to our lack of life space in the curriculum, and to our lack of status. I believe we should give the public what it professes to want. Therefore, I propose that we, as good activists should, go home tomorrow and begin implementation without awaiting the legislative mandate that is just around the corner.

3. **Extended Programs**

George Denemark of the University of Kentucky contends that teachers do not now receive a fully professional preservice
EDUCATION; THAT THEIR PREPARATION IS NOT COMPARABLE IN LENGTH OR RIGOR TO THAT OF MOST RECOGNIZED PROFESSIONS. GEORGE INSISTS THAT OUR PROGRAMS ARE NOT GROUNDED IN THE BASIC CONCEPT THAT MARKS A TRULY PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: THAT THE GRADUATE MUST HAVE ATTAINED A LEVEL OF COMPETENCE SUFFICIENT TO GUARANTEE SAFE PRACTICE WITH CLIENTS. HE CONTENDS THAT THE PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS ARE INADEQUATE IN TERMS OF TIME AND THAT WE NEED FIVE YEARS MINIMALLY TO ADEQUATELY PREPARE THE BEGINNING TEACHERS.

THERE ARE MANY OTHERS WHO SHARE WITH GEORGE THE CONVICTION THAT OUR LIFE SPACE IS INADEQUATE, THAT WE NEED A FIVE-YEAR INTEGRATED PROGRAM TO EVEN BEGIN TO APPROACH THE NECESSARY PROGRAMMATIC DEPTH AND RIGOR OF AN EFFECTIVE PREPARATION PROGRAM. I AM ONE WHO AGREES WITH GEORGE. I BELIEVE WE, TOO, SHOULD DENY AS ADEQUATE THE 15-25 HOURS PRESENTLY ALLOTTED IN MOST STATES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION OF SECONDARY TEACHERS.

THEREFORE, I PROPOSE TO YOU THAT WE SUPPORT EXTENDED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS; THAT WE ADVOCATE A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM AS MINIMAL FOR CERTIFICATION IN OUR VARIOUS STATES. WHETHER WE ARE SUCCESSFUL OR NOT SUCCESSFUL MAY NOT BE AS IMPORTANT AS OUR TAKING THE POSITION. WE MUST NOT CONTINUE TO BE SWAYED BY PUBLIC OPINION, WE MUST SWAY PUBLIC OPINION. OUR PROFESSION HAS NEVER BEEN IN GREATER NEED OF LEADERSHIP. TEACHER EDUCATORS MAY NOT BE POWERFUL AT THIS TIME, BUT THE POWER OF GOOD IDEAS IS INESTIMABLE. I AM AWARE THAT MANY SMALL PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS FEAR FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMS BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THE FIFTH YEAR WILL INEVITABLY
BE A GRADUATE PROGRAM. I HOPE NOT, BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT WOULD DEFEAT OUR PURPOSE. I BELIEVE IN A FIVE-YEAR INITIAL PREPARATION PROGRAM.

BUT, YOU ASK, "WON'T A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM FURTHER EXACERBATE THE COMING TEACHER SHORTAGE?" OF COURSE IT WILL. I HAVE THE SAME ANSWER I GAVE TO COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT. I'M READY TO EXACERBATE THE SHORTAGE. LET'S TAKE A STAND FOR QUALITY AND LET THE PUBLIC WORRY ABOUT THE CONSEQUENCES.

4. TALENT POOL

Timothy Weaver of Boston University paints a bleak picture of the quality of applicants to teacher education programs. He is able to demonstrate with statistics drawn from many sources that test scores on the ACT and SAT are dropping dramatically for all college entrants, but teacher education scores are the lowest, and still dropping.

There are numerous reasons for this:

1. The abominably low pay
2. The poor and declining status of the profession
3. The problems of classroom management
4. The reports of teacher surplus
Perhaps even more significant is the loss of women and minorities who once found teaching an avenue to upward mobility. Now with so many new and exciting professional opportunities, they find teaching to be only an alley.

I see little promise of improvement if conditions stay the same. Something must be done to raise the status of the profession to equal or exceed its past levels. I propose that we do not accept into our programs the mediocre and the inept. I propose that we establish meaningful admission requirements, selective admission requirements, and that we rigidly administer them.

But, you ask, "Won't rigid admission requirements greatly exacerbate the coming teacher shortage?" I think you know the answer. It's "What the hell, give the public what they want."

The Teacher Shortage

And now, let's deal with the teacher shortage. Is it real or imagined? For many years prior to 1968, the demand for new teachers exceeded the supply by thousands. In 1969, the supply/demand was almost in balance. But in 1970, the situation abruptly changed and the supply exceeded the demand by almost 50,000. The dramatic decline in the demand for new teachers can best be illustrated by the fact that in 1969 the new teacher demand was approximately 245,000. By 1980, this figure had fallen to approximately 115,000.
As could be expected, there has been a lagging but corresponding decline in the number of new teachers prepared during the same period of time. Since students in the teacher education pipeline and teacher preparatory institutions were caught by surprise by the sudden drop in demand, production continued unabated until 1972 and 1973, years in which the greatest disparity occurred between supply and demand. Since 1972, however, the supply of new teachers has dropped precipitously in response to the reduced demand as well as to a number of other factors. The net result is the prediction that the lines of supply and demand will cross in the mid to late 1980's.

Despite the fact that no one denies that a vast surplus of teachers has existed during the decade of the 70's, this surplus has not been uniform across the various teaching specializations. The NEA, for example, reported a 50% excess of new teachers over available positions in 1978. They indicated, however, that the supply was least adequate in trade-industrial areas, mathematics, vocational agriculture, sciences; distributive education, and special education-LD.

In reporting teacher supply/demand for 1981, the Association for School, College, and University Staffing (ASCUS) listed eight teaching fields with a considerable teacher shortage: mathematics, industrial arts, physics, special education (LD), vocational agriculture, chemistry, general science, and speech correction. Ten areas were listed as fields with a slight teacher...
SHORTAGE: INCLUDED WERE FIVE AREAS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, BILINGUAL EDUCATION, EARTH SCIENCE, BIOLOGY, SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST, AND BUSINESS. ELEVEN TEACHING FIELDS WERE LISTED AS BALANCED AND EIGHT AS HAVING A SLIGHT SURPLUS. THOSE LISTED AS HAVING A SURPLUS WERE FRENCH, GERMAN, ELEMENTARY (BOTH PRIMARY AND INTERMEDIATE GRADES), HOME ECONOMICS, HEALTH EDUCATION, SOCIAL EDUCATION, ART, AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

ASCUS REPORTED A DECREASE OF 41% IN THE NUMBER OF NEW ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND 51% IN NEW SECONDARY TEACHERS BETWEEN 1970 AND 1980. THEY FURTHER REPORTED ANTICIPATED DECREASES IN THE NUMBER OF PERSONS COMPLETING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION BETWEEN 1980 AND 1981 TO BE 21% IN ELEMENTARY AND 14% IN SECONDARY EDUCATION.

ALL INDICATORS POINT TO INCREASING BALANCE BETWEEN SUPPLY/DEMAND IN THE NEAR FUTURE. MANY PROJECT A SHORTAGE AS EARLY AS 1985. CERTAINLY THE DATA PROJECTED BY THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS SUPPORT A FORTHCOMING SHORTAGE IN THE LATE 1980'S.

THE SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS WILL BE CAUSED BY A NUMBER OF FACTORS:

A minimum of 33 states have taken some action relative to competency testing of teachers either for admission to teacher education programs or for certification. The result is to tighten up requirements both for admission and certification.

Students report a reluctance to enter teacher education because of low pay, low status, and discipline problems.

In addition to low pay, low status, and discipline, inservice teachers add bureaucratic demands and "burnout" or stress as factors causing high turnover rates estimated at 6% by NEA and 8% by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Increased job opportunities for women and minorities provide options other than teaching to these groups for whom teaching once provided upward mobility.

Although these and other causes may tend to produce a more favorable relationship between the supply/demand of teachers and may, in fact, create a shortage, the crisis of supply does not lie in numbers or quantity, but in quality! The quality of teacher education students is diminishing at an alarming rate as evidenced by test scores and other measures.
THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS CAN BE SUPPORTED BY DATA:

A. **The ratio between supply/demand is rapidly coming into balance.** Moreover, shortages exist in selected teaching fields presently and promise to expand from these to other fields in the near future. Given the trends that exist today, a general teacher shortage can be expected.

B. **Given the general lack of confidence exhibited by the public in education at all levels, states can be expected to continue mandating competency assessment measures for both admissions and certification, thereby further restricting the supply of new teachers.**

C. **Given the lack of incentives for entering teacher education programs (low pay, low status, etc.), the quality students will increasingly be siphoned off by other professions and vocations. Therefore, one can expect the academic quality and scholarship of students entering teacher education to continue to decline.**

D. **Given the conditions listed in C above, the flight from teaching of practicing teachers will continue or increase, thereby causing the turnover rate to more nearly approach the NCES projection of 8% rather**
THAN THE NEA PROJECTION OF 6%--A FACTOR THAT WILL CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE DEVELOPING TEACHER SHORTAGE.

E. THE INCREASE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, AGES 5-18, IS A VALID ASSUMPTION AND WILL FURTHER EXAGGERATE SHORTAGES.

F. THE PRESENT SHORTAGES OF MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHERS WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY CRITICAL.

G. THE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS AND TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO TEACHER SHORTAGES WILL LAG BEHIND THE INCREASING DEMAND EVEN MORE PRONOUNCEDLY THAN IN RESPONDING TO THE OVERSUPPLY. THE MAJOR FACTOR WILL PROVE TO BE LACK OF INCENTIVES TO ENTER THE TEACHING PROFESSION.

IF YOU BELIEVE THESE DATA, IF YOUR INSTITUTIONAL DATA CONFIRM THESE PREDICTIONS, THEN YOUR OACTE SHOULD PREPARE A NEWS RELEASE AND INFORM THE PUBLIC OF AN IMPENDING CRISIS THAT CAN ONLY RESULT IN STATES FLOODING THE CLASSROOMS WITH EMERGENCY CERTIFICATED TEACHERS AND THEREBY FURTHER REDUCE THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

6. GOVERNANCE/COLLABORATION

FINALLY, TEACHER EDUCATORS SHOULD BE ACTIVE IN BUILDING COALITIONS BETWEEN THE TRAINING ARM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE
PRACfICING PROFESSION. THE POLARITY BETWEEN THE PRACTICING PROFESSION AND HIGHER EDUCATION THAT HAS EXISTED AND CONTINUES TO EXIST CAN ONLY LEAD TO A FURTHER WEAKENING OF SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION.


ARE THESE RELEVANT QUESTIONS? INDEED, THEY ARE. BUT THESE AND OTHER QUESTIONS WILL NOT BE SOLVED BY ANY ONE SEGMENT OF THE EDUCATION COMMUNITY. THEY CAN ONLY BE SOLVED BY COLLABORATIVE PROCESS OF ALL THE INVOLVED EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY. THEREFORE, WE MUST LEARN MORE ABOUT COLLABORATION AND HOW TO DEVELOP VIABLE RELATIONSHIPS WITH TEACHER AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. WE MUST LEARN TO SHARE GOVERNANCE IN NEW WAYS AND TO SPEAK WITH ONE VOICE ON SIGNIFICANT ISSUES. WHAT ARE YOU, THE OACTE, DOING TO PROMOTE COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER EDUCATION?
SUMMARY

I regret the fact that many will find my presentation unduly pessimistic and my recommendations unfounded. However, I see no great cause for optimism. The picture is bleak. Bleak in terms of financial support for education. People are no longer willing to make financial sacrifices via taxation for education. They won't increase taxation nor will they pass bond issues for new facilities. Education budgets are essentially flat.

As teacher educators, you can do something about these issues. As the Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, you have both a forum and a vehicle to implement change. If you are to be loving critics and protective spokesmen for teacher education, what resolutions will you pass in your business meetings today (tomorrow)? What issues will you discuss? Assuming you take positions on issues, how will you publicize your stances? Who writes your press releases? Of most importance, are they published?

I believe the state associations to be the most promising change agents in teacher education today. Far more important than our national association in terms of immediate impact on a state. I am a proud member of our Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. We have resolutions, we lobby for legislation, we support political candidates. We are proactive. I'm certain that your association is also, but if not, today is the best day to start political action.
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