



6-1978

Some Perspectives on the Governance of Teacher Education

M. L. Cushman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal>



Part of the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cushman, M. L. (1978) "Some Perspectives on the Governance of Teacher Education," *Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 3 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal/vol3/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

Some Perspectives on the Governance of Teacher Education

M. L. Cushman

Dean Emeritus and Professor of Education
University of North Dakota
(Currently at Southern Illinois University)

The job of preparing teachers is one of great magnitude as John King, chairman of the Department of Higher Education at Southern Illinois University, pointed out some time ago. Though the percentage of university effort devoted to preparing teachers has declined from 50% (during the period from the end of the Civil War to Pearl Harbor) to 33% in 1957, the year of Sputnik, to about 20% in 1976, the total numbers of teachers being prepared has grown very large. Year in and year out we are now educating 2,000,000 future teachers from kindergarten through graduate school in about 900 institutions. The cost of this preservice preparation of teachers is about \$10 billion a year. With a task of this magnitude, the way we organize ourselves to govern teacher preparation is especially important.

My concern in this paper is with the governance of teacher preparation, the way by which teacher preparation policy is determined.* In order to find out what agencies and organizations influence the preparation of teachers I recently summarized over

*I distinguish between governance and administration. Governance is policy formation while administration is policy implementation. Thus, within a university, there are mechanisms to determine purposes, goals, procedures and the assignment of functions to the various levels -- faculty, department chairmen, deans, vice presidents and presidents -- some of whom then administer whatever was decided. Governance, then, is decision-making, while administration is decision implementation.

400 reports, chapters, committee findings and research studies done by departments in institutions of higher education.* I then organized the information in these reports into 12 categories which allow us to see more easily some of the key influences at work on the governance of teacher preparation. In this paper I'd like to highlight the forces impinging on teacher education and see what the implications are for teacher education governance.

(1) Changes in economic and social setting have a bearing on teacher education. Tremendous socio-economic changes have rocked American society in the last twenty years. We have moved from an individualistic society to a highly corporate kind of society. We've moved into a society that has big labor, big government, big business, even big professions, like the AMA or the NEA. The individual is very helpless in this complex corporate society. If an individual wants to get something, he has to join an organization with sufficient political clout to achieve his purpose; otherwise he's quite helpless. Many books have been written describing the nature of the social, economic, political and cultural changes that have occurred in this country in the last twenty years, and the growing involvement of the United States in international affairs as we've succeeded Great Britain in the post-World War II years as the keeper of the world's police force.

Some of the changes in the larger society have had impact on teacher preparation. We have all seen stories in local newspapers telling how local banks or businesses can't hire high school or even college graduates because they can't do simple computations or write a sentence so that they can be understood. The chain of logic reaching from these stories to teacher preparation runs something like this: our children aren't well enough educated; that means the schools must not be good enough and that means the

*See M.L. Cushman, The Governance of Teacher Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977. 296 pp.

teachers aren't good enough; if the teachers are bad, that must be the fault of the institutions that prepared them, specifically, the faculties, department chairmen and the deans of the colleges of education. Clearly the general social and economic setting has some role in establishing educational policies.

(2) Historical antecedents provide useful information about the influence on teacher preparation. History shows, for example, that the idea that universities should be interested in teacher education has a much earlier origin than most people think. In the time of Henry VIII, in England, a teacher by the name of Richard Mulcaster developed the unheard of thesis that the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers was a legitimate undertaking for universities. He was a voice crying in the wilderness 300 years before his time. Unfortunately, the idea that the preparation of teachers was beneath the dignity of a college or a respectable state university has persisted for centuries. It was primarily because colleges and universities did not provide for that kind of preparation that the teachers college movement grew from the normal school movement back in the 1830s. It wasn't until the 1970s that the universities began to take interest in teacher education. And even then they did it in a backhanded way, because the early professors of education -- known as professors of pedagogy -- were really professors of either philosophy or psychology. As the subject matter of teaching practices developed, education professors were given a chair in these universities. The University of Michigan was one of the original ones in this field although the University of Iowa also makes such a claim. When the Land Grant Colleges came into being (subsequent to 1862) they began to prepare teachers of agriculture and home economics, but again they did it in an apologetic manner. The preparation of teachers in colleges and universities is still regarded by some as beneath the dignity of a respectable state university. This attitude has hampered the freedom of movement, the independence and the authority to prepare teachers by the units within the institution, whether it's the department, school or college of education.

(3) All-university governance has a good deal of impact on teacher education governance. The university has a senate, vice presidents, president; it has deans and department chairmen. These governance mechanisms have in recent years undergone many new assignments of functions, out of which grew one of the rather interesting developments in teacher education -- namely, the concept of the all-university teacher education policy-forming committee. The preparation of teachers differs from the preparation of other professionals. Universities have a law school to prepare lawyers and a medical school to prepare physicians; these schools generally have complete control over their programs. Not so with teacher education. The teacher's preparation is not all strictly pedagogical i.e., methods of teaching, classroom procedures, skills, abilities, knowledge, understandings. The preparation of a teacher is not confined to a four year undergraduate program that is uniquely professional; as a result, teacher preparation is not confined alone to the college of education. The teacher who is going to be a mathematics teacher has to get that specialization in the mathematics department in the college of liberal arts. The teacher who is going to be a music teacher gets music specialization, competency, skills, knowledge and ability, from the music department. In addition to the area of specialization, all teachers are liberally educated persons, or should be. The teacher ought to be able to hold his or her own in the community with architects, lawyers, doctors, engineers and other educated people. That means the teacher must have a very respectable background, not in one area of knowledge, but in practically all of them -- mathematics, English, science, social studies, speech, foreign language. The result has been that over the last thirty years we have developed the notion that all these other agencies which contribute to teacher education ought to have some voice in the decision as to how it should be done. But this does not mean that all these supporting departments should control general education and subject matter specialization. This is different from the preparation of a nurse in the school of nursing, because that school has complete control of the program from the time the

student is a freshman until he or she graduates. In preparing engineers, the college of engineering does not defer to the mathematics department to prescribe the mathematics for a prospective engineer. The college of engineering advises that. But the education professors don't do that: they leave it to each department. This complicates the governance mechanism.

(4) Early surveys of institutional organization showed the importance of sound structure in the governance procedure of education. One study showed a very high positive relationship between the structure for teacher education and its effectiveness; that is, the more centralized the teacher education policy formation process was, the greater was the likelihood that the institution was doing a better job in preparing teachers. In 1947 a study was made by the dean of education at the University of North Carolina which concluded quite clearly that faulty structure meant faulty development of teacher education policy.

(5) The need to improve the organization for teacher education was impeded on most campuses by a failure to recognize the difference between a discipline and a profession. We speak of the academic disciplines and the professions. Every university has a number of subjects to be studied called disciplines -- mathematics, science, social studies, speech, foreign language, fine arts and so on. The liberal arts college is the usual common seat of the disciplines and is organized in such a way as to facilitate teaching and research in these disciplines. There is a specialization of professors of chemistry, of professors of physics, and of professors of history. Thus, the philosophy of organization is subject matter oriented. But when the professional schools organize themselves in a similar way, they get into trouble because their subject matter is a practicing one; the people who succeed in it are accomplished practitioners and not merely knowledge-possessors. When we try to organize the professions according to disciplines, we have a very difficult structure. The total subject matter for the teacher must encompass not only knowledge but how to use it in teaching.

(6) Teacher education programs are influenced by a very large number of institutional governance structures. For example, the graduate school determines a great deal of what is done in the preparation of Superintendents of Schools. The president and his staff have an influence upon teacher education. A council of deans establishes policy. The college of arts and science is a great contributor to the academic components of teacher education. Also we frequently forget that there is another group of teaching fields: the vocational area, such as industrial arts, home economics, business education, that prepares many teachers. Then there is a group of fine arts subjects; art, music, and dramatics, in which teachers specialize. Students have gained a greater voice in the management of their programs in recent years and that has been manifested also in teacher education.

(7) Another group of forces that have an influence on teacher education are agencies that provide funding. Whoever can contribute some funds to get a certain kind of job done has an element of control in it. In recent years the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation, for example, have had a tremendous influence upon teacher education because they are in a position to award thousands of dollars to institutions which are willing to carry on teacher education in the way the foundations believe it should be done.

The financial agency that has had the most influence on teacher education in recent years has been the federal government. The U.S. Office of Education has poured literally millions of dollars into promoting a purpose which that office feels is necessary. Initially the federal government's role in education was the collection of statistics about education throughout the country. The second phase of influence of the federal government after 1900 was the conducting of many surveys of education. In more recent years the officials of the federal government have said, "We have another purpose," or, "We are assuming another purpose." (I'm not sure whether Congress ever legislated it or not). "We think we should stimulate change in the direction we think

teacher education ought to go." The federal government has become an influencing agency which purposely and deliberately attempts to promote their particular concepts. My feeling is that there is as much wisdom in a college or university as there is on the banks of the Potomac.

(8) A number of state agencies also exert considerable influence on teacher education policies. The state government itself in its appropriations to higher education and to teacher education influences what an institution can and cannot do. Over all the institutions is a state board of higher education which determines the structure for teacher education in its colleges and universities and determines the scope of the teacher education program. At the state level, also influencing teacher education, is a governmental agency that certifies teachers. You have to get a teaching certificate before you can tamper with youngsters' minds, and you cannot become a teacher without a license any more than you can go duck hunting without a license. (I sometimes wonder whether there is any determination as to which is more important). The legislature, the governor, and the courts also are state education agencies which control or at least influence the kind of programs and the structures for the delivery of those programs in institutions of higher learning.

(9) Governance of teacher preparation is increasingly influenced by the practitioners in the teaching profession. The total membership of the teaching profession at all levels is about 3,470,000. The National Education Association is the leading agency insofar as numbers are concerned, but the American Federation of Teachers has over three hundred thousand. It does not have the influence nationally, except in larger cities like New York and Chicago, that the NEA has.

The National Education Association has for the past several years been changing from a professional organization designed to improve the professional competency of its members to an organization whose purpose is like a labor union in that it attempts

to improve such working conditions of its members as salary, fringe benefits and even to limit the number of students in a class. In more recent years it has also attempted to control entrance into the profession. The American Medical Association controls entrance to the profession by restricting enrollment in medical schools. The American Bar Association does the same thing. These people are quite unashamed of the fact that you have to pass a bar examination before you can be a lawyer in any state. The National Education Association is embarking upon a similar program. They want to control the numbers entering teaching. There are two places in which you can do that more easily than other places: at entrance into the training program, and at the certification level just before one is licensed to teach. The NEA is supporting legislation in each state which would provide for a professional practices commission, composed largely of teachers, whose job it would be to (1) accredit the institutions that are permitted to prepare teachers in the state; (2) approve the programs which those institutions will provide for prospective teachers, and (3) issue the license once the preparation program is completed. Only two states, Oregon and California, now have such all-powerful commissions. For a number of years, a small war has been brewing between those in higher education who prepare teachers, and the NEA officials in Washington. It's going to be the education battle of the century. I have maintained that those of us who have been in teacher education in universities for a quarter of a century are also a profession in our own right -- and we therefore have the right to decide who shall enter, by what programs they shall be educated, and when they are qualified to receive a certificate for teaching. Since we are a sub-profession of the overall teaching profession, the overall teaching profession will probably tell us what to do.

(10) The profession of teacher educators in colleges and universities and in state education agencies have organized an agency that accredits teacher preparation programs. This is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

(NCATE). In the last twenty years, NCATE has had a tremendous influence in determining the organization for teacher education and the academic and professional programs in institutions of higher learning as they have become accredited institutions for the preparation of teachers. The purpose has been to improve teacher education by stimulating the faculty in teacher education to understand its job better and to assure the public of some level of competence. The extent of this influence is debatable, but most educators agree that it has been rather large. The many publications of AACTE, ATE, SPE, etc., are evidence of NCATE's significance.

(11) The internal organization of the teacher education unit also has influence on teacher education policy. We have a college, a school, or a department of education. How could you logically organize it internally so as to enable it to discharge its function? You can organize it in levels -- elementary, secondary, higher. You can organize it by subject matter area: specialists in mathematics education, social studies education and other areas of specialization. Or you can look on it as a way by which we decide what the teacher is -- what the teacher does in the classroom, or what kind of person is required. Classroom procedures differentiate the teacher from just another educated person.

There is also the necessity for keeping teacher education units up to date, for providing some means for innovation. We have to slough off the old when it has become obsolete -- we must have enough adaptability and initiative to take on the new as it becomes available and proves its worth to teaching in the classroom. All this has a bearing upon how you organize the teacher education unit.

(12) In addition to all these other structures, the politics of control exerts influence on final teacher preparation policy. What happens when the teacher education policies are actually made is probably more thoroughly explained by political expediency than by such other somewhat more desirable procedures as the collegial atmosphere prevailing

among professional colleagues. Policy decisions can also be reached by typical bureaucratic procedures. When you look at the three major ways by which decisions are reached -- the collegial, the bureaucratic and the political -- it is the opinion of many authors that probably what happens on a university campus is better explained by the political model than by the other two.

As a result, people in higher education are learning political skills. The notion that politics was a dirty sort of thing which schools, especially colleges and universities, should not be engaged in, had its origin a long time ago. After all, we like to think we are above politics; we like to think we make decisions on the basis of logical, objective, scientific solutions, and not by pulling strings or by old-fashioned horse-trading. But education is a political system; teacher education is a political system, and there are certain kinds of structures that facilitate this political process and others that do not.

The procedures that are commonly used to reach decisions on a political basis are easily recognized. For example, if the Vice President for Academic Affairs wants to get a certain job done, he presents the appearance of being collegial, professional, and scholarly, by appointing a committee. The committee makes a report, and objectively reaches a decision, so it appears, except for one thing: the Vice President for Academic Affairs actually appointed to the committee only those professors who would come out with the decision he wanted. Politics is also the procedure of "you vote for my candidate, I'll vote for yours." Then too there is the procedure of appealing through the press, the local student newspaper, or the local TV media to convince people that yours is the way to get the job done. There are a lot of political maneuverings in higher education and educators better start using all legitimate procedures.

(13) Finally let me evaluate the needs of teacher education governance and recommend some structures and procedures which are more effective than

others. I think the first thing that should be done is for administrators to recognize that teaching is a profession; that the preparation of teachers in the universities is as much a legitimate part of that university's function as is the preparation of lawyers, doctors, engineers, or business managers. If they do that, they will accord the college of education the same autonomy that they accord the faculties, the administrators and the deans of other professional schools and colleges within the university.

Secondly, I think that all faculty members in higher education must recognize that teacher education is a full four year program. It is not just 20 or 30 hours of professional education tacked on to any type of bachelor's degree. It is just as important for a teacher to be well versed in the major academic disciplines as it is for a chemistry professor to know his chemistry, a business administrator to know his economics, or a lawyer to know his political science. The problem arises because teacher education is a derived profession, resting more upon other academic specializations than almost any other profession's preparation. Still, people in professional education must be given the authority to either themselves provide, or control some other unit that could provide, the academic disciplines and the supporting backgrounds in teacher education. This would also include such other areas of supporting disciplines to the profession of education as educational sociology, educational psychology, historical foundations of education, political foundations of education and economic foundations of education.

I think in the future, colleges of education are going to continue to grow. One reason for this is that there is a great deal of expertise in the field of education that is applicable to other social professions, the helping professions, particularly. As evidence of that, New York University several years ago expanded their college of education into an institution called the College of Education and Human Services within which they now have their School of Nursing, because a great deal of what nurses learn and do can be assisted by knowledge of education.

The University of West Virginia, several years ago, organized a College of Education and Human Resources. The University of Vermont has a College of Education and Social Service as its title, and there are several others. About 40 percent of the Colleges of Education in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges have something more in their colleges than teacher education. They have programs in which people may complete the Bachelor's Degree in Education, and yet not be certified for teaching in public schools. They are preparing school psychologists, school nurses and guidance and counseling specialists who may not be able to teach in classrooms at all because they don't have the record of academic or subject matter specialization. I think they're moving in the right direction. If colleges of education weren't already here, it would probably be necessary to organize them.

There are two groups of influences on teacher education: one outside the university, one within the university. From within the university we have the university governance structure -- the university senate, student organizations, the president and his staff, a council of deans, a college of arts and sciences, vocational departments, other professional schools and the graduate school; and we have the professional teacher education unit itself which has three major components -- practice, theory and clinical experience. Each of those elements within the university has some say in governing an institution's teacher education program.

On the other hand, there is also a group of influences outside the university: foundations which influence by the money they make available, the legislature and its appropriations, the teaching profession itself, the state board of education that determines the scope of the college of education programs, professional teacher educators, learned societies, various federal agencies, the State Certification Agency, and finally the local district which hires the graduates.

There are 18 agencies inside and outside the

university which have a powerful impact on teacher education and the preparation of teachers. In general, however, the colleges of education do not have the legislative allocation of power necessary to control these functions. I believe that the major job of a college of education is to reconcile the differences of all these impacting agencies: The major job of the college of education is to be the arbitrating and reconciling agency for all the others. There is nobody else that can do it. But, in the past, it has not had the same authority to do that as the other professional schools on the campus. I conclude that colleges of education must have authority commensurate with their responsibility.