

PREFACE

This collection of narratives, stories, and case studies seeks to inform teacher educators and related professionals about various kinds of policy processes that affect their aims, work, and accomplishments. Each chapter, while treating an event or process worth knowing in its own terms, is illustrative of the much larger set of policy initiatives in and out of the field that have come to impact upon us in the last decade or so. The basic purpose in commissioning this collection is to increase the awareness and sophistication of teacher educators in respect to such matters in hopes that we become, if not wholly in control of our destiny, much more effective participants in its determination. Impetus for this project came from two sources: first, my experience as a long-term participant in teacher education's policy processes in several different arenas and, then later, my experience as I sought to organize formal coursework for doctoral candidates with career aspirations in teacher education.

In the summer of 1989 the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU) invited me to address the lessons we in teacher education ought to have learned from the avalanche of recent state regulation of teacher education (Gideonse, 1990). I was asked to work from the perspective of opportunities which had arisen for me to address policy struggles in a number of individual states and also to study policy initiatives across the board in connection with several years of service on the Government Relations Task Force of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

Over a couple of months I distilled my thoughts and then undertook a dialectic on them with colleagues across the country.¹ I ended up with a baker's dozen plus one of observations to share with the TECSCU membership.

NUMBER 1: HOW LITTLE WE KNOW

An ironic conclusion is how little we know that satisfies others' policy queries of us. Teacher educators, the presumed repositories of the specialized knowledge pertaining to our field, are constantly being asked questions by policy makers to which we do not have ready answers. How many students in teacher education programs? How many different kinds of programs? How might the different kinds of programs be best characterized? How many states have alternative routes, and how many certificated teachers have taken those paths? What are the retention rates of different kinds of programs? How do the products of the different routes and programs differ from one another as input and as output?

In some states, progress is being made toward the collection of data that would begin to answer such questions. Organized teacher education (that is, AACTE) began a few years ago to address the demands of the policy processes at the state level,² but even the AACTE effort cannot do much more than generate and update the valuable compendia of state-level activities.

Part of our problem is that the kinds of things *we* consider knowledge are of lesser interest to legislators and policy makers, but our inability (and sometimes unwillingness) to provide what *they* consider knowledge actually undermines legislators' acceptance of our claims to know things of importance to teacher education. Our natural propensity to see the complexities of our work makes us reticent to make the simplifying assumptions legislators often feel necessary to the formulation of policy. Our difficulties are not eased by our own more-than-occasional assessment of the questions we receive from policy makers as ignorant, or our failure to keep that assessment to ourselves, a failure which sometimes leads policy makers to see us as arrogant or contemptuous.

NUMBER 2: DIFFERENT RHYTHMS

The rhythm of the work of state-level policy bodies is different from the rhythms with which college and university teacher educators are familiar. This is a reflection of two different cultures at work.

Policy bodies feel teacher educators drag their feet; teacher educators feel policy bodies move with inordinate speed. Different time frames and work structures are part of the explana-

tion. Another is that policy makers seek to make decisions, but because of the collegial assumptions underlying academic enterprises, teacher educators strive for a more time-consuming aim—the development of consensus.

NUMBER 3: ORAL TRADITIONS VS. WRITTEN

While policy proposals and their results eventually get written down and teacher educators in the academy are no strangers to protracted discussion, there is an important truth in noting the oral character of much of what takes place in the processes by which policy is developed. While written analyses may be important and available (especially where policy staffs exist and are involved), legislators, particularly, tend to function most frequently and effectively in an oral mode, particularly when trading and testing ideas. The truism of “who you know” being important in politics is validated by the fact of the connections, yes, but also because it is an indication of whom you can and do *talk* to. The political process depends heavily on relatively brief, pertinent conversations among and between legislators and other policy makers and those in whom they have trust. Volumes of written material will not overcome distrust; where trust is present, however, very brief interactions can be almost unbelievably efficacious. Oral processes, however, are difficult to keep track of if one is unable to stay on top of them all the time.

NUMBER 4: THE HEAVY TIME DEMANDS OF PARTICIPATION IN POLICY PROCESSES

A crucial corollary of the different rhythms and the oral character of policy processes, therefore, is the heavy time demand of participation in the policy process. Keeping up with who knows or says what, what has happened most recently, and which directions protagonists are taking is incredibly taxing. And to play, one must keep up.

Active participants must stay in touch with one another, must dialogue continuously to assess what is happening, and must be prepared to be places or cover one another when needed, even on the day or two notice that a quick luncheon appointment or a swiftly scheduled (to say nothing of simultaneously scheduled) hearing may require.

When developments occur it is not unusual for protagonists to need to be on the phone with one another two or three times a day. On days during the most intensive activity dozens

of such calls, many of them quite lengthy, may be exchanged. If teacher educator deans or faculty are to be involved, there are implications for prioritizing activities, availability, scheduling, and interruptions in addition to the issue of total amount of time involved.

NUMBER 5: BEING TOO LATE

When a disturbing policy proposal is first initiated by a key legislative or other policy official, teacher educators should view it as a signal not of the *starting* point of their involvement but of their *failure* to involve themselves in processes already ongoing. True, there have been more than a few successes in mounting holding actions to minimize harm from otherwise problematic initiatives. But the surprise appearance of an otherwise damaging or even outrageous policy proposal should be seen by teacher educators not as the start of their problems, but confirmation that they have existed for some time.

NUMBER 6: DISCOUNTING EXPERTISE AS VESTED INTEREST

A most disheartening realization of teacher education policy activists is the way many policy makers treat expressions of expertise as evidence not that we know something but that we seek only to protect our vested interests. The irony of the dismissal of expertise as mere defensiveness should not be lost. What teacher educators believe is the reason they should be listened to is the signal for policy makers to, as it were, mentally turn off our microphones!

NUMBER 7: SERENDIPITY

Many teacher educator policy activists report, with both surprise and relief, how important it has been that they found themselves in the right place at the right time. It is a rightness that they felt they could not have predicted before the fact, but that they clearly recognized after the fact. We can find a familiar analogy in our own scholarship. Every scholar has experienced reading a library shelf or browsing through a computerized index, in effect, being in "places" where our operant research and bibliographic search terms really didn't suggest we should be, and as a result finding a crucial citation that, perhaps, even changed the course of the quest on which we were embarked. The chance hall conversation outside a committee room as the bill is being marked up, seeing the respect accorded an "adversary" and the way she is questioned by a

legislative committee (and thus coming to understand something about why the respect is there and what that might suggest about one's own stance), or actually being mistaken as an ally by an opponent and hearing the policy strategy unfold before your very eyes and ears—all these are real examples of events that made a difference in one or another policy context.

NUMBER 8: GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY

Given the rhythms and the oral character of policy formulation, individuals who are geographically closer to where policy is made are in a better position to be players than those who are more distant. That does not mean that distance cannot be overcome, but there is no substitute for being there when it counts. That places special burdens on those who are closer. Teacher educators who are in or near their state capital—or their president's or provost's office—have opportunities and obligations respecting policy formulation that it is difficult for others to assume.

NUMBER 9: DO WE FACE EVIL, IGNORANCE, OR SOMETHING ELSE?

Given the impulse to in some way label the latest policy struggle, assign the second greatest weight to ignorance, the least weight to the likelihood of evil, and the greatest weight to "something else," more than likely fragmentation of interest, different information, or competing purpose. The problem with attributing explanations to evil being visited on teacher education is not just that it is so often mistaken, but that it risks violating an important rule of politics: "Never make any permanent enemies."³

NUMBER 10: TOO FEW LEADERS

Many teacher educators believe that the burden of engagement in policy processes has fallen on a relatively small number of people. That may be because there are few leaders among us. It may be that there are few with the time and energy to devote after the on-campus requirements of their duties. It may also be that there are few who are willing to take the career or on-campus risks associated with such activity. Some faculty do not always understand or appreciate the importance of policy work. Provosts and presidents may not understand it either, and sometimes what they *think* they understand reflects a priority of the larger campus needs as contrasted with the needs of the

teaching profession and its clients. More than once activists have experienced sometimes subtle—and sometimes much less so—signals to butt out of policy involvement, especially with the legislature, but occasionally with the higher education policy structure, too, because of perceived conflicts in purpose with the “larger” interests of the college or university.

NUMBER 11: CONFLICTING MOTIVATIONS

Legislators may not be as interested in the specifics of change as the fact or perception of change as accomplishment in itself. Lobbyists talk of legislative aides who acknowledge that all their principal wants is a “boffo,” something that stands out and looks good.

Whatever teacher educators may be tempted privately to think in such instances, what we need to remember is that policy makers of all stripes have career agendas, as indeed do teacher educators, and while theirs are different from ours, they are no less legitimate in their particular context. They have constituencies to which they are responding, as presumably do we. But their’s are different agendas and different constituencies, just as legitimate as ours, and we need to understand and respect those differences if we are to be effective players.

NUMBER 12: DIVISIONS WITHIN THE PROFESSION

The serious divisions within teacher education—purposively, institutionally, professionally—weaken us in our dealings with policy-making bodies. When professional sectors speak with divided voices, the range of choice open to policy makers expands dramatically. When we cannot “get ourselves together” or, worse, when we actually fight with one another in the policy arena, we have only the illusion of involvement, for the operational effect of disunity among us is the certainty that decisions will be made by nonprofessionals on premises other than ours.

NUMBER 13: TEACHER EDUCATORS AS REACTIONARIES AND FOOT DRAGGERS

This observation is related to the one already made about treating expertise as vested interest. But it is different. (Pursuing vested interests, for example, can lead to the request for change as well as stasis.) All too often we are seen as reactionary, seeking only a return to times of quiet and inattention by others. Some who would make teacher education policy

view, or at least talk as if they view, teacher educators as incompetent or contemptible. Though the perception be false, however, does not eliminate its impact on the policy process. Where it is present, it is deeply held and tends to be extremely resistant to head-on challenge.

NUMBER 14: YOGI BERRA WAS WRONG

The adoption of a policy or the passage of a statute should never be seen as the end of a policy process; it is only the beginning of a next round. In other words, it isn't over when it's over. That next round may be the tasks of regulation writing, the development of enabling procedures, or the implementation of the intended programs. Or it may be the beginning of an initiative aimed at seeking eventual reversal. Policy engagement must be seen, therefore, not as an episodic phenomenon but as a continuous commitment.

These observations shared with the TECSCU teacher education administrators are admittedly impressionistic and highly experiential, perhaps not terribly profound, and yet still important for teacher educators to comprehend. However, one way to look at these specifics in the aggregate plus the TECSCU request that they be addressed in the first place is the perceived need to increase the sophistication of teacher educators' involvement in the policy processes affecting us.

There was a second stimulus to this volume. After a twenty-two year absence from full-time teaching responsibilities owing to the assumption of a variety of administrative duties, in and out of the university, I sought to design a seminar on teacher education policy as my contribution to the offerings of a department many of whose graduate students ultimately assume teacher education responsibilities. While I had been living, working, and writing in the policy arena for over twenty years, shifting to a more exclusively scholarly and instructional role itself proved to be a learning experience.

Systematic examination of the policy literature pertaining to teacher education was, at first, disappointing, mainly because of the discovery of its scarce supply. A few important works existed (for example, Shulman and Sykes, 1983). Materials were available from research centers (for example, RAND's Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession or the Center for Policy Research in Education), a number of the major policy agencies (for example, the National Governors Association, the Southern Regional Education Board, or the Education Commission of the

States), or professional associations (for example, the National Education Association or the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education). Journal sources, notably *Phi Delta Kappan* and the *Journal of Teacher Education*, contained a fair amount of material, and the national education press of record—the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Education Week*—offers considerable discussion of the specifics of emerging teacher education policy proposals. With the recent publication of *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (Houston, 1990) several useful chapters with some comprehensiveness bearing on teacher education policy concerns are newly available.

Examination of the materials available from this variety of sources showed that while many policy issues were treated and were subjected to a variety of different kinds of analysis (e.g., quantitative, philosophical, policy, historical, etc.), in very short supply were expositions and studies of policy development—stories, narratives, and cases that explored the how and why of policy development for teacher education as compared with the what (that is, the more or less formal analysis of the issues *per se*). This very imbalance is part of the problem faced by those who might wish to participate constructively in the development of teacher education policy—the issue orientation subtly reinforces the belief that rational analysis and action can be achieved, thus drawing attention away from the complex, idiosyncratic, personalized, context-bound, and sometimes seamy political realities which often govern. This volume aims to make a contribution toward meeting the need for narratives, stories, and cases illuminating realities of the policy processes for teacher education.

The planning for the volume followed a straight-forward path. Policy was defined as goals, criteria, standards, sanctions, and accepted procedures impinging on performance. Any policy arena has a particular set of topics which identifies its domain. Teacher education policy embraces stakeholders, actors, and agencies, and it follows the rules and norms of the agencies in which it originates or is applied.

Among the categories for teacher education policy may be found, for example:

Topics

State licensure standards (initial and continuing)
Degree and program approval

Supply and demand
Testing for licensure purposes
Professional certification
Curriculum sanctions in higher education institutions
Accreditation
Continuing education standards
Financial provisions for support of teacher education
Structural arrangements for policy (e.g., state boards; advisory commissions; legislatures; professional standards and practices boards; etc.)

Stakeholders

Society
Children
Parents
Education professionals of all kinds
Policy makers

Actors

The public
State and local education policy officials
State and federal legislators
Education professionals (teachers; administrators, state and local)
College/university personnel (professional education and other faculty; administrators)
Educational and policy research community
Professional organizations
Temporary systems (e.g., commissions, etc.)

Given this considerable diversity of topics, stakeholders, and actors and given the aim of increasing the awareness and sophistication of teacher educators in such matters, several parameters were set for the development of the volume. Yarger and Smith (1990) reference five distinct research methodologies commonly used in teacher education: narrative studies, case studies, surveys, correlational studies, and causal/experimental studies. Clearly, the substantive chapters of the volume fit into both the narrative and case study classifications, but as a group they range widely from historical treatments, to personalized narratives, to quite demanding and highly structured case studies, one of which even aims at assessment and

interpretation in terms of theoretical propositions bearing on educational policy.

The variety of approaches is a direct consequence of the development strategy for the volume. Two considerations were central: attending to the credibility of the authors in the eyes of the teacher educator audience; and facilitating the preparation of the chapters in a reasonable period of time.

Accordingly, all the chapters presented herein (excepting only the one by Nona Prestine) were commissioned specifically for this volume. They were drafted by individuals who, in the main, participated directly in the events they describe and analyze. This has the effect of reducing substantially the scholarly "start-up" time. On the other hand, it risks objectivity as it is classically understood. Then again, commissioning authors who themselves have lived through or close to the events they consider promises to increase the credibility of the exposition and interpretation in the eyes of eventual audiences, primarily because it gives greater promise of preserving the perceived meaning of the unfolding events.

This, of course, speaks to an issue in behavioral and social inquiry that is ultimately unresolvable. Can objectivity ever be achieved save *within* the boundaries of a given cultural or dispositional paradigm or point of view? Conversely, can steps taken to serve the principle of objectivity have the effect of damaging or at least interfering with credibility and essential meaning? The best that can be hoped for is recognition of the problem and then action with that knowledge in mind. Accordingly, each author identified at least two persons equally involved or close to the case to undertake a formative critique. Authors were asked to present their cases in a nonpartisan (though not necessarily dispassionate) fashion. (Policy debates are "juicy" for those whose lives are affected by them; to deny that characteristic would have been a mistake.) In preparing their chapters, each author was asked to address common topics—significance; key actors and structures; motivations, purposes, and strategies; chronology; policy outcomes; and case study sources.

The chapters selected sought to represent a broad range of issues and arenas for teacher education policy. The chapters are grouped into seven that focus on state-level policy developments, two that focus on policy development at an institutional level,⁴ and three that address national or regional policy developments.

Substantively, the largest set focuses on state-level policy developments. Richard Ishler addresses Texas SB 994 and its imposition of credit hour caps on teacher education programs.

David Colton and Barbara Simmons narrate New Mexico's different attempt to impose caps, in this instance on the amount of *subject matter* future teachers could be required to take.

Richard Mastain and Ralph Brott draw lessons from the last thirty years of legislative and administrative policy developments in California bearing on teacher credentialing. The importance of this experience can be seen in, among other things, the ups and downs of California's willingness to second-guess or trust the role of professionals with responsibility for defining and maintaining teacher credentialing standards.

Kenneth Carlson treats New Jersey's imposition of the alternate route to teacher certification, an object lesson in teacher education's vulnerability to an unfriendly policy blitz.

Ellis Joseph and James Biddle address the background for and then the pursuit of 1989 initiatives in Ohio to create an alternate route for teacher certification, on the one hand, and a uniform teacher education program for all institutions in the state, on the other. It is a story of a drift from collaborative, cooperative policy development within the larger professional community toward less responsive, more directive, and more political legislative processes.

Robert Barr describes and analyzes Oregon's experiences as it moved to master's-level professional certification, including a coda added after completion of the chapter to report the surprising demise of the OSU College of Education and the decimation of teacher education at the University of Oregon.

Finally, James Cooper and Philip Tate describe and explain Virginia's teacher education reforms of the mid-1980s, a rather different approach to the establishment of a less constrictive form of credit hour caps in teacher education.

Two chapters focus on institutional policy in higher education. Donald Anderson employs the catbird seat of his deanship of the Ohio State University's College of Education to narrate and reflect upon implementing curricular reform in connection with the Holmes Group initiative.

Nona Prestine presents and analyzes the University of Wisconsin's unsuccessful struggle with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction over the governance of teacher education programs.

Three chapters address policy activities in regional or national terms. Maynard Reynolds treats the passage and implementation of PL 94-142 as an instance of federal policy initiatives impacting teacher education.

Richard Wisniewski explores the Southern Regional Education Board's role as a disseminator of teacher education policy ideas during the 1980s.

My own chapter tells the story of the 1980 to 1986 redesign of the standards, processes, and structures of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The volume concludes with David Clark's cross-chapter analysis. In it he comments on the condition and future prospects for developments in teacher education policy as illuminated by the case studies.