Beginning Professors and the "Reform" Agenda: Reform or Response?

Ardra L. Cole is an associate professor in the Department of Adult Education and J. Gary Knowles is a visiting professor, both at The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. They served as co-guest editors for this issue of Teacher Education Quarterly. *They acknowledge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for financial support for the preparation of this collection of articles and Dhanna Mistri for her tireless assistance and constructive comments.*

By Ardra L. Cole & J. Gary Knowles

"Reform" is but one of the many "re" words invading our personal and professional lives.[1] We are hard-pressed to open or turn on any form of mass media without being confronted by "calls," "proposals," "prescriptions," "strategies," or "accounts" related to reforming, restructuring, reengineering (or any other of the numerous "re" words in vogue) some governmental or societal program or institution. Education, as one societal institution, is once again front and center on the reform stage.

The Reform Agenda

Calls for educational reform are numerous and take many forms. In North America and beyond, recent calls to reform education have been prompted by politicians, business leaders, educators, parents, and the populous, variously motivated by reduced government incomes, drastic cuts in government spending, public demands for fiscal and institutional

accountability, and espoused interests in improving schools for the societal good—the latter of which also includes improving the quality of the teaching profession. Aronowitz and Giroux (1993, p. 226) point out, however, that the restructuring movement in education results mainly from "narrow economic concerns, private interests, and strongly conservative values," a view that is echoed by Webber (1995), commenting on the draconian education "reforms" recently initiated in Alberta, Canada. (Similar reforms "promised" in Ontario and other provinces of Canada prompt similar responses.) Like most sought after and achieved changes in education, current large-scale reform efforts seem to be driven more by politics than pedagogy. Nevertheless, the pressure for change is very real and prescriptions abound.

One such prescription is written for teacher education. In North America, one of the central arguments upon which the broad education reform agenda is based is that school (and therefore education) reform is dependent on the reform of teacher preparation. The Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum in the United States, for example, have launched major campaigns to improve the standards of teacher education programs and the quality of teachers. According to the Holmes Group, the "ills of American education" are rooted in inadequate teacher preparation (1995, p. 5), a very weighty burden indeed for the teacher education professoriate. The following quote, taken from the third in a series of reports by the Holmes Group, clearly articulates this position:

> The education school should cease to act as a silent agent in the preservation of the status quo.... Those who prepare teachers and other educators continue to dwell in a bygone era, using outmoded conceptions of professional work to guide their preparation programs. (1995, p. 8)

While we agree that teacher education is in dire need of improvement, and that schools of education as university-based institutions are perhaps more interested in perpetuating than reforming themselves (Wisniewski, 1996a), we disagree with the intensity of the above generalized assessment of teacher educators. It is not our intention in this article to critique the Holmes Group agenda or any other reform prescription, although we are not without criticism (for thoughtful responses to the Holmes Group Reports, see, *e.g.*, Labaree, 1995; Soltis, 1987); it **is** our purpose to debunk notions that lay blame on teacher educators themselves for the inadequate preparation of teachers to deal with the complexities and demands of today's classrooms. Moreover, it is our intent to highlight the conditions under which a particular group of teacher educators works towards bringing about sustained reform. We know that there are a tremendous number of teacher educators working for change, many of them new to the professoriate. And the changes many of them envisage are best represented by deep conceptual shifts—the very basis for substantial and sustained reforms—regarding schools and their functions, and teachers and their work.

In this issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* we focus on beginning professors

of teacher education ("junior," untenured but tenure-track faculty members) and explore elements of their role in the reform of teacher education. Although we acknowledge that not all beginning teacher educators are involved in change efforts and not all change efforts involve beginning professors, a close look at the role of beginning professors in teacher education reform is warranted for several reasons. Beginning professors represent a new generation of teacher educators and, because they will "inherit the professoriate" (Ducharme, 1993, p. 102), it is important to understand their orientations and commitments. Faculty renewal in the form of hiring is viewed by many deans of education and others as a change strategy; in many institutions teacher educators, like those featured in this issue, are hired **because** of their commitment to improve teacher education. It is important to examine this "faculty renewal" change strategy within the context of current institutional structures and practices. Given the untenured, and therefore vulnerable, status of beginning professors, it is vital to consider the appropriateness of the expectations and demands placed on them as well as the commitments they themselves make. In light of these and related concerns we introduce this theme issue with two broad questions in mind:

- Given current institutional structures, is teacher education reform probable or even possible? and,
- How can university-sponsored reform efforts proceed in ways that are fair and just to those members of the professoriate who take part?

These questions are not the driving forces of the individual or collective work that is represented in this issue, nor are they the articulated concerns of the various authors; these questions are the ones that naggle us, more so now that we have been further exposed to and privy to the experiences, dilemmas, and concerns of those who would change schools and the preparation of teachers.

In the sections which follow we address, first, the nature and place of teacher education reform against the broader reform agenda; second, schools of education and their relation to the reform agenda; third, schools of education as contexts for reform; fourth, teacher educators and their work; and, fifth, the role of beginning professors in teacher education reform. Together these sections provide a context, backdrop, and reference for the experiential, analytical, and responsive accounts which follow in the remainder of the issue.

Teacher Education Reform and the Broader Reform Agenda

The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) reports that between 1983 and 1985 alone more than 700 pieces of legislation were enacted in the 50 states to improve the quality of teachers (ATE, 1991, p. 5). Consider, then, what the figure might be if added to this number were all the non-legislated efforts by individuals

and institutions, and if the time-span were extended by a decade or more. The figure would be staggering. (Imagine further what the figure would be if we consider four decades of calls for reform of teacher education. See Klausmeier's [1990] review of the teacher education reform agenda from the 1950s through the 1980s.) In Canada, the focus on teachers and teacher education as part of the broader political reform agenda is more recent; however, since the late 1980s every education reform document released by a provincial government includes a call for changes in the way teachers are prepared. For example, in the *Report to the College of Teachers on Teacher Education in British Columbia*, Bowman (1990) states: "It is of the utmost importance that all who teach teachers must be fine teachers themselves...[and] be recognized and rewarded appropriately" (pp. 109-110). Although the impetus for such reports and suggestions for change and actions vary widely, the point is that the reform of teacher education is high on the political agenda in North America. One has only to scan the titles of education publications over the past decade for further evidence of the topical nature of education reform in the United States and Canada.

A review of recent literature on teacher education reform reveals tremendous variation in the nature and scope of the various reform prescriptions. Indeed, there is an overwhelming volume of conflicting, confusing analyses of the condition of teacher and general education, and subsequent proposals and programs for achieving reforms. To those less inclined to question the philosophical assumptions behind this vast array of materials, making sense of this unwieldy, scattered literature is an incredibly daunting challenge. Zeichner and Liston (1991), for example, in their analysis of reform efforts in the United States over the past century, cite four traditions associated with teacher education reforms, each reflecting different educational priorities: an academic tradition; a social efficiency tradition; a developmentalist tradition; and a social reconstructionist tradition. Klausmeier (1990), who overviewed the calls for teacher education reform during four decades, attributes a common impetus for the various proposals in each decade. (For example, the 1950s reforms were largely motivated by competition in the "space race with the Soviets"; the 1960s reforms were spawned by the humanistic movement; the 1970s reforms represented a backlash against the humanistic movement; and the 1980s reforms were fueled by international economic competition, especially fears about the superiority of Japanese education.) What follows is a brief overview of the numerous and varied approaches to teacher education reform suggested in the literature we reviewed. We present it here as a backdrop to our consideration of the role of "junior," untenured, tenure-track faculty in these efforts.

Many calls for reform focus on the "products" of teacher education institutions, calling on schools of education to consider the kind of teachers they want to produce (*e.g.*, Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; Hughes, Irvine, Jansson, Long, & Stapleton, 1993; Thiessen & Pike, 1992). Some suggest that improvement of the quality of the teaching profession should reasonably begin with a focus on the candidates admitted to preservice programs—their age, ethnicity, academic stand-

ing, experience profile, for example (*e.g.*, AASCU, 1992; ATE, 1991; Bowman, 1990; Clark, 1984; Facione, 1985; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990). Similarly, it is suggested that consideration be given to the kinds of teacher education faculty recruited—their ethnicities, professional and academic backgrounds, and orientations to teaching and teacher education (*e.g.*, Bowman, 1990; Ciscell, 1993; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990; Holmes Group, 1995).

For other critics, a reorientation of the teacher education curriculum is the key to reform. For example, Hughes *et al* (1993) propose a normative framework inspired by Shulman's (1987) notions of a professional knowledge base; Grimmet (1990) proposes the incorporation of "craft knowledge" in the teacher education curriculum; and the Association of Teacher Educators (1990) and the Holmes Group (1995) advocate a focus on particular areas of educational knowledge and skills. Further, Giroux and McLaren (1986) and Zeichner and Liston (1991) call for a critical or social reconstructionist curricula reorientation while Bullough and Gitlin (1994) and Knowles and Cole (1996; Knowles & Cole with Presswood, 1994) promote a curriculum that takes into account the personal and socio-cultural dimensions of teaching as well as the contextual complexities of educational institutions and communities in which they are located. Numerous authors writing about reform and teacher preparation identify an explicit role for the practice and use of research in the teacher education curriculum (*e.g.*, ATE, 1991; Clark, 1984; Holmes Group, 1986, 1995; Joyce & Clift, 1984; Richardson, 1996).

Another area of focus in teacher education reform proposals is the structure of preparation programs. Some suggest a time reallocation to program components (often giving quite pointed prescriptions). For example, the Association of Teacher Educators (1990) and Clark (1984) suggest more time for subject matter specialization while others (*e.g.*, Holmes Group, 1995; Knowles & Cole, 1996; Ratelle, 1994; Shapiro, Clandinin, Gaskell, Crocker, Currie, & Fullan, 1994) call for an extension of the field experience component. The role of the university in teacher preparation and alternatives to university-based programs have received critical attention from several authors (*e.g.*, Palmer, 1986; Sharpe & Gopinathan, 1993). Parker (1993) cites a 1991 report which reveals that, at that time, 39 states had or were developing alternatives to university-based preservice programs. Similarly, Pellow and Kuhns (1992) acknowledge the prevalence of government interference in teacher education within some states, witnessed for example by the political promotion of alternative paths to university-based teacher preparation. Others such as the Carnegie Forum (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986, 1995) assert that raising academic standards for both entrance to and completion of teacher preparation programs will have the desired effect in schools. Indeed, the development and implementation of national standards within the United States for the professional accreditation of teachers is central to both the Carnegie Forum and Holmes Group agenda, although no such calls have (yet) been made in Canada.

There are those whose prescription for reform involves a reconceptualization

of teacher education as a career-long process so that preservice preparation is followed by a substantial commitment to continuing inservice education (*e.g.*, AASCU, 1992; ATE, 1991; Bullough & Gitlin, 1994; Cole & McNay, 1988; Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990; Knowles & Cole with Presswood, 1994). And, following along this line of thinking—that teacher education is a responsibility shared by universities **and** schools—are those who advocate a focus, in the reform agenda, on the conditions of schools as settings to assist and support the day to day work and ongoing professional development of teachers (*e.g.*, Bullough & Gitlin, 1994; Cole, 1991, 1992; Kirst, 1986; Meier, 1992).

Finally, a "trilateral prescription" (Kowalski, 1985) that fuses teacher education, the teaching profession, and society is the basis for Goodlad's (1991, 1994) Centers of Pedagogy notion which focuses on the development of school-university partnerships. The creation of professional development schools (*e.g.*, Holmes Group, 1986; Jacobson, 1992), clinical schools (Carnegie Forum, 1986), and numerous other related efforts to strengthen school-university relationships are listed on most reform proposals and represent perhaps the most pervasive efforts to improve teacher education. As is evidenced in a number of the articles in this issue, efforts by teacher educators to work more closely with schools are fraught with perplexing difficulties. The work is complex, enervating, and time-consuming; the institutional rewards unclear and evasive at best, and career-destructive at worst. As Reynolds (1995) indicates, from his large-scale survey of teacher educators' perceptions regarding their self-esteem, while relations with schools are generally perceived by teacher educators as central to their overall function, this focus has a negative impact on their acceptance by the academic community.

Schools of Education and the Reform Agenda

Schools of education are caught in a maelstrom of political, public, and internal pressures to improve the way teachers are prepared. Responses to such pressures are as varied as the demands. Some institutions have made a commitment to large-scale, high profile reform efforts. For example, several schools of education have aligned themselves with the Holmes Group or the Goodlad agenda (see, *e.g.*, Kleinsasser, Bruce, Berube, Hutchison, & Ellsworth, pp. 35-54 in this issue). Others, such as the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE)—a coalition of nine United States and Canadian schools and colleges of education—have banded together to promote and effect systemic educational change (see, UNITE, no date). Local, institution-wide reform efforts are evidenced throughout North America as deans of education, or faculties as a whole, endeavor to reform their preparation programs. These efforts, like many others, are widespread but not typically well publicized. Some examples, however, are presented in the Winter 1996 issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* which focuses on innovative colleges of education (Wisniewski, 1996b). In that issue, deans of five colleges of education, forming the

Network for Innovative Colleges of Education, articulate some of the processes and prospects associated with serious restructuring of their respective institutions. In this issue Rios, McDaniel, and Stowell (pp. 23-36) provide a close-up look at one of those endeavors from the perspective of involved junior faculty.

Perhaps the most pervasive change efforts are those silently undertaken by individuals and small groups of faculty (sometimes in collaboration with school personnel). While it is more difficult to pinpoint these initiatives and their influence because they are not typically identified as reform efforts *per se*, from experience, informal and formal contact, and a perusal of literature on teacher education, we know that they are widespread. Most of the articles in this issue reflect small group and individual efforts to "change the system." Whether it is by focusing on developing better relationships with teachers and other educators in the field in explicit attempts to bring about programmatic change (*e.g.*, Kleinsasser *et al*, pp. 37-54), by challenging status quo teaching practices (*e.g.*, McCall, pp. 143-152; Cole & Knowles, pp. 109-126), by offering an alternative conceptual basis for programmatic work, or by just being different (*i.e.*, representing an alternative set of values, practices, and orientations to teacher education and the professoriate, *e.g.*, Arizona Group, pp. 153-168; Chin & Russell, pp. 55-68; Elijah, pp. 69-90; Finley, pp. 91-107; Knowles & Cole, pp. 109-126; Olson, pp. 127-142), many individual teacher educators are involved in reform efforts.

As implied in most of the articles, and as explicitly discussed by Elijah (pp. 69-90) and noted by Cole & Knowles (pp. 109-126) it is the commitment to teaching itself, as the **heart** of teacher educators' work, that represents a challenge to the status quo. And, it is precisely this heartfelt, mind-informed, research-driven commitment that is at the center of many of the difficulties associated with reform in schools of education. It is well and historically recognized that since their inception and affiliation with universities, schools of education have struggled to serve the demands of both the academy and the teaching profession, a struggle indicative of two **very** different kinds of institutions with often highly incompatible and competing agenda.

Schools of Education as Contexts for Reform

> Schools of education...have become ensnared improvidently in the academic and political cultures of their institutions and have neglected their professional allegiances.... They have seldom succeeded in satisfying the scholarly norms of their campus letters and science colleagues, and they are simultaneously estranged from their practicing professional peers. (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 3)

Given their dual mandate to the university and professional communities, how realistic is it to expect schools of education to be both a **context** and **impetus** for reform? Schools of education are caught in a bind. On the one hand they are committed to meeting university standards of scholarship, research funding,

prestige, and general operations associated with academic institutions (Newport, 1985); on the other, they are obliged to respond to standards associated with teaching excellence, professional service, and relationships with schools and community set by the professional community and the public (Nolan, 1985). And, they attempt to do both as Watson and Allison (1992) point out in their report based on an analysis of policy documents and interviews with ten deans of education in Ontario, Canada. These authors note, however, that **despite** valiant attempts to "walk the thin line between the university and the field," the "question of possible conflicts between research and teaching, and research and involvement in the field continues to bedevil faculties of education" (p. 21). The dilemma presented by the conflicting demands of the two institutions to which schools of education are responsible is poignantly made evident within the context of reform mandates. It is within this context that deans of education and faculty members, individually and collectively, are required to confront their commitment to a reform agenda.

Schools of education, by virtue of their position and location in the university community, traditionally have given priority to meeting university standards of performance. For faculty members, this means working within reward structures based primarily on academic merit (that is, rigorous standards of research and scholarship). It also means, as Roemer and Martinello (1982) observe, that schools of education are pressured by the university parent to retain a competitive edge in attracting both large numbers of high quality students to their programs and high profile academicians and researchers to serve the priorities of the university agenda. All of these ingrained policies in practice militate against any real reform of teacher education. Proposed and attempted changes in teacher education require adherence to a different or modified set of institutional priorities, one that also incorporates the values of the professional teaching community.

To make a commitment to teaching (and, by extension, to the teaching profession), which is essential for real and sustained change in teacher education to occur, may require schools of education to sacrifice their current position or, otherwise, struggle for status within the university structure as it is **currently** defined—a sacrifice few (if any), it seems, are prepared to make, or prepared to even negotiate. For, as several authors remind us, the struggle for acceptance by and legitimacy within the university system has a long history, and schools of education are not likely to relinquish any gains, however incremental, that may have been made over the past century (see, *e.g.*, Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Ducharme, 1993; Clark & Marker, 1975; Hazlett, 1989; Jones, 1986; Reynolds, 1995). Alternately, though, to serve as contexts for reform, schools of education **must** strongly oppose the application of some of the existing priorities and standards of the academy, and proactively propose equitable, sustainable alternatives.

The Teacher Education Professoriate

Faculty members in schools, colleges, faculties, and departments of education have been variously described as: "the most maligned of academics" (Lasley, 1986); "the least welcome guests at the educational lawn party of the establishment of higher education" (Ducharme, 1986a); and, "marginal people at the periphery of the university" (Ryan, 1975). While it is not our purpose in this article to explore how teacher educators have earned this reputation, such an acknowledgment does underscore the magnitude of the challenge teacher educators face as they struggle for acceptance in the academy. It also serves to magnify the situation for beginning teacher educators as the least powerful members of that group. As well, it highlights the daunting nature of the task and challenge that Wisniewski and Ducharme (1989a) set out in the following statement:

> The prescription for reform is embarrassingly simple.... Somehow, and soon, attitudes and policies in schools, colleges, and departments of education...will have to change. The place within them of those who are Professors of Teaching...must be dignified. (p. xiii)

Indeed!

The literature on the teacher education professoriate is scant—"remarkably silent" according to Weber (1990). Troyer (1986) attributes this paucity to the relatively recent emergence of teacher education as a function of colleges and universities; others such as Lanier and Little (1986), Hazlett (1989), and Ducharme (1993) suggest that the problem is one of identification. According to Hazlett, the education professoriate lacks definition and delineation both within and outside its ranks. Ducharme elaborates this assessment to suggest that many faculty in education and other disciplines, who are actively involved in the preparation of teachers, **choose not** to identify themselves as teacher educators. And, we surmise, such decisions about identity expression are as much silent commentaries on teacher educators' searches for acceptance with patronizing peers as they are expressions of professional role delineation.

In 1985, in an attempt to develop a data base on teacher education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) established the Research About Teacher Education (RATE) project. For a five-year period, researchers annually gathered demographic and descriptive information about programs, faculty, students, and administration (see RATE I, RATE II, RATE III, RATE IV, RATE V). The resulting data base, in effect, has provided a line sketch of teacher education, including the professoriate, to be filled in as additional in-depth information is accumulated.

Other demographic or large-scale survey studies have been conducted (*e.g.*, Howey, Yarger, & Joyce, 1978; Clark, 1978; Mager & Myers, 1983; Reynolds, 1995). Reynolds' study of teacher educators' perceptions regarding self-esteem

and the perceived value of their work by other academic disciplines is relevant to the topic of reform. A result that Reynolds ranks among the most notable in the entire 40-item survey is the unanimous affirmation by teacher educators of the conflict associated with "serving two masters: the teaching profession and the academic community" (p. 222). The study conducted by Mager and Myers is also pertinent because of its focus on beginning teacher educators (one of only a few such studies). Mager and Myers studied work patterns of new professors and concluded that 73 to 81 percent of new professors' 50 to 69 hour work week is spent on teaching, advising students, and administrative work; research and program development work could only be done by extending the work week beyond 70 hours. We suggest that this is precisely what happens; scholarly work of various kinds is squeezed into the odd cracks of workday and weekend time.

Observations about teacher education faculty have been included in several reports and analyses of teacher education institutions (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990a, 1990b; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Judge, 1982; Lanier & Little, 1986). Lanier and Little, in the *Handbook for Research on Teaching*, paint a grim portrait of teacher educators, one that bears little resemblance to the new generation of teacher educators we know and have been studying. Lanier and Little acknowledge the identity struggle that characterizes teacher educators' careers in the academy, and proceed to justify the situation, blaming teacher educators themselves—their "humble social origins" and "cultural characteristics"—for their lack of fit in the academic culture. Adopting a classist stance, they describe teacher educators as a group having lower social class origins which fundamentally affects their ability to belong to, and adequately function within institutions of higher education. Directly related to these humble social origins are the following characteristics: low level knowledge and skills—primarily associated with a practical focus—as opposed to high level or abstracted knowledge; practical rather than theoretical or abstract orientations; less scholarly productivity than their academic "peers"; lack of cognitive flexibility necessary for the kind of knowledge development and creativity expected in higher education; conservative and conformist orientations; and lack of indoctrination in cultural norms and values of the academy. We are reminded, by this analysis, of Eliza Dolittle's immortal words to Colonel Pickering in George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*:

> You see, really and truly, apart from things anyone can pick up ..., the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves but how she is treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he always treats me as a flower girl, and always will; but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady, and always will. (1920, p. 284)

Fortunately, not all researchers have portrayed teacher educators as poor flower girls or, at least if they have, have not insisted that they remain so. Ducharme (1993), for example, admits to having written about the problems and weaknesses

of teacher educators, especially in terms of their socioeconomic backgrounds, academic credentials, and status within the university. He acknowledges, however, in his recent and more comprehensive study, *The Lives of Teacher Educators*, that "It was refreshing to listen to and analyze the remarks of these teacher educators who, for whatever reasons, do not fit those molds.... It is always good when the future shows positive changes from the past" (p. 112).[2] Nevertheless, there remains a hint in the academic air that Lanier and Little's (1986) perspectives of faculty are still held by some.

Other writers also report on comprehensive or in-depth studies of teacher educators. For example, Carter (1981) reports on the characteristics of 28 teacher educators; Howey and Zimpher (1990) write comprehensively about professors and deans of education in their chapter within the *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*; Hazlett, Allison, Schwebel, Ducharme and Agne, Burch, Raths *et al*, Gideonse, and Wisniewski provide various perspectives on "The Professors of Teaching" in an edited book by that same name (Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989a). Weber (1990), in one of the few in-depth interpretive studies of teacher educators, captures the essence of six participants' experiences as teacher educators, and highlights, among other things, tensions related to the duality of commitment. In a similar study by Whitt (1991), the essence of the professional realities of six beginning professors of education is depicted in the title, "Hit the Ground Running."

Perhaps the most recent work focused on teacher educators is Russell and Korthagen's (1995) edited book, *Teachers Who Teach Teachers*. This work is itself a part of a reform agenda because it both represents and advocates the self-study of teacher educators (see also, the Summer 1995 Issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* on "Self-Study and Living Educational Theory" edited by Pinnegar and Russell). In so doing, it presents a challenge to status quo conceptions of both knowledge and research. Authors in this volume, through intensive and often personal examinations of their lives, some as untenured teacher educators, permit more than a glimpse into the education professoriate. They reveal the passions, anxieties, successes, frustrations, commitments, and complexities that characterize their work and personal lives—a somewhat different depiction than that offered by others such as Lanier and Little (1986) or Hazlett (1989), for example.

The articles in this issue follow a similar vein, in that they provide a close up and personal look at what it means to be contemporary teacher educators working to change and improve the way teachers are prepared. We focus our attention, however, on beginning professors because we sense that, while their efforts may not be any more impassioned or valiant than some of their more senior colleagues, their struggles are exacerbated by virtue of their status, authority, and experience as faculty members in higher education institutions.

While the field's knowledge of teacher educators in general is inadequate, we know considerably less about **beginning** teacher educators. This collection represents, we believe, a significant contribution to a very meager knowledge base. If

teacher education of tomorrow is in the hands of those entering the professoriate today, we need to know more about the prospects and possibilities for tomorrow's ideas within the context of today's structures.

Beginning Professors and Teacher Education Reform

As indicated earlier, new (usually junior, tenure-track) faculty are being hired at many schools of education as part of an explicit (but, perhaps, ultimately haphazard) reform agenda. Typically, job postings for assistant professor positions list a requisite background in teaching and research and a commitment to working closely with schools and teachers. Those who are successful in securing such positions usually take up their responsibilities expecting to be rewarded for the qualities and practices which stimulated job offers and secured their positions. Most often, these are former elementary and secondary teachers, well socialized to public schools, who have explicit notions about the ways schools could be.[3] By virtue of their career histories and their commitment to teaching and the improvement of schools, beginning professors of teacher education generally have a personal reform agenda more in line with professional community standards or priorities (as outlined earlier) than with university standards. This allegiance reflects both who they are as professionals and the institutional norms with which they are most familiar.

In spite of the rhetoric about institutional support for their commitment to reforming teacher education, many beginning professors soon discover that "the more one's work ties that faculty member to the public schools, the more marginal the rewards and status in the education school" (Holmes Group, 1995, p. 64). For, as the Holmes Group authors go on to say, "the university's reward system continues to favor a steady stream of publications over **all** other criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit pay" (p. 65). Even those who work in institutions where the dean of education gives prominence to teaching may run the risk of discovering, too late, that the university (usually meaning the provost, "chief academic officer," or a university-wide promotions and tenure committee) actually rewards research and scholarship over everything and anything else (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

And so, those beginning teacher educators who are committed to and involved in the change and improvement of teacher education become caught in the same bind as the heads of their employing institutions, torn between often conflicting priorities and expectations. The internal conflicts expressed within institutions, by extension, become the mind-wrenching dilemmas of new faculty.

Cornbleth (1986), in her analysis and critique of various predominant reform calls prior to 1986, asserts that the rhetoric of the calls for nation-wide reform of teacher education in the United States is part of a legitimating ritual to assuage public concern and create an illusion of change. Citing Deal, she extends this analysis to schools of education which, she says, "engage in their own reform ritual and ceremony" characterized by "an expressive activity of pomp and circumstance...a

dance of legitimacy, not a strategy of change" (Deal, 1985, p. 128, cited in Cornbleth, 1986, p. 10). Thus, she asserts, "schools of education as self-preserving institutions will likely respond to the recent and forthcoming calls for reform by adopting proposals for change that are congruent with their pre-existing norms, interests, and structural arrangements while resisting others.... Existing organizational arrangements are thus preserved under the banner of reform" (p. 10).

At this point we remind readers of the distinction, to which we referred in the title of this article, between reform and response, and suggest that while beginning professors strive to **reform** teacher education, many schools of education are engaged in **response** efforts. Schools of education can only be contexts for sustained and substantial reform **if** they sort out their conflicting agenda and make a commitment **not** simply to the rhetoric of reform but to the values underlying the reform agenda they purport to support.

We invite you now to read, enjoy, and reflect on the remainder of the contributions within this issue on "Beginning Professors and Teacher Education Reform." What follows are profiles—many of them self-portraits—of beginning teacher educators committed to change, and ongoing (self)-analyses of both their professional and personal commitments. In the concluding article, we take a retrospective look at an earlier analysis of our own experiences as beginning teacher educators, and comment on some of the prevailing similarities between our experiences and those of the beginning professors represented in this issue. In closing we present a challenge to deans of education in an open letter written on behalf of the many untenured professors of teacher education who are trying, against high odds, to make a difference in the way teachers are taught and, ultimately, in the way children learn.

Notes

1. We borrow from Kerr (1986) who makes the distinction between reform—"something someone wants to do in relation to a set of values"; and response—"something someone must do in reaction to the situation" (p.xvi).
2. Ducharme, alone and with colleagues, has made to date the most significant contribution to the knowledge base on the teacher education professoriate (see also, *e.g.*, Ducharme, 1985, 1986a, 1986b; Ducharme & Agne, 1982, 1985, 1986, 1989; Ducharme & Kluender, 1990; Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989).
3. We recognize that this characterization contrasts, for example, with Ducharme's (1993) finding that none of the 34 teacher educators in his study (seven of whom were beginning professors) indicated an expressed intention to contribute to the reform of schools or teacher education. Rather than trying to change schools for the new generation of teachers, they focused on helping new teachers to be better prepared to survive the existing system. We also acknowledge that this finding conflicts with that in an earlier study (Ducharme & Agne, 1982).

References

Allison, C. (1989). Early professors of education: Three case studies. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 29-51). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1985). *A call for changes in teacher education*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (1992). *Teacher education for the twenty-first century. An agenda for improving teacher education*. Washington, DC: AASCU.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H.A. (1993). *Education still under seige* (2nd ed.). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1991). *Restructuring the education of teachers*. Report of the Commission on the Education of Teachers into the 21st Century. Reston, VA: ATE.

Bowman, J. (1990). *Report to the College of Teachers on teacher education in British Columbia*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: British Columbia College of Teachers).

Bullough, R.V., & Gitlin, A.D. (1994). Challenging teacher education as training: Four propositions. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(1), 67-81.

Burch, B. (1989). Perceptions of the role and scholarly reputation of the education professoriate. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 87-118). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bush, R.N. (1987). Teacher education reform: Lessons from the past half century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 13-19.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* New York: The Carnegie Foundation.

Carter, H. (1981). *Teacher educators: A descriptive study*. University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 354).

Ciscell, R. (1993). Who's teaching America's teachers? *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 14-15.

Clark, D. (1978). *Research and development productivity in educational organizations* (Occasional Paper No. 41). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

Clark, D.L. (1984). Better teachers for the year 2000. A proposal for the structural reform of teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66(2), 116-120.

Clark, D.L., & Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (E.), *Teacher Education* (74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2, pp. 53-86.) Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for professional education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cole, A.L. (1991). Relationships in the workplace: Doing what comes naturally? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(5/6), 415-426.

Cole, A.L. (1992). Teacher development in the workplace: Rethinking the appropriation of professional relationships. *Teachers College Record*, 94(2), 365-381.

Cole, A., & McNay, M. (1988). Induction programs in Ontario schools: Issues and possibilities. *Education Canada*, 28(4), 4-11,44-45.

Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. *Educational*

Researcher, 15(4), 5-14.

Deal, T. (1985). National commissions: Blueprints for remodeling or ceremonies for revitalizing public schools? *Education and Urban Society*, 17(2), 145-156.

Ducharme, E.R. (1985). Establishing the place of teacher education in the university. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 8-11.

Ducharme, E.R. (1986a). Teacher educators: Description and analysis. In J. Raths & L. Katz (Eds.), *Advances in Teacher Education* (Vol. 2, pp. 39-60). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ducharme, E.R. (1986b). The professors and the reports: A time to act. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), 51-56.

Ducharme, E.R. (1993). *The lives of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ducharme, E.R., & Agne, R.M. (1982). The education professoriate: A research-based perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(6), 30-36.

Ducharme, E.R., & Agne, R.M. (1985). Establishing the place of teacher education in the university. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 8-12.

Ducharme, E.R. & Agne, R.M. (1986). Professors of education: Beasts of burden, facilitators, or academicians. *Journal of Human Behavior and Learning*, 4(2), 1-9.

Ducharme, E.R., & Agne, R.M. (1989). Professors of education: Uneasy residents of academe. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry* (pp. 67-86). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ducharme, E.R., & Kluender, M. (1990). The RATE study: The Faculty. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(4), 45-49.

Facione, P. (1985). A vision for teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 12(4), 75-83.

Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., Connelly, F., & Watson, N. (1990). *Teacher education in Ontario: Current practices and options for the future.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Ministry of Education and Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

Gideonse, H. (1989). The uses of time: Evocation of an ethos. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry* (pp. 119-133). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213-238.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. *Educational Leadership*, 49(3), 4-10.

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (Eds.) (1990a). *Places where teachers are taught.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (Eds.) (1990b). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grimmett, P. (1990). Crafting the curriculum of teacher education. In S. Majhanovich (Ed.), *Re-forming teacher education: Problems and prospects*. London, Ontario, Canada: The Althouse Press.

Hazlett, J. (1989). Education professors: The centennial of an identity crisis. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 110-128). Albany,

NY: State University of New York Press.
Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
Holmes Group (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
Howey, K., Yarger, S., & Joyce, B. (1978). *Improving teacher education*. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.
Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1990). Professors and deans of education. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 349-370). New York: Macmillan.
Hughes, J., Irvine, J., Jansson, L., Long. J., & Stapleton, J. (1993). *Final report of the task force on initial teacher education programs*. University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 154).
Jacobson, F. (1992). An annotated guide to university/school collaboration in enhancing teaching. *Teaching Education*, 4(2), 177-191.
Jones, A.H. (1986). The powerless profession. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 13(2), 1-8.
Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 13, 5-19.
Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
Kerr, C. (1986). Foreword, in Cerych, L., & Sabatier, P. *Great expectations and mixed performance: The implementation of higher education reform in Europe*. Stoke-on-Trent, United Kingdom: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.
Kirst, M.W. (1986). Sustaining the momentum of state education reform: The link between assessment and financial support. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(5), 341-345.
Klausmeier, R.L. (1990). Four decades of calls for reform of teacher education: The 1950s through the 1980s. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 17(4), 23-64.
Knowles, J.G. & Cole, A. L. with Presswood, C. (1994). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry.* New York: Merrill.
Knowles, J.G., & Cole, A.L. (1996). Developing practice through field experiences. In F.B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 648-688). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Kowalski, T. (1985). A trilateral presciption for improving teacher education. *Teacher Educator*, 20(4), 2-7.
Labaree, D. (1995). A disabling vision: Rhetoric and reality in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education. Teachers College Record*, 97(2), 166-205.
Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd. ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.
Lasley, T. (1986). Editorial. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), inside cover.
Mager, G., & Myers, B. (1983). *Developing a career in the academy: New professors of education, Technical Report No. 143*. Washington, DC: Society of Professors of Education.
Meier, D. (1992). Reinventing teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 93(4), 594-609.
Myers, C.B. (1995, April). The importance of self-study in teacher education reform and re-accreditation efforts. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
Newport. J.F. (1985). Let's refocus the reward system in teacher education. *Teacher Educator*, 20(4), 8-11.

Nolan, J.F. (1985). Potential obstacles to internal reform in teacher education: Findings from a case study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 12-16.

Palmer, S. (1986). A "Marshall Plan" is urged to reform state colleges. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33(11), 1, 29.

Parker, F. (1993). *Reforming U.S. teacher education in the 1990s*. Cullowhee, NC: School of Education and Psychology, Western Carolina University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 084).

Pellow, R., & Kuhns, P. (1992). *The "Re" maelstrom of educational reform: Restructure, renewal, reform, recreate, reconstitute, redesign, refurbish, rethink, redraft, re-strengthen*. Shippensburg, PA: Shippensburg University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 353 225).

Pinnegar, S., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (1995). Self study and living educational theory (theme issue). *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 22(3).

Portman, P.A. (1993). Barriers to change in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(1), 14-21.

Project UNITE. (No date). *The Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education* (UNITE). [Brochure]. Columbus, OH: UNITE.

RATE I. *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. (1987). Washington, DC. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

RATE II. *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. (1988). Washington, DC. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

RATE III. *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. (1989). Washington, DC. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

RATE IV. *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. (1990). Washington, DC. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

RATE V. *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. (1991). Washington, DC. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Ratelle, L.F. (1994). Quebec's Education Minister unveils major reform of teacher training. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 40(33), A49.

Raths, J., Katz, L., & McAninch, A. (1989). A plight of teacher educators: Clinical mentalities in a scientific culture. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The Professors of Teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 147-162). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reynolds, R.J. (1995). The professional self-esteem of teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 216-227.

Richardson, V. (1996). The case for formal research and practical inquiry in teacher education. In F.B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 715-737). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Roemer, R., & Martinello, M (1982). Divisions in the educational professoriate and the future of professional education. *Educational Studies*, 13(2), 203-223.

Russell, T., & Korthagen, F. (Eds.). (1995). *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education*. London, United Kingdom: Falmer Press.

Ryan, K. (Ed.). (1975). *Teacher education* (74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schwebel, M. (1989). The new priorities and the education faculty. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 52-66). Albany, NY:

State University of New York Press.

Shapiro, B., Clandinin, J., Gaskell, J., Crocker, R., Currie, E., & Fullan, M. (1994). *Teacher education in Nova Scotia: An honourable past, an alternative future.* A report to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education.

Sharpe, L., & Gopinathan, S. (1993). Universitisation and the reform of teacher education: The case of Britain and Singapore. *Research in Education*, (50), 5-16.

Shaw, G.B. (1920). *Pygmalion*. London, United Kingdom: Constable & Co., Ltd.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Soltis, J. (Ed.). (1987). *Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group Report.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Thiessen, D., & Pike, R. (1992). *Project 95 + images of the future teacher*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Teacher Education Council of Ontario.

Tierney, W., & Rhoads, R. (1993). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Troyer, M. (1986). A synthesis of research on the characteristics of teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(5), 6-11.

Watson, N. & Allison, P (1992). *Ontario faculties of education: Responding to change*. A report prepared for the Ontario Association of Deans of Education.

Webber, C. (1995). Educational change in Alberta, Canada: An analysis of recent events. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* [on-line] 3(12), Available: LISTSERV@ suvm.inre.asu.edu.

Weber, S.J. (1990). The teacher educator's experience: Cultural generativity and duality of commitment. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 20(2), 141-159.

Whitt, E.J. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 14(2), 177-197.

Wisniewski, R. (Ed.). (1996a). Introduction: The Network for Innovative Colleges of Education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 5-7.

Wisniewski, R. (1996b). The transformation of a college. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 9-17.

Wisniewski, R. & Ducharme, E.R. (Eds.). (1989a). *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wisniewski, R., & Ducharme, E.R. (1989b). Where we stand. In R. Wisniewski & E.R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp.147-162). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Zeichner, K.M., & Liston, D.P. (1991). Traditions of reform in U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 3-20.