The Beginning Professor and Goodlad's Simultaneous Renewal:

Vignettes from Wyoming's School-University Partnership

By Audrey M. Kleinsasser, Mary Alice Bruce, William G. Berube, Linda Hutchison, & Judith Z. Ellsworth

Audrey M. Kleinsasser, Mary Alice Bruce, William G. Berube, Linda Hutchinson, and Judith Z. Ellsworth are faculty members at the College of Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming. *The authors thank Jane Nelson, Director of the University of Wyoming's Writing Center, who reacted to drafts of this article with unlimited patience, good humor, and thoughtfulness.*

> **vignette**: a picture that shades off gradually into the surrounding paper; a short descriptive literary sketch; a brief incident or scene.
> —*Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary,* p. 1,315

For us, vignette is a word that captures the role a beginning professor plays in a university undertaking complex educational renewal. In 1992, the University of Wyoming (UW) inaugurated a new teacher education program, one that placed preprofessionals in K-12 settings immediately upon beginning the program. The field sites were districts in partnership with the university to change teacher education as

well as K-12 education and courses within the college of arts and sciences. Guiding the changes were John Goodlad's (1990, 1994) views of educational renewal, described in more detail below. In 1992, one-half of the college of education faculty was untenured. Thus, changes in the teacher education program affected every beginning faculty member in the college. In this article we profile five beginning professors and their attempts to make sense of the professorate in the context of simultaneous educational renewal.

The Wyoming Context for Educational Renewal

The University of Wyoming, the state's sole four-year degree granting institution, is a comprehensive land grant institution enrolling 12,020 students. Undergraduate teacher enrollment stands at 1,034 students with graduate programs in the College of Education enrolling 278 students.[1] Seven community colleges offer localized postsecondary education and coordinate with the university at Laramie, a southeastern Wyoming city of almost 27,000 residents located about 120 miles north of Denver, Colorado.

With wry humor, the poetic characterize the state of Wyoming as a medium-sized American city with very long streets. Wyoming is one of the least populated states with fewer than 500,000 citizens: it has a population density of 4.69 persons per square mile with 48 percent of all Wyoming residents living in counties defined as "frontier." According to 1990 census figures, 71 percent of Wyoming residents are classified as rural. As a result of Wyoming's rugged, frontier isolation, its schools, teachers (almost 6,750 full time equivalent), and K-12 learners (100,314) experience significant educational inequities.[2] Identifying and addressing the inequities is one goal of Wyoming educational renewal.

The Wyoming School-University Partnership is one example of John Goodlad's vision of educational renewal. Goodlad's model distinguishes itself from other educational reform models in that change is simultaneous and renewing. At the same time that the education of educators changes, K-12 change occurs through professional development and the infusion of teacher education students and university faculty into partnership settings. Goodlad's research and proposals are detailed in three key writings, *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*, (1994), *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (1990), and *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching* (Goodlad, Sirotnik, & Soder, 1990).

In Wyoming, simultaneous renewal has taken several forms. Important to our vignettes is the fact that the teacher education program was designed by a balanced number of university professors and K-12 partnership teachers. Thus, the original program was owned by the Wyoming School-University Partnership, not just the College of Education. Key to the new program was grouping students by cohorts who would identify with a particular partnership school district for field experiences. Field experiences increased in intensity and duration as the students moved

through each of three preprofessional phases, culminating with a teaching internship. The program was outcome- and performance-driven, with program outcomes documented in portfolios students completed at the end of each phase. The cohort leader, a university professor, led on-campus courses, monitored portfolio development, and accompanied cohort members to the partnership district.

With a small population and no competing in-state universities, simultaneous renewal of Wyoming education would seem to present a straightforward, uncomplicated challenge. Such was not the case because of three factors. First, travel presented intractable logistics and plagued the program's delivery. Vast distances (up to 400 miles) from some of the partnership schools increased living and travel costs for teacher education students and proved highly unpopular among faculty who delivered the program and supervised field experiences.

Second, the university had implemented what became known as a five-year teacher education program, a negative and unpopular descriptor among students, parents, and some university faculty. In addition to higher cost related to maintaining residence and traveling to a partnership district, most teacher education students were in certification programs longer and thus paid more tuition.

The third factor challenging renewal was resistance to change. Many UW faculty, as well as community college faculty and some university students, had invested in traditional on-campus programs which they understood and supported. As Fullan (1991) outlines in *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, implementing educational innovation offers three critical lessons, each of which we experienced in Wyoming. The first lesson is that change is multidimensional and varies within the same person as well as within groups. Second, change challenges people's sense of self—their occupational identity, competence, and self-concept. Third, Fullan identifies unclear "dynamic interrelationships" as a change dimension.

Heavily dependent on Goodlad's research and recommendations, especially the 19 postulates outlined in *Teachers for our Nation's Schools* (1990), program planners representing a variety of Wyoming constituencies developed a set of assumptions. The assumptions became the pre-conditions for renewal in our setting (*A Three Phase Teacher Education Model*, 1990):

The 13 Assumptions Guiding the Wyoming Teacher Education Program

1. Faculty will be willing to explore new areas.
2. All faculty will be involved in some aspect of undergraduate education.
3. Faculty views on traditional ways of viewing load distribution, teaching, research, and service will change.
4. Promotion and tenure standards will change to accommodate a new structure.
5. Collaboration among colleagues in public schools and university faculty will be viewed as a strength of any new program.
6. Standards for the successful development of teachers will be adhered to by all elements involved in the preparation program.
7. University and college administrators and trustees are committed to positive educational change, and further, are committed to providing the resources

necessary to implement proposed changes.

8. Technology of all forms will become an integral part of the new proposed program.
9. Reasonable time will be allocated for implementation.
10. The proposed program will be based on standards that may alter traditional approaches, such as limited enrollments, class size, Full-time Teaching Equivalents (FTE), faculty loads.
11. The structure of the undergraduate committee will change with the college reorganization.
12. The college UNIREGS will be modified to charge the undergraduate committee with the following: (a) the implementation of this model; (b) its ongoing evaluation; (c) the monitoring of programs developed under the model to make certain they meet the criteria proposed in the model; and (d) the implementation and monitoring of the screening.
13. Individual program areas will develop their own specific programs which follow this model.

The assumptions listed guided specific program features and, in turn, affected all college of education faculty, especially untenured faculty.

Our College of 49 tenure-track faculty members is organized into two divisions: (a) leadership and human development; and (b) lifelong learning and instruction. Both divisions are represented by the five of us who teach within four unique program units: educational leadership, counselor education, curriculum and instruction, and educational inquiry.

Our Vignette of Reforming

We present our account of educational reform in a set of anonymous, individually written vignettes because each of our voices is unique, yet part of a greater whole. These personal vignettes focus on experiences and challenges likely to affect untenured faculty members in contexts similar to ours. The vignettes portray intense relationships with students, colleagues on campus, and K-12 administrators and teachers that have caused us to reflect on our new roles as beginning professors in a college deeply immersed in change. They also evidence the tensions, the personal and professional costs, and the benefits which have accompanied educational renewal. Conclusions and recommendations based on the vignettes close the article.

The Importance of Mentoring

As a transplant from the public school system, I looked forward to the privilege of structuring my own destiny as an assistant professor in the educational leadership unit. The demands of being a school administrator seemed huge compared to my perceived vision of fulfilling the teaching, research, and service requirements of university tenure and promotion. On arrival, I allowed self-imposed time consumers to block my tenure path. For instance, I spent a year directing the college's laboratory school. I also became involved in moving educational leadership

programs to performance-based programs. Along with teaching everything I could, numerous consultant jobs seemed to fill up the calendar. Although my efforts in teaching and service may have been noble and acceptable, my research efforts were not.

After one year of working in the College of Education, personal reflection revealed that life in higher education was not as different from my administrative experience in K-12 public education as I thought it would be. Time management was time management, and change was change. Whether it was change regarding multi-age grouping in the public schools or change in a teacher education program, the same kind of apprehensions resulted. "How will the change affect me?" is one question everyone asks. "Will I still be able to do what I like and want to do?" is another.

Having been on both sides of the Wyoming School-University Partnership fence also provided me with insights into the visibility of change. When change occurs in Wyoming public schools, some College of Education faculty might be aware of it and some might not. When change occurs in the teacher education program, everybody in the state knows about it because of its visibility. To the College's credit, the change in the teacher education program was much more radical than most changes in the public schools. That remains an issue for some of us. After all, wasn't Goodlad's (1990, 1994) notion to change teacher education and public schools simultaneously?

In the midst of radical change, my charge to research and publish did not go away. My colleagues in the educational leadership unit were probably more aware than I was of my need for a research and publishing attitude adjustment, actually a wake-up call. My friends mentored, encouraged, and collaborated with me to help me create some publications. Even the dean of the College invited me to work with him to write an article. As I reflect on the generous and willing invitations to collaborate, I see clearly the value and importance of mentors for assistant professors and feel fortunate to work with the people I do. During my time at UW, I have mentioned often that working with my educational leadership colleagues is like having a second family. They care about my personal and professional growth and well-being. They want me to be successful, as I also want them to be. It makes for a great working environment providing security in the midst of overwhelming changes, teaching responsibilities, and public school collaboration desires.

As our College's vision emerged and the messiness of change surfaced, I saw that some of my untenured colleagues who did not have the encouraging and nurturing mentors in their corner were having problems. Some of them fell short of completing the tenure aspiration. The networking assistance produced as a result of collegial mentoring can serve as a compensation for a limited insight and ability related to the world of research and publishing. This is exactly my case. Without the mentoring, I'm dead.

Faculty Teams: Learning to Collaborate

Effective collaboration is critical in a change process such as ours where

preservice education requires more interactive roles among university faculty. My first year teaching assignment was to be a member of a faculty team instructing an intense 18-credit-hour course which integrates general and specific pedagogy in the content areas of science/mathematics, literacy, and the humanities. I quickly became aware of the importance of learning to collaborate. As I came into this instructional role, I was excited about the possibilities of working as part of a team. It is harder than I anticipated. Looking back after the first year, I realize that as a team, we did not have what we would insist that teachers provide for students: the time to develop the skills of effective teaming.

My first discovery was that just deciding to be a collaborative team does not necessarily make it happen. Learning how to interact with and support team members is a critical step. For example, during my first semester, faculty team members often stood at various places in the room while one person presented. The intent was to show support for the faculty presenter and to create a "cohort feeling" between faculty and students. Despite good intentions, this was not always the most comfortable situation for the presenter. At times I felt like I was on stage. I think others did as well. Faculty on the sidelines found it difficult to figure out how to participate in someone else's session, particularly if the content was not familiar. Was it acceptable to share ideas? Was it supportive or threatening to ask questions? In those cases where team members were familiar with the session content and felt they had something to contribute, we were able to function as a team. Those experiences indicated that team teaching could become comfortable and rewarding, and that the quality of presentations could improve because of the larger field of expertise. Unfortunately, time was always an issue.

In order to address time demands, during the second semester we changed our strategy. Instead of faculty team members trying to be at most sessions, we defined specific days and times for each person to teach his or her part of the curriculum. We were now taking turns or teaching in isolation, thus losing opportunities for collaboration and modeling integrated teaching. Students were also not identifying with the faculty team in ways they had during the first semester. For me, the isolation of the second semester did not turn out to be a satisfactory solution to the time problem. Much of the collaborative intent of the new program was missing in that alternative solution.

We have all struggled to learn to collaborate in ways that enhance the quality of the program. While time remains a major factor, I have come to see that collaboration requires not only time to plan and reflect but also the opportunity for team building through some risk taking. These risks initially revolve around differing philosophies about teaching and about the nature of compromise.

The issue of varying team member philosophies about teaching and learning must be addressed as part of the collaborative process. Different methodologies can create confusion among students if viewed as in conflict rather than as fitting into the whole process of teaching. It was clear that students were, at times, trying to

figure out to whom they were responding in order to determine the "acceptable approach" for an assignment. The issue of understanding philosophies was exacerbated by faculty teams that changed from semester to semester. For the collaborative teaming process to be successful, those working together must trust each other. It is difficult to grow into this kind of trusting relationship without ongoing common experiences.

The risk taking of compromise must be viewed as a way to create a more workable program rather than as individual loss. Initial instincts are to protect individual content pedagogical space, trying to gain the time to include everything that had been included in separate courses. The protection of time has to come at the expense of someone else's time, for there are not enough hours for all of the content every team member wants to cover. Something has to give.

Through the process of compromise, I have learned a lot about myself, not always liking ways I have interacted. I have also been disappointed in some of the interactions of others—everyone has contributed to and hindered this process at one point or another as we have all struggled to find a place within the team.

Reflecting on these past two semesters, I am beginning to recognize for myself that learning to be part of a team is learning to think differently about what is important to accomplish. For a new faculty member, team teaching with a variety of experts can open up more opportunities for collaborative research and mentoring, but collaborative teaching is a difficult process. Is it comfortable? Not yet. Is it worth it? Absolutely. Will it help me in tenure and promotion? I worry about that.

Collaborative Action Research: University Faculty and K-12 Teachers

As a member of a three-year federal grant implementation team, I helped create a coaching/mentoring course taught via interactive compressed video throughout the state to potential mentor teachers of the preprofessionals. Unexpected challenges occurred in our collaborative efforts. I was one of four university faculty with four K-12 teachers on the grant team. I enjoyed our dialogues related to theory-into-practice, the creation of the coursework, distance teaching, and the personal interactions with practitioners across the state. However, the different job responsibilities and accompanying diverse reward systems of K-12 teachers and university faculty mentors presented some concerns.

As the team worked together, we university faculty discussed with K-12 teachers possible research projects, data collection, and publications. With their more immediate professional and personal responsibilities, the K-12 teachers were not motivated to hammer out a research project with university faculty.

One faculty member offered to write a presentation proposal for the regional American Educational Research Association conference with all team member names included. The faculty member explained the process and implications. One teacher asked not to be included. Later, the teacher complained that she had not really understood the importance at the time of such professional activities. She

expected the faculty member to reinvite her to participate and was resentful the invitation was not reissued. The team co-leaders, a university faculty member and public school teacher, had difficulty collaboratively resolving such miscommunications and misunderstandings. After three years, the university faculty and public school teachers had not completed a collaborative research project.

Other connections with school counsellors and teachers have led me to several research activities in the schools. At one site, two counselors and I had been working for several years to build our vision and prepare for an empirical study in their schools. Finally, we were ready to work with the teachers who would give the experimental treatment in their classrooms.

As we began the teacher-training in the schools, one teacher said, "Once before I was part of a research project with a different university and did not get anything for it. I need to talk about how I can play a part in the presentations and publications that come out of this study. I want to be an active member in this project." Consequently, we put issues on the table for discussion and eventually became a working team. Open communication and shared responsibility have underlined this effective, albeit time-consuming, university-school partnership.

What have I learned? Nurturing respectful relationships, as well as continued discussions related to everyone's expectations and needs, have become top priorities for productive, collaborative action research projects. Meanwhile, my mentors at the university have told me to balance the number of collaborative writings with enough sole author articles for tenure and promotion. Thus, I very selectively have participated in research projects, and I have been frustrated by having to refuse intriguing offers of inclusion. I have found myself carefully constructing a safety net of sufficient publications to wrap around my teaching, service, and collaborative research. I collaborate, but not too much.

Who's My Team?

I left graduate school in 1988, a new educational psychology and research Ph.D. "Try to stay out of teacher education," a graduate adviser offered as a final bit of advice.

I have thought about that advice often during my seven years at UW (I was tenured and promoted in 1994). I frequently describe my professional life as the best of two teaching worlds. My teaching is roughly one-half graduate research courses and one-half undergraduate teacher education. My contributions to undergraduate education in the new program are related to educational psychology and tests and measurement, for example, learning theory, classroom management, cognitive styles, special needs learners, and meaningful assessments.

Teaching both undergraduate and graduate students is one benefit of UW teaching, likely possible because of the College's size and comprehensiveness. A second benefit is that it does not take long to implement new courses and be recognized (rightly or wrongly) as an expert. Such flexibility and autonomy also put

a beginning faculty member at considerable risk for being an enthusiastic innovator. At about the same time I came to UW, the college was stepping up its efforts to change the teacher education program. The dean and department or division head tapped me for almost every committee working on the changes. I thought I was on the team moving our program ahead and presumed that the changes had college-wide support.

Perhaps it is true of all social interactions at American universities, but the term "academic village" is apt at UW. For example, my colleagues in other university departments make no distinction between educational psychology and educational leadership. To most university faculty here, those of us in the College of Education are, simply and generically, education. Within the College, however, there seems to be no inclusive or generic community. We might have an on-paper vision for teacher education, but people see a different vision depending on their program unit, their proximity to undergraduate education, and their willingness to confront change.

Most College of Education faculty affiliate and identify themselves with specific and rigidly defined programs: counselor education, special education, curriculum and instruction, educational leadership, and adult education. When educational psychology and tests and measurement were embedded into Phases I and II of the new teacher education program, some faculty felt as if they had lost their academic identity. For these colleagues, educational psychology was an academic discipline. One of the new identifiers, Phase I, did not carry disciplinary meaning. Only recently have I come to realize that Phase I meant "teacher educator" to these faculty, an identification they did not want or value since it was not discipline-based, like an arts and sciences course.

As a member of the team who developed and implemented the new program, I soon came to understand the misery of being a border crosser. I am someone comfortable working in more than one context (graduate and undergraduate), teaching in a brand new program. I also tend to resist labels of any kind, whether teacher educator, educational psychologist, even university professor. What I viewed in myself as a flexible strength and talent, some faculty viewed as abandonment of specific disciplinary content. What I viewed in myself as an openness to provide high quality undergraduate teacher education experiences, some faculty viewed as a lack of compassion for students who would now gain teaching experience but also have the pressures of being in isolated K-12 partnership settings. What I viewed in myself as a willingness to embrace needed educational renewal, some faculty viewed as selling out to pressure from K-12 constituencies.

Having been asked by my dean and division head to serve on the planning and implementation team for the new program, I was becoming confused about the number of teams I was trying to serve. Did I have a team? Wasn't the college a team? Without team affiliation, I would have been in tenure and promotion trouble, and my adviser's advice rang in my ears, "Try to stay out of teacher education."

What Role Do I Play?

As an assistant professor of counselor education working with graduate students, how could I be involved in some aspect of undergraduate education as guided by the program assumptions? When I arrived at my new job, a colleague had warned me against involvement in the newly reconfigured teacher education program, "an abyss of unfathomable depths which will drown you." However, the College's mission gave priority to undergraduate education. In fact, I was informed that the university board of trustees directed the College to give undergraduate education its primary focus, as it was university-wide.

Concerned College of Education faculty wondered if I would lead an undergraduate student cohort group, if I would go along with the demands that we all play a part in the new program, and if I would be able to accommodate our counselor education graduate program plus be involved in the undergraduate program. Tension increased at a division meeting when it was announced that administrators were creating a three-year matrix assigning all faculty to semester-by-semester teams to lead undergraduate cohort groups.

It was clear to me that we in counselor education needed to find a unique way to integrate ourselves as an essential piece of the undergraduate program, drawing upon our work emphasizing community mental health, student affairs, and school counseling. But how could we effectively demonstrate our relevance to the reconfigured mission of the college? To begin with, I saw counselor education as a unique and essential part of a College team addressing large scale educational reform. Therefore, we should find some ways to infuse knowledge and skills from counseling into undergraduate teaching and learning in order to meet the undergraduate program's designated outcomes. Indeed, I believed our survival as UW counselor educators depended on it.

Subsequently, we counselor educators proposed the development and delivery of modules of information which related to counseling skills and knowledge we know so well. We developed and presented information modules regarding learning styles as well as self-esteem to the cohort groups of students. The modules met state department of education as well as program outcomes related to the first phase of the undergraduate program. Important questions emerged. What if students did not attend our modules? What if they did not complete the assignments successfully? We realized that we had accepted responsibilities without authority. In some cases, outcomes were not met, yet consequences were not in place.

We received acknowledgement of our participation in undergraduate teaching and learning by means of warm "thank you" letters from several faculty members leading cohorts, but no credit for teaching/service load, and virtually **no** recognition for tenure and promotion purposes. Despite these proactive efforts to utilize our cognate area in a manner helpful to all preservice teachers, a colleague told me, "You in counselor education are regarded as trying to keep out of the undergraduate

program. Think about expanding your role and doing some public relations work for yourselves." Meanwhile, I was advised by mentors "to publish and lie low."

The Graduate Versus Undergraduate Dilemma

Those of us working in graduate programs fear erosion of our programs because of the undergraduate teacher education emphasis. Given the assumption that all faculty would be involved in the restructured teacher education program at UW, the level of anxiety increased dramatically among faculty primarily focused in graduate programs. When it came time to determine which faculty would first be involved as teacher education cohort facilitators, two program units (educational leadership and counselor education) were hesitant for fear of not being able to deliver graduate programs or risking a decline in the quality of the program.

Battling back and forth, between an allegiance to our new graduate programs (which were similar to the undergraduate program in emphasizing outcomes-driven, performance-based learning) and a persuasive dean who offered to team-teach a cohort group with me, I ended up being directed to spend one full semester completely assigned to the undergraduate teacher education program.

My involvement in the teacher education program as an "on loan" faculty member also created another obstacle on the tenure track. For me, leading a cohort group created some unintended extras which required more of my time and attention. This was not new to me because of my experience with cohort groups in our graduate programs. Some of the extras included portfolio assessment, observations in schools, individual and small group conferences, and more time communicating with and counseling students. All of these responsibilities and others took time away from graduate program delivery. I began to question the assumption that says all faculty must be involved in the teacher education program. Who says all faculty should be involved?

Intensified Student Relationships

The mathematics education students in the program have been important to me. In some ways, I have had more interaction with them than any other group of people involved in the teacher education equation. These relationships have taken time and energy to develop. I have had the same group of secondary mathematics methods students for three semesters. Since I have only worked at UW for five semesters, this accounts for a long period of time. It is fortunate for me that these students have proven to be mature and capable, able to function in a cohort group even though their field placements are hundreds of miles apart. They have made the effort to keep in contact with me as well as their fellow students. During job-hunting time, they have functioned as a unit to help each other with their professional portfolios, videos, and accumulation of background information about school districts. I find their collegial support exemplary since they compete for the same jobs. For example, the students have talked about the districts in which they have worked and

told their fellow students what each district is looking for in hiring decisions. They have discussed how each student's professional portfolio looked in relation to the goals of the student and his or her personality. Over these three semesters, I think my students and I collaborated in learning about how to teach. The only way I have found to do this is to take the time and energy to develop relationships.

My first experience with them was in a course on quantitative reasoning for educators, during which they had the opportunity to see how other education majors think about mathematics. While I thought that developing and teaching this new course would be too time-consuming, and thus professionally costly for me, it turned into a benefit. Many of our discussions have used this course as a reference point for how students can react to learning mathematics, their conceptions about mathematics, and their perceptions of the relevance of mathematics.

The next semester they were enrolled in a mathematics methods course which was intense for them because it was half of their semester load. During this time period, they came with questions and created many teachable moments that were important in modeling how mathematics could be taught in a constructivist fashion. For example, we discussed how to deal with certain beginning teaching situations, what mathematical concepts are important to teach, and how to examine what students understand.

The final semester I worked with them was their student teaching semester and their final professional four-week period. These capstone experiences have created a new rapport that I found to be important. I was amazed at the sophistication of their teaching. Only two out of the five had to work on classroom management, usually a common dilemma in student teaching. By about half way through the semester, these two students were past the management issues and into math content discussions with peers. They are all now reflecting about improvements to their teaching. During the final four-week period back on campus, the students and I discussed a variety of philosophical positions. I was pleased to see that the students were able to articulate their ideas about what it means to teach.

Ours is an intense relationship that could have developed only within the new teacher education program. As with any intense relationship, it has required energy and time to maintain. Frantic students felt comfortable enough calling in the evening with personal problems which affected their teaching. Students regularly stop by my office to get ideas about teaching mathematics concepts as well as advice on how to handle situations with their mentor teachers or students. I have the responsibility of completing evaluation forms for their teaching/interview files. I have also spent most Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays in classrooms, or on the road to their classrooms, during their 12 weeks of student teaching. I anticipate these intense relationships will deepen further because I am now advising all of the secondary mathematics education majors. I doubt that I would have dealt with these many pieces of their education in the old program.

As rewarding and beneficial as these relationships can be, the additional time

is costly when research is critical to tenure decisions. Many times, I have found myself struggling with the tension of finding time to write and still be the kind of teacher that I can respect. My choice to mentor well-prepared mathematics teachers has taken precedence. This dilemma could affect my tenure and promotion since college and university research and writing expectations have not changed to reflect our new teacher education program. I have to write to survive.

There's Got to Be a Personal Life

I have had two major responsibilities since I was hired. One was to create a course in quantitative reasoning for the education majors. The course would fulfill a new university general education requirement. A second was to help mathematics methods fit into the college's new teacher education program for both secondary and elementary education. As if these demands are not complex enough, my relationship with the university has been made more complicated through a university workload policy which relates directly to tenure and promotion.

This is my second year in the tenure process. At about the same time that I began to work at the university, university trustees mandated a workload policy which would spell out our jobs. The College of Education responded, but many of its proposed policies were rejected at the university level. Our ability to change the view of load distribution to fit with our new program was invalidated. While faculty in the College of Education may have changed their views about traditional work load, the university did not.

One of these rejected ideas has had a great impact on my relationship with the university. Because preprofessionals have been placed in partnership school districts early in the program and these relationships are cemented by the time students reach mathematics methods, I have no control over my supervision travel. Travel time in the new program has been intense for me, yet the university has not considered the distance traveled to observe preservice teachers as counting for a part of my workload. I have received the same credit for supervising preservice teachers placed in one district close to the university as I have for supervising in four locations in three corners of the state.

My work with the first group of mathematics students illustrated the supervisory dilemmas in our new program. Every student was in a different district and spread to every corner of the state. Given the large rural state and treacherous winter weather conditions, this was a difficult situation. For the first 12 weeks of their student teaching semester, I travelled eight to ten days a month, driving about 500 miles a week to observe five mathematics student teachers. In addition, I have other teaching responsibilities at the university to fill out my workload. Because of the workload policy, the refinements in the program may require different conceptions of field supervision. The low enrollments in secondary education have made it possible for the College to consider assigning secondary education faculty the responsibility of teaching methods and supervising field placements simulta-

neously. My colleagues and I have been examining placements, mentor teacher roles, and technology to solve the difficulties presented by field placement in a large, rural state like Wyoming.

The travel and supervision puts pressure on my research as well as my home life. It is difficult to find the time to write when one is behind the wheel of a car. When I return, I find myself needing to spend time with my child who does not always understand why her mother has had to go see a student teacher. The stress that travel places on both research and family has been difficult for me to resolve. There must be a way to have a personal life.

Some of our Conclusions about Professional Life

Graduating students as well as public school administrators and teachers tell us that the changes in Wyoming teacher education are producing a better prepared, more effective beginning teacher. Such evidence confirms our own judgments about the program. We are excited, supportive, and committed to the importance of preparing better beginning teachers. At the same time, the vignettes illustrate that each of us has heard the conflicting messages affecting our work and personal lives: messages from the university (the workload policy), the college (assumptions undergirding the teacher education program), colleagues (their peer evaluations of our tenure and promotion), and our students (their course evaluations and face-to-face interactions with us). The messages are mixed: engage in time-consuming new collaborations, but publish as much as before. Specific tensions and dilemmas result.

Ambiguous, Undefined Professional Roles

All beginning professors share similar worries: preparing classes for the first time; beginning a research/writing agenda; figuring out what kind of on and off campus service makes sense; and maintaining a personal life. How is surviving pretenure different in a setting committed to educational renewal? Expectations and corresponding evaluation criteria are in a state of flux. At the same time, the pressures on beginning faculty are intensified by a professor role that is changing and thus ambiguous.

Promoted and tenured professors also experience ambiguity, which intensifies problems for the beginning professor, a problem Fullan (1994) identifies. In a time of change, how are a tenured professor's expertise and competence valued? Even though our vignettes show evidence of mentoring from senior faculty, more often faculty struggling with changes in their own roles have been less than able to support beginning faculty like us. They, too, have been trying to understand the changes, define their roles, and survive.

Undefined and Unidentified Time Commitments in Uncharted Waters

There is more team planning and collaborating with K-12 partnership colleagues and university colleagues. Although teaming may be intrinsically satisfying, it is time-consuming and emotionally intense. Teaming, especially with K-12 colleagues, remains unconnected to traditional reward systems in postsecondary education. How much planning time is enough? How much teaming and collaboration time can a beginning professor give? Collaboration requires that time be spent with on-campus colleagues and K-12 colleagues to understand the local context of the reform effort, prepare, implement, and modify. The new role emerging for the beginning professor in the context of educational renewal may require as much as double the time in order to fulfill one's professional obligations on campus and maintain strong relationships with K-12 teachers and administrators.

In a teacher education program such as Wyoming's, travel to partnership districts presents an enormous time problem for the beginning professor. Travel not only takes time from writing, it exacerbates personal and family stress. Increased demands on limited time underscore the importance for beginning faculty to find ways of linking teaching and service to their research and writing.

Naivete about Postsecondary Teaching and Research

Our vignettes reveal that we approached our tenure-track positions in a naive and unprepared manner. We understood too little about the realities of university culture, focusing on the features most personally appealing: opportunity to think, write, and consult.

Professors like us who are starting new careers may be asking themselves more often and more poignantly than any time in their professional lives, "**Can** I be successful here?" Thus, the potential for self-doubt and insecurity is likely greater in settings of educational renewal than other settings with established, well-accepted promotion and tenure guidelines and expectations. Compounding self-doubt and insecurity is the inability of senior colleagues to assist us as much as we might like. At a time when some of our senior colleagues may be least able to mentor and nurture us because of their own struggle with educational renewal, we need their guidance even more.

Naivete about Personal and Professional Autonomy in the Academy

The surprise and challenge depicted in our vignettes suggest that we came to the professorate with false impressions about the work environment. We thought university teaching would offer more personal and professional autonomy than it does.

Although our vignettes offer evidence that simultaneous renewal is occurring—a better teacher education program, strong communication with K-12 constituencies—heavy cost shadows the benefit of large scale educational renewal. Some conditions are beyond our control. For example, certification area enroll-

ments may determine whether faculty with primary obligations to the undergraduate program will ever be able to teach a seminar course outside of the program. While many of us teaching in the program are convinced that we are preparing a better beginning teacher, the effect on personal and professional autonomy is significant. A provocative challenge emerging from our experiences at UW is that programmatic integrity in teacher education may mean abandoning traditional notions of professorial autonomy.

Some Recommendations

To his credit, John Goodlad (1994) has outlined conditions for educational renewal, presented as postulates. In Postulate Two, Goodlad speaks directly to professional demands on untenured teacher educators:

> Programs for the education of educators must enjoy parity with other professional education programs, full legitimacy and institutional commitment, and rewards for faculty geared to the nature of the field. (1994, p.74)

One of the preconditions (Goodlad lists this as Postulate One) is a financial commitment by university administrators to support changes in teacher education, a budget increase of as much as 20 to 30 percent. In Wyoming, such an increase is unlikely, particularly since enrollments in the teacher education program have decreased. Thus, securing extramural funding is a top priority for the college.

An intractable problem evidenced in our vignettes is that renewing teacher education affects both graduate and undergraduate faculty. Goodlad explores and poses solutions for the problem in his conceptualization of a center for pedagogy (Goodlad, 1994). His recommendations do **not** mandate that all faculty be involved in teacher education. Goodlad is clear, however, that teacher education must "enjoy parity with other professional education programs" (p. 74). The Wyoming reality is that a college the size of ours with a comprehensive mission will always face the dilemma created by emphasizing undergraduate education (the university and college's primary mission) at the same time that it offers accredited graduate programs in curriculum and instruction, special education, counselor education, adult education, and educational leadership. Staffing viable graduate programs causes inequities for faculty committed to undergraduate education since the graduate programs are small, expensive, and viewed by some as elite.

As cited throughout this article, Goodlad has detailed his vision for educational renewal, as well as the preconditions and the pitfalls, in numerous writings. We suggest that aspiring and beginning professors examine not only Goodlad's writing but that of others recommending large-scale school change. This growing literature base addresses the complex and far-ranging issues involved in changing teacher education as well as the effects of change on individuals. Representative sources include Fullan (1991), Goodlad (1990, 1994), Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik (1990), Sarason (1971, 1982, 1990), Schlechty (1990), and Sizer (1985, 1992).

Perhaps most important of all, beginning professors must find mentors to provide personal and professional support. Mentors can provide insights about the university culture as well as information concerning the school-university partnership culture. As described in one of our vignettes, mentors provide solid support for a beginning faculty member who is developing a research/publishing agenda. No formulas or guarantees ensure personal nurturing and mentoring let alone a successful professional tenure and promotion. We realize that our more experienced, tenured colleagues face a dilemma in mentoring us. Do they have the time, energy, and knowledge about the difficulties of educational renewal necessary to help us?

Finally, we address an issue that seems to be against the rules to express. Beginning professors need more help, more support from their administrators. The success of beginning professors is jeopardized when administrators ask that we participate in intensive educational renewal without adjustments in expectations for tenure and promotion, additional time allocations, and a clear understanding that our participation puts us in professional disagreement with colleagues resistant to change.

Our vignettes picture strong individuals, each with specific personal and professional goals. Individual goals can mesh with a large-scale renewal effort such as that in Wyoming, leading to rewarding and successful careers. Without administrative and collegial support however, it is just as likely that we will disappear, as vignettes do, into the blurry and complex picture of educational renewal.

Notes

1. These figures reflect Fall, 1994, enrollment figures as reported by the University of Wyoming Office of Institutional Analysis.
2. These figures, Fall, 1994, are from the Wyoming State Department of Education.

References

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

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

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

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

Sarason, S. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S. (1982). *The culture of the school and problem of change*. (rev. ed). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sizer, T.R. (1985). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sizer, T.R. (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

A three phase teacher education model: A flexible framework designed to accommodate variable-length and dual-degree programs. (February, 1990). Laramie, WY: Delivery System Task Force, College of Education, University of Wyoming.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1991). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Wester Inc.