Changing Teacher Education in the Context of a School-University Partnership: Disrupting Temporal Organizational Arrangements

By Audrey M. Kleinsasser & Edward E. Paradis

Introduction

In this article, we describe one aspect—the temporal—of what John I. Goodlad terms the "organizational arrangements" needed to promote change in teacher education (*Teachers for our Nation's Schools*, 1990a, p. 249). Despite a decade's worth of calls for educational reform, Goodlad's research describes business as usual in a representative sample of the country's teacher education programs. His conclusions are disheartening. Goodlad reports that organizational arrangements have not changed, that little has been reformed or restructured.

Typically, when researchers address teacher education reform, they focus on program ideals and available resources. The tack we take sets a different course. We examine the temporal dimensions of

Audrey M. Kleinsasser is an associate professor in the Division of Leadership and Human Development and Edward E. Paradis is a professor in the Division of Life-Long Learning and Instruction, both in the College of Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.

organizational arrangements to illustrate how Wyoming teacher education restructuring occurred during the 1992-1993 school year. This was the year that the University of Wyoming (UW) implemented a radically different teacher education program.

By focusing on the day-to-day realities of organizational arrangements, we invoke Seymour Sarason's substantial body of work. One of Sarason's contentions is that schools will not change until stake holders challenge and alter institutional arrangements, *i.e.*, instructional practices bounded by traditional time, space, and place uses (1972, 1982, 1983, 1990, 1996). In *Schooling in America* (1983), he states:

> In the field of education, the graveyard of ideas is strewn with good ideas that died because their makers were enamored more with the idea's truth than with its institutional consequences. Separating an idea from the institutional arrangements to which that idea is a reaction, as well as from the predictable social dynamics the idea sets in motion, is unrivaled as a formula for failure, another example of the separation of theory and practice, of treating ideas as social products of the human mind. (p. 159)

If Sarason is right, altering traditional organizational arrangements will produce different learning experiences. Learning experiences are likely to change when schedules bend and learning occurs outside of school buildings. Rearranging institutional time, place, and space hold the key to substantial institutional change.

In this article, we focus specifically on temporal arrangements, analyzing how Sarason's change theory applies to restructuring a teacher education program. Allowing that others are likely to theorize temporal arrangements differently, we define temporal arrangements this way: temporal arrangements are the minutes, hours, and days of interaction in a teacher education program. Temporal arrangements include student learning time, teacher and professor learning time, and partnership school learning time. Temporal arrangements also include duration and intensity of experience.

The Setting for Wyoming Teacher Education Restructuring

Program planners for the restructured program represented both university and K-12 school constituencies. In partnership with 16 public schools, UW was in a nine-year-old Goodlad school restructuring project involving program implementation. Goodlad's model distinguishes itself from other current reform ideas in that change is simultaneous. At the same time that the education of educators changes, K-12 change occurs through staff development and the infusion of teacher education students and university faculty into partnership settings. Goodlad and his colleagues at the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington detail their research findings, change strategies, and beliefs in two key writings,

Teachers for our Nation's Schools (Goodlad, 1990a) and *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching* (Goodlad, Sirotnik, & Soder, 1990).

Backed by Goodlad's research, Wyoming planners committed to the simultaneous renewal of teacher education program and K-12 education. College of Education representatives joined planners from five partnership school districts to design a program that purposefully altered traditional temporal arrangements. To achieve an outcomes-based program, discrete courses were eliminated, *e.g.*, foundations of education and principles of learning. Content was subsumed, altered, or enlarged into learning outcomes designed to be met during the three preprofessional teacher education phases. In each phase, teacher education students and College of Education professors were based in partnership schools. The duration and intensity of the field experience increased with each phase, culminating in a 12-week teaching internship.

Mindful of Sarason's warnings, planners made "resisting business as usual" a guiding principle as they developed the new program. A set of assumptions that College of Education faculty discussed and ratified by vote guided planning efforts (*A Three Phase Teacher Education Model*, February, 1990). The document presented a list of the shoulds that a cutting-edge teacher education program exemplified from a Wyoming perspective. See Figure 1 for a complete list of the assumptions.

Three of the assumptions are central to the changes in temporal organization we describe and analyze:

- Faculty will be willing to explore new areas.
- Collaboration among colleagues in public schools and university faculty will be viewed as a strength of any new program.
- The proposed program will be based on standards that may alter traditional approaches, such as limited enrollments, class size, FTE, faculty loads.

Although we expected difficulty translating the program's idealistic assumptions into day-to-day activity, Wyoming's vast geographical distances and small population (fewer than 450,000 residents) stymied simultaneous renewal efforts. UW is the state's sole baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Practically and politically, teacher education occurs throughout the state, not just in K-12 settings a short drive from the University. It is not unusual for UW students to face student teaching experiences in settings 300 miles from campus. To that end, the installation of an interactive compressed video state-wide network enabled us to conduct some meetings and deliver some graduate-level classes. Although compressed video use alleviated some travel to and from the university and thus saved time, its use was restricted almost completely to the delivery of graduate courses. Interactive compressed video did not reshape day-to-day interactions between and among preprofessional teacher education students and K-12 teachers and learners.

Figure 1

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, 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.

Temporal Arrangements

Temporal shifts in the redesigned teacher education program related to preprofessionals' time, teachers' time, and professors' time. Assumptions 5 and 10 from Figure 1 provided a foundation for the temporal changes we made: "Collaboration among colleagues in public schools and university faculty will be viewed as a strength of any new program," and "The proposed program will be based on standards that may alter traditional approaches, such as limited enrollments, class size, FTE, faculty loads." (*A Three Phase Teacher Education Model*, 1990). Guided by these two assumptions, planners created experiences for the professionals that connected campus learning to K-12 classroom settings. Building the connections demanded new kinds of collaboration that, in turn, altered the way preprofessionals, K-12 teachers, and university teachers thought about and used time.

Preprofessionals' Time

In our old program, a traditional teacher education program typical of many programs Goodlad investigated in his five-year study (1990a), students registered for two- and three-credit-hour courses, all independent of each other. We charac-

terized traditional credit-hour time as the time the student met with a professor in a classroom on campus to complete course goals. A professor's teaching load was similarly calculated, with most professors teaching two or three courses totalling six, eight, or nine credit hours. On-going, programmatically defined links to K-12 settings were weak or non-existent in such traditional programs.

In contrast to the traditional model described above, Wyoming's new teacher education approach reshaped traditional conceptions of time. Instead of measuring what students completed by credit hour and seat time, program planners focused on a set of program outcomes that students were required to complete at a satisfactory level. Planners altered traditional arrangements for classes, *e.g.*, 50 minute sessions, three times a week. Instead, some meeting times were all afternoon Thursday, some Thursday evenings, and some all day Friday for the entire semester from late-August through early-December. In the next course, students spent two full weeks on campus, four weeks in the partnership school, and two weeks back campus. This arrangement necessitated block scheduling in order to mesh with other university courses.

In both of these courses (one of them five credit hours and the other eight credit hours), we characterized instructional arrangements in the new program as having significant time for small group work, in depth discussion, student-instructor and student-student conferences, draft writing, and course portfolio development. Sometimes, we designed instruction to model the time needed for an intensive workshop, similar to workshops K-12 teachers plan and attend. Most important, the schedule enabled us to spend Thursdays and Fridays away from campus in school settings during one course and a full month away from campus in a second course.

Students drafted written documents that connected course outcomes, the workshops, and field experiences. Students' time in partnership schools and campus-based meetings allowed for in-depth, time-intensive projects. For example, one document was a self-assessment called "My Strengths and Weaknesses as a Teacher." The document ranged from eight to ten pages and was drafted and redrafted until it was polished enough for portfolio inclusion.

Secondary education students faced knotty scheduling problems when course meeting times bumped up against traditional university scheduling. Despite program directors' aggressive efforts to coordinate with other colleges on campus, scheduling problems remained pervasive for students. Scheduling was a major program criticism by students, parents, university administrators, and some college of education faculty.

Teachers' Time

Planners voiced a recurring concern about the new program because expectations had increased for K-12 mentor teachers. Each phase of the three-phase program had a field experience component which required that teachers spend time with the preprofessionals. What were the pay-offs for K-12 mentor teacher participation? What was the role of tuition waivers and outright payments to the

teachers? Would the pay-off during a 12-week teaching internship with the same preprofessional be substantial enough for teachers to invest time in earlier field experiences with the preprofessionals?

From interviews with mentor teachers, we learned that as long as the preprofessional provided an extra pair of hands benefitting learners, mentors found students in their classrooms a positive addition. Naturally, the mentor teachers' reactions to the preprofessionals varied. Many teachers found that the preprofessionals required additional time to prepare them for being useful in the classroom. In some cases, the preprofessionals were there to observe and thus required little of the teachers' time. In most cases, however, they assisted learners who required preparation time from the mentor teacher. Since K-12 learners benefitted from additional attention, most mentor teachers viewed their own commitment as time well spent.

Mentor teachers were concerned about the time needed to help preprofessionals complete assignments designed by the university professors. This was especially true when the teachers had not been included in the planning for the assignments, but had the responsibility of providing information or making arrangements for the preprofessionals.

One successful example of an assignment where teachers were included was the writing of a school/community portrait. The portrait was a kind of inquiry project requiring community research. Mentor teachers willingly provided the preprofessionals time for interviews necessary to develop preprofessionals' perceptions of the school culture. Teachers helped the preprofessionals arrange meetings with school administrators to learn about school finance and after-school programs. In this assignment, teachers did not consider their time disrupted. When the portraits were completed, teachers in all of the sites were interested in seeing and reacting to the preprofessionals' inquiry projects.

In contrast to the school/community portrait, teachers did find their time disrupted by some university assignments. One example was when preprofessionals were asked to teach lessons using a particular strategy, *e.g.*, direct instruction or discovery learning, following principles outlined in an educational psychology text. Teachers complained that they had to contrive situations where the preprofessionals could teach the lesson because few teachers used textbook-perfect strategies.

As teachers and UW faculty wrestled with changing preprofessionals' assignments, Assumption 3 guided us. The collaborative discussions strengthened the program as the assignments became more realistic with guidance from the teachers.

For the most part, teachers did not identify time disruptions as problems. According to the teachers, the time invested in the preprofessionals was returned when they worked with the learners, especially for a 12-week teaching residency. We emphasize that for these mentor teachers, the pay-off for their time invested in the preprofessional was individual attention provided to K-12 learners, especially those requiring extra attention.

Professors' Time

At the beginning of the article, we identified two assumptions guiding program changes. Changes in professors' use of time occurred as a result of the following assumption: "Faculty views on traditional ways of viewing load distribution, teaching, research, and service will change" (*A Three Phase Teacher Education Model*, 1990). During the first course of the redesigned program, on-campus time shared by UW faculty and preprofessionals proved extensive and intense. We met from early Thursday afternoon through late Friday afternoon. This included group travel time when we were away from campus. Due to longer instructional periods, professors were forced to reject lecturing as a primary instructional mode in the new temporal arrangement since it was physically impossible and pedagogically unwise. We saw ourselves moving from transmission teaching to a more critical constructivist mode characterized by workshops, discussions, one-on-one interactions, and increased writing-to-learn assignments.

We came to realize that the new temporal arrangement strengthened relationships between professor and preprofessional, a time- and energy-consuming change from the traditional ways most professors view teaching. Building relationships took time untenured professors needed for research and writing (Kleinsasser, Bruce, Berube, Hutchison, & Ellsworth, 1996). It also took time to build positive relationships with teachers in the partnership schools, *e.g.*, telephone calls, fax transmissions, letters, on-site visits, compressed interactive video meetings, and staff development sessions. The professors, together with the preprofessionals, spent more time in K-12 classrooms with mentor teachers.

Professors committed to the changes in the new program came to realize that the most valuable class time was the direct instructional time we gave up to be in conversation with students. The conversations nurtured relationships. Thus, the radical temporal change altered social interactions, defusing the traditional teacher student hierarchy about which Sarason writes (1990).

Professors and preprofessionals spent increased amounts of time together that altered traditional professor-student role boundaries. Student comments from course evaluations corroborate this point. For example:

> [the instructor] stressed student involvement, and was more than willing to give the extra push when it was needed. She introduced us to ideas and then led us to discussion and exploration of them as a group.

The assumption that traditional teaching roles would change led to another example of time disruption for professors. The six professors in the first cycle of cohort leaders planned together, up to six hours a week. We relied heavily on teaming, uniform syllabi, and evaluation rubrics we co-constructed with the preprofessionals. Since the program was new to us, planning and preparation took more time than any of us anticipated. We scheduled two- to three-hour workshops

on topics such as self esteem, learning theories, special education, and educational technology. All workshops related directly to experiences in the field.

Summary

We disrupted rigid temporal arrangements of traditional university scheduling to meet teacher education program outcomes. The outcomes demanded the integration of campus experiences and experiences in partnership schools. The change was based on an undergirding program assumptions that professors would collaborate with K-12 teachers to plan and implement the program and that professors' approaches to traditional ways of viewing load distribution, teaching, research, and service would change. According to Michael G. Fullan (1994) these changes challenge people at the core of their belief structures about self, role, and job requirements. In our setting, some faculty reacted by resisting the change. Others took early retirement or resigned.

Though disruptive, the changes did allow preprofessionals more intensive and coordinated time in K-12 classrooms. Increased time in schools yielded an intense professional learning experience that seemed more like real teaching to the preprofessionals and to some university professors. From the preprofessionals' perspectives, time in schools was the most important part of preprofessional experiences, as reported in a formal evaluation of the implementation year (Moore, Leighty, & Fertig, 1994).

More time in schools also demanded increased interactions between university professors and K-12 teachers. Most university professors involved in the implementation of the outcomes-based program had spent little time interacting with K-12 teachers previously about teacher education, let alone about a jointly owned program. One outcome of the time investment was a profound respect for the perspective of mentor teachers, a perspective some professors reported at UW faculty meetings that focused on the new program.

Conclusion

We conclude that temporal organizational disruptions must be viewed as an inevitable consequence when program assumptions such as the ones we describe here guide teacher education change. In our setting, the changes in traditional forms of university teaching and instruction created significant temporal disruptions for preprofessionals, K-12 mentor teachers, and professors. Although K-12 school settings were affected, the disruptions were most visible on campus. In this article, we connected the guiding influence of program assumptions (*A Three Phase Teacher Education Model*, 1990) to the organizational disruptions we experienced. A third assumption seems to override all of the others: "Faculty will be willing to explore new areas." The exploration and implementation of exploring a different kind of time for learning caused significant disruption.

We offer three caveats to policy makers for whom a school-university partnership is a change vehicle. The first will seem obvious: disruption **will** occur. For UW education professors, temporal disruption occurred when we came to grips with basic beliefs about curriculum, instruction, grouping, and our personal and professional relationships with preprofessionals and K-12 mentor teachers. Disrupting the traditional temporal arrangement resulted in deeper personal and professional relationships for some preprofessionals, K-12 mentor teachers, and university faculty.

Second, planners must first conceptualize the program, then solve logistical problems. We concur with Ann Lieberman (1992) who writes that program assumptions must be developed first, with logistical specifics and problems hammered out afterward. In our change effort, we consciously changed temporal arrangements to match theoretical program assumptions. These changes presented ongoing disruptions that we have been solving semester to semester. Above, we suggested that meeting the challenges of changing temporal arrangements provided a day-to-day structure for program changes. As suggested by Sarason (1972, 1982, 1983, 1990), had program planners first tackled what seemed to be intractable temporal arrangements challenging the status quo, program outcomes would have never been planned or implemented. Therefore, to realize **programmatic** change, it was necessary to create significant **organizational** change.

Our third caveat is that an undergraduate teacher education program such as ours was forced to mesh with the university's temporal logistics. Even though other organizational strategies may work better for preprofessional teacher education, we were forced to work within traditional university scheduling.

Changing teacher education in the context of a Goodlad-type school-university partnership demonstrates the potential of creating a radically different teacher education program. We were guided by key assumptions that presented the shoulds of Wyoming restructuring. To make the shoulds real, we altered temporal arrangements. Despite continued difficulties and challenges to business as usual,[1] we conclude that restructuring teacher education necessitates restructured temporal organizational arrangements.

Note

1. We postscript the article by describing how the organizational arrangements have weathered the four years since the program's Fall, 1992, implementation. Four factors have affected the program since the successful implementation. First, some tenured and untenured college of eduction professors argued to return to a more traditionally organized program. Second, the dean spearheading the changes left Wyoming for another leadership position. Third, travel and housing costs coupled with payments to partnership teachers for their work presented financial pressures for the college. Fourth, support for the new undergraduate program was eroded by the announcement of a 30 percent College of Education enrollment drop, publicized in mid-October, 1994. A

confluence of these four factors caused the University's president and provost to challenge the College of Education to alter its program, making it more user friendly. We were told that if we could not recover enrollments, we would face resource cutbacks.

Despite positive evaluations from students and partnership teachers (Moore, Leighty, Fertig, 1994), the new program was too much of a change for too many people; specifically, some university professors and a vocal group of students critical of the program. Untenured professors, confronted by the challenge of publishing and meeting other promotion and tenure requirements, questioned the loss of on-campus time for demanding relationships in K-12 school settings and time-robbing travel. Some senior faculty were reluctant to leave campus. For some faculty, the program's philosophical underpinnings were untenable, *e.g.*, a complete rethinking of the psychological and historical educational foundations' courses.

Despite implementation difficulty, we continue adapting the new program. We characterize the old program as having few or no field experiences prior to student teaching and an unfocused, loosely-coupled relationship with K-12 school settings. Those of us who were directly involved in planning and implementing the changes are humbled by the complexity and enormity of basic organizational changes idealized by Goodlad and Sarason, analyzed by Fullan, but lived by us. The changes in Wyoming involved too many teacher education students. Changes like the ones we described are, perhaps, best implemented in low-enrollment programs or with a small group of students and committed faculty. In *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, Fullan (1994) makes that specific recommendation.

We are convinced, however, that the quality of the program, structurally supported by the temporal changes described above, can be maintained and improved. A segment of the College of Education faculty maintain a heightened commitment to a strong relationship with school-university partners. This commitment is a result of teaching in the program. It is likely that fewer professors will be involved, but those who are involved share a deep commitment to undergraduate teacher education that we did not have prior to 1992.

This article is based on a paper presented in a symposium entitled "Strategies for Teacher Education Reform: Six Cases and Analysis" at the American Educational Research Association 1993 meetings in Atlanta, Georgia.

References

Fullan, M.G. (1994). *The new meaning of educational change*, 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990a). Better teachers for our nation's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72 (3), 185-194.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990b). *Teachers for our nation's school*. 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.

Kleinsasser, A.M., Bruce, M.A., Berube, W.B., Hutchison, L., & Ellsworth, J.Z. (1996). The beginning professor and Goodlad's simultaneous renewal: Vignettes from Wyoming's school-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23 (3), 37-54.

Lieberman, A. (1992). School/university collaboration: A view from the inside. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74 (2), 147-156.

Moore, A.D., Leighty, J.W., & Fertig, G.H. (1994) *The New Teacher Education Program at the University of Wyoming: Preliminary evaluation report.* Laramie, WY: University of Wyoming.

Sarason, S.B. (1972). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* (1st Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Sarason, S.B. (1983). *Schooling in America: Scapegoat and salvation.* New York: The Free Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of school and the problem of change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

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.