

THE TENTH ANNUAL WILLIAM E. DRAKE LECTURE A PROFESSION OUT-OF-FOCUS AND THE REALIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

Billy F. Cowart

INTRODUCTION

A profession has been defined as "...an occupation with a crucial social function, requiring a high degree of skill and drawing on a systematic body of knowledge...Certain characteristics make an occupation a profession: an exclusive body of knowledge, applying that expert knowledge for children's welfare, a high level of autonomy in decision making and controlling standards, and a sense of collegiality within a formal structure. Teaching, in certain quarters, has been considered to fall short of these criteria, and, as a result, has been judged to be no more than an "emerging profession." (Smith & Smith, p.383) For the purpose of this paper, teaching will be considered to have professional status, emerging or otherwise. Particular attention, however, will be paid to the phrase "applying that expert knowledge for children's welfare." In that connection, this paper will consider two basic arguments. First, that professional education is under indictment by the American public for a "perceived failure" to provide effective schooling for their children and that the response of the profession in attempting to resolve the "perceived problem" has been fragmented and "out-of-focus" thereby rendering it ineffective.

The activities of a profession will be considered to be "in focus" when there is a sense of clarity and coherence to professional practice, and the research and development activities of the profession are effective in providing leadership for the resolution of problems facing the profession and the constituency for which it is responsible in a timely and costeffective manner.

Second, teacher work must be directly related to student learning for any meaningful progress to occur. This will require a realignment of responsibility within the profession, and between the profession, the general public, and all external agencies impacting the authority of the school. This realignment will need to include, in particular, a redefinition of the role of the classroom teacher in regard to his or her authority, responsibility and accountability for student learning, a meaningful role in the decision-making process as it relates to all phases of the teaching/learning process, the support necessary to maximize the opportunity for student learning and the conditions necessary to insure fair and equitable evaluation of performance for this increased level of responsibility.

Professional education has given at least the appearance of being incapable of focusing its resources toward the development and delivery of a model of effective schooling acceptable to the public. It might be more realistic and honest to admit that the profession, in spite of a considerable research effort, funded at public expense, has had no acceptable response to present. The result has been the creation of a vacuum in educational leadership which has been filled by public initiative and piecemeal political solutions which, by design or result, are taking the leadership away from professional educators and forcing them to reform, by external mandate, their profession and the schools for which they are responsible. The only significant ally of professional education may be inertia; that overwhelming accumulation of effort required to "re-form" millions of teachers and professional support staff from x into y.

Public perception regarding ineffective schools is adequately documented in *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, the work of John Goodlad, *A Place Called School*, Diane Ravitch's, *A Troubled Crusade*, and in the action of state departments of education and state legislatures all over the country, so it will not be the primary object of debate within this

presentation. It should be noted that it is a "perception" based, primarily, on the revelation by the College Board in 1975 that "scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), taken each year by more than a million high school seniors, had declined steadily since 1964." (Ravitch, pp. 311-312)

This has been interpreted by the public to be "irrefutable evidence" of ineffective schooling and provided a strong platform for traditional critics, concerned parents and expedient politicians, alike. Robert M. Hutchins sensed the climate before it became readily apparent and made some observations intended primarily to "illuminate the unreality of our past expectations." "Pondering the school's sudden fall from grace, he wondered about what had happened to the institution that so recently had been the foundation of our freedom, the guarantee of our future, and the cause of our prosperity and power, and the bastion of our security, the bright and shining beacon...the source of our enlightenment, the public school." (Goodlad, p.3) Hutchins was essentially referring to the contents of a speech made only a few years earlier by Hubert Humphrey.

The decline in student scores has fundamentally abated, however, gains in student scores have been marginal, at best, and the level of public concern remains high. Question, is this concern any different or any more serious than previous demonstrations of public concern such as the reaction to Sputnik? The response by analysts such as John Goodlad, Diane Ravitch and Albert Shanker is that for the first time the American public appears to be considering action which could have the effect of dismantling their system of public schools. Initially, the response to Sputnik took the form of a campaign for national mobilization against the Russian space program which was portrayed as a threat to our national defense. Seriously negative, and in many ways unsubstantiated allegations were made against our science and math programs, however, the indictment against public education was eventually overshadowed by the larger effort to involve the federal government in the funding of education and the general tone evolved from one of indictment into one better characterized as "a cooperative effort to resolve a common **A PROFESSION UNDER INDICTMENT**"

By the mid-1970s, conditions had changed. Diane Ravitch provides a particularly insightful description of some of these changes in *The Troubled Crusade*. She states:

During the decade after 1965, political pressures converged on schools and universities in ways that undermined their authority to direct their own affairs. New responsibilities were assigned to educational institutions, even as effective authority was dispersed widely among students, faculty, unions, courts, state and federal regulatory agencies, state legislatures, Congress, the judiciary, and special interest groups. Educational administrators found themselves in the midst of unfamiliar power struggles...In elementary and secondary schools, almost no area of administrative discretion was left uncontested: students demanded new rights and freedoms; teachers' unions asserted a new militancy; political-action groups complained about books in the classrooms and libraries, for reasons of sexism, racism, or immorality; the courts ordered busing of students in many communities, as well as reassignment of faculty, to achieve racial integration; Congress, the courts, federal agencies, and state legislatures imposed special mandates across a wide range of issues, such as restricting or requiring certain tests, setting standards for promotion and graduation, and establishing new requirements governing the treatment of handicapped students and of students who were either female or member of a racial or linguistic minority. Considering the traditional reluctance of the

courts to intervene in the internal affairs of educational institutions, of the federal bureaucracy to violate local control of schools, and of Congress to bestow federal aid upon education, it is remarkable how rapidly the courts, the federal bureaucracy, and the Congress shed their doubts and hesitation after 1965. (Ravitch, pp. 277-8) Ravitch went on to say,

...the public schools did not adjust easily or quickly to the new programs of the 1970s. For one thing...schoolteachers were directly affected by some aspect of the new situation--by the introduction of bilingual education; by the mainstreaming of mildly retarded children into their classrooms; by busing of school children or by reassignment of teachers for racial balance; by the removal of a textbook because it was offensive to some particular group; by the splitting of history into courses on ethnic groups or women; or by the ethnic revival, which some professional educators joined by declaring that all students have the "right to their own pattern and varieties of language---the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own native identity and style." (Ravitch, p. 311- 312)

Besieged as they were by the rapidity of change, the public schools sustained yet another blow when the College Board revealed their report in 1975 on the decline of students' Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. More than any other single factor, the public's concern about the score declines touched off loud calls for instruction in the "basics" of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Complaints about lax standards in the schools increased in 1977 when the College Board's own blue-ribbon panel reported that, though the causes of the score declines were many and complex, they certainly included the findings "(1) that less thoughtful and critical reading is now being demanded and done, and (2) that careful writing has apparently about gone out of style." (Ravitch, p.311-312) It is probably not reasonable to expect any social institution to experience this degree of external intrusion, over a relatively short period of time, without having an impact upon its functionality as an institution. However, it is interesting to speculate why the profession waited for the College Board to make the announcement regarding eleven years of declining student scores. Such action does not appear to be consistent or "in-focus" with the behavior of a group interested in "autonomy in decision making and controlling standards," and responsible for "applying their expert knowledge for children's welfare." The announcement gave the initiative to the critics of public education and placed the profession on the defensive, a position from which they have yet to recover. It provided the critics an opportunity which they had sought for years, because they now had data which could be represented as objective, and which appeared to vindicate many of their otherwise unsubstantiated allegations against public education. Why did the profession fail to exercise leadership in drawing national attention to the problem; accepting blame where necessary, but offering solutions and attempting to mobilize national support to resolve the problem? Is the profession so fragmented into different interest groups that it is incapable of, at least, intellectually focusing attention to a problem of this magnitude by making it the principal topic for every national convention for a specified period of time? As a minimum, the profession could have developed its own national report on the status of schooling in America. If the nation refused to act on the recommendations, it would have stood as a matter of public record and, at least, a beginning defense against the criticism to come later.

But this is hindsight. It is not particularly unique for American education to be a primary focus of public attention. There has been a "major reform effort" of some kind within every

decade of this century. The Progressive Education movement began to emerge and exert its influence shortly after the turn of the century; serious public concern arose regarding adult illiteracy with the induction of men into the armed services for both WWI and WWII; after Sputnik, the frenzy to revise the math and science curricula emerged during the 1960s, and others followed: the Conant Report, desegregation, busing, the War on Poverty, the report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and teacher education reform.

When viewed in this broader historical context, can the current crisis be labeled as just another negative attack on education, or does it potentially represent a more serious shift in public support for education? In his book entitled, *A Place Called School*, John Goodlad stated, "American schools are in trouble. In fact, the problems of schooling are of such crippling proportions that many schools may not survive. It is possible that our entire public school system is nearing collapse. We will continue to have schools, no doubt, but the basis of their support and their relationships to families, communities, and states could be quite different from what we have known." (Goodlad, p.1)

As a personal observation, I have participated in one policy discussion wherein the Chancellor of a state system of higher education took the position that due to the breakdown of the American family as a functional unit, the public schools will have to be converted into fundamentally social service institutions to replace many of the functions previously performed by the family and in this revised format, would no longer carry the intellectual development of children as their primary mission. Goodlad continued by saying,

To survive, an institution requires from its clients substantial faith in its usefulness and a measure of satisfaction with its performance. The primary clients of American public schools---parents and their school age children---have become a minority group. Declining birth rates and increased aging of our population during the 1970s increased the proportion of citizens not directly involved with the schools. And there appears to be a rather direct relationship between these changed demographics and the growing difficulty of securing tax dollars for schools. To the extent that the attainment of a democratic society depends on the existence of schools equally accessible to everyone, we are all their clients. It is not easy, however, to convince a majority of our citizens that this relationship exists and that schools require their support because of it. (Particularly in a society where self-indulgence and instant gratification are common values.) It is especially difficult to convince them if they perceive the schools to be deficient in regard to their traditional functions. Unfortunately, the ability of schools to do their traditional jobs of assuring literacy and eradicating ignorance is at the center of current criticism...During the 1970s, however, public criticism included the institution, not just those who run it. Schools shared in our loss of faith---in government, the judicial system, the professions, and even ourselves. Uncertainty swiftly arose about the inherent *power* of schools, and indeed, education. (Goodlad, p.3)

In responding to the criticism, Goodlad noted "...the current wave of criticism lacks the diagnosis required for the reconstruction of schooling. This criticism is in part psychologically motivated---a product of a general lack of faith in ourselves and our institutions---and is not adequately focused...What we need, then is a better understanding of our public schools and the specific problems that beset them. Only with this understanding can we begin to address the problems with some assurance of creating better schools. As a nation, we have a history of capitalizing on this kind of **focused diagnosis** (emphasis added) and the constructive criticism emerging from it. A few initial successes would renew our sense of confidence in both ourselves

and our schools." (Goodlad, p. 2)

The title of this paper suggests that professional education is not currently in a position to provide the "focused diagnosis" suggested by Goodlad. The results of his extensive study indicate that schools are not as bad as they are perceived to be, but he outlines a formidable agenda for school improvement. "It includes clarification of goals and functions, development of curricula to reflect a broad educational commitment, teaching designed to involve students more meaningfully and actively in the learning process, increased opportunities for all students to gain access to knowledge, and much more." (Goodlad, p. 271)

Regarding the same subject, at the conclusion of his book, Goodlad stated,

At the heart is the need for data of a contextual sort to guide the determination of priorities by planning groups of responsible parties at the school site level. Guidelines for local initiative in the curricular area must come from the state and from school districts. Opening up new career paths for teachers and creating new staffing patterns require 14 policies not now on the books. There are many obstacles to be overcome in securing the appropriate participation of universities. For example, professors in research-based schools of education must learn to transcend the problems and paradigms of the academic disciplines if their work is to enlighten educational policy and practice. Some of the needed curriculum development, pedagogical experimentation, and evaluative inquiry require the creation of new centers and institutes. (Goodlad, p.360)

Of particular note is Goodlad's comment regarding the need for professors in research-based schools of education to learn to transcend the problems and paradigms of the academic disciplines if their work is to enlighten educational policy and practice. The implication is clear that, according to Goodlad, something is "out-of-focus" between educational policy and practice and programs of research on teaching. Is this a simple disagreement over what constitutes pure vs. applied research or is it something deeper? Is the teaching profession having to face this serious challenge to its credibility and competency without strong support from its research community? If the medical profession is an acceptable model, they appear to have an almost unlimited capacity to focus the resources of their research community on a crisis whether it be the long term battle against cancer or the sudden appearance of a new communicable disease.

PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING

If Goodlad is correct that, "the current wave of criticism lacks the diagnosis required for the reconstruction of schooling," who will provide the "focused diagnosis" that he feels is required to "renew our sense of confidence in both ourselves and our schools? The most logical source would be the research community and while it is recognized that there are many lines of research within professional education, the research on **effective teaching** was chosen for this analysis because the education of teachers is a fundamental responsibility of the profession and because of its importance to the teaching/learning process.

Initially, it is interesting to note that fragmentation within the profession and the rise of professionalism were two critical factors cited by Lawrence Cremin in his classic work, *The Transformation of the School*, as contributing to the decline of the Progressive Education Movement. (Cremin, pp.248-250) The movement was never able to regain momentum after WWII and slid steadily downhill after 1947. (Cremin, p. 247) However, no professional organization or movement since that time, has been able to articulate a vision or sense of purpose equal to that provided by this movement.

The study of teaching has always been clouded by the debate over whether it should be

considered an art or a science; and any attempt to define teaching as both an art and a science has never been widely accepted, probably because it would require the science side of the inquiry to accept a multitude of unanswered questions. Harry S. Broudy identified part of the problem in a chapter on "Historic Exemplars of Teaching Method." He stated,

...Protagoras, Socrates, Isocrates, Quintillian, Abelard, the Jesuits, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart were teachers by vocation and without exception believed that they could justify their method by a theory, not only of learning and teaching, but of truth, beauty, and goodness as well. Each man demonstrated how a distinctive set of values was to be embodied in the lives of a new generation by instruction. These great teachers did not experiment in a way that would edify the researchers of our time, they did not control their variables, they did not quantify their data. They were acute rather than systematic observers, but they did sense the important problems and they did classify human experience into categories which in turn have structured our language and our thinking, and thus even our most current research. (Broudy, p. 1)

In a discussion of current research, the work of these individuals would obviously be placed on the "art side" of the discussion because of their lack of supportive quantitative data, however, some of them were at the very forefront of attempting to develop a more disciplined, scientific approach to the study of teaching during their lifetime. Most of the quantitative research on effective teaching is of very recent origin. In fact, it can be dated as originating since the 1950 meeting of AERA, when a group of interested persons met informally at the joint invitation of Warren W. Coxe and Jacob S. Orleans to discuss criteria of effective teaching. At the suggestion of the group, AERA Pre Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness, which issued reports in 1952 and 1953. In 1955, a continuing committee, now named the Committee on Teacher Effectiveness, was appointed by AERA President Francis G. Cornell. The new group adopted as its goal the development of the *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. "A conceptual framework was to provide an orientation for the entire volume and each chapter was to flow from the framework...This framework for research on teaching specified three major classes of variables: central variables, relevant variables, and site variables." (N.L. Gage, Preface.)

This discussion of research techniques could go on for some time. Suffice it to say that a line of research specifically directed at effective teaching was initiated in 1950 which appeared to have some structure to it and was supported by a major professional organization. 15

N. L. Gage, who was deeply involved in this early work, identified another difference between the work of the earlier writers and current research. Where Broudy indicated that the ancient philosophers could "justify their method by a theory," current research works through paradigms which are defined as "models, patterns, or schemata." Paradigms are not theories, they are, rather, ways of thinking or patterns for research that, when carried out, can lead to the development of theory. (Shulman, p.3) Does this mean that we understand the problems associated with teaching better than the earlier philosophers and therefore have developed a more subtle description or does it mean that we are operating at a more primitive level, i.e., paradigm before theory, in attempting to describe effective teaching? **Perhaps our current problem is the inability to develop productive educational theory from paradigm-based research.**

In his chapter on paradigms as they relate to the study of teaching in the 1986 edition of the *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Shulman stated, "...a healthy current trend is the emergence of more complex research designs and research programs that include concern for a

wide range of determinants influencing teaching practice and its consequences. These "hybrid" designs which mix experiment with ethnography, multiple regressions with multiple case studies, processproduct designs with analyses of student mediation, surveys with personal diaries, are exciting new developments in the study of teaching. But they present serious dangers as well. They can become utter chaos if not informed by an understanding of the types of knowledge produced by these different approaches." (Shulman, p.4) The key point here is that the development of educational theory is following a significantly different and more complex format than in the past. It appears to be attempting to move away from the philosophical, rational, moral basis used by ancient philosophers as a justification for theory to a purely scientific basis. Further, according to the work of Thomas Kuhn, it is being conducted under a different logic and structure than the organized research effort of the so-called "hard sciences." In Kuhn's sense of the term, a paradigm is an implicit, unvoiced, and pervasive commitment by a community of scholars to a conceptual framework. In a "mature" science, only one paradigm can be dominant at a time. It is shared by that community, and serves to define proper ways of asking questions, those common "puzzles" that are defined as tasks for research in normal science. Members of the community acknowledge and incorporate the work of perceived peers in their endeavors. Kuhn would expect members of such a group to be relatively incapable of communicating meaningfully with members of other communities. (Quite literally, the ability to *communicate* is a central definer of *community* membership.) "A research program not only defines what can be legitimately studied by its advocates, it also specifies what is necessarily excluded from the list of permissible topics." (Shulman, pp. 4-5) Shulman reported Kuhn's concern that social scientists, "seemed to argue, even when they came from the same discipline, about basic matters of theory and method that physical scientists tended to take for granted. It was then that he realized that they failed to share a common conception of their fields so characteristic of the more "mature" disciplines. He called that network of shared assumptions and conceptions, a paradigm, and concluded that the social sciences were, therefore, "preparadigmatic" in their development." (Shulman, p. 5) This is relevant to a discussion of educational theory because education has chosen to pattern much of its research design on effective teaching after the social sciences. Shulman states, "...Social scientists pursue their research activities within the framework of a school of thought that defines proper goals, starting points, methods, and interpretive conceptions for investigations. These schools of thought operate much like Kuhnian paradigms...insofar as they are relatively insular and predictably uniform. However, in no sense are social science fields necessarily dominated by one single school of thought." (Shulman, p. 5) Merton, a sociologist, is cited by Shulman as arguing, "for the superiority of a set of competing paradigms over the hegemony of a single school of thought." He asserts that theoretical pluralism encourages development of a variety of research strategies, rather than premature closure of investigation consistent with the problematics of a single paradigm. (Shulman, p.5)

No attempt will be made within this paper to make a judgment regarding the advisability of following Kuhn's single paradigm design or Merton's theoretical pluralism since the purpose for their inclusion, here, is to illustrate differences in research design and the increasing complexity of current educational research. As an observation, however, it would prove very difficult to equate the success level of the sal research questions, and thereby expanding the knowledge base of their disciplines and its application to social concerns such as health, the diagnosis and cure of contagious diseases, nutrition, the exploration of space, etc.

A review of the major research programs which have been conducted on effective teaching within the past forty years will provide some additional information on the ability of the profession to address the critical issues which it currently faces. It will clearly indicate that a major research effort has been ongoing, and over a sustained period of time. It will not, unfortunately, explain why the results of this work have not been more helpful in explaining the recent decline in student achievement.

The most publicized of these programs is the **Process-Product** research. It is defined through the work of Duncan and Biddle, Gage, Mitzel, Rosenshine and Stevens, Anderson, Evertson, Brophy and others. The thrust of this research 16 program was "to define relationships between what teachers do in the classroom (the processes of teaching) and what happens to their students (the product of learning). One product which has received much attention is achievement of basic skills..." (Shulman, p. 9)

The Coleman Report, in 1966, created considerable concern with its apparent claim that teachers, or more accurately variations among teachers, do not make a difference in school achievement. One of the most significant findings from process-product research on teaching entailed the demonstration that teachers do make a difference. Another central topic was teacher expectations, an interest that resulted from the Rosenthal & Jacobson research that produced the provocative study *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. This line of research was consistent with a strong existing research tradition---applied behavioristic psychology and its task-analytic, training tradition. According to Shulman, "The implications of the processproduct research for practice and policy were frequently seen as holding direct implications for in-service training." (Shulman, pp. 10-11)

Other programs of research on effective teaching include: (a) studies on **Time and Learning** which sought to identify the key mediators of teacher behavior in the activities of pupils; (b) **Pupil Cognition and the Mediation of Teaching** which sought to study the inferred thought processes of the pupils themselves through the direct observation of teacher and student behavior; (c) **Classroom Ecology** which is more closely aligned with sociology, anthropology and linguistics and tends to deal with topics such as the "microanalysis of interactions, both verbal and nonverbal, within a single reading group lesson"; but it was recognized that this line of research seldom produces propositions that can be readily translated into principles for policy or maxims for practice; (Shulman, p. 18) (d) **Classroom Process and Cognitive Science Research** which ascribes substantial cognitive and/or social organization to the participants in their studies, and assumes that prior knowledge, experience or attitude frames the new encounters and their interpretation; (Shulman, p. 22) and, (e) research on **Teacher Cognition and Decision Making** which attempts to understand adequately the choices teachers make in the classrooms, the grounds for their decisions and judgments about pupils, and the cognitive processes through which they select and sequence the actions they have learned to take while teaching. (Shulman, p. 23) In summary, programs were developed around the host of alternative units of inquiry for studying teaching. They included: participants - teacher, student, group-as-a-unit attributes of those participants - capacities, thoughts, actions, context or levels of contextual aggregations - individual, group, class, school content - topics, type of structure, duration of instructional unit agenda - academic tasks, social organization and foci within that agenda such as subject matter content, participant structures research perspective - positivist/law seeking or interpretive/personal meaning oriented (Gage, Preface) This is not presented as new information. It should surface in any basic course on research design. It is included here to help provide a

focus for this discussion. It does raise a fundamental question. With this level of research being conducted, on site, in naturally occurring classrooms, all over the country, over an extended period of time, why was it not possible for the results of this research to have a greater impact on teaching? Is the research perceived to be irrelevant or is the research community, higher education, the regional labs, and the Research and Development Centers isolated from the public school community in a way that prevents a productive flow of information from research to practice? According to Lee Shulman, the Process-Product research program was seen as having very straightforward implications for practice and policy

The research frequently identifies large numbers of teacher behaviors, discrete variables that were correlated with student outcomes and that defined the key elements of teaching effectiveness. These, in turn, lent themselves to lists of "teacher should" statements that were handy to those who wished to prescribe or mandate specific teaching policies for the improvement of schools. Moreover, the work was tied to an indicator that both policy makers and the lay persons took most seriously as a sign of how schoolchildren were doing: standardized achievement tests...This dual advantage of ready association with observable results for pupils and the appearance of clear implications for evaluation, training, and policy, made the process-product approach attractive indeed. Although a number of processproduct researchers actively opposed the oversimplification of their findings, warning against the premature application of results, others seemed to encourage the development of teacher education or evaluation systems that employed the findings of their studies as a framework for assessing teacher quality. (Shulman, p. 11) As time passed, the process-product research seemed to surprisingly lose intellectual vigor within the research community. Shulman speculated that there were several reasons to consider: 1. the program had succeeded relative to its goals and the funding for large scale research of this nature diminished; 2. ...while the claim could be made that the program studied naturally occurring behavior, and, therefore, met the ultimate reality tests, in principle, **the manner in which individual behavioral elements were aggregated into patterns or styles of teaching performances** (emphasis added) did not necessarily meet this criterion. (Shulman, p. 12) 17 Shulman cited Gage's explanation of this practice. The difference is between naturally occurring patterns and styles as composites. Naturally occurring patterns compare intact patterns of teaching such as direct and open whereas "styles as composites" deal with many specific dimensions or variables of teaching styles or methods wherein the investigators synthesize, from hundreds of correlations, the style or pattern of teaching that seems to be associated with desirable kinds of pupil achievement and attitude. Shulman concluded, "Thus the bulk of process-product research, while based on naturally occurring correlations, defined effective teaching through an act of synthesis by the investigator or reviewer, in which the individual behaviors associated with desirable pupil performance were aggregated into a new composite. **There was little evidence that any observed teacher had ever performed in the classroom congruent with the collective pattern of the composite.**" (emphasis added) (Shulman, p. 12)

Let me repeat for emphasis. The process-product research identified large numbers of teacher behaviors, discrete variables that were correlated with student outcomes and that defined the key elements of teaching effectiveness, however, the bulk of this research defined effective teaching through an act of synthesis by an investigator or reviewer. Therefore, there is little evidence that any observed teacher ever performed in the classroom congruent with the collective pattern of the composite. Question: Why go to all of the trouble to conduct the research in naturally occurring classrooms and then commit the unnatural act of converting the results into

composites? The composite would appear to represent some idealized description of effective teaching behaviors which would appear to be even less useful than attempting to encourage teachers to copy the behavior of a particular "master teacher." It reads like science fiction. It appears that lists of effective teaching behaviors emerged from this work which were used for training and staff development, perhaps even for evaluation, but the model was a composite of many different people at work. Further, the results described aspects of teacher behavior associated with classroom management, generic instructional behavior (use of lower - or higher order questions, frequency of praise). It seldom described behavior directly related to substantive subject - specific content of instruction. As mentioned earlier, personnel in selected public schools did pick up the data and attempt to convert it into programs for staff development but were not successful. Perhaps they were too intent on implementation without consultation with the research community. It was the type of raw data that would have required a maximum coordination of effort among all segments of the profession to implement in a productive manner and this coordination failed to occur.

THE REALIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

The realignment of responsibility, for purposes of this presentation, will mean that work performed by one individual or group within a given model of schooling will be discontinued, modified or assigned to another. It could result in the continuation of the existing model of schooling in a modified format or insufficient change as to constitute a substantially different model

Perceptions will vary, as to whether the profession has developed or is in the process of developing an adequate response to the current public concern regarding declining student achievement

There is evidence to support the claim that many of the current problems in American education originate from causes outside of the direct control of the school. This could be visualized as justification for attempting to force the public to find a solution to the problem by delaying the development of any set of alternative solutions which would require significant adjustments in the professional roles of educators

There is also evidence of a teaching profession more interested in protecting "working conditions" than in establishing and enforcing high standards of performance. There is a growing conviction that the profession has developed into a costly bureaucracy, much of which makes no direct contribution to student learning. Albert Shanker dramatized this point in an article entitled, "Toward a Reform of Teaching." He stated, child. Since the fiscal crisis, each class has at least thirty children---sometimes more than thirty. For a class of thirty children, New York is spending \$150,000 in each classroom. The teacher's salary, at the top, is \$40,000 and if you add pension and other benefits, maybe the teacher is getting \$50,000. Now where is the other \$100,000? In reality, most of the remaining money goes into support staff to help teachers, although, by and large, the average rank-and-file teacher would be hard pressed to identify exactly what sort of help he or she is getting." (Shanker, p. 215)

From the perspective of this writer, the profession has been on the defensive for the past twenty years, attempting to adjust to a variety of initiatives from the general public, local boards of education, and state and federal government. This is an appropriate role for the public and it is reasonable to assume that this process of public debate will, over time, reveal an agenda for change. It is not reasonable, however, to assume that nonprofessionals will, on their own, develop a resolution to the problem of declining student achievement based on any depth of

professional knowledge. If the decision is left to the general public, it will be based on personal, political and economic considerations which operate quite apart from professional knowledge and understanding of the problem

Conditions would appear to dictate the need for decisive action by the profession, as a whole, if it is to regain credibility in the eyes of the public and reassume its appropriate role of leadership in the education of children. There is a precedent for such action. In 1897, Margaret A. Haley, a graduate of Francis Weyland Parker's Cook County Normal School, was teaching in an elementary school in Chicago and actively involved in organizing the Chicago Teachers Federation. Haley was elected vice-president and Catherine Goggin, President. They fought hard and were successful in winning approval for a salary increase and the creation of a pension fund, however, the board failed to follow through on the salary increases. Haley and Goggin pressed the board hard for action and found that the treasury was short of revenue because many corporations had not paid taxes on property valued at over \$100 million. It was clear that the Chicago Board of Education would take no action to secure the delinquent taxes. Haley and Goggin considered a course of action well beyond the normal responsibility of professional educators. They set out to collect the delinquent taxes on their own. In setting a course of action, they consulted with attorney and former Governor John P. Altgeld and he informed them that they were correct in what they were trying to do but that they would never be successful in challenging such powerful businesses. They filed suit and won their case in court in 1902. I don't want this to sound like a fairy tale because even after receiving the windfall of \$600,000 in delinquent taxes, through no action of their own, the board refused to use the additional tax revenue to pay for salary increases for teachers until 1906. The moral victory for the Chicago Teachers Federation in winning the lawsuit was overwhelming and the eventual realization of a salary increase against this level of apathy and organized resistance was an important milestone for the union movement, but it occurred only because individuals dared to move outside of established lines of responsibility

This same type of creative imagination will be required to involve union organizations today in the resolution of the current problem because the search for a solution of the problem must begin with the teaching/learning process. Myron Brenton noted that this will require a change of attitude on the part of unions: "Every professional group closes rank to protect its own; teachers are no exception. But teachers are the exception in that they seem to want--at this juncture, at least, the best of both worlds, the security of the civil servant and the prestige and rewards of the professional. More than that, they want a major say in matters of educational policy while getting tenure protection. In other words, they want power without accountability..."(Myron Brenton, p.255.)

Albert Shanker, in his work referred to earlier, enters a plea for a full review of all the recommendations included in the report prepared by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. He indicates that the tendency is to focus on some of the more daring proposals such as professional-level salaries and the professional-certification board. According to Shanker, the real problem with the Carnegie report lies with the recommendations for a "restructured teaching profession" and "a completely redesigned school system," which he considers to be extremely controversial. He stated, "What the Carnegie report advocates will never be imposed on teachers. We will never force teachers to take responsibility for making educational decisions regarding the training of other adults or regarding the running of the schools as senior partners do in a law firm or as faculty members do in a college." (Shanker, pp. 216-217) Shanker did acknowledge

that if teachers manifest too narrow a perspective in reacting to the report that it will be "removed from the table" and "we are unlikely to see another that is equally promising for a long time." (Shanker, p. 218) It is interesting to note that nowhere in his remarks did he suggest that professional organizations take over the national agenda for reform by drafting guidelines and conditions under which teachers would be willing to accept accountability for student learning. In addition to stipulating conditions for collecting and evaluating data on student learning, these conditions could include procedures to be utilized in teacher evaluation, and a voice in tenure decisions. Or, from another perspective, develop a proposal which would permit the teachers in a given school or district to contract with the board to assume responsibility for running a school in the same manner that Boston University contracted with a board of education in the Boston area. There are other examples of dramatic action. The employees of United Airlines took steps to purchase the airline when the parent company got into financial trouble and was considering the discontinuation of service. It is my understanding from discussions with a staff member for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that unions in at least two cities in the Midwest have proposed additional areas of responsibility which their teachers would be willing to assume in return for an expanded role in decisions regarding tenure. In general, the basis for negotiations between school boards and teacher unions regarding working conditions are at an impasse. Teacher unions are perceived, by many, as self-serving organizations who do not provide a quality service. It is time to shift the emphasis of the negotiations from the working conditions of teachers to the conditions required for effective student learning. Once this is articulated properly, it will define the parameters of "reasonable" working conditions, however, teacher unions will have to forge a much stronger relationship than currently exists between their professional activities, teacher education and the research community in order to mount a successful effort. They will also have to help define 19 and be prepared to support responsible action against ineffective teaching

Del Schalock, a member of the Teaching Research Division of Western Oregon State College, is the lead researcher in a research project on teacher effectiveness which has been in progress for the past seven years. He also provided the primary support for a group of eighteen, basically rural, school districts, called the Valley Education Consortium, that formed a coalition for school improvement which extended over a period of twenty years. In a project conducted for the consortium during the 1983-84 school year, the data collected indicated large differences among teachers in their ability to foster learning in students taught. This was the case across subjects, across students, and across areas of learning within a subject. Schalock, et. al., reported in an article for the *Journal for Personnel Evaluation in Education* on data collected for the three third-grade teachers in one district, which was illustrative of what was found repeatedly for teachers at grades one through eight throughout the consortium schools. "Students enrolled in the district were 60 percent white, 27 percent Hispanic, and 13 percent Russian of old believer faith, and tended to be from families of lower and middle socioeconomic status. (Of the 674 students in the district, 204 were served by free or reduced cost lunch programs.) Students were assigned to the three third-grade teachers without regard to ethnic background, academic ability, or academic achievement. Prior to the collection of these data, the district had adopted a set of well defined and sequenced learning goals for grades one through eight in the basic skills of mathematics, reading, and writing. The district assessed student performance at each grade level on these goals, in the fall and spring each year, with curriculum-aligned tests that were developed by teachers from a variety of districts in order to assess student gains toward goal attainment.

tests that were developed by teachers from a variety of districts in order to assess student gains toward goal attainment.

Table 4. Index of student growth: Total student gain by teacher by subject

Subject	% student growth, Teacher A	% student growth, Teacher B	% student growth, Teacher C
Mathematics	43.0	33.2	76.5
Reading	47.2	37.5	41.4
Writing	69.6	58.4	72.3

Table 5. Index of student growth: Variations in student learning by goal areas within a subject

Subject/Goal	% student growth Teacher A	% student growth Teacher B	% student growth Teacher C
Mathematics			
Complex word problems	8.5	-18.2	64.5
Measurement	18.3	1.5	82.8
Reading			
Literal content	66.8	25.9	22.3
Main idea	92.1	43.4	43.7
Writing			
Sentence structure	63.1	42.4	77.5
Paragraph structure	76.6	45.5	31.9

Table 6 Index of student growth: Variations in learning among groups of students by goal areas

Teacher/Subject	% student growth, top quartile	% student growth, second quartile	% student growth, third quartile	%student growth, bottom quartile
Teacher A				
Mathematics				
Complex word problems	-15.8	-5.6	18.2	58.2
Geometry	85.7	77.8	30.0	55.6
Teacher B				
Writing				
Capitalization	89.9	81.7	66.7	45.0
Grammar	0.0	0.0	86.6	83.3
Teacher C				
Writing				
Punctuation	83.5	66.3	100.0	100.0
Paragraph structure	83.1	100.0	-2.7	-3.7

Note: a. These tables are taken from the article by H.D. Schalock, et. al., "Student Learning in Teacher Evaluation," *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, Vol. 7, No. 2, August, 1993, pp. 117-118.

b. The data are reported in a form suggested by Millman (1981) and referred to as an "index of student growth (ISG) by students. The formula used in arriving at student growth was: post-test - pre-test ISG = 100% - pre-test

Table 4 shows the average Index of Student Growth for each of the three teachers in each of the three subject areas where testing occurred." (Schalock, et. al. p.119) It can be seen from these data that considerable variation existed among these three teachers in terms of their success in fostering learning gains within subject areas. It can also be seen that no teacher was outstandingly effective across all subject areas, and that two of them were reasonably effective in only one area

According to Schalock, et. al., "The data in Table 5 support the premise that teachers are not equally adept at fostering all types of learning that need to occur within a particular subject. This can be seen in the variation that appears not only across teachers for a goal area, but also across particular goal areas within a subject for a particular teacher. This is especially evident in the example given for Writing. Teacher, who was most successful in fostering learning in the area of Sentence Structure, was least successful in fostering learning in the area of Paragraph Structure

Table 6 extends this view of the differential success of teachers in fostering learning to groups of students within a classroom who differ in their level of academic achievement prior to instruction. If one looks at the learning gains from fall to spring for students who have been assigned to one of four quartiles on the basis of their scores on an end-of -the year examination that is taken when they enter school in the fall, large variations in gain scores appear between quartiles. The data in Table 6 suggest that for some teachers in some subject areas most of the learning that takes place in their classroom may be concentrated in only a portion of their students. It also would appear from these data that teachers may be more adept at fostering learning in some goal areas with weak or strong students than they are in other goal areas." (Schalock, et.al., p. 119) The fundamental argument being presented is that teacher work must be related to student learning. There are significant differences between the abilities of teachers to foster learning in students. There have always been these differences but we have operated on the assumption that if a teacher performed specified teaching behaviors, learning would take place. It was a naive assumption thirty years ago, though perhaps understandable with the difficulty in collecting and analyzing data on student learning in relation to teacher performance. It is inexcusable today with our current capacity for collecting and processing data. And this cannot be visualized as an attempt to dehumanize the learning process. It must be infinitely more humane for both teachers and students to monitor this kind of evidence and to utilize it to make informed decisions regarding the best ways to support teachers in improving their instruction, and to create differentiated teaching assignments which capitalize upon the recognized strengths of teachers rather than assignment criteria influenced primarily by seniority

The merged school of education at Western Oregon State College and Oregon State University made the decision to establish a quality assurance program for all of their graduates in 1985. Essentially it constituted a "warranty" to any school that hired one of their graduates, stating that if a problem developed regarding the performance of a graduate, the college would assume r, additional counseling, tutoring, and/or additional course work at no expense to the

district or the student. In the period between Fall, 1986 and August, 1995, three cases had been reported to Western Oregon State College, all of which were remediated with limited consultation. The misassignment of a beginning teacher was a factor in every case. Misassignment, here, is defined as assigning a teacher to an area of responsibility for which he or she has limited or no preparation

The call to relate teachers work directly to student learning is not limited to this paper or conservative business groups. Proposals presented by the Southern Regional Education Board (1985, 1986), the National Governors' Association (1986), and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986) have all called for linking student learning and teacher evaluation. According to Schalock, et.al., the Southern Regional Education Board is the most prescriptive. The Carnegie Forum's report, which is the most comprehensive, provides a blueprint for an outcome-based agenda. Some of the points cited include: 1. the need to refocus learning (curriculum) in our schools to better prepare young people to live and work in a knowledge-based economy; 2. the need to raise our sights (expectations) around who is to learn what in school, and how hard they are to work in learning it; 3. the need to develop good (criterion-referenced, curriculum-aligned) measures of student progress toward learning goals, and efficient means for teachers, parents and administrators to use the information these measures provide in monitoring student learning, planning instruction, and improving instructional programs; 4. the need to hold both teachers and principals accountable for student progress in learning, though obviously students and parents share in this responsibility... (Schalock, et.al. p. 109) Richard N. Goodwin, in his eloquent and provocative book, *Promises to Keep*, contends that our country is engaged in a political crisis that is far deeper than most politicians realize. A major breakdown of the major components of American society is in process. Goodwin argues that the party system, Congress, and the executive branch have fallen under the sway of special interests at the expense of the nation and its capacity to create wealth and social justice. He contends that Washington is cut off from the realities affecting most Americans and that government is paralyzed. The consequence, according to Goodwin, is the betrayal of the American dream. These are sobering thoughts but they lend credence to the position that the current attack on education is not likely to diminish. Limited economic growth nationally over a period of some twenty years, coupled with the "tax revolts" that began with the passage of Proposition 13 in California have resulted in stagnant or reduced revenues at all levels of government. This has shifted the emphasis in budgetary discussions at the state and national levels from arguments over how to distribute new revenues to the "reallocation of existing resources." Education constitutes the largest item in virtually every state budget in the country and, as a result, has been, and will continue to be the most conspicuous target of opportunity. The strategy is "if we can make education look bad enough, there will be no public outcry when we reallocate their resources." Goodwin opened his book with the statement, "America was conceived not merely as a land to be inhabited and exploited, but as an idea and a great experiment, as a home where men and women could be free, joined in one nation by a common dream. From our earliest day---not because of our mounting material wealth and military power, but because of our dedication to Thomas Jefferson's assertion that "the equal rights of man and the happiness of every individual, are now acknowledged to be the only legitimate objects of government." (Goodwin, p. 1) He further observed, "Our future depends on the ability to mount a struggle for extensive even drastic changes in the institutions that compose both the private economy and the process of politics and government, along with the intricate web of

relationships that connect them with each other and with the people." (Goodwin, p. 8) In summary, it is not just a time for change, it is a time for leadership by the profession, it is a time to focus intellectual and material resources toward developing a resolution for the current crisis in student achievement. It is a time for the realignment of responsibility within the profession and between the profession, the public, and all external agencies impacting the teaching/learning process. It is a time to insure that public initiatives such as "choice" and "vouchers" do not detract from the capacity of the public school to serve and preserve a democratic form of life. It is a time to insist that the intellectual development of children, in concert with their emotional and physical development, remains the primary mission of the public school. In my mind, the basic unit of instruction continues to be the single teacher and the single student, regardless of the context of their assigned relationship, be it 1:20 or 1:30. It is this relationship which must function effectively in order for learning to take place. Further, in order to Page 25 protect the public school model of fundamentally open access to education, the profession must demonstrate, beyond question, the ability to deliver an effective teaching/learning process. It is more than a professional responsibility. It is our moral obligation to a democratic society

REFERENCES

- Barr, A. S., Project Director, (1961). Wisconsin studies of the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness: A summary of investigations. Madison, Wisconsin, Dembar Publications, Inc. 22
- Brophy, Jere, Good, Thomas L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (ED), *Third handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 328-375.
- Broudy, Harry S. (1963). Historic exemplars of teaching method. In N.L. Gage (ED), *Handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., AERA, pp. 1-43.
- Brameld, Theodore (1995). *Philosophies of education in cultural perspective*. New York: The Dryden Press, Inc.
- Brameld, Theodore (1970). Patterns of educational philosophy: *Divergence and convergence in culturological perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Brenton, Myron (1970). *What happened to the teacher?* New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan Publishers.
- Elmore, Richard F., & Associates (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. Center for Policy Research in Education. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers.
- Cremin, Lawrence, A. (1961). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Dewey, John (1917). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Duncan, Michael J., & Biddle, Bruce J. (1974). *The study of teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Frymier, Jack, (ED) (1983). *Bad times, good schools*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Phi.
- Gage, N. L., (ED) (1963). *Handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.,

AERA.

Goodlad, John. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodwin, Richard N. (1992). *Promises to keep: A call for a new American revolution*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Ravitch, Diane (1983). *The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980*. Basic Books, Harper Collins Publishers.

Remmers, H. H., Rivlin, Harry N., Ryans, David G., Ryden, Einar R., (EDs) (1957). *Growth, teaching, and learning: A book of readings*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Rosenshine, Barak, & Stevens, Robert (1986). Teaching functions. In M.C. Wittrock (ED), *Third handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 376-390.

Schalock, H. Del, Schalock, Mark D., Cowart, Bill & Myton, David (1993). Extending teacher assessment beyond knowledge and skills: Emerging focus on teacher accomplishments. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 7:105-133.

Schalock, H. Del, Schalock, Mark D., David & Girod, Jerry (1993). Focusing on learning gains by pupils taught: A central feature of Oregon's outcome-based approach to the initial preparation and licensure of teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 7:135-158.

Schalock, Mark D., Cowart, Bill, and Staebler, Bonnie (1993). Teacher productivity revisited: Definition theory, measurement, and application. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 7:179-196.

Shanker, Albert (1990). Restructuring the teaching profession in our schools. *What Teachers Need to Know: The Knowledge, Skills, and Values Essential to Good Teaching*, Dill, David D.,(ED), San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., Publishers, pp. 203-223.

Shulman, Lee (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M.C. Wittrock (ED), *Third handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 3-36.

Smith, Joan K., & Smith, L. Glenn (1994). *Education Today: The Foundations of a Profession*. St. Martins Press, Inc., New York. 23

Walberg, Herbert J. (1986). Syntheses of research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (ED), *Third Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 214-229.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Gardner, David P., Chairman.