

1993

Back to the Future: The De-professionalisation of Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales

Peter Gilroy
University of Sheffield

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gilroy, P. (1993). Back to the Future: The De-professionalisation of Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1993v18n2.2>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol18/iss2/2>

Beardon, T., Booth, M., Hargreaves, D. and Reiss, M. (1992). *School-led initial teacher training: The way forward*. Department of Education: University of Cambridge.

Beazley, K. (1993). *Teaching counts*. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (1989). *Discipline review of teacher education in mathematics and science*. (Chair: G.W. Speedy). Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (1992). *Teacher education: A discussion paper*. Canberra: DEET.

Knight, J. and Lingard, B. (1993). *Dis/counting teacher education: The Beazley papers*. Paper presented at the ATEA Conference, Fremantle, Western, 11-14 July, 1993.

Schools Council (1989). *Teacher quality: An issues paper*. Canberra: AGPS.

BACK TO THE FUTURE: THE DE-PROFESSIONALISATION OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES

Peter Gilroy
University of Sheffield

INTRODUCTION

In many ways this paper reads like a report from an educational battlefield. From the 1980s those involved with initial teacher education in England and Wales can be seen as dealing with sporadic sniping at their work, followed by more substantial skirmishes, culminating in the 1990s with full-blooded assaults. This paper begins by describing the position being attacked, identifies the first intimations of aggression, then focuses upon the battering inflicted in the 1990s upon initial teacher education. The analysis which follows indicates that, savage though it has been, the attack on initial teacher education is in some ways only a feint to disguise an indirect assault on the concept of teacher professionalism and thus on education per se.

THE DISTANT PAST: TEACHER EDUCATION 1848-1969

Until the middle of the nineteenth century initial teacher education in Britain was conspicuous by its absence. In fact at the primary level untrained and poorly educated pupil teachers were the norm, with pupils over the age of 12 being apprenticed to schools for periods of 5 years. A small minority of these pupil-teachers progressed to colleges, that were in the main denominational, to study for their teacher's certificate (which was introduced in 1848). However, the basic pattern of both primary and secondary teacher education was a form of apprenticeship, where teachers 'learned-on-the-job', an approach criticised as failing both children and teachers by the 1861 Newcastle Commission (see Patrick et al., 1982). Subsequently the 1888 Cross Committee recommended that universities should be involved with teacher training and so, as a result of the McNair report of 1944, university education departments began to be created to serve this need. By 1947 the way in which university departments were coming to influence college courses was recognised by the creation of Area Training Organisations (ATOs), which facilitated the universities' supervision of college-based initial teacher education courses. Working through the ATOs, universities and their colleges could recommend to the Ministry of Education

the award of Qualified Teacher Status to successful students. The colleges/universities link was such that it was possible to argue that it served a major role in initial teacher education, in that it "had the effect of both strengthening and broadening the professional and academic aspects of training" (Gosden 1989, p.2), a role that Her Majesty's Inspectorate itself identified as being "significant" (DES 1988a, p.1).

By 1960 the colleges' course had been increased from two to three years and subsequently, in 1963, to four years so as to allow colleges to offer the B.Ed. degree. By the end of the 1960s it was unusual for a teacher to enter the profession without a degree and thus without a substantial period of both the study and practice of education. The growth of the graduate profession can be seen from the Department of Education and Science's own figures (DES 1991, p.38), which show a six-fold increase in primary graduate teachers between 1972 and 1988 (from 5% to 30%) and almost a doubling of secondary graduate teachers in the same period (from 37% to 63%). The idea that teachers could be inducted into their profession by means of an apprenticeship scheme could be seen as a quaint, and flawed, relic of the Victorian past.

THE RECENT PAST: TEACHER EDUCATION 1970-1984

Another way of describing the way in which initial teacher education had developed by the 1960s was that there was virtually no central control of provision, other than that provided by the universities and, for some institutions, the Council for National Academic Awards. The first hint of a reversal of this laissez-faire policy came in 1970 with the James Report. Only one of its recommendations was implemented by the Conservative government (the introduction of an induction programme for teachers in their probationary year), but this was doubly significant. First, it indicated that the central government was focusing its attention upon initial teacher education; second, that it felt competent to direct initial teacher education.

The spotlight of attention found expression in a spate of reports produced by the government's agents, the Department of Education and Science (DES) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI). For example, in 1981 a survey of new teachers in schools was carried out (DES 1982), followed in 1987 by a similar survey (DES 1988b). In themselves these surveys and publications were not objectionable. Indeed, they supported the idea that the existing form of initial teacher education was working well, with schools, for example, reporting that they were dissatisfied with only 4% of new teachers (DES 1988c, p.59). However, as might be expected, selections of these reports could (and, as will be shown, would) be easily quoted out of context to give the opposite impression by those who wished to denigrate the contribution of higher education to the process of initial teacher education.

Secondly, the government now began to exert direct control over initial teacher education. University influence on college-based initial teacher education was considerably lessened when the ATOs were abolished in 1975. It almost disappeared altogether when, following on from the HMI recommendations concerning the content of initial teacher education (DES 1983), the government created in 1984 the first Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) which, through its regional committees, advised the Secretary of State for Education as to whether or not courses of initial teacher education should be 'approved'. To teacher educators the Orwellian nature of 1984 represented a major blow to the autonomy that university education departments in particular had, according to the DES (see above, DES 1988c), satisfactorily and responsibly operated with.

Thus by 1984 the Secretary of State for Education had, through CATE, control over all initial teacher education courses, such that he (rather than, as in the past, universities or the Council for National Academic Awards) could accept or reject them. Moreover, he controlled the membership of CATE, with professional educators being very much in the minority. This was to be expected, given the phrasing of the circular which introduced CATE (DES 1984), which seemed to imply the Secretary of State's "lack of trust, indeed suspicion" of those professionally responsible for initial teacher education (Gosden 1989, p.9), coupled to the Conservative Party's almost mystical appeal to the power of the market and businessmen. However, to have such a lopsided membership of a body as important to teacher education as CATE was, to say the least,

ominous and caused some difficulty for the whole process of accreditation (see Barton et al., 1992).

Some optimists still felt that the process of CATE-based accreditation was acceptable, not least because the sheer numbers involved with the standard routes into teaching (via the B.Ed./B.A. or the Post Graduate Certificate in Education - PGCE- for those with degrees) meant that higher education's contribution to initial teacher education could not easily be cast away (cf. Gosden 1989, p.17), especially when compared with the expensive innovation of the Articled Teacher Scheme (where students were paid a bursary for a two-year course, in which at least 80% of their time is school-based and mentor supported). The official costs at 1991/92 prices per students were as follows (Parliamentary Answer 1991):

• 4-year B.Ed./B.A.	£25,000,
• 1-year PGCE	£6,000
• 2-year Articled Teacher Scheme	£19,000

The numbers on course in the academic year 1990/91 were (DES 1990 and Hansard May 1991):

• 4-year B.Ed./B.A.	11,838
• 1-year PGCE	11,956
• 2-year Articled Teacher Scheme	403

The total cost of bringing the B.Ed. and PGCE students within the Articled Teacher Scheme would be more than £452 million, an increase of more than £80 million over the 1990/91 initial teacher education finances. If the Articled Teacher scheme were to be adopted wholesale then the logistical problems of having more than 24,000 student teachers based in schools for most of their period of initial teacher education appeared overwhelming. Given these figures, and the fact that the Articled Teacher scheme had already "run into trouble" (TES, 7.9.90), how could the government abandon higher education-based initial teacher education?

THE SNIPING BEGINS

Until the late 1980s it was unusual to read much in the press that was critical (or, for that matter, supportive) of initial teacher education. The field was simply not newsworthy. However, running in tandem with the government's newly awakened interest in (and perhaps hostility towards) institutionalised teacher education a hotchpotch of 'Groups' and 'Institutes' began publishing monographs which were food and drink to the popular press. These groups, recently

identified as the "wild men, and women, of the Right" (TES, 12.10.90), gave themselves a spurious respectability by basing themselves in 'think tanks' which they had themselves created. Press releases came thick and fast from the Centre for Policy Studies, the Hillgate Group and the Institute of Economic Affairs (all of which seemed to share much the same membership), reporting on publications whose astonishing ignorance of the reality of initial teacher education was matched only by their lack of scholarship. On the basis of no evidence whatsoever, the complexities of initial teacher education were typified by Cox in the Times Educational Supplement (TES 6.1.89) as a "rigmarole of training" (Cox 1989), as providing "spurious and questionable studies" which had no "solid grounding in the real world" (O'Hear 1988, p.6) and which were taught, he implied, by neo-Marxists (ibid., p.23).

A common thread running through these snipings at initial teacher education was that the skills of teaching could easily be picked up in the first year of teaching, so all certificated routes into the profession could be swept away (Lawlor 1990). Yet, when one looks more closely at Lawlor's attempt at producing arguments to support her claim one finds that her 'survey' of initial teacher education courses was conducted by the simple expedient of collecting the institutions' prospectuses. Moreover, she has no direct experience of initial teacher education courses, having recently admitted that she had yet even to set foot in an institution offering teacher education. Pointing out such niceties has the double drawback of appearing to give some sort of academic respectability to a group where none in fact exists, as well as being far from newsworthy. Inevitably there was a tendency for teacher educators to hunker down and try to ignore the snipings, even though O'Hear was subsequently drafted by the Secretary of State onto CATE. There may also have been an assumption that the rational members of the DES and HMI could see that the New Right's posturings were without substance. This viewpoint was supported at the 1991 annual conference of the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) by a senior member of the DES, Clive Saville, who tried to allay the fears of teacher educators by speaking with confidence of the need for multiple routes into teaching (UCET 1991). Four weeks later Saville was removed from responsibility for teacher education.

THE FIRST ATTACK: JANUARY 1992

There had been many 'leaks' reported in the press forecasting a radical overhaul of initial teacher education in the period leading up to the 1992 North of England Annual Education Conference, hence the fears expressed to Saville concerning "half-baked but sinister ideas circulating in influential circles about the future of teacher education" (TES, 12.10.90). However, even the most pessimistic teacher educator had not forecast what was revealed in the Secretary of State's (Mr Clarke) speech, which gave, in effect, the heavy firepower of central government support to the snipings of the New Right. Mr Clarke stated that he was going to break "the hold of the dogmas about teaching methods and classroom organisation" which higher education was spreading (Clarke 1992, p.7) by handing over the responsibility of teacher training to schools. He claimed that HMI had shown that such school-based training was "sound and can be put into practice effectively" (ibid., p.5). As a result, by September of 1992, and certainly no later than three years from the date of his speech, all secondary teacher education courses would have to locate 80% of their programme in schools, with a concomitant "considerable shift of funds from colleges to schools" (ibid., p.13). He would consider primary courses when the current DES inquiry was completed.

These "uncontentious" changes (ibid., p.14) were widely, and in the main favourably, reported in the press. In fact the popular press seemed keen to take Mr Clarke's innovations still further. Whereas he had closed his speech by saying that he did not intend to "take teacher education away from higher education" (ibid., p.15) this course of action was precisely what many in the press advocated, claiming, contra the findings of the Newcastle Commission, that a totally school-based system had "worked for teachers...in the days when few underwent formal training of any kind" (Sunday Express, 5.1.92).

The content of Mr Clarke's speech was then re-worked into a consultation document (DES 1992a). This was dated January 28th and requested responses by March 31st, thus providing a consultation period of less than nine weeks. Indeed, the cynical disregard of the democratic process of change (alternatively, of the possible contribution that teacher educators might make to Mr Clarke's plans for initial teacher education) that such a short period of consultation implied appeared to be recognised by another powerful body. On February 3rd the

Universities Funding Council requested universities to apply for extra funding so as to allow them to adapt their PGCE courses to meet "the new course criteria" (UFC 1992, p.1). Not only did this request reify what had been merely 'proposals' for consultation into fully fledged 'course criteria' but also, by requesting that funding applications should be returned to the Council by March 27th (ibid., p.4), the Council pre-empted the results of Mr Clarke's consultation process by four days. Clearly, the Council seemed to have reached the conclusion that Mr Clarke's proposals would be in place in spite of the results of what, apparently, would be an empty sham of consultation.

Reactions

The Journal of Education for Teaching (JET) decided that, even if the results of the consultation process were to be ignored, it was important that teacher educators should be given a platform to allow their voices to be heard. A survey was run of 112 institutions in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland concerned with initial teacher education courses asking for their responses to the proposals. These were subsequently published (Gilroy 1992, pp. 13ff) and copies of the paper were sent to Mr Clarke and the DES.

The survey produced major, and informed, criticisms. Briefly, there were two categories of response. The first gave example after example of the many practical difficulties that the proposals would create. The Chair and Vice-chair of UCET pointed out in a personal letter to Mr Clarke a range of practical questions which had not been addressed. For instance, there would be an important problem concerning the accreditation and validation of school-based courses. If universities were only to have direct responsibility for PGCE students for one day per week (a total of 36 days), it was likely that they would not be prepared to accredit a course over which they had so little input. On the other hand, if the schools were somehow to be allowed to accredit 'their' course then there would presumably need to be some form of CATE-style validation, which was likely to be extremely cumbersome (Edwards & Tomlinson 1992).

The second type of response argued that there was no evidence either to support the "ludicrous caricature of the reality of the current routes into the teaching profession" or to justify the radical proposals of January 1992 (Gilroy 1992, p.17). The premises which might seem to support Mr

Clarke's position were shown, often by reference to evidence that Mr Clarke himself had commissioned from the DES and HMI, to be false (as was his interpretation of the HMI document he had cited - DES 1991) and he was invited to respond.

His only public response was to say that the respondents to the survey were those responsible for the current form of teacher education (Independent, 6.4.93) and so, presumably, were likely to be biased against his proposals. This was, to say the least, a strange reaction, if only because less than two months before his speech he had, by implication, praised these self-same respondents, saying that the "training of teachers is now more rigorous than it has ever been" (Guardian, 23.10.91). Perhaps of more significance was the fact that not one counter-argument was advanced against the host of points presented in the JET survey.

The Educational press also began to pick at some of the difficulties with Mr Clarke's proposals. The key questions of how much of the £35 million PGCE budget would be devolved to schools and how many extra teachers schools would have to support their new role as the major partner in teacher education remained unanswered (TES, 31.1.92). If the change was to proceed with neither of these problems resolved then teacher education would obviously be underfunded. Indeed, the Articled Teachers scheme, upon which the new course was based, had already run into similar difficulties (TES, 7.9.90) and the director of one long-established school-based course at Sussex University, with 66% of its course in schools, argued that his course would become even less viable economically if it moved to the proposed 80% model (TES, 6.3.92). One example makes the point. Just one school taking part in a form of school-based training run by London University's Institute of Education was reported as requiring some £44,000 for their input to the training of 20 students (TES, 27.3.92). This would cut by nearly a third the fee income that the Institute received from those students, with all that implied for the staffing of the Institute's courses.

The DES report on primary education was published at the end of January and was properly cautious about plunging in to a teacher-led training programme (DES 1992b - see especially p.51). Small-scale research at Loughborough University suggested that the schools themselves were unhappy with the proposals, with only 12% of teachers in favour of school-based training and not one head teacher favouring the proposals (TES,

31.1.92). One head teacher responded to Mr Clarke's proposals by pointing to many of the difficulties that the JET respondents had picked out, and expressed her concern that school-based training would "degenerate into an unco-ordinated series of experiences within schools" (TES, 21.2.92).

Finally, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) expressed what they termed "strong reservations" (CVCP 1992). The CVCP reiterated the problems already identified, concluding with the suggestion that a 60/40% split would be a more sensible form of school-based training.

Any further reactions were hidden by the dust thrown up by the leadership struggle within the Conservative party and the eventual General Election. With a new Conservative prime minister and a new Secretary of State for Education, Mr Patten, the battle lines were about to be re-drawn.

A STRATEGIC WITHDRAWAL

It soon became clear that few, if any, institutions were going to be able to start school-based courses in September 1992 and that the bids that had been received doubled the original figure of £6 million actually available for the transition (THES, 15.6.93). In May Mr Patten wrote to the Chair of CATE thanking him for CATE's response to the January proposals and stating that the original 80% school-based experience would now be modified by being reduced to 60%, what he called a "tough but fair requirement" (Patten 1992, p.1). The tricky question which CATE had asked for a ruling on, that of costing these courses, was neatly side-stepped, with the statements that schools and higher education institutions should negotiate for themselves the way in which the principle that "money should follow the student" would be carried out in practice (ibid., p.2). This new system was eventually formalised at the end of June by the DFE (the Department For Education, previously the DES), with the increased responsibilities and contributions from schools to be "recognised through transfer of resources...negotiated locally" from institutions of higher education (DFE 1992, p.4). CATE remained responsible for overseeing initial teacher education courses to ensure that they met the criteria laid down for accreditation (ibid., p.13).

The financial problems with the revised scheme began to receive increasing attention. A member of CATE publicly agreed that the scheme would be "extremely expensive" (TES, 5.6.92). Even

more to the point, two flagship school-based courses expressed concern with the funding arrangements. Oxford University's course director predicted it would face severe difficulty with the local education authority financial support being removed and transitional support from the UFC only available for one year. Sussex University's course director went further, speaking of the possibility of having to close the course down (TES, 3.7.92). In spite of this major problem CATE continued to try to plan ahead for the academic year 1992/93 and proceeded with its task as the only accrediting agent for initial teacher education courses (see, for example, CATE 1992a, p.3).

THE SNIPING RESUMES

Subsequently the possibility of primary courses being re-located in schools seemed to fade, as it became clear that primary school teachers had neither the time nor the expertise to train students in the full range of subjects that the new National Curriculum required of them. In addition, the financial difficulties of the scheme raised themselves, albeit in a new form, because buying in teaching cover for those teachers involved with training students (an absolute necessity in tightly staffed primary schools) would be prohibitively expensive. The sting was in the tail, however, as the New Right brought forward the possibility of finding these funds by removing them from the control of higher education. If the finances for initial teacher education went directly to schools, institutions of higher education would have to bid to schools for them, which would reinforce the Clarke approach of school-led teacher training (TES, 30.10.92).

Teacher trainers barely had time to digest the implications of such a possibility when, a week later, they were faced with another scenario. It was reported that the National Curriculum Council had suggested to Mr Patten that, because initial teacher education was school-based, and because the Council was concerned with schools, then CATE's accreditation role should be passed on to the Council. Significantly, there was no formal public response to this suggestion by Mr Patten, who "let it be known" that he was not necessarily supporting CATE's approach to initial teacher education (TES, 6.11.92). Even the prime minister was reported as saying that he wanted to return to the 80% model, with schools receiving 80% of initial teacher education funds (TES, 22.1.93). It seemed that the sniping had begun again.

Although CATE's future appeared less than certain, education departments subsequently received CATE Guidance on how to create school-based courses in partnership with schools which would then be accredited by CATE (CATE 1992b). One of the many interesting suggestions in this document was that the trainers would need training (ibid., pp. 6-7), which raised the strange and wasteful possibility of staff in higher education training teachers to take on many of the responsibilities which were previously located in higher education. Again, the answer to the question of how this process was to be funded was conspicuous by its absence. The urgency with which this question had to be addressed was made clear the following month when it was reported that head teacher unions were demanding a minimum of £2,000 per student, a figure very close to that predicted by London University's Institute of Education when Mr Clarke was Secretary of State for Education (see above). Yet the reality was that, with the best will in the world, higher education could not afford to pay much more than approximately £600 per student and even that required them to make cuts in their staffing (TES, 18.12.92). Moreover, the heads were not prepared to continue with the scheme unless the funding issues were satisfactorily resolved in their favour.

This second period of sniping culminated with an astonishing leading article in a paper, *The Spectator*, usually held to be relatively moderate in its views. In spite of evidence to the contrary (see above) its readers were informed that both head teachers and teacher unions were vociferous in their complaints about the quality of the new teachers they received (The Spectator 1993). The article advised Mr Patten to remove accreditation procedures altogether and so bring to an end the "period of Marxist indoctrination" which higher education courses represented. As a result the institutions currently responsible for initial teacher education, "these harmful political training grounds", would disappear.

THE SECOND ATTACK: MARCH 1993

The following month the DFE issued a press release announcing news of the "first wholly school-based teacher training projects", covering both secondary and, in spite of all that had been argued before, primary training (DFE 1993a). The funding issue was resolved in precisely the way the New Right and The Spectator had suggested, with money being "paid directly to participating schools to cover the cost of training, buying in outside expertise where they wish" (ibid., p.1). In

the first instance the scheme would be limited to 250 graduates, but ominously Mr Patten was quoted as saying, "This initiative paves the way for further possible reforms of teacher training" (ibid., p.2). Furthermore, it transpired that the government's own accreditation body, CATE, only discovered the existence of this initiative in the national press (TES, 12.3.93). It was subsequently revealed that the government would be funding this pilot project at £4,000 per student, twice the cost which head teachers themselves had previously requested (see above).

The very next day another reform was reported. It was reported that CATE had been required to create a route into the profession for people such as nursery nurses who already worked with young children and parents, but were not necessarily graduates (TES, 5.3.93).

The first project produced criticism which pointed to the extraordinary cost of extending the project to all one-year initial teacher education students and the question as to whether universities would be prepared to validate a 'course' to which they might have no input whatsoever (TES, 12.3.93). It was also pointed out by the National Union of Teachers that if higher education's input to initial teacher education disappeared then so would other aspects of education departments' work, in particular research (TES, 28.6.93). However, it was this second reform that attracted most criticism, not least because it flouted the hard-fought principle of an all graduate teaching profession. For example, the Chair of the British Association for Early Childhood Learning called the plan "an absolute outrage" (TES, 11.6.93). Significantly, CATE subsequently announced it had rejected the plan put before it by Mr Patten (TES, 28.5.93). The attacks on the reform, castigated as Mr Patten's 'Mum's Army', continued throughout the summer drawing fire from teachers, head teachers, local authorities and even a senior Conservative Member of Parliament (TES, 25.6.93). Eventually the second reform's proposal was withdrawn in November, by which time it could be interpreted by some as a smoke screen to disguise a way of implementing the first reform (TES, 26.11.93).

Thus, whilst those in higher education were attempting to deal with the various reforms, proposals, consultation documents, projects, pilot schemes and so on that were flooding their way, a direct assault on what was left of their autonomy was being planned. It was announced at the end of the summer of 1993.

THE THIRD ATTACK: SEPTEMBER 1993

As has been already indicated, there had been warnings made by those running school-based courses of initial teacher education that the financial implications of the new partnership training system were such that they might have to withdraw from the field altogether. On the other hand schools, and teacher unions, felt that they could not commit themselves to the new partnerships until the financial aspect of the scheme was clarified. The third attack on teacher training resolved both these difficulties.

Mr Patten claimed that because of the way in which initial teacher education was now located in both schools and higher education it was necessary to create a new funding agency for initial teacher education, the Teacher Training Agency. He proposed that this new Agency, in quantities yet to be announced, would draw funds from finances previously allocated to initial teacher education administered through the Higher Education Funding Council (previously the Universities Funding Council). Moreover, it was not only to be concerned with the funding of initial teacher education from 1995. The Agency would also become the new initial teacher education accreditation body, so sounding the death knell of CATE, and would take over responsibility for in-service education, higher degrees in education and the funding of research into teacher education (DFE 1993b, pp. 6-13). Finally, the period of consultation over this proposal was to be no more than twenty-three days.

The outburst of criticism of these proposals was overwhelming. They were identified as "dishonest" (TES, 17.9.93), "shabby" and "sinister" (TES, 5.11.93). The Committee of Vice-chancellors and Principals responded by threatening to withdraw from initial teacher education, and expressed their concern that the proposals were "a serious threat to quality and would lead to an increase in political control", as well as damaging the independence and quality of educational research (ibid.), a point taken up by the British Educational Research Association (TES, 12.11.93). Furthermore, there were no arguments presented by the Minister to support such a retrograde step, whereas there were many arguments which existed to oppose it (THES, 5.11.93). The Universities Council for the Education of Teachers criticised the proposals as fundamentally flawed and the Higher Education unions also felt that the loss of CATE in particular gave the Secretary of State the opportunity to seek

advice from ill-informed sources, a veiled criticism of the hold the New Right appeared to have over the Minister.

The recently retired Chair of CATE, Sir William Taylor, also felt moved to produce a most damning criticism, the more effective because of the experience of the various forms of initial teacher education that he had amassed on CATE. He identified three principles that any change to teacher education should be measured against, namely, will the proposed training:

1. attract good candidates?
2. produce better educated and more competent teachers?
3. provide a sound basis for continued professional development?

and argued that the new proposals failed "on all three counts" (THES, 22.10.93).

However, it was clear that, again, 'consultation' had no meaning, a point recognised by the leader writer of the Times Educational Supplement, who claimed that the proposals would appear in the Queen's Speech the following week, when she announced the government's forthcoming legislative programme. As the leader writer said, "if any heed were paid to the results of the consultation...ministers would withdraw their planned Bill at once", but this was unlikely to happen (TES, 12.11.93). The emptiness of consultation was confirmed by the publication a few days after the Queen's Speech of the Bill creating the Teacher Training Agency.

CONCLUSION

With hindsight it is clear that, although it might not have been planned as a formalised campaign, the central government has spent the last decade or so creating and then strengthening its stranglehold over initial teacher education. En passant, it will also gain control over all aspects of teacher education, including continuing professional development and most forms of educational research. While the justification for this policy is completely absent, the methods are now perfectly transparent. The methodology would involve the following tactics:

1. use a whispering campaign to denigrate and de stabilise the focus of your policy change, the 'enemy'
2. attack one element of the enemy's position so as to draw their fire
3. withdraw if necessary

4. repeat steps 1 and 2
5. when the enemy is suitably weakened administer the coup de grace

What is so disquieting about this methodology is that those who seek to offer their experience and informed advice to the government are identified as, in some sense, the enemy, even when they include government-appointed agents, such as members of CATE. Indeed, the way in which the democratic process of consultation has been systematically and cynically abused is a deeply worrying feature of the process described in this paper.

Another disturbing feature of the campaign conducted against institutions of higher education is the way in which, by implication, the teaching profession has been devalued. If the government minister ultimately responsible for the well-being of the profession can honestly feel that higher education adds nothing of value to the profession (despite all that his own advisers inform him) then the model of teacher professionalism which guides him is savagely restricted to mere apprenticeship. It is one thing to learn on-the-job with inanimate objects how to be a carpenter or a plumber, but quite another to learn how to teach with often highly animated children to educate. The very fact that such a banality has to be expressed is a measure of the vacuous nature of the attack on initial teacher education.

The most recent effect of the school-based partnerships is the beginnings of more extensive cuts in higher education staffing and, therefore, decisions being made about what subjects can and cannot be offered. The result is that government targets will not be met. For example, the government had planned to increase science teacher numbers by 415, but only 52 can be offered and in mathematics 110 places are on offer, when the plan was to increase numbers to 220. Two universities are reported as closing their four-year courses and one will stop training teachers of Russian, Spanish and Italian (*Independent*, 2.12.93). This information was tabled by UCET at a meeting with the Department for Education: given all that has been presented here it is clear that their warnings are likely to fall on deaf ears.

This paper's title bites in two ways. The first is that the Minister of State for Education has led the profession back to the future by effectively reintroducing the way in which teachers were trained in the nineteenth century, isolated from

the influence of higher education, thereby adding a new twist to the Prime Minister's call to go "back to the basics". The second is that, in so doing, teachers have clearly been de-professionalised, acting as mere agents of the National Curriculum and, as they once were in the nineteenth century, unable to gain access to independent forms of continuing professional development or educational research.

The Duke of Wellington is supposed to have remarked to Lady Shelley that "next to a battle lost, the greatest misery is a battle gained." Clearly the publishing of the Teacher Reform Bill represents a battle lost for all those professionally concerned with teacher education in England and Wales. In one sense it is a battle gained for Mr Clarke and Mr Patten, as both appear successfully to have 'done something' about teacher education. Unfortunately the criteria for identifying loss and gain have clearly not been clarified and, if nothing else, the sorry campaign described here represents a major loss to all those concerned with the continued development of an effective and knowledgeable teaching profession. The effect on the political careers of the two protagonists, however, remains to be seen as they clamber higher over the unnecessary wreckage of what remains of formalised initial teacher education.

POSTSCRIPT

The paper you have just read was completed immediately before Christmas (1993). With the new Education Bill being presented to the House of Lords in December there was, however, no Christmas truce. The attacks on the Bill came from all quarters, including Conservative Lords which, with only three speakers able to find anything to defend, was passed with a narrow majority. Furthermore, the Lords' Parliamentary committee responsible for scrutinising the delegated powers of ministers published a criticism of the "excessive powers given to the Secretary of State by the Bill" (TES, 31.12.93), which is reported to have "embarrassed" the government (TES, 21.12.93).

It is widely believed that the government "badly miscalculated the potential weight of opposition" to the Bill (THES, 17.12.93). According to Lord Sheffield this opposition included the whole of the teaching profession, all the university vice-chancellors and principals, the church colleges, the head teachers (as represented by the Headmasters' Conference), the Girls Schools Association and the National Confederation of

Parent-Teacher Associations (TES, 31.12.93). If, as is rumoured, the committee stage of the Bill (originally planned for the second week in January) is being delayed whilst ministers plan how to deal with its criticisms, then there is time, even now, for a last ditch defence against the government's onslaught on teacher education. Cynics, however, might see something different as they look forward to 1994.

The Bill also contains proposals for controlling the activities of student unions and it is these which have begun to steal the limelight. It is possible that the government will produce a compromise, whereby they reduce, or remove altogether, these highly restrictive clauses of the Bill but retain the Teacher Training Agency, with all that this means for the autonomy of university education departments. In this way the student union clauses would act as a diversion to allow the main attack to be thrust home. The best that might be hoped for in this scenario would be that the Agency might become a sub-committee of the Higher Education Funding Council, and so controlled in some measure by the Council's attitude to funding Higher Education.

A measure of the attention that teacher education has had from the government is the fact that in the past 14 years there have been 15 Education Bills. As they say, "Watch this space."

REFERENCES

- Barton, L., Pollard, A. and Whitty, G. (1992). Experiencing CATE: the impact of accreditation upon initial training institutions in England. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(1), pp.41-57.
- CATE (1992a). *Letter to all institutions offering courses in initial teacher education*. Mimeo, 23 September.
- CATE (1992b). *Note of guidance*. Mimeo, November.
- Clarke, K. (1992). *Speech to the North of England Education Conference*. Mimeo.
- CVCP (1992). *Letter to the Secretary of State for Education*. Mimeo, 30 April.
- DES (1982). *The new teacher in school*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1983). *Teaching in schools: The context of initial training*. London: DES.

DES (1984). *CATE Circular 3/84* (revised in 1989 as Circular 24/89). London: DES.

DES (1988a). *Education observed*. London: DES.

DES (1988b). *The new teacher in school*. London: HMSO.

DES (1990). Personal communication to Andrew Smith, MP. (Cited in Anon 1991, *Investing in quality*).

DES (1991). *School-based initial teacher training in England and Wales*. London: HMSO.

DES (1992a). *The reform of initial teacher training*. (Consultation Document 40/92). London: DES.

DES (1992b). *Curriculum organisation and classroom practice in primary schools: A discussion paper*. London: HMSO.

DFE (1992). *Initial teacher training (secondary phase)*. (Circular 9/92). London: HMSO.

DFE (1993a). *DFE NEWS*. 67/93. Mimeo, 4th March.

DFE (1993b). *The Government's proposals for the reform of initial teacher education*. 7 September.

Edwards, A.D. and Tomlinson, J (1992) *Letter to the Secretary of State for Education and Science*. 7.1.92 (London, UCET, ref. M/1/92).

Gilroy, D. P. (1992). The political rape of initial teacher education in England and Wales: a JET rebuttal. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 18(1), pp.5-22.

Gosden, P.H.J.H (1989). Teaching quality and the accreditation of initial teacher-training courses. In V.A. McClelland and V.P. Varma (Eds.) *Advances in teacher education* (pp.1-18). London: Routledge.

Hansard April 1991. (Cited in Anon 1991, *Investing in quality*).

Hansard May 1991. (Cited *ibid.*).

Lawlor, S. (1990). *Teachers mistaught*. London: Centre for Policy Studies.

O'Hear, A. (1988). *Who teaches the teachers?* Research Report 10, London: The Social Affairs Unit.

Parliamentary Answer (1991). (Cited in Anon, op. cit.).

Patrick, H., Bernbaum, G. and Reid, K. (1982). *The structure and process of initial teacher education within universities in England and Wales*. Leicester: University of Leicester School of Education.

Patten, J. (1992). *Letter to Sir William Taylor*. Chairman, CATE. Mimeo.

UCET (1991). *Report on the 1991 Annual Residential Conference 29th November - 1st December*. Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

UFC (1992) *Letter to Principals and Vice-Chancellors*. 3 February.

Note:

The *Times Educational Supplement* (TES) and the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* (THES) have been extensively used, so their abbreviations have replaced the normal referencing conventions in the body of the paper.

SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: AN UNEVEN EVOLUTION

Mary Kluender Ducharme and Edward R. Ducharme
Drake University

What does school-based teacher education mean in the United States? Certainly, it does not mean that funding, decision-making and management of programs are the province of individual school districts; in the United States, teacher education is firmly ensconced in higher education. The overwhelming majority of teachers are prepared in colleges and universities, licensed by individual states, and employed by local school districts. Law, tradition, and funding suggest that this general pattern will not change soon.

While teacher education is located primarily in higher education institutions, school-based teacher education exists. It exists in many forms, ranging from student teaching and other field experiences in which students apply concepts and skills learned on campus to comprehensive partnerships among higher education institutions and local school districts for comprehensive initial and continuing teacher development. In this article, we explore several configurations of school-based teacher education. We first present brief scenarios that illustrate common school-based patterns, then describe several configurations currently in operation in the United States. We then summarise some of the issues inherent in school-based teacher education.

USING SCHOOL SITES FOR TEACHER PREPARATION: FOUR SCENARIOS

More than 1,200 higher education institutions offer teacher education programs in the United States, varying in size from small private colleges to large public universities. The teacher education programs in those institutions may range from small departments with two or three faculty members to colleges of education within universities with faculties of 200 or more. Each program is affected by a variety of influences: state legislators and policy makers, university-wide committees, school district personnel, individual faculty members and cooperating teachers. At the same time, however, curriculum in teacher education follows a remarkably similar pattern: "a composite of general undergraduate education, specialised study in academic departments or schools of education, and clinical experiences in elementary or secondary

classrooms and schools" (Doyle, 1990, p.6). The extent to which the clinical experiences' component of teacher education programs is integrated with the other curricular elements or a shared responsibility of higher education and the schools varies widely. The following four scenarios demonstrate the range of configurations:

Scenario 1: Traditional Teacher Preparation

Amy is a twenty-one year old undergraduate majoring in elementary education in a state university in the mid-western United States. She is beginning her fourth year of study and plans to graduate next spring. During her first two years of college, most of Amy's coursework was in arts and sciences, but she also took an introductory course in education, during which she spent approximately 80 hours observing in elementary education classrooms, and an educational psychology course. During her third and fourth years, she took more coursework in education and developed an area of concentration in science, a subject she looks forward to teaching. Amy's education professors took classes to elementary classrooms a few times during her education courses, usually for one-hour visits so students could try out lessons they had planned in the college classes. One professor required her to videotape her teaching episode so she could later critique it. She was pleased with those opportunities, but she felt like a visitor to the classroom, not like a real teacher. She is looking forward to next semester's student teaching, when she will be in an elementary classroom full time. She wonders: will her cooperating teacher use the same methods and have a similar philosophy to that of her campus professors? Will she remember all the ideas and concepts she has recently learned?

Scenario 2: Campus School Teacher Preparation

Jane is also twenty-one years old, an undergraduate majoring in art and elementary education, but she attends a private college in the eastern part of the United States. Jane chose this college because it has a high quality liberal arts program and a campus school serving as a