

6-30-1992

Teacher Education and Service-Learning

Robert D. Shumer
University of Minnesota

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen>

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shumer, Robert D., "Teacher Education and Service-Learning" (1992). *Service Learning, General*. Paper 10.
<http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/10>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Service Learning at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Service Learning, General by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



National Information Center
for Service Learning
1954 Buford Ave, Room R290
St. Paul, MN 55108-6197
1-800-808-SERVE

TEACHER EDUCATION AND SERVICE-LEARNING

REPORT TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
DR. GEORGE COPA, CHAIR

ROBERT SHUMER

JUNE 30, 1992

NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

3652

Robert Shumer

DRAFT

PREPARING TEACHERS TO USE THE COMMUNITY
AS A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE LEARNING PROCESS

Recommendations for Educational Reform

Suggestions for needed educational reform have been made for some time. Reports from the 1970s condemned the isolation of schools from their communities and the lack of student participation in the educational process (Brown, 1973; Coleman, 1974; Martin, 1974; Gibbons, 1976). Similar claims were made in the 1980s, where lack of active learning led to student passivity and inability to relate classroom learning to life beyond the school (Goodlad, 1984; Boyer, 1983; Carnegie Council, 1989; W.T. Grant Foundation, 1988). In the 1990s there is a continued call for an end to this isolation, primarily through inclusion of experiential and service-learning opportunities for students in their local communities (The Action for Children Commission, 1992; Hamilton, 1990; Sarason, 1991).

Research on vocational education and school-to-work transition programs call for active participation in community programs. The majority of the studies and reports recommend learning about the world of work through apprenticeships, cooperative education, monitored work experience, and service-learning (National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, 1984; W.T. Grant Commission, 1988 and 1991; American Vocational Association, 1990; Hamilton, 1990). To make these programs effective, it is suggested that academic instruction be tied to community activities, bringing the effort into the mainstream of educational practice.

Recent reports from business emphasize the importance of learning in the community to acquire interpersonal and broad based skills and attitudes. Studies define the skills high school graduates need for entry level work: ability to apply knowledge, teamwork, reasoning, ability to use computers, and a passion for learning (SCANS, 1991). Other studies report on the skills employers want from their new employees: ability to learn how to learn, apply basic skills, communicate effectively with co-workers and supervisors, be adaptable, develop with the job, work effectively in groups, and influence others on the job (Carnevale, Gainer, and Meltzer, 1988). These reports describe the tasks and educational skills necessary for occupational success in the twenty-first century.

Research in the field of cognition recommends learning in real-world contexts. Students need to do "cognitive apprenticeships"---

where they perform real tasks, apply contextualized practice, and observe others doing the work they are expected to learn (Resnick and Klopfer, 1989). Real tasks involve activities such as calculating the number and cost of meals needed for a homeless shelter, or writing information guides for a local nature center. Doing tasks for people and agencies beyond the school encourages serious effort, the kind that has meaning for others besides the teacher and student. There are consequences imbedded in the activity which impose real challenges to the work. It also places the learning in context so the abstractness of the work is focused and grounded for a particular purpose and for a particular audience. By observing others do similar work, students see how tasks are done prior to executing them on their own.

High dropout rates and dissatisfaction with school among racial and gender groups indicate a need for flexible, more effective school models. Such alienation requires programs which address individual and group needs, which connect young people with adult role models, and which stress alternative learning environments (W.T. Grant Commission, 1988 and 1991; Carnegie Council, 1989; Orr, 1987; Weis, Farrar, and Petrie, 1989; American Association of University Women, 1992). Schools need to do a better job of integrating social, cultural, and human differences into the educational process. This cannot effectively be done without active involvement of the community.

The Mismatch: Teacher Education Does Not Support Educational Reform

As one attempts to connect recommended reforms in teacher education called for in the Holmes Group (1986), the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), and the series of books and articles on teaching by Goodlad and others at the Center for Educational Renewal (Sirotnik, 1989; Goodlad, 1990; Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik, 1990) with the reforms mentioned above in educational practice, a glaring mismatch appears: one does not support the other. If schooling needs to be more connected with community experiences for purposes of academic, career, vocational, and service-learning, then teacher training institutions ought to be preparing teachers to deliver such educational programs. Unfortunately, they do not. Major recommendations for change in teacher education have included professionalizing teaching, raising academic standards, revising the way teachers are selected, providing alternative methods of certification, and developing professional practice centers separate from schools of education -- but not the redesign of schools to include community experiences as a significant part of the learning process. The advent of professional practice programs could support more community-based learning, but most do not. Goodlad has recommended that teacher education do a better a job of combining theory and practice -- of having prospective teachers work in schools as they learn about the theories supporting educational practice. Why not suggest that teacher education programs do a better job of combining learning

theories and theories of social development with educational practice? Surely this relationship will require more involvement between schools and the communities within which they function.

One must wonder why support for community-based learning has failed to be included in the educational process. Perhaps a compelling reason is models of teaching have simply remained constant over the past several decades. In discussing one reform effort, Mary Kennedy, Director of the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning at Michigan State University, says "role models that novice teachers observed while they were children continue to hold tremendous sway. Often, despite their intentions, new teachers teach as they were taught (Kennedy, 1991)." Thus, the educational system reinforces itself -- introduction of new methods are thwarted by years of exposure to traditional classroom structures.

A second reason is community-based learning programs are much more complex than classroom models. In classrooms one must deal with administrators, teachers, students, lessons, and parents. In community-based learning models (such as experiential and service-learning programs), one must deal with all of the above, plus community sponsors, transportation officials, minimal and/or uncertified supervision of students, uncontrolled learning environments, difficult evaluation procedures, issues of liability, and concern over the quality of learning taking place in the community. Simply put, it is easier to isolate young people in classrooms than to have them involved in community activities.

A New Effort

Despite this history of classroom supremacy and slow change, the Vocational and Technical Education Department at the University of Minnesota decided to explore the possibility of making a better fit between reform in educational practice and reform in teacher education. To accomplish this goal, they funded a brief study to determine possible changes in teacher education which might support schools using community-based learning as a significant part of the educational process. They wanted to know what elements of experiential and service-learning were already part of the educational offerings at the University and what courses could be altered or added which would produce teachers able to connect the community with the school.

The following report contains information about changing the teacher preparation program to include community-based and service-learning opportunities. The suggestions are based on a series of interviews with faculty from the University of Minnesota College of Education and with community members who either teach in a community service program or are community members who include students in their community programs. The survey results are presented first, followed by recommendations.

COMMUNITY MEMBER SURVEYS

Seven members of the Minneapolis community were interviewed either in person or by phone to get feedback on what they would do to prepare teachers to work where community experiences were an integral part of the learning program. Members interviewed included a representative from the State Department of Education, a district superintendent, a school principal, a teacher involved in service-learning courses, and three coordinators involved in community learning activities. They responded to questions included on the Community Members Survey (see Appendix) and to follow-up questions. Data was analyzed to determine frequency of themes or topics mentioned. The themes and topics most commonly indicated are presented here for discussion.

Community members were unanimous in their belief that any program which trains teachers to do experiential/service-learning must itself be experiential in nature. This means prospective teachers themselves must partake in an internship/apprenticeship in an educational program which uses community experiences for learning. They can either work in a community agency, a business, or other community entity and do what a typical student would do at the site. The best way to learn to teach in this kind of environment, according to this group, is to engage in the process and study about it while it is occurring.

There was consensus among community members about the personal characteristics of good experiential educators. They had to be flexible and open-minded. One person said they had to be "able to tolerate ambiguity." They also needed to possess good organizational skills, be eager and enthusiastic about learning, and most importantly, be able to relate well with young people. Because much of the experiential process is quite personal, teachers need to learn to relate to students on a personal level. Teachers need to also possess an attitude which respects students as valuable resources who can contribute to society. All of these characteristics are required for teachers to function as facilitators of learning; guides and coaches who help students with their own development rather than simply telling them what they need to know.

Community members felt it was important for prospective teachers to know about communities, about youth development, and about the learning process as it relates to problem-based education. First, they felt it was vital that teachers know the community -- where students could perform different tasks and who could provide them with a good educational experience. Second, it was important to know developmental theory. It was critical that teachers guide students through their community experiences with age appropriate suggestions and reinforcements. Knowledge of youth development is important in site selection and appropriateness of tasks performed in the community. Third, they felt it was most important to help

students problem-solve -- to pose questions about the community experiences and then to explore the resources (both human and media) to discover answers to their questions. This process was considered essential to help students see connections between formal and informal learning and to establish a pattern for lifelong learning. Fourth, they felt it was important for teachers to know how to evaluate student learning and program effectiveness. Because of the variability of community projects associated with experiential learning, it was important for teachers to know how to evaluate what students learn in their community experiences and relate it to more traditional classroom learning. They also needed to evaluate the programmatic goals in order to determine the effectiveness of the effort. Along with this is the need for teachers to learn how to write educational goals and outcomes so they can assist students in developing educational projects.

Most community members felt it was important for prospective teachers to know the theory and philosophy of experiential education and service-learning. They felt that knowledge of the history and policies of experiential and service-learning would instill a basic understanding of the reasons why such programs should be included in teacher education. It was especially important to include the role of civic and social responsibility in the practice of citizenship in a democratic state. The role of learning by doing was deemed important in understanding how to function in a free and democratic society.

Many community members expressed some discomfort with the fact that the University of Minnesota was going to do the teacher preparation. They suggested that the process for learning about experiential/service-learning was itself quite "hands-on", and that the University could undermine the effort because of its focus on academic/intellectual development at the expense of practice and application. It was also suggested that the research agenda of the University might be juxtaposed to the perceived importance of developing technique and practice; that the goal was not enhanced teacher preparation, but simply better research. To alleviate this problem, it was suggested that the program be administered jointly by community people and faculty. They desired a professional practice school, where there was more emphasis on refining and enhancing actual teaching practice, and less emphasis on research.

FACULTY MEMBER SURVEYS

Surveys were also conducted with eight faculty from the College of Education. Members were from Vocational and Technical Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Psychology, Secondary Education, and Recreation, Parks, and Leisure Studies. Three were involved in teacher education programs. Phone and personal interviews were conducted using the Faculty Member Survey (see Appendix) and follow-up questions based on faculty responses. Again, analysis of data was based on frequencies of themes and

topics presented by those surveyed. Reported here are the most commonly mentioned themes or topics.

Most faculty thought there was a need for an educational program which prepared teachers to use community experiences as an integral part of the learning process. There was mixed reaction as to whether such a program should be integrated into existing courses or whether there should be several distinctive courses which focused solely on experiential/service-learning issues. Faculty in the Vocational and Technical Education Department indicated they covered philosophers and issues of experiential learning more than their colleagues in other areas, but none covered the topic in much depth and all felt that issues of service-learning were rarely mentioned in School of Education courses. Two suggested this was because historically service-learning had been covered in courses from the Center for Youth Development and Research, and therefore there was not as great a need for coverage in College of Education classes. However, they also indicated it was the more appropriate role for the College of Education to offer the courses, especially since funding for the Center was not stable from year to year (and in fact, the Center was closed in June 1992).

Most felt topics and concepts related to experiential learning could be highlighted more in existing courses. Several faculty indicated that they used material from important authors in experiential learning: Dewey, Kolb, Schon, Chickering, Kohlberg, Newmann, Piaget, and Freire. Yet none of them spent much time on the topic and few used the material to support development of community projects either in student teaching or in other practica. One faculty member who supervises student teachers did require students to produce a lesson plan for involvement of students in a community activity. However, students were not required to implement the plan, and in fact, none had done so.

Only two faculty members mentioned any of the better known authors in service-learning -- James Kielsmeier, Diane Hedin and Fred Newmann. Kielsmeier was mentioned because of his service-learning work in Minnesota and at the national level. Hedin was familiar because of her work (and that of Dan Conrad) with the Center for Youth Development and Research located at the University of Minnesota. Newmann was identified because of his work with social studies curriculum; the faculty member who knew him was involved in preparing teachers in social studies. No one else mentioned any of the other well known authors in service-learning: William James, Kurt Hahn, Robert Greenleaf, Parker Palmer, Robert Sigmon, Robert Rutter, Anne Lewis, Eliot Wigginton, Frank Newman, Alonzo Crim, Richard Kraft, Tim Stanton, Charles Harrison, Stephen Hamilton, Frank Slobig, Jane Kendall, Roger Landrum, Richard Danzig, Peter Szanton, Donald Eberly, Ernest Boyer, or Alec Dickson. Most faculty felt the history and topics related to service-learning and national service were not covered by any courses, and therefore, the College of Education was justified in proposing a new class in

this area.

While the majority of faculty thought experiential and service-learning different enough from existing courses to warrant its own course, most cautioned against making the program totally separate, apart from existing topics covered in traditional areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Psychology, Elementary and Secondary Education, Higher Education, and Educational Policy and Administration. They suggested that whatever course or courses were developed, that the content be coordinated with and complement other existing courses in the College of Education. For example, it was recommended that courses in Educational Psychology be reviewed and topics and authors used in these courses be integrated into any new classes focusing on experiential/service-learning. Courses such as "Knowing, Learning, and Thinking" (5112), "Introduction to the Psychology of Instruction" (5113), and "Psychology of Student Learning" (4113) all cover topics which would have relevance for experiential and service-learning. Similarly, for Curriculum and Instruction, topics covered in core courses such as "Introduction to Curriculum Systems" (5600), "Principles and Procedures in Designing Curriculum" (5605), and "Alternative School Designs: Implications for Teacher Education" (5186), should be integrated into any new courses emphasizing experiential/service-learning.

Two people interviewed recommended that a faculty committee from various units of the College of Education review courses and suggest ways of incorporating topics into both new and existing courses. An advisory committee would thus be formed to guide the development of the new program on experiential learning. Inclusion of senior faculty would lend credibility to the effort, as well as provide input from those who have the longest history with the College of Education.

Recommendations

The survey results suggested two major options for consideration of programs to prepare teachers to use community-based learning as a central part of the educational process. Each option will be presented, with a brief discussion of its benefits and drawbacks.

Option One: A Professional Practice School Tied to the College of Education

The most preferred model would be a professional practice program integrally tied to the College of Education. Such a program would be equally controlled by faculty and community members. There would be an advisory board, composed of faculty from the College of Education, teachers, and members of the community involved in service and experiential activities, to set policy and to monitor program development. Emphasis on educational techniques and

processes, yet with strong ties to the academic courses offered in the College of Education, would serve the needs of all groups.

This semi-autonomous program could be operated out of the Generator Center (as part of the Vocational and Technical Education Department). Since the Generator Center is supposed to focus on research and practice of experiential and service-learning, this would be one possible placement for the program. There would be distinctive courses which emphasize principles and practice of experiential and service-learning. A separate student teaching component would focus on preparation for community-based learning schools. In addition, several core courses from departments of the College of Education, specifically Vocational and Technical Education, Educational Psychology, Curriculum and Instruction, Child Psychology, and Elementary or Secondary Education would be required.

Specific new courses focusing on issues of experiential and service-learning would be included in a one year, full-time teacher education program. The following courses include topics and activities recommended by those surveyed, as well as additional input from those who have taught courses on experiential and service-learning at other institutions of higher education.

Introduction to Experiential and Service-Learning -- This course would cover the philosophy and principles of experiential and service-learning. Works from Dewey, Kolb, Piaget, Whitehead, Coleman, Hahn, Greenleaf, W. James, Kraft, Kielsmeier, Conrad, Hedin, Eberly, Freire, Boyer, Dickson, Lewin, Kohlberg, L. Resnick, Eisner, D. Moore, Keeton, and Csikszentmihalyi would be possible sources for readings.

Topics and subjects covered might include the experiential learning process, use of reflection (and its relationship to cognition), service-learning, national service, experience and motivation, active and cooperative learning, national and state legislation, barriers to implementation of experiential learning in public schools, adventure education and Outward Bound, and community service.

This would be a one quarter course, taken at the beginning of the program.

Field Experiences in Community Settings -- This would be a companion course to the Introduction class, taken simultaneously, which engages students in a actual service-learning project. Students would be placed in a community agency, a business, or some organization which provides goods or services to the public. Students would receive a brief introduction to field research methods (ethnography) and would take extensive field notes about what happens at

their placement. Readings for this course might include works on ethnographic methods, such as Spradley, Lofland, Emerson, Patton, or J. Johnson. Topics and subjects covered in this course might include social interactions, goals of the organization, potential for use as a field site for a community-based learning program, how people learn on the job, barriers to meaningful learning in field settings, and comparing classroom learning with learning in community settings.

Additional readings might include Hamilton, Schon, Dewey, D. Moore, Coleman, Kraft, Rogoff and Lave, and Wittrock.

This would be a one quarter course, also taken at the beginning of the program.

Facilitating Experiential Learning -- This course would focus on the role of the teacher in an experiential learning program where the major functions include coaching, guiding, and counseling students. Using readings from Jencks and Murphy, Sizer, Coleman, Dewey, and others, students will examine the difference between traditional and alternative teaching roles which require intensive interpersonal interaction with students. This course will have a field component where students observe facilitative teacher role models and work with a few students in school settings.

Topics and subjects can include interpersonal skills, listening skills, coaching, mentoring, goal setting, self-evaluation, counseling, use of peer teachers/counselors, use of tutors and other community volunteers as aides, personal resource development (helping students identify human and media resources), problem-solving, evaluation processes, attitudes of openness, working with students on a personal level, viewing students as resources, and developmental theories related to effective interaction with young people.

This would be a one quarter course taken during the second quarter of the program.

Curriculum Development in Community-Based Learning Programs -- This would be a companion course to the "Facilitating Experiential Learning" and would cover the actual development of curriculum models and products in at least three different community sites. Students would use curriculum guides from the school district where they are doing their student teaching to develop curriculum models in areas of language arts, math, social studies, business, science, art, physical education, and work, family, and community roles. Students will develop learning plans for age appropriate placements (elementary or

secondary) and will produce at least two Resource Guides (descriptions of what students can learn) for two different community sites.

Topics and concepts in this course would include student centered curriculum, standard curriculum models, developing curriculum through thematic approaches, problem-based curriculum, developing curriculum checklists, awarding academic credit for field-based learning, and writing curricular goals.

Readings in this area could include Tyler, Dewey, L. Jencks, R. Thomas, L. Resnick, and the Curriculum Guides for Far West Model of Experience-Based Career Education.

Teaching Methods: Community-Based Learning -- This course would provide focused practical experience in the delivery of actual school programs. Students would work with a master teacher to learn the process through application. Students would be responsible for actual development and implementation of experiential/service-learning activities.

The series of courses outlined here is recommended for a complete teacher preparation program to be conducted as a joint venture between the Generator Center, the College of Education, local school districts, and public/private businesses and agencies in the Minneapolis area. The Generator Center would be responsible for the overall supervision of the program, for development and implementation of special courses related to experiential/service-learning, and for conduct of the student teaching component. The College of Education (departments outside the Department of Vocational and Technical Education) would provide other courses required for teacher certification and for general background in educational theory and practice. Local school districts would provide access to schools and master teachers for observation and student teaching in community-based learning. Community businesses and agencies would provide learning sites for teaching candidates and also for K-12 students engaged in experiential/service-learning programs.

The program could be implemented in its entirety or could be phased in over a period of a few years. Key courses could be developed as the requirements for teacher certification were modified. Then the program would be ready for full implementation.

Benefits/Drawbacks

There are many reasons why recommendation of this program is the best option available. First, it focuses completely on the experiential/service-learning process, from history and philosophy

to theory and practice. Its existence partly outside the College of Education provides a level of control for community members (through the program advisory board) not found in more traditional teacher training systems. It assures an emphasis on experiential learning throughout and alleviates concern of some community members that the program will be driven more by research than improvement and development of practice and technique. It will allow inclusion of faculty who have strong backgrounds in practice, in addition to research. Also, inclusion of courses through the College of Education adds academic credibility and diversity to the program and allows students to experience other approaches for broader exposure to educational issues.

Drawbacks to this option focus on changes in licensure requirements for certification. Because new courses would be offered, modification of state licensing requirements would be necessary so students who go through the program would be eligible for a teaching certificate. Thoughtful planning for this problem can help to ease the burden on students and assure the integrity of the program in producing credible, employable teachers.

The fact that University students spend more time in the community than in traditional programs will require faculty to be more involved with the monitoring of students. This presents a greater burden to faculty unless additional staff are hired to track community activities. In the latter case, there would be an additional expense required to implement the program.

Also, involvement of community sponsors in the development of the teacher preparation program would require faculty to share decision-making responsibilities with people outside the University. In effect, the shared-decision making promoted by some faculty as an educational reform for K-12 schools would have to be practiced at the university level. This could be potentially threatening to existing faculty and departmental decision-making practices.

Option Two: A Program Integrated into Existing Courses

If the idea of the professional practice program is not feasible, another option is available based on the recommendations of those surveyed. This alternative involves integration of experiential and service-learning topics and activities into existing courses and programs offered through the College of Education, with only one additional course added covering service and experiential learning.

Perhaps the best approach to this alternative would be to follow the recommendations of two faculty surveyed: form a faculty committee to review existing courses to determine how concepts and topics of experiential and service-learning can be integrated into

courses already offered in the College of Education. Courses required for teacher certification can be identified and faculty who teach these courses can be approached to modify their courses to include experiential and service-learning. Including authors who deal with these topics or introducing experiential and service-learning as subjects themselves could accommodate the need to expand prospective teacher knowledge.

As mentioned earlier, courses in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Psychology are natural places to introduce topics of experiential and service-learning. In "Introduction to Curriculum Systems" (56000) or "Elementary School Curriculum" (51000) students can study curriculum design which incorporates community experiences into current curriculum systems. At the secondary level, "Techniques of Instruction in Social Studies" (5152) includes examination of curriculum materials already, so it is possible to include social studies curriculum which is community-based. Examples abound where such modifications can be made: include the use of community-based learning theory and practice as a topic for the course.

A single course covering experiential and service-learning would be added to program requirements. The course, similar to the "Introduction to Experiential and Service-Learning" recommended in the professional practice program, would cover topics and issues not included elsewhere in College of Education courses. Specialty topics, including the history of national and community service, would be covered.

In addition to integrating concepts of community-based learning into existing courses, it is also necessary to include experiential/service-learning in student teaching programs. Methods courses, from elementary and secondary education, to vocational and technical education, can be modified to incorporate experiences in school programs which use the community as an integral part of the educational process. Selected schools would need to be developed, with changes made in the methods classes to accommodate the emphasis on the experiential learning process.

Administratively, this integrated program could be directed by a faculty team, with community members serving as advisors to program development. Since several faculty thought the program ought to be controlled by the University, not the community, a Community Advisory Group could provide input about the program, but not have actual decision-making authority. Thus, both parties would be represented, with the faculty still retaining the decision-making power.

Benefits/Drawbacks

Integration of experiential and service-learning into existing courses has obvious benefits. It allows students to take courses

necessary for certification almost immediately and provides a good overall learning experience for students. Only one new course would need to be approved through the College process. This would reduce costly delay. There would be more exposure to traditional learning environments and potentially a better sense of how to bring about the changes desired through the experiential program. The use of existing courses would also add credibility to the program because it would be taught by regular faculty. There is greater likelihood that faculty would be supportive of the program because they would control its development and implementation. Also, the fact that only one new course would be added should accelerate the acceptance and implementation process.

There would also be no change necessitated in teacher certification requirements. Since students would take the same courses offered currently for certification, no alterations would be required. Only the Introduction to Experiential and Service-Learning course would be added.

There are several drawbacks to integrating experiential and service-learning into existing courses. Because traditional courses in the College of Education focus more on theory than practice, there is a potential for undervaluing the experiential activities requested by those involved in the service-learning process. Also, potential reluctance of faculty to share decision-making with community members might prove to undermine the cooperative nature of the program.

Faculty reported that programs and requirements for prospective teachers are already full; there is little room to accommodate anything new, especially if it must displace people and techniques already included in existing courses. In essence, the program is overloaded; there is possibly no room to add more unless additional funding is generated or decisions are made to drop other College of Education offerings. This could generate disharmony among the faculty and serve to undermine the integrity of the program.

One alternative solution to this problem is the creation of a program where teacher candidates could receive a certificate for completing a series of courses on experiential/service-learning. Some of the same courses offered in the first proposal might serve as the basis for the certification -- covering theory and practice of experiential/service-learning. A certificate program might serve as an intermediary step to the development of a long term program, either separate from or integrated into the regular teacher education preparation.

Conclusion

Research and reports on education over the past several decades have recommended that learning become more integrally connected with the community. In the past, the connection came primarily

through work experience and vocational education. Currently, reform efforts promote experiential and service-learning activities as a way of involving many more students in community learning activities. Yet, schools of education have done little to prepare teachers to integrate community experiences into the academic fabric of the school.

The Department of Vocational and Technical Education of the University of Minnesota initiated a small study to determine the possibility of developing a program to prepare teachers to implement experiential and service-learning. The survey, conducted with faculty and community members, revealed that each group had differing ideas about how the program should be developed. Community members wanted a program which was only semi-controlled by the university, with an emphasis on the experiential nature of the process. They wanted to focus on improving practice, with lower priority placed on research and evaluation. On the other hand, faculty wanted a program which is integrated into existing courses, which has a solid academic base, and which has fewer experiential activities.

To deal with these differing views, it was recommended that a teacher preparation program be developed which is semi-autonomous. The courses on experiential and service-learning, as well as teacher preparation, would be offered through the Generator Center as a professional practice program. The program would be administered by a joint committee of faculty, community members, and teachers, thus allowing community members and teachers a voice in program implementation. Students would also take additional courses from the general offerings of the College of Education to complete their credentialing requirements.

An alternative recommendation, more satisfactory to faculty, involves integrating experiential and service-learning topics and models into existing courses offered through the College of Education. Modifications would be made in core courses required for certification, and student teaching would incorporate some application of experiential and service-learning.

Survey results highlight the differences between College of Education faculty and those who operate experiential and service-learning programs: they have differing needs and agendas. Goodlad (1990), Ferguson (1990), and others have pointed out this discrepancy -- between issues of research and broad-based knowledge versus emphasis on improved practice. Introduction of experiential and service-learning programs into teacher education merely accentuates these fundamental differences. Development of an effective program to prepare teachers to use the community as an integral component of the educational process will have to overcome these obstacles. The task is formidable, but the need is great. Solving this problem will move the University of Minnesota College of Education well ahead of most other teacher preparation

institutions in the country.

REFERENCES

- Action for Children Commission (The). Kids Can't Wait: Action for Minnesota's Children. St. Paul: The Action for Children Commission, 1992.
- American Association of University Women. The AAUW Report: How Schools Shortchange Girls. The American Association of University Women Education Foundation and the National Education Association, 1992.
- American Vocational Association. The AVA Guide to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Education Act of 1990. Alexandria: American Vocational Association, 1990.
- Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. Harper and Row, 1983.
- Brown, B. Frank, et al. The Reform of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1989.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1990.
- Carnevale, A.P., Gainer, L., and Meltzer, A.S. Workplace Basics: What Employers Want. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.
- Ferguson, Patrick. "Impacts on Social and Political Participation", in Handbook on Social Studies Teaching and Learning, James P. Shaver, Editor. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1991.
- Gibbons, Maurice, et. al. The Secondary Education. (Report of the Phi Delta Kappa Task Force). Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.
- Goodlad, John. A Place Called School. McGraw Hill, 1984.
- Goodlad, John I. Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Goodlad, John I., Soder, Roger, and Sirotnik, Ken. The Moral Dimension of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Hamilton, Stephen F. Apprenticeship for Adulthood. The Free Press, 1990.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group, 1986.

Kennedy, Mary. "Some Surprising Findings on How Teachers Learn to Teach." Educational Leadership, Volume 49, Number 3, November 1991, pp.14-17.

Martin, John Henry, et al. Report of the National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1974.

National Commission on the Study of Vocational Education. The Unfinished Agenda, Harry F. Silberman, ed. The National Center for Research on Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Orr, Margaret Terry. Keeping Students in School. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Resnick, Lauren B. and Klopfer, Leopold E., eds. Toward the Thinking Curriculum: Current Cognitive Research. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1989 Yearbook.

Rutter, R.A. and Newmann, F.M. "The potential of community service to enhance civic responsibility," Social Education, 53, 371-374, 1989.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. 1991.

Secretary's Commission on Necessary Skills. What Work Requires of Schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1991.

Weis, Lois; Farrar, Eleanor; Petrie, Hugh. Dropouts From School. Albany: State University of New York, 1989.

W.T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America. Washington, D.C.: W.T. Grant Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, et al, 1988.

W.T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. States and Communities on the Move: Policy Initiatives To Build A World-Class Workforce. Washington, D.C.: W.T. Grant Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, et al, 1991.

APPENDIX A

Generator Center
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Minnesota

Name: _____

FACULTY MEMBER SURVEY

We are conducting a survey of educators and community members to determine the curricular needs of courses which address the topics of experiential and service-learning. Specifically, we want to know what knowledge and skills should prospective teachers have to operate educational programs which use community sites (in both the private and public sectors) as an integral part of the learning process. Your brief responses will help us to develop programs which are responsive to faculty concerns and needs. Please include copies of current syllabi for your courses and return the survey form and the syllabi to Dr. Gary Leske, Room 210, Vo/Tech Building. Please return this information by Monday, May 18.

1. Do you cover the topics of experiential and/or service-learning in any of your courses? If so, what topics do you cover?
2. Do you ask students to participate in experiential and/or service-learning activities as part of your course offerings? If so, what are students asked to do for these requirements?
3. If you were to include topics related to experiential and/or service-learning in one of your courses, what topics would you cover and how would you cover them (readings, field work, ...)?

APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY MEMBER SURVEY

We are conducting a survey of educators and community members to determine the curricular needs of courses which address the topics of experiential and service-learning. Specifically, we want to know what knowledge and skills should prospective teachers have to operate educational programs which use community sites (in both the private and public sectors) as an integral part of the learning process. Your comments will help us to develop programs which are responsive to community needs. Please use the back of the paper to record your responses.

Return your responses to: Dr. Robert Shumer, The Generator Center, R 460, Vo/Tech Ed Building, 1954 Buford, St. Paul, MN 55108-6197.

1. What should students know to work effectively at your site/workplace?
 - a. skills
 - b. subject matter knowledge
 - c. interpersonal skill/knowledge
 - d. other

2. What should teachers know about your site to facilitate student learning?
 - a. skills
 - b. subject matter knowledge
 - c. interpersonal skill/knowledge
 - d. other

3. What advice would you give to college faculty who are responsible for preparing students to work effectively at your site/business?

4. What is lacking in teacher preparation or undergraduate study which fails to prepare teachers to use the community as a classroom?

5. What specific recommendations would you make for courses which help prospective teachers learn how to use the community as an instructional setting?

4. If you were expected to prepare teachers to use community sites (business, non-profit organizations, etc.) as an important part of the educational process, what readings and/or activities would you have them perform?

5. As you understand it, what are the generic or general principles and practices of experiential learning which can easily be covered in education courses or teacher training programs?

RESPONSES

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.