12

Sustaining the Moral Framework: Tensions and Opportunities for Faculty

Pamela C. LePage

Noddings (1997) argued that a morally defensible mission for the schools in the 21st century "should be to produce competent, caring, loving, and lovable people" (p. 28). That demands, I suggest, that teachers and teacher educators must themselves demonstrate these qualities in a clearly defined moral frame.

That frame must first include the moral, rather than the technical, aspects of teaching. People who think education is a technical business believe there is a right way to teach and the teacher educator's job is to explain the right way. People who adopt a moral approach believe there are many choices available, none of which are perfect. Those exposed to a technical approach will spend their lives trying to figure out how to teach the right way. Those who are trained with a moral approach will spend their lives experimenting, reflecting, making mistakes, and starting over. Their focus is on continuous improvement and "doing what's right," not "doing it right" (a hopeless endeavor).

Second, the moral frame must also include a moral professionalism that focuses on interactions with students, colleagues and the community. The quality of the moral behavior of K–12 teachers is often associated with treatment of children. The quality of the moral behavior of college professors is reflected in the treatment of their students and the commitment to improve their own practice. But, moral professionalism does not just have an internal focus. It also provides a frame for examining how we treat colleagues and others outside the program in the schools and the community. Most important, it provides a basis for judging the quality of relationships within a community.

Finally, a moral approach demands philosophical inquiry. Noddings' (1997) mission opens up the opportunity for continuous dialogue and debate. What do

we mean by competence? What does it mean to care? How can we teach someone to be loving? These kinds of moral inquiries find a specific context in the work of IET. For example, how do we select faculty teams in a way that is fair and appropriate? How do we interact with a traditional bureaucracy using a moral rather than a technical epistemological approach? How do we seek input from the outside and listen to it? How do we show care for each other and for students, and, above all, how do we talk about these issues?

Since the early 1990s, IET has had mixed success struggling with moral issues. In this chapter, I describe the tensions we have experienced implementing a moral frame, while acknowledging there are many different interpretations of *moral*. Earlier in the book, morality was connected with social justice and democratic practices (see chap. 3). In chapter 5, the authors focused on care as a moral imperative in teaching. In chapter 4, Sevick contrasted the *prescriptive* interpretation of *moral*, which she claimed is closer to ethics, to *moral* as a *descriptive* way to train one's eye on the world. In the descriptive interpretation, people do not depend on rules to decide right or good conduct in a situation; a person taking a moral point of view is able to describe aspects of a situation such as complexities concerning relationships among the people or ideas or incidents involved, none of which is seen in isolation. In taking a moral point of view there is careful search for good reasons (Fenstermacher & Goodlad, 1997), a sense of struggle, and also an awareness that, because the outcome is uncertain, continued observation and reflection are warranted.

In this chapter, I advocate for democratic practices in institutions and care among colleagues, but the distinction between prescription and description is blurred. It is necessary for a community of learners to establish norms and expectations about how people will function in a community. But I also "struggle" to untangle the "complexity concerning relationships." I search for "good reasons" for our difficulties, and my ultimate aim is to "further reflection and refinement" as well as set policy.

For a morally based innovation to have credibility, it has to adhere to moral principles and examine where it falls short. Our most significant lapses have occurred when we try to deny that we have moral lapses and when we ignore the contradictions and paradoxes we face. Because it is impossible for individuals and groups always to make the right moral choice, denying the struggle indicates a serious lack of self-reflective capability, which must surely be at the center of a moral organization. Like other teacher educators, we have tried to expose our shortcomings and confront the gaps between rhetoric and reality (e.g., Macgillivary, 1997; Moje, Southerland, & Wade, 1999), a practice that we urge on professional K–12 teachers studying with us.

Although this chapter is based on my personal reflections as a faculty member, it was circulated to my faculty colleagues (and some former staff) for comment. All of us (including myself) have fallen into moral traps over the years. In this chapter, I provide a penetrating critique of our culture, while acknowledging

and affirming the incredible care and effort faculty put into their work to create a good program.

This chapter has three parts. In the first part, the goal is to understand the tensions a moral frame sets up for faculty inside the program; specifically, in terms of the complex relationships with teachers studying with us and the interplay between the moral standards we set for them and our attempts to meet those standards ourselves. In the second section, the goal is to explore tensions outside the specific teaching context, specifically the pragmatic problems arising for faculty in their role and in the university context. Finally, I ask what motivates faculty to work through the difficulties inherent in innovative morally framed programs and indicate a way forward to address the need for improvement.

THE PRAGMATIC CHALLENGE INSIDE THE PROGRAM

The challenges of embracing a moral foundation rest not only in working with teachers to grapple with complex questions, but also in experiencing the difficulties ourselves and struggling with the realities inherent in this approach. Inside the program, tensions for faculty arise in the implementation of a moral frame for ourselves and advocating to teachers their articulation of such a frame, specifically in respect of the following:

1. Working with teachers to develop authentic relationships with their students and our developing authentic relationships with them.
2. Advising teachers to develop collaborative relationships with colleagues against the background of some of our own difficulties in collaboration.
3. Advising teachers in their teams to grapple with problems and imperfections and living up to that injunction as faculty.
4. Extolling the value of reflective practice against our own problems of sustaining individual reflective practice.
5. Expecting teachers to develop community at their schools against the backdrop of our own efforts to build community.

Throughout these tensions run the confusing question of faculty autonomy. In some ways, individual IET faculty members have an amazing amount of autonomy, and yet in other ways it is seriously constrained. The degree structure allows faculty teams to recreate an entirely new program with each new student group. Yet, every decision we make, every book we assign, every paper we require is by convention agreed on by a team. When faculty are working in compatible teams, the autonomy is extensive: Where there is incompatibility, individuals can feel horribly constrained by "the group process."

Authentic Relationships

The question of autonomy has not provoked interfaculty tensions on the treatment of students. The program was designed to draw faculty into the professional lives of teachers by providing a structure where professors connect more intimately with students and where they are more accountable to students as teachers and advisers. The focus on teaching has never posed a problem for a faculty dedicated to teachers, none of whom would see the quality of practice with regard to teaching as anything less than their first moral priority. Indeed, connecting moral behavior primarily to their interactions with teachers is the reason why IET faculty see themselves as people who adhere to moral principles.

Collaborative Relationships

Collaboration among faculty is another matter, with the potential for severe friction. First, in IET, we do not have the freedom to distance ourselves from team colleagues with whom we disagree or with whom we have no personal bond. Even small differences in philosophy have created problems. For example, one faculty team member might believe in re-envisioning the teaching and learning relationships between professors and teachers as "everyone learns and everyone teaches," whereas another believes in a modified traditional hierarchical relationship. Some IET faculty are anxious to preserve what they view as the nontraditional and transformative nature of the program and fear that faculty will fall back toward the familiar. Because the faculty come from different disciplines, these conflicts and misunderstandings can be amplified because members use different language to describe the same things. Sometimes there was argument when there should have been agreement. Within a team, such dissonance creates confusion with regard to the "type of community" the faculty plan to foster among teachers who will then face infuriating contradictions because of faculty team divisions. Collaboration becomes a burden, not a joy, undermining everyone's autonomy. Moreover, there is the threat that a simple difference of philosophy or style can in principle damage a career because it can negatively affect student evaluations and faculty recommendations when promotion and tenure come along.

Second, interfaculty relationships are influenced by traditional academic norms. In a team context, an "unreasonable" individual is protected bureaucratically from being treated unfairly if he or she is disliked (because this is not uncommon in academia), whereas the rest of the team is not. On the other hand, the "rest of the team" might be the "unreasonable party," working to marginalize a person who is somehow different. Collaboration problems often stem as much from clashes of style and personality as teaching ideology. Is it even possible to define "unreasonable" faculty? Anyone whose opinions were constantly in a minority could be considered problematic and unreasonable to the rest of the

team. For me "unreasonable" would describe a colleague who didn't seem to understand or was not willing to engage in productive conversations about IET's ideology, did not realize the extent of its ambitions and its influence on their workload, had particular character traits that undermined his or her abilities to work in teams, or whose previous experiences turned out not to be as valuable as either he or she or the search committee thought! Whether we call the phenomenon "reasonable" or "unreasonable," this immensely difficult issue has to be faced in the context of faculty autonomy within a moral frame.

In IET we have found it difficult to live up to our rhetoric. We need to recommit to:

- treating everyone (whether or not they are liked) with fairness and respect;
- working with people who need technical assistance as teachers;
- avoiding engaging in subtle forms of harassment and marginalization;
- standing up and together against unjust practices; and
- developing assessment procedures where teaming, communication, and adherence to moral principles are somehow recognized as important parts of our program.

Because IET faculty members are perfectionists when it comes to teaching, and collaboration problems can affect program quality, faculty members have trouble accepting responsibility for a program that does not meet their standards. Therefore, we have succumbed too much to arguing behind the backs of people, perhaps even trying to force them out by subtly (sometimes unconsciously) marginalizing them. Some have disdained working with others. Some have raised concerns about the temptation of the faculty to focus too much on creating a "comfortable" space for teaching, rather than attending to serious moral issues (with any or all faculty) in the development of an innovation. Also, much like forcing the first-year K–12 teacher to take on the most difficult kids, we have considered placing burdens on certain people who should not be asked to shoulder those burdens.

Facing up to Imperfections

Yet, to address these challenges and to live up to our self-imposed moral standards, we need strategies to implement this vision. First, it is important to establish open communication where we confront our own and each other's weaknesses in open dialogue with specific references to real events and behaviors. Such communication would be a drastic departure from what most faculty experience in traditional academic settings, where publicly confronting weaknesses is extremely rare.

Academics have various tactics when facing conflict. They use innuendo, ignore the problem, or use intellectual debate as a professional façade to fight personal battles. Some cannot see the weaknesses or will deny they exist, and/

or will think a person should keep silent in any case. Conventional ways of functioning become so normative that people do not even notice them. These norms then exert both dormant and active power over others by dictating how people should act. The norms become strengthened by traditions (this is not the way things are done). Those who challenge them, or those with different moral emphases, are considered out of step, accused of making trouble, acting crazy, whining, or acting arrogant or superior. Those in the majority seek to silence these people for the sake of group harmony, or control. In a hostile climate, people will ignore behaviors as insidious as overt racism or sexism because conflict in such an environment can be so damaging. People wait for others to address relational problems because they want to avoid being labeled "trouble-maker" or getting marginalized themselves. A hostile environment is not merely one that lacks tolerance for nontraditional verbal and written styles, or promotes silencing behaviors and unspoken racist and sexist norms. It can be one where the lack of open communication (a culture of silence) fosters injustice.

Whether my colleagues would agree on this or not, problems have arisen in IET because some have dealt with confrontation in a less direct way and others in a more direct way, which itself causes friction. Some confront issues and are accused of "relishing confrontation." Some avoid issues and are accused of "avoiding open communication." Some do both. Some don't say anything until they get angry, dispatching e-mail that is more personal than professional. I certainly have fallen into this trap myself.

Installing a dialogue in IET on our imperfections is a key part of the moral frame. We must be dedicated to providing a welcoming climate for people who challenge conventions, and we have a responsibility as colleagues to create a nurturing work environment for the entire community. The first step in developing good relationships is to clarify beliefs and principles (see chap. 2) and decide together how to communicate about them.

Service and Community

Faculty autonomy in IET is also influenced by two other considerations: the conception of service within IET and the interweave of autonomy with community. First, faculty members are asked to do specialized service, such as recruiting students, fostering connections with alumni, and reaching out to the community. By institutionalizing certain types of service work (especially recruitment), the faculty is obliged to reach out to principals, superintendents, and teachers. The ivory tower is no longer a hiding place. Teachers come to us and we must reach out to them. Our hierarchical authority, by design, is diminished. The service work in IET, although unusual, does have the common theme of a focus outward to the schools and to the community. This contrasts with the view of traditional citizenship in the university where people serve on governance committees.

Such service can be a source of real confusion for promotion and tenure

committees, as it is seen not as "real service" but as just a way to "sell the program." The upshot is that to continue service work in IET and prepare ourselves for tenure, we must engage in both nontraditional service to IET and also traditional service work that is recognized by the university.

IET has an emphasis on building learning communities. For the faculty, community can cover at least three areas: the faculty team, the identity of a particular group of teachers and faculty, and the faculty as a whole. In faculty teams, it is easier to develop community because it is easier to carry on conversations about specific educational issues and philosophies, given the context of a particular group of students moving through at a particular time. People learn to care for "their" students and intimately understand the complexity of their particular group. Although we have had some success building community within our faculty teams, we have had less success building community in the larger program. Some have claimed that experiencing community in a team has satisfied their need for community and they do not have time for additional community development.

The desire to build community within a team is understandable, but in some ways, it is analogous to our teacher students telling us, "Well, I can work to develop community with a few people on my grade level, but it is too hard to develop community with the entire school." So, by asking teachers to develop learning communities in their schools and not expending the energy to do this work ourselves (especially given the fact that we have more flexible time than K–12 teachers), we create a gap between what we profess and what we do. Furthermore, we are not experiencing the complexity of what we are asking teachers to accomplish. College faculty have historically been criticized for telling teachers what they should do, while at the same time not understanding the complexity of teachers' work and not practicing what they preach. We are interested in avoiding this trap.

Reflective Practice

Working to live up to our rhetoric and avoid moral traps, however, can be a source of considerable stress and requires a "managed heart" (Hochschild, 1983). Developing learning communities demands emotional energy to constantly build and reflect on our own program, while working to help teachers build and reflect on their programs. This is an acute challenge in our program. First, the same faculty works with the same group of students throughout an entire 2-year program, so individual teacher-student success is completely dependent on the dedication and competence of a few individuals. Second, learning can be a painful process for returning professionals. They face insecurities and must push themselves to learn and grow. The IET faculty shoulders some of the emotional strain that students experience. We listen, we sympathize, we push, we advise, we confront and we bluntly state the obvious. But, even at the end, when students tell us what a wonderful program we have and apologize for that one e-mail

tirade or that one angry outburst in class, I still find their tears of joy and relief emotional.

Our job thus requires a managed heart and a moral epistemology of practice, rather than the traditional empiricist-positivist one with which teacher education practice is dominated (see chap. 1). Traditionally, a school relies on moral conventions and also on local laws (e.g., prohibiting sexual harassment) to govern teaching and learning with regard to interpersonal interactions. In this type of institution, bureaucracy and convention aid people in separating right from wrong, so people do not spend time to explore how "what is taught" and "how social relations are conducted" interface. In a moral innovation, questions about the institution's fundamental values and its day to day conduct surface quickly and are always on the table. Constant reflection is essential. For you cannot simply ignore complex moral issues, many of which require naming. Problems crucial in the moral model are often ignored in the empirical model. Within this new paradigm, the IET innovation is on a kind of moral expedition, trying to recover through reflection moral ground lost to the dominant paradigm. The transformative shift IET embraces is therefore one in which the moral epistemology is installed both as a way of understanding what teaching is and as a way of understanding what an educational institution is. Faculty autonomy in the moral paradigm implies living up to high moral standards as a member of a community. And that is a very different concept of faculty autonomy.

SUSTAINING MORAL INTEGRITY IN A COMPETITIVE BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE

When IET was separated from the Graduate School of Education, the university administration believed that for an innovation to succeed it had to be nurtured, separate from the influence of entrenched tradition (see chap. 14). Left exposed to the "dark side of the force"—the individualistic, competitive styles of traditional academics, the bureaucratic malaise that inhibits progress, and the privileged disassociation of the ivory tower, the innovating faculty would be defeated. Critique of this dark side underpins many commentaries on teacher education. "Nowhere is the imperative to shift our effort from 'my work' to 'our work' more needed than in schools of education," wrote Hugh Petrie, emphasizing the importance of collaboration (Jacobson, Emihovich, Helfrich, Petrie, & Stevenson, 1998, p. 24). A more fundamental critique (see chap. 1) also widens to faculty conduct in general. Braxton & Bayer (1999) were unforgiving in their descriptions of faculty behaviors that they labeled moral turpitude, uncooperative cynicism, and condescending negativism, to name but a few. When IET was separated from the Graduate School at GMU, clearly the faculty resented the implication that they were part of "the evil empire" who embraced the dark side of academic life.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that faculty with traditional career expectations realistically will be torn between university norms and IET's new

ways. Such conflicts will include the amount of time spent in schools, how power relations with teachers are negotiated, how to get individual recognition as they strive to adhere to a collaborative mission, and how to negotiate the rewards of innovation with the conventional forms of promotion and tenure criteria. Because IET was recently moved back into the Graduate School under a new president, it is important to face up to this legacy and name the problems. They represent continuing tensions (as I see them) that stem from an innovation with a moral epistemology that is institutionally located within a traditional hierarchical bureaucracy and that encapsulate the problems for faculty I have outlined. These can be discussed as (1) politics and the complexity of deceit, (2) collaborative teaching and university evaluations, and (3) challenging hierarchies.

Politics and the Complexity of Deceit

In the late 1980s, a friend of mine (call her Joanne) worked in a special education department that provided a toy-lending library to local low-income parents of special needs kids. The toys were specially designed with adaptations for children who had trouble manipulating objects. The program caught on quickly and it was a great success. But, for some reason, the program still was not very well supported by the department. Joanne was told by one of the professors in the department that the toy library staff needed to let the department chair get credit for this program, even though she had never supported it, let alone been involved in the design or the implementation of the program. Joanne didn't say anything, but if she had inquired or protested, she probably would have been told that it didn't matter who deserved credit, the toy library staff had better start pretending.

This example is morally complex, although it could be dismissed as institutional convention. First, if people higher up on the hierarchy are trying to "steal" credit, are they morally wrong? Second, how do those who deserve the credit react? Should they give up the credit to gather support so they can reach more parents and kids? We do not have to be selfless in all cases, but in a situation where poor kids might have access to educational toys otherwise unaffordable, the moral choice seems obvious. Yet, there is still one other layer of complexity to discuss. Are we sure this is the right moral decision? With the solution offered so far, we are solving a problem under traditional norms. The fundamental immorality of the situation remains. The dishonesty behind it is accepted. The assumptions (e.g., that the bad academics have immoral motives) provide fodder for later antagonism. Secrecy is left to feed future rumors and gossip. This situation will prove divisive, leading to a breakdown in community. Accepting there is no clear answer, in a morally framed program, we need to open dialogue, rather than accept deceit.

Politics of this sort is common in higher education. That I feel constrained not to use an example of political manipulation and deceit from the IET context

shows either my cowardice or how thin the ice is when one believes it important to open serious moral dialogue. To consider the morality of such a situation finds no locus within the dominant paradigm and misbehaviors are rarely sanctioned. The lack of disciplinary action can be attributed in part to people in the academy placing a high value on autonomy, thereby making administrative interventions inappropriate (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

A second hypothetical example is a more direct instance of deceit (see Bok, 1978, 1983). Consider this situation: We don't like the work of an adjunct, but she is nice and certainly a friend, so we tell her we don't need her anymore. We tell her that we fought long and hard to keep her (when we, in fact, suggested she go). We blame the dean, the university president, or the ambassador to France, none of whom even know this person. Given a moral frame, such clear deceit must be carefully considered, but perhaps not always completely eliminable. Bok (1978) tells us that some marginally deceptive social excuses and conventions are sometimes unavoidable if feelings are not to be needlessly injured. But most people who stretch the truth do so because they feel guilty. They actually care about what people think so they often lie in an effort to please everyone. Bok also indicates that people use deceit as a way to gain and abuse power, hence its potential as a weapon for manipulation.

Under a moral frame, it would not be appropriate to mislead the adjunct because she needs to know how people feel about her work. In this situation, we are not being nice to her when we lie. We are being cowardly in an effort to maintain our popularity or to avoid an uncomfortable conversation, or we are just being lazy or selfish. By avoiding the truth, we are probably invalidating this person's own intuition, and we are invalidating the person who told her the truth last week. We will probably have to lie again when we refill that "unnecessary" position. A better approach would be to emphasize the positive, let her know we care, tell her the truth, and most important, admit that we may be wrong, for our evaluative comments are subjective.

Faculty must, I believe, struggle openly with the moral complexity of deceit. We can admit that "stretching the truth" is commonplace, even when we say we never lie and we understand and value honesty. We should feel social pressure to enter dialogue and be honest, to break free of the fear generated by entrenched norms protected by abusive power relations, and to take risks (responsibly) even if it might provoke conflict. Not rocking the boat is the motto of the status quo. If a morally framed program sticks to its principles to deal with these common problems, it often has to face serious conflict in the search for responsible solutions in the community.

In IET, we have not had much success resolving some of these types of issues. First, people must be confident to reflect on their inadequacies and it is difficult to always tell the truth (especially if someone's feelings might be hurt) and it is also difficult to hear the truth. Second, many people honestly believe it is better to avoid conflict, because they don't want to make the situation worse. Productive disagreement is so unusual that they find it emotionally draining to

engage in tense discussions that they assume will be unproductive. Many people have never experienced learning through cognitive dissonance or conflict resolution so they do not understand its value. They have never made deeper connections with people by working through uncomfortable issues. Understandably, they don't like the way conflict makes them feel. Third, we are trying to change our current paradigm, while functioning within an old paradigm (both in our heads and in our contexts). We are trying to "do it differently" with very little guidance, support and time. Working within an institution that operates with different conventions and a different epistemology means oscillating between two sets of epistemological norms and moral practices. Finding a balance is hard on individuals because there is a thin line between being politically suave and politically manipulative, being deceitful and being diplomatic, and protecting yourself and being selfish. There are no clear boundaries. We must constantly negotiate these subtle distinctions.

Collaborative Teaching and University Evaluations

Team teaching exemplifies both the promise and the hazards within IET as an innovation that redefines faculty relationships as collaborative. Personally, I have learned a great deal from my colleagues. I have learned about collaboration, leadership, and group dynamics. I have been exposed to different teaching methods and perspectives on curriculum. I have learned an enormous amount of "content" from my colleagues. On the other hand, I have argued and talked and confronted and stepped in and negotiated myself to death! It is true that even where preexisting relationships, as in a Professional Development School (PDS) smooth the way, the development of the more intimate, even intrusive, form of collaboration is not straightforward (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Previously, I talked about how the desire for faculty autonomy affects collaboration. In this section, I focus on barriers to collaboration posed by university policies and procedures.

Programmatically, team teaching enhances instructional quality. It forces faculty to adhere to certain principles and standards. It pushes people who are not strong teachers to improve, as their colleagues are in constant attendance. Moreover, because the team has input into every class session, activities have a greater probability of being useful or powerful or interesting in some way. Nevertheless, there are problems associated with the challenge of working *collaboratively* within a bureaucratic frame designed to evaluate and reward *individual effort.*

Institutionally, the problem is that the university administration does not understand and therefore does not allow for assessment for nontraditional collaborative teaching in a way that is truly understood and embraced by the promotion and tenure process. In regular university classrooms, the instructor chooses his or her own syllabus, methods, and styles. At the end of an IET course the university student evaluation process demands that students complete Scantron

forms evaluating each faculty member individually, regardless of the circumstances.

By contrast, IET has historically not emphasized individual faculty contributions to teaching. Teaming means that each person is differently involved at some point during every class day (e.g., as discussion leader, presenter, small group adviser, or comic relief). IET faculty members have different strengths and commitments. Some people like presenting to large groups while others don't believe in "transmission." Some are excellent leaders of discussions in cohorts, getting students thinking and talking about the material presented (see chap. 4), whereas others would prefer to have students work in small groups so the instructor is not at the center. In a team-teaching situation, everyone must negotiate how the team will interact with students, who will develop and deliver certain instruction, and what each instructor will do at any given time. People cannot always choose to teach in the way that is best for them; they must teach in a way that is agreed on by the group. These decisions are often affected by group power relations that can be influenced by gender bias, elitism, discipline-ism, ageism, politics, fear of survival, and potential conflicts of interest.

The IET student evaluation process could be described as a constant open communication with students. We ask them to evaluate every class session. We talk with them about their evaluations. At times the faculty has given evaluative responses back to the students to analyze as data. We work constantly to improve on the program, as we improve on our own teaching. So evaluation for us is viewed as a formative and dialogic process that is constant and continuous and not a bureaucratic end of the program response to determine whether it was good or bad.

Evaluations can never therefore accurately assess individual teaching abilities because no one ever develops or delivers instruction in isolation, even though this is how the university views them. The scores on these evaluations cannot thus be individual. They are obviously affected first by how other faculty team members respond to each other and how a person "compares" with other faculty on the team. Second, they are affected by whether a team sets an emphasis and a tone that is different from what an individual is comfortable with. One group may focus on identity issues and empowering teachers to understand bureaucratic barriers. Another may concentrate on teacher research and improving kids' learning. Another might emphasize intellectual challenge. Faculty will fare better or worse on university student evaluations depending on whether the team can agree on an overall philosophy and emphasis.

Third, if an individual member of faculty is a weak instructor, but surrounded by other strong teachers, the better instructors will bolster the weaker instructor. Therefore, it can help the overall program for weaker faculty to be paired with stronger faculty. And when our K–12 teacher-students start complaining to us about "bad teachers" at their schools, we ask them how they are helping those teachers get better. Of course, because university evaluations influence not only promotion and tenure decisions, but also yearly salary adjustments, this can be

problematic in a situation where an individual gets a smaller salary increase because he had to invest extra time to compensate for the bad teaching of a weak professor. For some, this could also frustrate their career ambitions in an organization where individual achievement is valued over the group process.

So far I have been explaining how we seek to compromise with the dominant evaluation paradigm that we believe has little merit, which does not match our practice, and insidiously influences our interprofessional relations. What should we do? Given a moral frame, we should not be seduced by traditional, competitive, individualistic rewards as determined through unhealthy assessment instruments that discriminate between those who are really good and really bad in an effort to make things "fair." In a collaborative situation, this causes resentment and ultimately makes things worse. When stronger faculty are willing to help weaker faculty, this shows care not only for colleagues, but also for the students who will experience a better program.

To repeat, the problem is that institutionally, the university does not understand and therefore provide assessment for nontraditional collaborative teaching in a way that is truly understood and embraced by the promotion and tenure process. We thus have no formal way to evaluate the progress of a team as an instructional unit, to monitor the growth of a team, or to reward those who make special efforts or who develop new and interesting curricula. We have no way to reward teams that face more incompatibility, yet struggle to work together productively. We have no way to reward the faculty member who spends time and energy teaching, mentoring, and compensating for weaker faculty.

In short, our work has been bedeviled by the dominant paradigm and our responses have been morally confused. Faculty members have fought to work with compatible people in an effort to avoid the difficulties of teaming, which does not reduce conflict. When some faculty decide whom they want to work with, some others are left without a choice. Who gets to choose? Most importantly, by failing to grapple openly with this problem, we are missing opportunities to learn and to struggle with the complexity of what we ask K–12 teachers to do in a less supportive environment.

Challenging Hierarchies

Challenging the hierarchy is not a problem exclusive to moral innovations (Slater, 1996). Because IET encourages teachers to interact as equal colleagues, or as partners, in the public school hierarchy, we also strive to flatten the hierarchy by treating university colleagues as equal partners, no matter what their status or title. This is much easier for university or college faculty because we cannot "be fired" for insubordination and it is part of the academic culture that colleagues relate to each other as equals. Still, people in positions of power in the university find ways to "reward loyal followers" and pass opportunities by those who are not so loyal. So, challenging the hierarchy can be a risk, a fact exemplified by my reluctance here to specify cases.

The norms of a moral-democratic program (see chap. 3) conflict with the rules and norms of a traditional hierarchy. In a moral program, people constantly question the procedures. They speak their minds, demand to be informed, don't show deference, and reject the chain of command. They have nontraditional practices that break down the power of the hierarchy. Frequently, they shock people with nontraditional verbal or written styles. To them, the university is a republic, not a corporation. Believers in hierarchy and the proper chain of command within an academic setting find this unsettling, for people in democratic programs don't adhere to the conventions as the hierarchy understands them. In particular, the hierarchy loses the critical skill of predicting what these people will say or how they will act in certain situations. Therefore, developing trust across such ideological differences is especially difficult.

A program that believes in (and implements) democratic principles can face contradictions that reside within a hierarchy, especially when the program is composed mostly of women (and men) who have adopted feminist, democratic, anti-paternalist values. Paternalism is the policy or practice of treating or governing people in a fatherly manner, especially by providing for their needs without giving them rights or responsibilities. Paternalism rarely allows decisions to be made on their merits. It usually crushes or disallows innovations not led from the top and heavily relies on patronage, as in applications for discretionary funds. Fatherly leaders (men or women) usually care very much about the people who work for them and welcome the opportunity to do something to demonstrate their dedication and care. Employees under a paternalistic leadership can feel protected and as important as the good son or daughter. Such care is too often perverted, however, for it can become a weapon of control, not an authentic caring for the other. Paternalists are closed to dissent, viewing dissenters as disloyal or troublesome children, rather than helpful and important adults.

DEVELOPING A CRITICAL CULTURE AND WORKING TOWARD IMPROVEMENT

Faced with such major challenges inside and outside the program, what provides the motivation to maintain the program? The most significant reward comes through intellectual stimulation. IET is dedicated to both the intellectual life of teachers and also the intellectual life of college faculty. So, historically, those who focus on teaching and those whose scholarly interests intersect with the priorities in the program (e.g., teacher research, teaming, school transformation, democratic learning communities, etc.) can find a very intellectually stimulating community. Within the confines of the degree structure, IET also provides the faculty (in the context of teams) with the opportunity to develop an entire master's degree program every 2 years. The faculty has an opportunity to be creative with curriculum (see, e.g., Wood, 1996) and they have more influence over the "entire graduate experience" than they would in other programs.

Most importantly, the faculty are also rewarded by their belief that we are making a difference in education. Although IET professors must engage in work that is unusual for college faculty, certain program features, like recruitment, teacher-friendly scheduling, and driving to schools are not gratuitous gestures, they transform the teaching–learning experience. The following are some comments taken from a survey (LePage & Kirk, 1999) that asked IET alumni whether the program was useful to them:

- "Yes, very thoughtful program in terms of me thinking about my students, my assignments—where am I going with it all and what do I hope to achieve—I now always have these questions in my mind."
- "I learned a great deal about myself as a teacher through reflective practice. The collaborative work has been especially useful to me in my role as department chair."
- "Absolutely, I am using many of the techniques that I learned there to the advantage of my students—fewer failures, more interest. The students are as energized as am I."
- "Yes, I learned a great deal from my research. I feel confident to voice my opinions in decision making. I love to collaborate with my grade level and team teach whenever possible. I have read books by authors we read in the program."
- "Yes, it gave me the confidence to know that I could do research and be a part of a collaborative team."
- "Yes, technology was very helpful to me! Reflection caused me to rethink some of my practice."
- "The program was extremely useful in that it encouraged me to be reflective and to use my new skills to change and improve my practice. It has also broadened my view of the role of public educators and has deepened my commitment to morality."
- "Yes, I am able to view the world differently (and my students!). I am now a better writer. I am technology literate. It also encouraged me to continue taking more classes."

Such typical responses encourage faculty members, first, to be proud of their deep connections with schools. Currently, each faculty member works with approximately five to eight teams of teachers, each from a different school, so faculty works with teachers in approximately 50 to 70 schools in the northern Virginia area at any one time. Second, some faculty strive to develop other community-based work (e.g., in the Urban Alternative; see chap. 1) where one faculty member has worked with low-income immigrant families and other community members to establish and maintain a high-quality early education program that greatly informs our work with teachers (see chap. 10). Third, I have developed one of IET's original ambitions (for work with whole schools). I facilitate the George C. Round Elementary School Community Project in Manassas, Virginia, which provides a pilot for the vision of having teachers in teams graduating from the program go back to their workplace and develop a collaborative, moral community. Out of 35 teachers at that school, 12 have earned their master's degree through the IET program. Some of these alumni,

as well as other teachers, are working together on a group research project to understand how the teachers, administrators, and staff in the school can work together better to improve instructional quality at the school.

Given the value of the IET innovation to teachers, can this program be as rewarding to faculty as it is for students? Will faculty be motivated to struggle with moral dilemmas? Not, I think, without continuous long-term program development that includes the constant renewal of commitment by faculty to adhere to a moral frame of professionalism and the development of nontraditional communication patterns; the institutionalization of nontraditional procedures based on feminist, moral and democratic principles; and the development of moral leadership across all the faculty.

As part of that moral commitment to the *Beliefs and Principles in IET Practice* (see chap. 2), we must somehow first institutionalize honest and open communication, going beyond these rhetorically expressed values to such questions as "What do we mean by integrity?" and "What constitutes a morally coherent fit?" And, "What happens when we have neither?" Second, we also need to have discourse procedures available to reconcile philosophical conflicts (see, e.g., LePage & Sockett, 2000). Third, we need to work harder with each other, especially with those who are uncomfortable with nontraditional communication styles or who are not used to discussing moral issues in an open forum. Fourth, we need to negotiate consequences when these commitments are ignored, for we cannot be committed to a moral base of professionalism and simultaneously be unmotivated and uninvolved.

Fifth, for the bureaucrats among us and the bureaucrat within us, it is important to establish some nontraditional procedures that govern the program. Teaching is not just moral, it is also technical (e.g., eye contact with the audience) and it is partly bureaucratic (grading). In the past, people lost trust in a paternalistic system that sought to "privilege their friends." As a result, these people were convinced that the only way to have a fair system was to bureaucratize it! So moral judgment was replaced with rules and procedures and many people forgot what it meant to make decisions about what is right, what is fair, what is moral. We need drastically to revise the model of improvement, "grounded in the view of the schools as bureaucracies run by carefully specified procedures that yield standard products (students), based on a faith in rationalistic organizational behavior, in the power of rules to direct human action, and in the ability of researchers to discover the common procedures that will produce desired outcomes" (Darling-Hammond, 1997a, p. 39). We need to import procedures that provide some structure, while also celebrating our spirit of experimentation, flexibility, and continuous improvement.

Finally, we need to welcome all faculty taking responsibility for leadership. Faculty need to set up, organize, and foster productive communication within and outside the program and help negotiate ambiguity within. Faculty must take turns providing a moral compass. All leaders in morally based innovation need to effectively negotiate different cultures in the university, in the community,

and in the public schools. They must communicate respect for organizational structures not like our own, and at the same time, work to change structures they believe to be hostile to many faculty. Each individual must acknowledge his or her responsibility to do the following:

- Serve as a moral compass.
- Direct the democratic process.
- Interact in a number of different cultures and communicate effectively given a broad range of philosophical traditions.
- Work appropriately with problematic faculty and help faculty negotiate ambiguity.
- Support and protect faculty when nontraditional methods and styles clash with traditional bureaucratic university structures.
- Organize productive discussions about the vision, the philosophies and direction of the program.

CONCLUSION

Faculty in a moral innovation must strive to understand and address moral complexity. The effort to coexist with the dominant paradigm leads to taking on its more unpleasant features (e.g., manipulation, dishonesty, pushing people out, building power camps, etc.). This temptation needs to be resisted in favor of admitting and understanding our frailties, openly acknowledging our mistakes, working to redress our past transgressions, reflecting seriously on our roles and responsibilities, and working toward improvement. Hopefully, the new dedication to morality that is emerging as a major force in teacher education (see, e.g., Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Hansen, 1998; Sockett, 1993; Tom, 1984) will provide programs like IET with support, protection, and guidance. For now, it is important to practice what we preach, foster trust, develop a caring community and support dedicated, idealistic faculty members who are committed to a moral approach.