Partnering, Democratic Citizenship, and Goodlad's Agenda for Education in a Democracy

Robert V. Bullough, Jr
Brigham Young University

Abstract: Situated in a description of current challenges facing democracy that suggest the, at one time, unthinkable possibility of deconsolidation, the author describes the origins under John Goodlad's leadership of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy and the Moral Dimensions of Teaching. He describes briefly work done within the BYU-Public School Partnership to illustrate Goodlad's influence. The argument put forth is that public education has a special responsibility for articulating and strengthening democratic citizenship, characterized as *dialogic democracy*, as a way of life and that this aim sets the purposes of school-university partnerships, an aim that ought to be embraced by the NAPDS.

KEYWORDS: John Goodlad, Agenda for Education in a Democracy, the Moral Dimensions of Teaching; dialogic democracy, NAPDS

NAPDS NINE ESSENTIALS ADDRESSED:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structure

Introduction

This special issue of *School-University Partnerships* is dedicated to the legacy of John Goodlad, most specially his aspiration for the simultaneous renewal of teacher education and schooling. The intention of this introductory article is to explore Goodlad's work in relationship to the important ambition of the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) to further the cause of partnering. Particular attention will be given to the emergence of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy and development of the Moral Dimensions of Teaching, two efforts underscoring a key insight of Goodlad's and his colleagues – for partnerships to be powerful, they must be purposeful and the driving purpose of public education is democratic citizenship understood, as John Dewey (1939) and the philosopher Boyd Bode (1937) argued, as a way of life.

The Question of Partnership Aims

In August 2007, the NAPDS held a summit to "hammer out Nine Essentials which define the PDS mission" (https://napds.org/nine-essentials). Of the Nine Essentials, the first two focus on the purposes of partnerships and the social purposes of education: 1. "A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community" and 2. "A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community." Considering these two Essentials, a statement came to mind of Bode's written during the rise of Nazism and the growing threat of a second world war (1937). Bode wrote, "A democratic system of education is ordinarily supposed to mean a system which is made freely accessible to all the members of the group. That it should also be distinctive in quality or content is not taken for granted in the same way" (p. 63). "Systems of education," Bode wrote, "are necessarily and inevitably bound up with some way of life" (p. 12; see also, p. 62).

Bode's comments prompt a question: What in the Nine Essentials would suggest that a PDS ought to represent a distinctive social philosophy and educational commitment? What way of life do the Essentials support, if any?

Present in the Nine Essentials are a few hints suggestive of an underlying and guiding social vision, but they are only hints: Advancing "equity" is mentioned in the first Essential. Essential 4 speaks of "innovation and reflective practice"; and Essentials 6, 7, and 8 suggest collaboration among partners to define roles and responsibilities and shared governance are important. Considering these statements, one wonders, is there anything about partnering under the NAPDS vision that would suggest partnerships in one or another nation or social system are or should be unique, different, somehow distinctive? Put differently, are the aims of education in China and Singapore identical to those of education in the U.S.? The question gives pause. Another Bode (1940) quote comes to mind: Comparing nations that were soon to be at war, he concluded, "co-operation in itself is scarcely an issue. The totalitarian states of today are all examples of large-scale co-operation." Then he extended the point: "What is important is, first, the end or purpose that is to be achieved, and, secondly, the appropriateness of the means to the end" (p. 270).

Over the past two decades an infectious test fetish has dominated and distorted then displaced discussion of the purposes of American public education. The chest beating and shrill ululating of politicians the past several years following release of international comparisons of student test results coupled with growing economic insecurity that elevated job training over education have silenced and overpowered other voices, and other, more fundamental, educational concerns – clearly the measures of quality education extend well beyond rising test scores or achieving gainful employment. At least they ought to in a nation proclaiming democratic aspirations and claiming exceptionalism. But, as John Dewey (1939) argued at a time of growing national angst, "we are learning that everything about the public schools, its official agencies of control, organization and administration, the status of teachers, the subjects taught and methods of teaching them, the prevailing modes of discipline, set *problems*; and that the problems have been largely ignored as far as the relation of schools to democratic institutions is concerned" (p. 42). Bode (1937) put the issue this way: "we have not yet made it clear that a democratic school [ought to] be substantially different in method or spirit from any other kind of school" (p. 16). John Goodlad and his colleagues (2004) formulated the problem for our time, observing that few of us "really think much about what it means to live in a democracy or what is needed to sustain one" (p. 36). Yet, as Goodlad argued, we must.

Goodlad stood in the tradition of Dewey and Bode and shared many of their concerns and commitments (see Goodlad, 2007). My understanding of the Agenda grew out of having known Goodlad, read his works, conversed with him, and of having lived with and worked with the Agenda and other of his ideas for two decades as a participant in the BYU-Public School Partnership and as a member of the center of pedagogy associated with that partnership (The Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling, CITES) (see Bullough & Rosenberg, 2018). This experience has profoundly shaped my understanding of and beliefs about education. Prior to turning to a direct discussion of the Agenda, the brief section that follows sets a context needed for appreciating the urgency of focusing on partnership aims associated with re/vitalizing democratic citizenship.

Deconsolidation of Democracy

Until recently the possibility that democracy would fail in the U.S. was unthinkable. The assumption has long been that once mature, democracies would endure. That assumption is increasingly questioned. "Is Democracy Dying?" was the theme of the October 2018 issue of *The Atlantic*; and each article published offers reasons for worry that suggest democracy maybe or is unraveling. Two constitutional scholars, Amy Chua and Jed Rubenfeld (2018), discuss the growing "threat of tribalism" warning that "every group in America – minorities *and* whites; conservatives *and* liberals; the working class *and* elites – feels under attack, pitted against the others not just for jobs and spoils, but for the right to define the nation's identity" (p. 80). In response they argue for what they describe as "constitutional patriotism" (p. 81), a sense of unity based on ideas and ideals rather than tribal triumph: "We have to remain united by and through the Constitution, regardless of our ideological disagreements" (p. 81). Offering a view from Europe, author and commentator Anne Applebaum (2018) wrestles with the implications of what she sees as the fading of democratic aspirations and the rise of the "illiberal state" (p. 57) in many parts of the world, where to stay in power leaders "encourage their followers to engage, at least part of the time, with an alternative reality. Sometimes that alternative reality has developed

organically; more often, it's been carefully formulated, with the help of modern marketing techniques, audience segmentation, and social-media campaigns." Offering the U.S., Hungary and Poland as examples, she argues that such realities "increase polarization and inflame xenophobia" (p. 59). "Polarization," she concluded, "is [now] normal. More to the point . . . skepticism about liberal democracy is . . . [also] normal. And the appeal of authoritarianism is eternal" (p. 62).

Applebaum's concern with widespread and increasing skepticism about democracy is a central theme of the recent research of political scientists Roberto Foa and Yascha Mounk (2016; 2017) on the "deconsolidation of democracy." Analyzing data from the World Values Survey, Foa and Mounk explored the "health of democracy" (2016, p. 10). A few of their conclusions from U.S. respondents prompting concern follow:

- "When asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 10 how 'essential' it is for them 'to live in a democracy,'
    - 72 percent of those born before World War II check '10,' the highest value" (p. 7).
    - In contrast, the "millennial generation (those born since 1980) has grown much more indifferent . . . [I]n the United States, that number is . . . around 30 percent." (p. 8).
- Furthermore, "in 1995 . . . only 16 percent of Americans born in the 1970s (then in their late teens or early twenties) believed that democracy was a 'bad' political system for the country" (p. 8).
    - Two decades later, that number had grown to 20 percent.
- In 2011, 24 percent of the same age cohort "considered democracy to be a 'bad' or 'very bad' way of running the country" (p. 8).
    - In 1995 one in 16 respondents thought it a "good" or "very good" idea for the "army to rule" but that figure is now one in six.

The message is clear, "younger generations are less committed to the importance of democracy" and are "less likely to be politically engaged" (p. 10). Similar patterns are apparent across several nations of Europe (see Foa & Mounk, 2017; 2018).

Responding to Foa and Mounk's argument, political scientist Paul Howe (2017) agreed the evidence supports a growing and worrisome "skepticism concerning democracy as a form of government" (p. 20). From his analysis of the data, Howe noted in addition to shifting attitudes toward democracy a significant increase in antisocial attitudes among the younger compared to the older age cohorts. Respondents were asked "whether certain behaviors or practices are 'ever justifiable' based on a scale from 1 ('never justifiable') to 10 ('always justifiable')" (p. 20). Taking a bribe, cheating on taxes, claiming government benefits to which one was not entitled, and avoiding paying a public transit fare were among the behaviors surveyed. "Whereas 90 percent of those over age 60 say that taking a bribe is never justifiable, only 58 percent of those under 30 concur" (p. 20). Similar patterns followed for each behavior. Howe found a strong correlation between reported tolerance of antisocial acts and anti-democratic attitudes.

> [The results] do not suggest a direct causal link between views on any specific issue (evading taxes [and so on]) and general democratic dispositions. Instead, they imply that indifferent feelings toward democracy are interlaced with a broader set of self-interested and antisocial attitudes that are present among a substantial minority of the U.S. population. They also suggest that assessments of democracy do not operate strictly on a

> political plane. Deeper dispositions and embedded values color more abstract political evaluations. (p. 23).

There has been, according to Howe, a "slowly spreading" and "troubling syndrome of attitudes reflecting broad disregard for social norms . . . over the past few decades" (p. 24). Political scientist Alan Wolfe (2018) appears to be correct: "Even in well-established political systems, democracy is always fragile" (p. 36). To strengthen democracy, young people need experience living it.

A Turn to Education

When considering the condition of democracy in America authors of two articles published in the October issue of *The Atlantic*, Yoni Appelbaum (2018), a senior editor, and Jeffrey Rosen (2018), professor of law and a contributing editor, like Goodlad, Dewey and Bode looked toward education as offering means for challenging current anti-social trends. Rosen urged "a return to principles" James Madison identified underpinning a "constitutional education" (p. 93).

> To combat the power of factions, the Founders believed the people had to be educated about the structures of government in particular. "A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy; or, perhaps both," Madison wrote in 1822, supporting the Kentucky legislature's "Plan of Education embracing every class of Citizens." (p. 93)

By moving beyond a concern for knowing about democracy, Appelbaum (2018) extended Rosen's argument, suggesting there is need for developing what he described as the "democratic habit," suggesting, as Bullough and Rosenberg (2018) have argued, students (i.e. young people) require experience living democratically, of becoming democratically normed, and not just studying the ideas and essential activities involved in democratic citizenship. Appelbaum wrote,

> Young Americans of all backgrounds deserve the chance to write charters, elect officers, and work through the messy and frustrating process of self-governance. They need the opportunity to make mistakes, and resolve them, without advisers intervening. Such activities shouldn't be seen as extracurricular, but as the basic curriculum of democracy. In that respect, what students are doing–club sports, student council, the robotics team–matters less than how they're doing it and what they're gaining in the process: an appreciation for the role of rules and procedures in managing disputes . . . The next step is to translate that activity into other realms. (p. 77).

Goodlad and the Agenda for Education in a Democracy

That Appelbaum and Rosen would look to schooling to improve the health of American democracy would not surprise Goodlad. For decades he, along with many others, struggled with this issue. Grounded in 15 years of intensive field-based research (see chapter 2, Sirotnik & Associates, 2001), the Agenda for Education in a Democracy grew out of a "set of strong beliefs and assumptions about the nature of educational and organizational change and about the purposes of public education in a democracy" (p. 13). Under Goodlad's leadership in the 1980s several school-university partnerships formed the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) and, following "conversations" in 25 states in addition to on-going research, awareness increased of the need for greater clarity of purposes.

> The most critically important omission [in teacher education] is a vision that encompasses a good and just society, the centrality of education to the renewal of that society, the role of schools bringing this education equitably to all, and the kind of preparation teachers require for their stewardship of the nation's schools. This is the vision that provides the moral grounding of the teacher education mission and gives direction to those teachers of teachers responsible for designing coherent programs for the education of educators. (Goodlad, 1994, p. 4)

Sirotnik (2001) reported: the Agenda "was never intended to denote a list of specific items that could be ticked off one by one, as if one were conducting a fairly straightforward meeting. Rather, the word was intended to suggest a complex, long-term, morally grounded initiative that required major commitments over time by major players" (p. 28). The "players" or, more accurately, the "partners," were expected to include school and district personnel, university administrators, school of education and arts and sciences faculty, everyone who had a stake in the success of public education and teacher education.

Emergence of the Agenda led to a reconstituting of the NNER. For continuing membership, sites were expected to embrace and test the Agenda and thereby make it their own. As Goodlad wrote, the hope was that the NNER would "draw attention to the unique role of education in a democratic society and the need to foster sound educational policies and practices that would not only support the broad purposes of democratic schooling but would also make possible the ongoing process of renewal" (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004, p. 25).

The Agenda was composed of three elements: 1. A four-part mission; 2. A strategy – the *simultaneous renewal* of schools and teacher education; and 3. A set of problems or institutional and partnership "conditions"– a set of "postulates" – deemed essential to renewal success (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 28; for the Postulates, see Goodlad, 1994, pp. 72-94). The four-part mission became the *Moral Dimensions of Teaching*, each dimension representing a moral obligation held by educators (see Sirotnik, 2001, p. 29) and includes: 1. "*Enculturating the young into a social and political democracy*"; 2. "*Providing access to knowledge for all children and youths"*; 3. "*Practicing pedagogical nurturing* with respect to *art and science of teaching*"; and 4. "*Ensuring responsible stewardship of the schools*" (italics in original; Goodlad et al, 2004, pp. 29-32). Goodlad and his colleagues (2004) explained that the intent of the four-part mission of schools was to address the question, "What are schools for?" (p. 32). Consistent with Appelbaum and Rosen's interest in education, a central concern of the Agenda was and is the "need to educate the American public about schools and the roles they must play in both promoting and sustaining our democracy" (Goodlad, et al., 2004, pp. 35-36). Echoing Dewey's views, Goodlad and his colleagues concluded, "Most of us understand that schools are supposed to teach youngsters to read, write, and figure. Most of us assume that schools will do something to prepare the young to enter the workforce. . . But little thought is given to educating for citizenship in a social and political democracy, to developing the character, competence, and skills necessary for such citizenship" (Goodlad, et al., 2004, p. 36).

The Moral Dimensions of Teaching

Enculturating the young. Political scientist Benjamin Barber (1997) captured the sweeping vision underlying the Agenda when he wrote "Public schools are not merely schools *for* the public, but schools of publicness: institutions where we learn what it means to *be* a public

and start down the road toward common national and civic identity. They are the forges of our citizenship and the bedrock of our democracy" (p. 22). The challenge is, What is the democracy into which the young were to be enculturated? Views often differ. In addition, the word, "enculturate," as Sirotnik (2001) anticipated, has proven to be somewhat controversial, suggesting to some a process of passive socialization.

"Enculturate" *was* intended to "convey the idea of preparing future citizens for a 'cultural democracy,' one marked by the consensus and commonality required for a healthy and functioning civic and democratic society" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 28). The belief was that there was no simple operational definition of democracy that schools could or should embrace; there were no blueprints (see Goodlad, 1994, p. 129). Rather, akin to developments within the Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association (Kridel & Bullough, 2007), the expectation was that partners in the various sites would negotiate relationships and strive to realize social ideals, rights and responsibilities, that would convey commitment to a form of institutional life that was recognizably democratic. Recent work undertaken within the BYU-Public School Partnership to describe what sort of way of life democracy represents has focused on "the manners of democracy" (see Bullough & Rosenberg, 2018). Democratic manners include hospitality (in support of conversation) and a "robust commitment to *listening and* '*listening out for*' *the other.*" So understood, the requirement is a "*dialogic* democracy, one that unites and balances voice with the openness required to hear others' voices" (p. 90).

The process of *enculturation* calls attention to the indirect nature of education: As Dewey (1916) argued, "We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment" (p. 22). Extending the point, the philosopher Thomas Green wrote, "one does not learn the norms of cooperation and then apply them . . . one simply comes to be cooperative. One comes to be normed" (p. 49), strongly or weakly. Hence, one learns to live democratically by actively participating in social environments that seek to be democratic. Bode (1937) made the point this way, "Teaching democracy in the abstract is on a par with teaching swimming by correspondence" (p. 75). Democracy, then, ought to find place not only in the formal curriculum as a topic for study but in both the informal and hidden curriculum that underpin the practices of schooling from the library to the lunch room and the classroom to the school commons.

Providing access to knowledge. "Obviously, access to watered-down curricula or curricula that fail to include substantial encounters with the disciplines that have defined human knowledge and understanding is no access at all" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 29). The concern expressed in the second Moral Dimension of Teaching, as Goodlad and his colleagues (2004) stated, was that often the most valuable forms of knowledge "have traditionally been poorly distributed within and among most schools. Poor and minority youngsters are those most frequently disenfranchised" (p. 30). Sirotnik (2001) described such practices as "morally indefensible" (p. 29). Similarly, access to quality instruction has been unequally distributed, and this too must change.

Nurturing pedagogy. The third Moral Dimension of Teaching calls attention to student-teacher relationships as well as to the importance of teachers possessing significant pedagogical skill and knowledge. Teacher-student relationships are central to all things educational. "The emotional bond between students and teacher–for better and worse–accounts for whether students learn" (Willingham, 2009, p. 65). Because schooling is compulsory for the young, "a quite special and unique burden is placed on the teacher. The teacher-student relationship in public schools takes on a moral dimension that is fundamentally different from, for example, that

which exists for private schools" (Goodlad et al., 2004, p. 31). Teachers must be caring and part of caring is to model and practice nurturing pedagogy but additionally this dimension offers a reminder that "taking seriously the art and science of teaching is indispensable to a morally based agenda for education in a democracy" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 29). Nurturing pedagogy "requires educators . . . to become students of teaching and of their own teaching practice" (Bullough & Rosenberg, 2018, p. 108) so that practice is consistently improving and is renewing.

Responsible Stewardship. "The fourth moral obligation requires that educators take responsibility for much more than just their classrooms and students. They, with their colleagues, must be responsible for the whole of the organization" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 29). More specifically, as Goodlad and his colleagues (2004) later argued, "teachers . . . must be purposefully engaged in the renewal process" (p. 32; see below). Carefully considering the extent of the stewardship responsibilities held by educators, Bullough and Rosenberg (2018) argue educators have a steward's responsibility for the future, for mind and memory (our own and our students'), for possibility–the dream of democratic education–as well as for democratic character (see pp. 141-145). Moreover, they argue that stewardship *is* a moral posture (p. 147).

Simultaneous Renewal

As an "overarching strategy" for educational improvement simultaneous renewal grew out of an argument that is "as simple in theory as it is difficult in practice: We cannot have better schools without better teachers, and we cannot have better teachers without better schools" (Sirotnik, 2001, p. 30). Metaphors matter; how we talk about the work of education determines outcomes, determining what opportunities and problems are recognized as legitimate and how problems are framed for management or resolution. The focus on *renewal* rather than *reform*, *restructuring* or *reculturing* is fundamentally important. For Goodlad improvement was first a learning problem. In contrast, *reform* suggests a reshuffling, rearranging or perhaps reshaping of the parts of an existing practice: New wine poured into old bottles. *Reform* also conveys images of fixing a broken something or someone; in this sense, to reform is to identify and remediate deficits. *Restructuring* suggests disassembling then reassembling; old parts are used to realize what is believed to be a new design. When relationships are altered and new purposes are introduced, reforming and restructuring may lead to *reculturing*, a changed life form or pattern of living that may or may not have anything at all to do the values and commitments that ground a democratic way of life. Reforming, restructuring, and reculturing, in contrast to renewing, each suggest that something is done to or for someone else, someone who possesses less power and understanding who is to be remade. *Renewal*, by comparison, like democracy, grows out of a different set of commitments—faith and trust in the ability of persons to learn, to grow, and to make wise and generous decisions affecting their own and other's futures when given the opportunity to do so and when supported in gaining requisite knowledge, understanding and social sensibilities. As John Dewey (1916) argued, democracy is a theory of education. Fixating on deficiencies rather than inviting engagement in reimagining a shared future is one certain way to undermine partnership ambitions before they get off the ground.

The Agenda and the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP)

Based on research conducted in the 1970s and continuing, Goodlad and his colleagues concluded that the "renewal of schools and the education of those who work in them had to go hand in hand for there to be significant educational improvement" (1994, p. 105). To that end, the Southern California School-University Partnership was created. Hearing of the partnership, in 1983 the dean of education at Brigham Young University (BYU) "showed up" at Goodlad's office at UCLA where he was dean. Goodlad reported: "[The visiting BYU dean] and some colleagues had resonated to the concepts of mutual collaboration that we had employed at UCLA. [He] saw them as having profound implications for the mission and activities of the college over which he presided" (1994, p. 105). The dean made Goodlad an offer to spend part of the next year working with BYU faculty to create a partnership. Goodlad agreed. At the end of that year, the intent was to formalize a partnership between the university and five school districts then enrolling about 30 percent of the students in Utah.

Of his final week of the year spent visiting Utah, Goodlad (1994) wrote:

> To BYU personnel early on in our meetings, I posed the questions, "What might you have to gain from a close partnership with the schools?" About a dozen major areas of potential benefit emerged. On Wednesday, at the meeting on their turf, I asked the five superintendents the same question. Again, about a dozen major topics emerged. There was overlap in about half of the topics agreed upon by each group. On Thursday of that week, on the neutral turf of the hotel, I presented six topics identified commonly by the two groups as a possible agenda for collaboration. With incredible speed and unanimity, the combined groups agreed to form a school-university partnership to address [these] overlapping self-interest[s], which included . . . the preparation of school principals, curriculum development, and research on critical problem areas. (p. 107)

Thirty-six years later, despite extensive and continuing participant turnover, the partnership is still living and still governed by the dean of education and the five district superintendents who share resources and commitment to the partnership.

Goodlad (1994) identified a handful of lessons about partnering following his time at BYU that are instructive. Among the lessons were these: The importance of making certain "the conditions necessary to a symbiotic relationship are present" (p. 106); and "if in seeking the satisfaction of one's own needs, the needs of the partners are ignored, the partnership will soon dissolve" (p. 106). Among the essential conditions, as described within the Postulates (the third element of the Agenda mentioned above), is that "Programs for the education of the nation's educators must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution's top leadership" (Postulate 1, Goodlad, 1994, p. 72). Partnering is expensive, especially if is to be "symbiotic" (Goodlad, 1999, p. 81). In addition, reflecting on his partnership experience, Goodlad (1994) concluded, "school-university partnerships will be successful only to the degree that they are forged early on and address consciously a common agenda" (p. 107). Wryly, he commented, "There is in the excess baggage of democracy the benign and often dysfunctional belief that good intentions accompanied by good will are sufficient to bring about near-miracles. Sometimes they do, but at least as often prolonged inability to agree on an agenda converts good will to ill will" (Goodlad, 1999, pp. 86-7). A "loosely constructed umbrella of collaboration," Goodlad warned, one that relies primarily on "mutual goodwill" rather than clarity of purpose and strength of commitment, is "bound to collapse" (p. 108). Uncertain or confused aims

undermine trust, dissipate energy, and weaken commitment needed to work through challenging times.

Partnerships face many threats. Among them are fluctuating and uncertain resource streams, key people moving on or retiring, pressing time demands, conflicting institutional values, and diverting, insistent and often unexpected problems. Strength of relationship, shared histories of commitment and trust, clarity of vision, and consistent institutional investment and support are, as Goodlad suggested, essential to partnership survival. Goodlad's colleague, Richard Clark (1999), underscored these conclusions when examining failed partnerships: "the two partnerships that died . . . lost sight of their original purpose and failed to develop a clearly articulated new purpose" (p. 51).

Learning Together: The Agenda and Simultaneous Renewal

After leaving UCLA for Seattle, Goodlad and his colleagues formed the Center for Educational Renewal (CER) associated with the University of Washington. From this base, as Sirotnik (2001; see also Goodlad, et al., 2004) described, an astonishing amount of activity followed designed to join "inquiry with practice" (p. 5). Studies, large and small, were conducted, books and articles were published, conferences were convened, the National Network for Educational Renewal was founded, as noted above, and later reconstituted, and the Institute for Educational Inquiry, a nonprofit, was formed to "put into practice the research findings of the CER" (p. 6). And there was more. Refining and extending the strategy of simultaneous renewal led to development in Seattle of what initially were thought of as seminars involving educators from across the Network in support of the study of the emerging Agenda. The intention was to build and strengthen a cadre of engaged and knowledgeable school and university leaders committed to partnering. Moreover, annual NNER conferences brought sites together for sharing, discussion and learning. Work of this kind, as Bullough and Rosenberg (2018) have argued, is designed to build and strengthen the relationships of a hospitable commons (see pp. 47-59).

Through the Network and through participation in the study groups, described as "Associates," educators from the various partnerships across the country extended Goodlad's influence as they gained in understanding of partnering and the Agenda (Smith & Fenstermacher, 1999). To build and strengthen relationships and extend shared understanding, the BYU-PSP, among other partnerships, developed its own Associates programs drawing initially on the Seattle curriculum as a model.

> The idea was presented to the [partnership] governing board at its January 1995 meeting. The proposal contained two programs, each designed for a different audience, but each targeting the need to increase the number of people in the organization who understood the key ideas of the partnership and could add to the generative leadership capacity of our NNER setting. The first program called for a leadership retreat [Leaders Associates] to be held twice annually for the purposes of building a shared education base and encouraging a more proactive leadership stance that would develop strategies and related projects for improving teacher education and schools. . . The second proposed program was to create an Associates cohort of eighteen to twenty people chosen from the faculty and administration of the five school districts and the university. (Patterson & Hughes, 1999, p. 272).

Both the Leaders Associates and the district associates are continuing. Well over two thousand educators have participated in the district associates, which now includes study groups associated with each of the five districts and university personnel who meet in five two-day retreats across an academic year (see Bullough & Rosenberg, 2018, Chapter 7). One school district has also organized building level study groups. A more recent development is an annual school of education retreat held each June that centers on one or another partnership aim or value.

Since teacher education is not only the concern of schools and departments and colleges of education, over time, Goodlad and his colleagues directed greater attention to creating ways of more effectively partnering with arts and science faculty. Associates provided one such strategy, but others were required. "For renewal to work effectively in the programs that prepare tomorrow's teachers, educators in the arts and sciences would need to be just as involved in the process as those in departments of education. But there were no existing structures that could accommodate such a change strategy. To make such collaboration possible, the idea of creating a *center of pedagogy* was born" (Goodlad, et al., 2004, p. 116). The aim was a three-way, a *tripartite*, partnership: public education, schools of education, the arts and sciences.

Centers of pedagogy were slow to develop (see Goodlad et al., 2004, p. 116). Part of the challenge was that only rarely was teacher education seen as a responsibility of or as important to faculty outside of departments or colleges of education despite the obvious fact that the majority of intending teachers' course work was housed in academic departments. At BYU, the Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES) was approved in 1996 by the university with a pledge of "administrative and monetary support" (Patterson, Michelli, & Pacheco, 1999, p. 115). Gradually, over the years, teacher education has increasingly come to be understood at BYU as a university-wide responsibility, a vision cemented when in 2003 the University Committee on Teacher Education (UCOTE), a policy-making body, was established with associate dean level representatives from all seven of the colleges involved in teacher education, the dean of education and the director of CITES and chaired by the associate academic vice president responsible for undergraduate education.

CITES has many functions in addition to Associates. Among the partnership initiatives is a large, endowed, and ongoing project in school arts education, a project in mathematics education and a mathematics teacher endorsement, a positive behavior support program attached to one of the partner districts, district-based research internships for select graduate students enrolled in a measurement and evaluation program, diverse studies of teacher education and teaching, and a fellows program that partially funds partnership-related research.

Evolving Aims

As Goodlad anticipated, as partnerships mature and especially as leadership turns over programs evolve and aims may change. So it has been for the BYU-PSP. After many years of close involvement with the partnership, the work in Seattle eventually slowed. Key leaders passed on or away. The BYU-Public School Partnership changed significantly following retirement in 2002 of dean Robert Patterson whose 11 years of leadership were transformative. The NNER also evolved as its leadership changed. Healthy partnerships periodically must review (if only to reaffirm) their purposes; drift in the face of the near overwhelming complexity of the work of partnering is a persistent danger. After Goodlad's partnership involvement diminished, during a period of introspection following changes in the NNER, despite being an

original member, in 2010 the BYU-PSP withdrew. In the time that followed, a slow turn toward the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) as an arena within which to engage in the wider conversation about partnerships and partnering began. Happily, the NAPDS proved to be welcoming. Pressures at home arising from vocal and sometimes angry enemies of public education also encouraged review of partnership values and purposes. A large, diverse, and complex committee was formed to consider future directions of the partnership. Over months of deliberation, which included a dramatic rejection of the initial work of the committee by the Leaders Associates at one of its retreats, the committee eventually produced a statement of aims for the partnership that grew out the Agenda for Education in a Democracy but better reflected the partner's experience.

The Commitments. The new mission and statement of aims took the form of four *beliefs* and a set of five shared partnership *commitments*. Echoing Goodlad and his colleagues, the first belief states that "Public education is the cornerstone of a civil and prosperous democracy" while the others recognize education as a shared responsibility, the importance for the young of both academic mastery and personal development, and the value of research and inquiry to improving educational quality. The commitments, which currently structure the district-level associates programs, include: 1. Civic preparation and engagement; 2. Engaged learning through nurturing pedagogy; 3. Equitable access to academic knowledge and achievement; 4. Stewardship in school and community; and 5. Commitment to [simultaneous] renewal. Each commitment includes a statement that clarifies and fills out partnership intent. For example, speaking to social aims, the first commitment includes the following statement: "The Partnership prepares educators who model and teach the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for civic virtue and engagement in our society" (http://education.byu.edu/cites/new_statement.html) In addition to serving as a mission statement for the partnership, the Commitments also serve as a mission statement for at least one of the five partner districts, a decision made by vote of the school board.

Conclusion

Early in this article Bode was quoted when he wrote that a democratic system of education ought to "be distinctive in quality and content." As suggested, John Goodlad understood and shared this belief and recognized that in university-school partnerships a unique and special opportunity resides for educators to explore and realize the educational meaning of democracy and thereby to grow morally and professionally. The issues raised by Foa and Mounk underscore the importance of Goodlad's project for our own time and of his belief in democracy as an essential "surround" (his word) supportive of the fullest development of human capacity and moral goodness. As Goodlad understood, when tightly linked to democratic citizenship aspirations, partnering represents a distinctive form of community building and ethics, points too seldom considered within current partnership discussions. Of community, Dewey (1916) wrote, "Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common. What they must have in common in order to form a community or society are aims, beliefs, aspirations, knowledge–a common understanding–like-mindedness as the sociologists say" (p. 5). Dewey (1927) understood that "neighborly" communities are places within which democracy "must begin" (p. 213). Such places can serve as commons – like schools, like Associates, and like

partnerships – and within such spaces people of goodwill come together, greet one another hospitably, cross thresholds, and hopefully will engage in the practice of "dialogic democracy" (see Bullough & Rosenberg, 2018, see Chapters 3-5). In commons and through purposeful activity and focused conversation within partnerships friendships form and the range of shared interests expands. When this happens, provincialism weakens, appreciation for and interest in otherness grows, and, eventually, understood as a learning problem, practice improves. These are among the potential fruits of partnering Goodlad sought. But to realize them, as he argued, first and foremost, they must be articulated as part of a shared and explicit agenda, an understanding that seems missing within the Essentials. An agenda is required because, as Goodlad and his colleagues reminded their readers, "democracies never *just happen*" (2004, p. 36).

References

Appelbaum, Y. (2018). Losing the democratic habit. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 74-77.

Applebaum, A. (2018). A warning from Europe. *That Atlantic Monthly*, *322*(3), 53-63.

Barber, B.R. (1997). Public schooling: Education for a democracy. In J.I. Goodlad & T.J. McMannon (Eds.), *The public purpose of public education* (pp. 21-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bode, B.H. (1937). *Democracy as a way of life*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., & Rosenberg, J.R. (2018). Schooling, democracy, and the quest for wisdom: Partnership and the moral dimensions of teaching. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Chua, A. & Rubenfeld, J. (2018). The threat of tribalism. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 322(3), 78-81.

Clark, R.W. (1999). *Effective professional development schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems.* New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Freedom and culture*. New York, NY: Putnam.

Foa, R.S., & Mounk, Y. (2016). The danger of deconsolidation: The democratic disconnect. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(3), 5-17.

Foa, R.S. & Mounk, S. (2017). The signs of deconsolidation. *Journal of Democracy*, 28(1), 5-15.

Foa, R.S. & Mounk, S. (2018). The end of the consolidation paradigm: A response to our critics. DOI: https//www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exchange-"democratic-deconsolidation"

Goodlad, J.I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J.I. (1999). Simultaneously renewing schools and teacher education: Perils and promises. In R.W. Clark, *Effective professional development schools* (pp.70-89). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J.I., (2007) Preface. C. Kridel & R.V. Bullough, Jr. Stories *of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining secondary education in America.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Goodlad, J.I., Mantel-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S.J. (2004). Education for everyone: *Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Green, T.F. (1999). *Voices: The educational formation of conscience.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Howe, P. (2017). Eroding norms and democratic deconsolidation. *Journal of Democracy*, *28*(4), 15-29.
Kridel, C. A. & Bullough, R. V. Jr. (2007). *Stories of the eight-year study: Reexamining secondary education in America.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Patterson, R.S. & Hughes, K.H. (1999). The Utah associates program for leaders. In W.F. Smith & G.D. Fenstermacher (Eds.), *Leadership for Educational Renewal: Developing a Cadre of Leaders* (pp. 271-288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Patterson, R.S., Michelli, N.M. & Pacheco, A. (1999). *Centers of pedagogy: New structures for educational renewal*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Rosen, J. (2018). Madison vs. the mob. *The Atlantic Monthly*, *322*(3), 88-93.
Sirotnik, K.A., & Associates. (2001). *Renewing schools & teacher education: An odyssey in educational change.* Washington, D.C.: AACTE Publications.
Smith, W.F. & Fenstermacher, G.D. (Eds.) (1999). *Leadership for educational renewal: Developing a cadre of leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Willingham, D.T. (2009). *Why don't students like schools?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Wolfe, A. (2018). *The politics of petulance: America in an age of immaturity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Robert V. Bullough, Jr., is associate director of the Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling. His most recent books include Essays on teaching education and the inner drama of teaching: Where troubles meet issues (2019), Schooling, democracy, and the quest for wisdom: Partnerships and the moral dimensions of teaching (with John Rosenberg, 2018) and Preschools teaches' lives and work: Stories and studies from the field (with Kendra Hall-Kenyon, 2018).