CCNews
Newsletter of the California Council on Teacher Education

"Beyond Collaboration — Fostering Communities of Practice" Is the Theme for Fall 2003 Conference

The theme for the Fall 2003 CCTE Conference, which will be held October 30 to November 1 at the Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina in San Diego, is "Beyond Collaboration — Fostering Communities of Practice." The Conference will be co-sponsored by the Independent California Colleges and Universities Council on the Education of Teachers and the California Association of Professors of Special Education.

The Conference program will explore issues and developments in teacher education across California at the college and university, community college, county office, and school district levels, with an emphasis on cooperative ventures between these levels.

Etienne Wenger of North San Juan, California, a consultant, researcher, author, and speaker who is a pioneer in "communities of practice" research, will be the featured speaker on Friday, October 31. Wenger holds a Ph.D. in artificial intelligence from the University of California, Irvine, and developed a new learning theory centered on the concept of community of practice while with the Institute for Research on Learning.

The Conference program on Thursday, October 30, will begin with presentations from the wide variety of institutions that comprise the teacher education community in California. The Conference will also include meetings of the Special Interest Groups, concurrent research and best practice sessions, policy sessions, a Thursday evening reception and banquet, an awards luncheon on Friday, and a concluding session on Saturday morning, November 1, focusing on policymaking and including a policy workshop conducted by Elizabeth Jimenez, our CCTE Legislative and Educational Policy Analyst.

The planning committee for the Fall Conference offers the following overview:

As California moves toward implementation of change, and our effectiveness is questioned by some national leaders, we look to the concept of building significant learning communities that can transform how we engage in the education of future teachers. How do we deeply engage with our partners — university subject matter faculty, community college faculty, K-12 practitioners, and policymakers — to move beyond simple collaboration to the building of a collective expertise that can strengthen our programs? How can we integrate and link the subject matter base of our candidates with their pedagogical understandings? How do we work with community college partners to provide a seamless higher education experience for our candidates? How do we significantly include K-12 practitioners in our communities? How can we engage higher education administrators to facilitate structural change that can strengthen our communities? How do we include policymakers in our communities? How do we overcome limitations of physical proximity that hinder our engagement as communities of practice? The CCTE Fall 2003 Conference will bring together various stakeholders to explore and demonstrate how to strengthen the greatest resource we have — our collective expertise — to help us architect communities that support strong teacher education programs.

The co-chairs of the planning committee for the Fall 2003 Conference are Cindy Grutzik of Pacific Oaks College, Hillary Hertzog of California State University, Northridge, and Jaime Romo of the University of San Diego.

The formal announcement and registration materials for the Fall 2003 Conference were mailed out to all CCTE delegates, members, and friends in August. The tentative program for the Fall Conference appears on page 2 of this issue of CCNews, and the registration form appears on page 3. The pre-registration deadline for the Conference is October 10, and on-site registration will be available as always.

In preparation for presentations and discussions at the Conference, CCTE delegates, members, and friends are encouraged to read the article entitled "Communities of Practice" by Etienne Wenger that begins on page 4 of this newsletter.

Fall Conference To-Dos

Register now if you haven't already — see registration form on page 3.

Check out the tentative program — see page 2.

Read Etienne Wenger's article on "Communities of Practice" — starting on page 4.

Tentative Fall 2003 CCTE Conference Program

Wednesday, October 29:
9 a.m. to 5 p.m. - Statewide meeting of CalStateTEACH.
Noon to 5 p.m. - Meeting of **Board of Directors** of the California Council on Teacher Education.

Thursday, October 30:
9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. - **Conference Registration & Exhibits Room.**
9:00 a.m. to Noon - Meeting of the **California Association of Professors of Special Education.**
9:30 a.m. to Noon - **Independent California Colleges and Universities Council on Education of Teachers**
    (begins with Continental Breakfast; meeting starts at 10:00 a.m.).
Noon to 1:15 p.m. - **First Set of Special Interest Groups**:
    Case Methods, Democratic Classroom Management, Educational Foundations, Lives of Teachers, National
    Board Certification, and Special Education (see list of CCTE SIGs on page 9 for further details).
1:15 to 1:30 p.m. - Break.
1:30 to 2:45 p.m. - **Opening Session**: Introductions, Conference Orientation, Activities, Stories.
2:45 to 3:00 p.m. - Break.
3:00 to 4:00 p.m. - **Policy Presentation**.
4:00 to 4:15 p.m. - Break.
4:15 to 5:45 p.m. - **First Policy Session and Delegate Assembly**, fearturing organizational and policy updates.
5:45 to 6:30 p.m. - **Joint Presidents' Reception & Social Hour.**
6:30 to 8:30 p.m. - **Conference Banquet**.

Friday, October 31:
7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. - *Teacher Education Quarterly* **Editorial Board Meeting.**
8:00 to 9:00 a.m. - *Issues in Teacher Education* **Editorial Board Meeting.**
8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. - **Conference Registration and Exhibits Room.**
8:00 a.m. - Coffee & Danish.
8:00 to 9:15 a.m. - **Second Set of Special Interest Groups**:
    Coalition for Educational Renewal, Credential Program Coordinators, Equity and Social Justice, Portfolio
    Assessment, Service Learning, and Technology and Teacher Education (see list of CCTE SIGs on page 9 for
    further details).
9:15 to 9:30 a.m. - Break.
9:30 to 10:30 a.m. - **First Set of Research and Best Practice Sessions**.
10:30 tp 10:45 a.m. - Break.
10:45 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. - **Keynote Address by Etienne Wenger**, followed by related activities.
12:30 to 1:30 p.m. - **Conference Luncheon**, with semi-annual CCTE awards presentations.
1:30 to 2:30 p.m. - **Second Set of Research and Best Practice Sessions.**
2:30 to 2:45 p.m. - Break.
2:45 to 3:30 p.m. - **Reprise with Etienne Wenger**, reflections on the day and the Conference.
3:30 to 3:34 p.m. - Break.
3:45 to 5:00 p.m. - **Second Policy Session.**
5:00 p.m. - **Trick or Treat.**

Saturday, November 1:
8:00 to 9:00 a.m. - Coffee & Danish, with Policy Panel Conversation with CCTE Delegates and Members.
9:00 to 10:30 a.m. - **Policy Panel Presentation**, featuring educational policymakers and CCTE leaders.
10:30 a.m. to Noon - **Advocacy Workshop,** conducted by Elizabeth Jimenez, CCTE Legislative and Educational
    Policy Advocate.
Noon - Final comments and Conference adjournment.

California Council on Teacher Education Fall 2003 Conference Registration Form
October 30 to November 1, Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina, San Diego

Please register me for the Fall 2003 Conference!

Name _____

Preferred Mailing Address _____

_____

(include ZIPcode)

Telephone _____

E-Mail _____

Institutional Affiliation _____

Registration Category (check the appropriate one):
    Basic Pre-Registration - $200 (will be $225 on site)
    Special for First-Time Registrants - $150 (will be $175 on site)
    Special for Students - $100 (will be $125 on site)

Food Service (check those desired):
    Thursday Box Lunch - $25
    Conference Banquet (Thursday evening) - $35
    Conference Luncheon (Friday noon) - $30
    Check here if you wish vegetarian meals.

CAPSE Meeting and Refreshments (Thursday morning):
    Special Fee for Those Attending - $15

ICCUCET Continental Breakfast and Meeting (Thursday morning)
    Special Fee for Those Attending - $20

Total from boxes checked above (please enclose check for this amount payable to CCTE): $_____

Membership in CCTE:
    It is not necessary to be a CCTE delegate or member to register for and attend the Conference;
    However, if you are not already a delegate or member, please consider joining
    (use the membership form on the reverse, and include membership dues in your check).

CCTE Special Interest Groups Will Meet on Thursday and Friday, and *all* attendees are urged to attend a SIG of their choosing each day (check the ones you plan to attend; see further details in listing on page 9):

SIGs meeting on Thursday:	SIGs meeting on Friday:
Case Methods in Teacher Education	Coalition for Educational Renewal
Democratic Classroom Management	Credential Program Coordinators
Educational Foundations	Equity and Social Justice
Lives of Teachers	Portfolio Assessment
National Board Certification	Service Learning
Special Education	Technology and Teacher Education

Send completed form with check payable to "CCTE" to: Alan H. Jones, CCTE Executive Secretary,
    3145 Geary Boulevard PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118
Pre-registration deadline is October 10; no refunds after that date. On-site registration will be available.

Communities of Practice
By Etienne Wenger

The term "community of practice" is of relatively recent coinage, even though the phenomenon it refers to is age-old and social scientists have talked about it under various guises. In a nutshell, a community of practice is a group of people who share an interest in a domain of human endeavor and engage in a process of collective learning that creates bonds between them: a tribe, a garage band, a group of engineers working on similar problems.

Not everything called a community is a community of practice. A neighborhood for instance, is often called a community, but is usually not a community of practice. Three characteristics are crucial:

1. The domain: Since a community of practice is focused on a domain of shared interest, it is not merely a club of friends or a network of connections between people. Membership therefore implies a minimum level of knowledge of that domain — a shared competence that distinguishes members from other people. (You could belong to the same network as someone and never know it.) The domain is not necessarily something recognized as "expertise" outside the community. A youth gang may have developed all sorts of ways of dealing with their domain: surviving on the street and maintaining some kind of identity they can live with.

2. The community: In pursuing their interest in their domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. That is how they form a community around their domain and build relationships. Having the same job or the same title does not make for a community of practice unless members interact and learn together. The claims processors in a large insurance company or the students in American high schools may have much in common, but unless they interact, they do not form a community of practice. The Impressionists, for instance, used to meet in cafes and studios to discuss the style of painting they were inventing together. These interactions were essential to making them a community of practice even though they usually painted alone.

3. The practice: A community of practice is not merely a community of interest — people who like certain kinds of movies, for instance. Members of a community of practice develop a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems — in short a shared practice. This takes time. A good conversation with a stranger on an airplane may give you all sorts of interesting insights, but it does not in itself make for a community of practice. The development of a shared practice may be more or less self-conscious. The "windshield wip-

ers" community of practice at an auto mamufacturer makes a concerted effort to collect and document the tricks and lessons they have learned into a knowledge base. By contrast, nurses who meet regularly for lunch in a hospital cafeteria may not realize that their lunch discussions are one of their main sources of knowledge about how to care for patients, even though in the course of all these conversations, they have developed a set of stories and cases that become a shared repertoire for them to think about and discuss new cases.

We all belong to communities of practice. They have been around for as long as human beings have learned together. At home, at work, at school, in our hobbies, we belong to several communities of practice at any given time. And the communities of practice to which we belong change over the course of our lives. In fact, communities of practice are everywhere.

Theoreticians often wonder whether the concept of community of practice is an analytical category, whether it exists only in the theoretician's mind, or whether it refers to actual social structures in the world. The answer is that it is both.

The extent to which any social structure is a community of practice is not something that can be determined in the abstract. Is a family a community of practice? What about a group of workers? A sports team? An orchestra? A classroom? This is always an empirical question that can only be resolved by analyzing the way the group operates. In this sense, the concept is an analytical category.

Yet, you can go into the world and actually see communities of practice at work. Moreover, these communities are not beyond the awareness of those who belong to them, even though participants may not use this language to describe their experience. Members can usually discuss what their communities of practice are about, who else belongs, and what competence is required to qualify as a member.

Communities of practice are a familiar experience, so familiar perhaps that it escapes our attention. Yet when it is given a name and brought into focus, it helps us understand the world better. In particular, it allows us to see the social world as structured by engagement in practice and the informal learning that comes with it, rather than more obvious formal structures such as institutional boundaries.

Theoretical Applications

Why have many social scientists found the concept of community of practice to be a useful unit of analysis? Well, if you want to understand broad issues such as culture, identity, and learning in terms of the processes by which people

create systems of meanings, then it is useful to consider a unit of analysis where these processes involve a direct experience of engagement for participants.

Communities of practice break down the traditional dichotomy in social theory between perspectives that give primacy to structure (history, culture, myths, or class, of which moments of life are mere instantiations) and perspectives that give primacy to immediate experience (local interactions, of which broader structures as an emergent property). A community of practice is a mid-level unit of analysis that combines both elements. It is neither an abstract structure nor a passing experience. Unlike a culture, it is within the reach of individual participants. Members of a community of practice contribute to the development of the practice through direct engagement in their community. Unlike momentary interactions, however, a community of practice has an enduring character as a social structure. It can therefore accumulate collective cultural resources over time. It is an elementary structure that has all the characteristics of social life — the "cell" of cultural production and reproduction.

Social scientists have used the concept of community of practice for a variety of analytical purposes, but the primary use of the concept has been in learning theory. The concept originated in studies of apprenticeship (Lave & Wenger, 1991). People usually think of apprenticeship as a relationship between a student and a master, but studies of apprenticeship reveal a more complex set of social relationships through which learning takes place — with journeymen and more advanced apprentices. The term community of practice was coined to refer to the community that acts as a living curriculum for the apprentice. Then researchers started to see these communities everywhere, even when no formal apprenticeship system existed.

As a basis for a general social learning theory, however, the learning processes of a community of practice are not limited to training novices. The practice of a community is dynamic and involves learning on the part of everyone. The shared competence defined by the community is always in interplay with the experience of members. Sometimes, as in the case of apprenticeship, it is the competence of the community that pulls the experience of the novice until the novice has a full experience of competence. Sometimes, members bring new ideas and insights: it is their experience that pulls the competence of the community along. One can think of learning as a tension between competence and experience (Wenger, 1998). Whenever either starts pulling the other, learning takes place. Learning so defined is a dynamic, two-way relationship between people and their communities. It combines personal transformation with the evolution of social structures.

While the concept of community of practice has been most widely used to analyze learning and the social organization of knowledge, it has also been useful for investigating other aspects of the social world: the construction of subcultures as a form of institutional resistance (Eckert, 1989); the

reproduction of social classes (Willis, 1977); the formation of identities as trajectories through communities of practice and multimembership combining the simultaneous influence of multiple communities (Wenger, 1998); local meanings and linguistic change through engagement in shared practice (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992).

It is often useful to look at a social entity — a culture, a linguistic group, a "social world" (Strauss, 1978), an organization — as a constellation of communities of practice. Such social entities are best understood, not as a uniform group, but as a complex set of interconnected communities of practice, each with its own local "mini-culture" as it were. Such a perspective makes it possible to understand local differences as well as the processes by which broad patterns are recreated in practice. The overarching entity then is the emerging property of interactions within and among local practices (Wenger, 1998; Brown & Duguid, 2000).

Practical Applications

Beyond social theory, the concept of community of practice has found a number of practical applications in business, organizational design, education, and civic life.

Business organizations. The concept has been adopted most readily by people in business because of the increasing need to focus explicitly on knowledge (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2001). Initial efforts had focused on information systems with disappointing results. Communities of practice provided a new approach, focused on the social structures that could best assume ownership for complex and dynamic knowledge with substantial tacit components. A number of characteristics make communities of practice a natural fit.

Unlike training or research departments, they are not separate units. Rather they pervade the organization, since people belong to communities of practice at the same time as they belong to their business units or teams.

Communities of practice address the informal and tacit aspects of knowledge creation and sharing, as well as the more explicit aspects.

They allow a much closer connection between learning and doing, while still providing structures where learning can accumulate.

In a time of globalization and disaggregation, they create connections among people across institutional boundaries and potentially across the globe.

From this perspective, the knowledge of an organization lives in a constellation of communities of practice each taking care of a specific aspect of the competence that the organization needs. However, the very characteristics that make communities of practice a good fit for stewarding knowledge — autonomy, practitioner-orientation, informality, crossing boundaries — are also characteristics that make them a chal-

lenge for traditional hierarchical organizations. How this challenge is going to affect these organizations remains to be seen.

Education. In business, focusing on communities of practice adds a layer of complexity to the organization — a kind of orthogonal structure focused on knowledge, while the core structure of the organization still focuses on business processes and results. But they do not imply a restructuring the whole system. Schools have been a bit slower at adopting the concept of communities of practice because sharing knowledge is already their main activity, and adopting communities of practice as a basic organizing principle implies a deeper rethinking of their structure. In educational circles, the hope is that communities of practice could bring the experience of schooling closer to everyday life along three dimensions.

Internally: How to ground school learning experiences in practice through participation in communities around subject matters?

Externally: How to connect the experience of students to actual practice through peripheral forms of participation in broader communities beyond the walls of the school?

Over the lifetime of students: How to serve the lifelong learning needs of students by organizing communities of practice focused on topics of continuing interest to students beyond the schooling period?

From this perspective, the school is not the privileged locus of learning. It is not a self-contained, closed world in which students acquire knowledge to be applied outside, but a part of a broader learning system. The class is not the primary learning event. It is life itself that is the main learning event. Schools, classrooms, and training sessions still have a role to play in this vision, but they have to be in the service of the learning that happens in the world.

More generally, the concept of community of practice has promise in suggesting ways to organize societies around issues and functions. The US government and the World Bank are experimenting with these approaches by connecting people across cities and countries with practice-based communities that complement place-based communities. New technologies such as the Internet have extended the reach of our interactions beyond the geographical limitations of traditional communities, but the increasing flow of information does not obviate the need for community. In fact, it expands the possibilities for community and calls for new kinds of communities based on shared practice.

References

Brown, J. & Duguid, P. (2000). *The social life of information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Identity in the American high school.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Eckert P. & *McConnell*-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and act locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21: 461-90.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. (1978) A social-world perspective. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction.* 1: 119-28.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2001). *Communities of practice: A practitioner's guide*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working-class kids get working-class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dates of Future CCTE Semi-Annual Conferences

Fall 2003 - October 30 to November 1 — Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina, San Diego
Spring 2004 — April 1-3 - Hyatt Sainte Claire Hotel, San Jose
Fall 2004 — October 7-9, Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina, San Diego
Spring 2005 — March 31 to April 2, Hyatt Sainte Claire Hotel, San Jose

A Message from CCTE President Andrea Maxie:

Teacher Preparation Research and Education Policy

With this Fall 2003 issue of *CCNews,* I continue to ponder the topic of teacher quality, not just because it is foremost among my topics of interest as a teacher educator, but because it is without question among the central topics in the education policy arena. Amid the efforts states are making to define "highly qualified" in accordance with the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*, it seems that defining teacher quality and, in particular, the role of teacher education in developing high-quality teachers are questions of paramount interest to those who shape education policy today.

An example of this interest is the Education Commission of the States' recent publication entitled, "Eight Questions on Teacher Preparation: What Does the Research Say?" The study, which is funded by the United States Department of Education, was unveiled at the July, 2003 National Forum on Education Policy (see www.ecs.org for the Executive Summary). It probes eight domains of teacher education research in an effort to draw strong linkages between teacher education and teacher quality. These domains or questions include subject matter knowledge, pedagogical coursework, field experience, alternative certification routes, preparation for teaching in low-performing schools, requirements for admission to teacher preparation programs, accreditation of teacher preparation programs, and institutional warranties. In an examination of 92 out of 500 studies related to the domains, the ECS study concludes that there is a dearth of rigorous conclusive research on teacher preparation. It further cites a need for the policy and education communities to come together to cultivate high-quality research on the education of teachers, research that has implications for policy decisions.

Why should we in California take note of this outcome of the ECS study? First, let me cite the obvious. The education policy environment is increasingly thirsty for research and driven by data. Witness the recent organization of national panels to explore learning and pedagogy in mathematics and science. Recall that a similar national panel produced a reading policy grounded in scientific research and resulting in the broad application of an approach to the teaching of reading. There is a national urgency for researched-based policy to solve pressing issues of teacher quality, particularly as they center on preparing teachers to teach in low-performing schools.

That urgency is also felt in our state. Although California has undertaken a number of initiatives to mitigate the effects of under-prepared teachers including alternative certification routes, and a major overhaul of teacher certification, recruitment and preparation, the state continues to have a shortage of quality teachers. Many children of color, English Language Learners, children with special needs, and children of poverty continue to experience schooling with more teachers who are without full teaching credentials (Quality Counts, 2003). Faced with the demands of federal Title I regulations, states and public school districts charged with providing quality teachers for all children are beginning to gather data which examine relationships among the variables of student learning, teacher quality and teacher preparation.

What does this context mean for teacher education policy in California? My response is shaped by the ECS recommendations at the 2003 National Forum on Education Policy. These call for strategic partnerships around research in teacher education. While these recommendations appear to target the national setting, I think California's teacher education, P-12, and policy communities need to develop one or more strategic partnerships to explore the state's teacher quality issues. Though the reform of teacher preparation is in the early stages of implementation, what is needed in my view is a "community or culture of research, policy, and practice." This community would do more than respond to policy, but would work together to shape policy important to California. Its mission might very well be to craft a research agenda on teacher education and teacher quality, particularly as these consider equity in schooling, teaching and learning. At a time when the efficacy of teacher preparation is in question and policymakers seek research that informs policy decisions, a community of research, policy, and practice could determine as well as respond to the important questions on teacher preparation.

How can CCTE support strategic partnerships for research on teacher education and education policy? Last year, we took an important step in education policy with the hiring of our new analyst, Elizabeth Jimenez. Her work as liaison to the policy community provides an essential line of communication and creates an opportunity for the teacher education community to learn about and provide early response to imminent policy questions. Going forward, CCTE can inform policy and support quality research on teacher education by building on its strengths with professional partnerships and its research expertise. The Fall 2003 Conference, *"Beyond Collaboration: Fostering Communities of Practice,"* offers an opportunity for CCTE to examine the notion of strategic research partnerships and possible strategies for developing them.

A Policy Update from Elizabeth Jimenez

There is so much going on in Sacramento these days that affects teacher preparation that it is hard to cover it all. As the CCTE website is refreshed it is my hope that I will be able to give you interim reports on what is occurring and how you can be heard. Following I have summarized a number of the big events and issues that impact our work.

The October 7 Election

The Recall: The influence of the upcoming referendum was felt long before it was certain that there would be an election in October. Some legislators were less willing to compromise on the budget bill, delaying passage far beyond the constitutional deadline. Others seemed motivated to find reasons to delay passage. Currently, all new Davis appointees are in limbo awaiting confirmation because the Republicans in the Senate have declared that no Davis appointees will receive the two-thirds vote needed for confirmation. This has a serious impact on the eleven-member State Board of education, which has 4 vacancies, three of which have been appointed, but not yet confirmed, in the last few months.

Proposition 54: More than any other government sector, higher education would be affected by the Connerly initiative, Proposition 54, the so-called Racial Privacy Act. The non-partisan Legislative Analyst's analysis shows that although there are a number of exclusions which permit the gathering of race-related information to meet some federal mandates, higher education institutions could no longer collect race-related information associated with:

High school students participating in some University of California educational outreach programs;

Public school students participating in a limited number of specific state education programs and tests;

Prospective University of California and California State University students;

College students participating in the state's loan forgiveness program; and

Students taking state teacher credentialing exams.
In those areas where agencies were restricted in their activities, state and local governments would have reduced race-related information. In such cases, the measure could have some impact on future public policy decisions.

Budget Passed

The contentious deadlock on the budget resulted in some minute-by-minute vigils. The budget was finally passed with an enormous impact on higher education. Overall the 2003-2004 budget for higher education is $443 million, or 4 percent less than last year. However, the increase in student fee revenue generated by higher student fees allowed the legislature to backfill for a net total increase to higher education of $24 million, or 0.2 percent, from the 2002-2003 level. One must drill down into the detail of this bottom line number to understand where these increases are found. For example, the dramatic increase in revenue generated by higher student fees means that the Student Aid Commission funding increased to offset the rise in fees.

SBE Charter Change

At the July State Board of Education meeting the board voted (with only two dissenting votes from new board appointees Carol Katzman and Luis Rodriguez) to amend its meeting schedule to meet every other month. This is a very significant development, with far-reaching implications since the Board has now placed many decisions in the hands of staff. This decision included authorizing Board staff to take on many of the decision-making duties that the board has traditionally carried out in public meetings. This means that Board members now receive "reports" on actions taken by staff rather than information packets for action items on the agenda. It appears that there is now no way for the public to give input or comment on most proposed actions, since they are now handled by staff, out of view of the public. In its vote the board also authorized the State Board President, Reed Hastings, to alone make appointments to the Curriculum Commission and other openings.

SBE Appointments

Since May, 2003, three new appointments have been made to the State board of Education: Curtis Washington, a high school physics teacher who was recommended by the California Teachers Association to the Governor; Carol Katzman, former Chair of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; and Luis Rodriguez, a public defender and incoming president of the California La Raza Lawyers Association. I have met Mr. Washington and Mr. Rodriguez to introduce some of our issues and concerns. Both have been very receptive. In July I worked with the Californians Together coalition to organize a reception for the new Board members at the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and CCTE President Andrea Maxie attended and was introduced.

All three new appointees to the Board were scheduled for confirmation hearings before the Senate Rules Committee on September 3, but the senior Republican Senator on the Committee made it clear that no Davis appointees will get the votes needed for confirmation now, so their hearings have been postponed until after the October 7 referendum.

CCTC Commissioner Appointed

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell has appointed Lillian Littman to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Lillian is a high school teacher active in the California Teachers Association who has previously served on the California Master Plan for Education Committee. Lillian teaches in Southern California in the Simi Valley area and has long been interested in the standards for the teaching profession.

No Child Left Behind

CTC Emergency Permit and Waiver Submission Deadline Extended: At the August CCTC meeting the Commission voted to phase-out emergency permits and waivers which the State Board of Education has stated do not meet federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements. The vote was to discontinue emergency permits and waivers in NCLB core areas (English, mathematics, science, foreign language, social science and arts) for Title I classrooms after September 1, 2003 and to no longer issue emergency permits and waivers in core areas for any classroom after July 1, 2005.

According to the CCTC electronic update of August 27, 2003, this deadline has been extended since several school districts have made it clear that they would have difficulties implementing this decision. The deadline has been extended and the CCTC will hear testimony on the issue at its October 2, 2003 meeting.

Highly Qualified Teacher: In July the CCTC held a joint "seminar" with the State Board of Education staff to hear testimony regarding the proposed definition of Highly Qualified Teacher that had been put forth. It was clear that the requirement of a rigorous test of subject matter knowledge would play a big part in the California policy. Testimony was taken expressing concern about the silence around the role of teacher training in pedagogy as well as unanswered questions about how middle school configurations would operationalize the NCLB proposals.

CCTE Supports AB648

CCTE was contacted by the NAACP with a request for support of AB648, the Dymally bill which would establish a nine-member advisory commission, funded by private donations, to develop community and educational awareness programs to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court decision in the *Brown v Board of Education of Topeka* case. We provided testimony in support of the bill. It was amended and was due to be heard back in the Assembly for concurrence on September 8.

—Elizabeth Jimenez, CEO, GEMAS Consulting
CCTE Legislative and Educational Policy Analyst
3755 N. Sumner Avenue, Pomona, CA 91767
909/596 5482; execjimenez@aol.com

CCTE Policy Framework

The California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) supports and encourages approaches to the preparation and continuing development of teachers which:

Work toward the integration of the professional preparation of educators into career-long professional development involving sound theory and effective practices at all stages.

Establish and foster strong support programs for teachers at all stages of their careers, particularly at the beginning stage, to help attract and retain high-quality teachers; such programs should include a role for university-based personnel as well as practitioners from the schools.

Recognize and support university and school personnel who work in partnerships to improve preservice preparation, induction, and professional development of educators.

Assure that professional programs include both scholarly study and school-based practice involving collaborative exchanges and cooperation between university and school personnel.

Foster the strong and balanced preparation of teachers in subject matter content, foundational studies, multicul-tural and multilingual education, and sound pedagogical practice at all levels of the professional development continuum.

Assure that the guidelines, regulations, and laws governing the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel in California are based on, and are continually informed by, research and best practice; and that these guidelines, regulations, and laws reflect the considered opinions and voices of experts in the field.

Include multiple and alternative approaches to the admission, retention, and credential recommendations for prospective teachers; and assure that all measures used to assess candidates at any point in their preparation are valid, unbiased, and relevant to teaching and learning practice.

Support accreditation and evaluation processes which improve professional practice and which are conducted in an unbiased, collegial atmosphere by university and school professionals.

Seek and ensure the active participation of the teacher education community in policy discussions and decisions regarding preservice education and the professional development of educators.

Foster public and political support for education at all levels, pre-K to university.

Recognize that quality teacher education is an intensely interactive and highly individualized activity requiring stable and adequate financial and personnel resources for ongoing development of effective teacher preparation programs.

—Originally adopted by the Delegate Assembly of the California Council on the Education of Teachers, April 17, 1997

Special Interest Groups (SIGs)
of the California Council on Teacher Education

The California Council on Teacher Education plays host to twelve Special Interest Groups.
These SIGs meet at each Semi-Annual CCTE Conference.
All CCTE Sigs are open to all interested persons.

Case Methods in Teacher Education: This group examines the use of case methods in the preparation of teachers, including the identification and sharing of case studies and case methods, and the refinement of materials available in this field. SIG coordinator: Mary Williams, University of San Diego. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

Coalition for Educational Renewal: The California Coalition for Educational Renewal is the state arm of the national network inspired by the work of John I. Goodlad. Coalition meetings focus on activities at California campuses which operate as part of the national network. SIG coordinator: Sally Botzler, Humboldt State University. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Credential Program Coordinators: This SIG offers an opportunity for coordinators of credential programs at colleges and universities across California to exchange information, discuss issues, and develop coordinated plans. SIG coordinator: Reyes Quezada, University of San Diego. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Democratic Classroom Management: This new SIG, which met for the first time at the Fall 2000 Conference, is exploring ways to prepare teachers to exercise and reflect upon safe, productive, and equitable classroom management practices that foster democratic learning environments. SIG coordinator: Barbara Landau, University of Redlands. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

Educational Foundations: What do we mean when we say that we teach Educational Foundations? What are our purposes? How do we teach it? The range of interpretations, purposes, and approaches varies from instructor to instructor and by institution. Given this milieu, we come together at CCTE to share with and learn from each other. SIG coordinator: Karen D. Benson, California State University, Sacramento. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

Equity and Social Justice: This new SIG, which met for the first time at the Fall 2000 Conference, is closely aligned with the mission of CCTE in general, and seeks to offer augmented support for a democratic vision in the field of teacher education. SIG coordinator: Magaly Lavadenz, WestEd. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Lives of Teachers: This SIG is intended for educators interested in conducting research, doing writing, or just discussing topics related to: (1) the evolution of teachers' careers, including the stages or "passages" that mark various phases of this evolution; (2) teacher biography and autobiography, with special emphasis on the stories that teachers tell about their professional lives; and (3) teacher professionalism, i.e., those features that distinguish teaching from other professions. SIG coordinator: Jerry Brunetti, St. Mary's College. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

National Board Certification: This SIG considers issues in California related to National Board Certification of teachers. SIG coordinator: Judith Shulman, WestEd. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

Portfolio Assessment: This SIG examines and shares information on the evolving use of portfolios in teacher education and the potential for portfolios as a form of assessment of teacher candidates and inservice teachers. SIG coordinator: Irene Oliver, Loyola Marymount University. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Service Learning: This SIG is exploring the use of service learning and other means of evaluating and recognizing prior and current experience in the field of teacher education. SIG coordinator: Silva Karayan, California Lutheran University. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Special Education: This SIG offers an opportunity for discussion and exchange between teacher educators interested and involved in the field of special education. SIG coordinator: Lanna Andrews, University of San Francisco. Meeting Thursday at noon at Fall Conference.

Technology and Teacher Education: This SIG explores issues and developments in educational technology and applications in the teacher education field. SIG coordinator: William Dwyer, University of Redlands. Meeting Friday at 8 a.m. at Fall Conference.

Call for Proposals for Research and Best Practice Sessions at the Spring 2004 CCTE Conference

The California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) invites submission of research and best practice proposals for the Spring 2004 Conference to be held April 1-3 at the Hyatt Sainte Claire Hotel in San Jose. Proposals are encouraged which address: (1) Research related to teacher education, including policy issues, classroom-based issues, teacher effectiveness, or other related topics; (2) Projects or programs reflecting best practice; and (3) Other innovative sessions related to teacher education. The research and best practice presentations will take place in concurrent sessions at the Conference.

General Procedures: CCTE is interested in receiving proposals from faculty directly involved in teacher education programs, county and school district personnel engaged in BTSA and other teacher induction and professional development efforts, and graduate students conducting research related to teacher education. Presenters will be selected from each of these categories to assure balance in the Spring Conference program.

How To Submit Proposals: Proposals must be submitted electronically. Submit (a) an email file cover sheet listing the names, affiliations, addresses, work and home telephone numbers, and email addresses, along with requested audiovisual equipment; and (b) an email file attachment (preferably in Microsoft Word or Microsoft Office) of a maximum 3-page, single-spaced proposal without names of the presenters. Proposals should be e-mailed to CCTE Northern Section Research and Best Practice Committee Co-Chair Janet Gless at:

jgless@cats.ucsc.edu

Content of the Proposal: Include the following: A brief overview of the study/project/program session including purpose/objectives, theoretical framework, methods, data source, results/conclusions/points of view, and significance to the field of teacher education.

Deadline: Proposals for the Spring 2004 Conference must be received by February 1, 2004.

Criteria for Selection: The selection criteria are: the proposal contributes to the knowledge base of preservice and inservice teacher education; the proposal is methodologically or theoretically sound; and the proposal clearly states its significance for teacher educators.

Scheduling: The concurrent research and best practice sessions will be scheduled on either Thursday or Friday, April 1 and 2, at times to be determined. Persons submitting proposals should be planning to attend the Conference on both of those days in order to be available once proposals are accepted and sessions are scheduled.

Miscellaneous: All presentations at CCTE Conferences are eligble for inclusion on the CCTE website following the Conference, and for submission to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Papers resulting from accepted proposals will also be considered for publication in *Teacher Education Quarterly* or *Issues in Teacher Education*, the two CCTE journals.

For further information, contact CCTE Research and Best Practice Committee Co-Chair Janet Gless at the New Teacher Center of the University of California, Santa Cruz, 725 Front Street, Suite 400, Santa Cruz, California 95060, email jgless@cats.ucsc.edu; or contact Alan H. Jones, CCTE Executive Secretary, 3145 Geary Boulevard PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118, telephone 415/666-3012, fax 415/956-3702, e-mail caddogap@aol.com

Looking ahead to Fall 2004 Conference

The Fall 2004 CCRE Conference will be held October 7-9 at the Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina in San Diego. The deadline for Research and Best Practice proposals for the Fall 2004 Conference is August 1, 2004. Such proposals, based on the same format and criteria as above, should be submitted via e-mail to Ed Behrman, Southern Section Research and Best Practice Co-Chair at ebehrman@nu.edu

CCTE Calls for Nominations for

"Quality Education Partnership Award for Distinguished Service to Children and the Preparation of Teachers"

At each Spring and Fall Semi-Annual Conference, CCTE honors a teacher education program which exemplifies collaborative efforts between a college/university and a K-12 school/district. The CCTE Awards Committee invites nominations (and self-nominations) from programs in Northern California for the "Quality Education Partnership Award for Distinguished Service to Children and the Preparation of Teachers" that will be presented at the Spring 2004 Conference in San Diego. Next summer the Awards Committee will seek nominations of programs in Southern California for the award to be presented at the Fall 2004 Conference in San Diego.

Nominations must be submitted via e-mail.

Nominees for this semi-annual CCTE award must reflect collaboration between college/university administration and faculty and K-12 school administration and faculty (individual schools, school districts, or county offices of education) in the planning as well as the implementation of the program to be honored. Eligible programs must have been in place for a minimum of three academic years. Such programs may involve public or private/independent colleges/universities and public or private K-12 schools. Nominations must show clear evidence that as a result of the program, all partners have benefitted — e.g., children, student teachers, beginning teachers, cooperating teachers, other teachers and/or administrators in the school or district, and college/university faculty.

Nominations must include the following information: The names of the leading participants in the collaborative effort; a description of the school/district/county office and its population; a history of the program, including original goals and/or research questions being addressed; a description of the perceived successes of the effort, including any synopses of evaluative data collected; and future plans for the project.

Nominations must be submitted jointly by the K-12 school/district/county office and the institution of higher education with a statement of verification by the appropriate college/university and school/district officials. Each official named in the document should send a separate e-mail verification statement.

The total nomination document should not exceed five pages.

Please submit nominations by e-mail to: jcantor@csudh.edu

The deadline for nominations for the award to be made at the Spring 2004 Conference is February 1, 2004.

Call for CCTE Individual Awards Nominations

The California Council on Teacher Education seeks to recognize individuals who, as part of their professional responsibility, are making significant contributions to the preparation and professional development of educators for California schools. Toward this end CCTE will, depending upon nominations received and the subsequent deliberations of the Awards Committee, continue the tradition begun by SCATE of honoring educators in the following categories at the Spring 2004 Conference:

Robert R. Roth Distinguished Teacher/Administrator New to the Profession: This award is intended for a teacher or administrator who has worked six years or less at a K-Adult school site, district office, or county office of education. The awardee must exemplify excellence in their primary assignment and in their work to improve the preparation, induction, and professional development of educators.

Distinguished Teacher/Administrator: This award recognizes and honors an outstanding teacher and/or outstanding administrator who have worked more than six years at a K-Adult school site, district office, or county office of education. The awardees must exemplify excellence in primary assignment and in work to improve the preparation, induction, and professional development of educators.

Distinguished Teacher Educator: This award recognizes and honors an outstanding teacher educator who is located at a university/college, community college, or educational agency other than K-12 districts or county offices. The awardee must exemplify excellence in work to improve the preparation, induction, and professional development of educators.

Nomination Procedure: Via e-mail (1) Submit an essay describing the work of your nominee with particular attention to: evidence of excellence in primary professional assignment; history and evidence of commitment to and success in teacher preparation; and ways in which the nominee's work reflects the goals of CCTE; (2) Include with your essay documentation/evidence (including nominee's CV) to support your claims; (3) Cover page to include: Name of Award; Name of Nominee; Nominee's Address, Phone, e-mail; Name of Nominator; Nominator's Address, Phone, e-mail; (4) Send nomination information via e-mail by February 1, 2004, to: jcantor@csudh.edu

For additional information contact CCTE Awards Committee Chair James Cantor, School of Education, California State University. Dominguez Hills, 1000 E. Victoria St., Carson, CA 90747, telephone 310/243-3775, e-mail jcantor@csudh.edu

Message from the CCTE Vice President for ATE

By Sally Botzler
CCTE Vice President for ATE
Humboldt State University

The Association of Teacher Educators' 2003 Summer Conference was held August 9-13, 2003, in Santa Fe, New Mexico, focusing on the strengths of ATE to "Promote Quality Teachers in a Supportive Environment." Although I was unable to attend because the event coincided with the birth of our new grandson (a joy!), I did participate in the development of a draft policy framework with Council of Unit Presidents' Executive Secretary Mary Selke, Chair of the ATE Government and Legislative Committee Jim Alouf , and our very own CCTE Board Member Ann Wood. The proposed framework was presented at the conference as part of the process of future adoption at the February meeting.

This proposed framework appears below in its entirety so that we in CCTE can readily see our connections with the national ATE group. I think the commonalities we share are striking and the potential for national and state collaboration is readily apparent.

As part of the process of drafting the ATE Policy Framework, we undertook a review of Linda Darling-Hammond's recent article "Research and Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Responsde to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered.'" Following my report in this issue of *CCNews* is a presentation by Ann Wood concerning our review and abridgement of the Darling-Hammond article.

I look forward to your reactions to these materials. Let me know what you think either via e-mail at sjb3@humboldt.edu or in person at the Fall 2003 CCTE meeting in San Diego. See you soon!

—Sally Botzler
CCTE Vice President for ATE
Humboldt State University
Arcata, CA 95521
Telephone: 707/826-5869
E-mail: sjb3@humboldt.edu

Policy Framework:
Association of Teacher Educators (ATE)

Drafted by members of the ATE Council of Unit Presidents and the ATE Government and Legislative Committee, summer, 2003.

The Background and Purpose of the ATE Policy Framework

ATE leadership will be strengthened by an association platform statement of policies and beliefs from which to view issues, speak out, and enact the purposes of the organization in order to fully, confidently represent membership. The need for a grassroots, proactive, and unified ATE voice has become especially pressing because teacher education has experienced an increase in its misrepresentation to the public and is being undermined as a result of national and state legislation that is not based on reliable, comprehensive research.

Therefore, a joint subcommittee of the Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee and the Council of Unit Presidents, after a vote of approval for their work from the 2003 ATE Delegate Assembly, drafted an ATE Policy Framework. The ATE Policy Framework is based on the ATE Mission Statement, Purposes, and ATE Corporate By-laws**.** The framework will be circulated among members of both committees via e-mail, presented to the ATE Board of Directors, and reviewed in an open hearing for all ATE members during the 2003 summer conference. Once the reviewed/ revised framework is brought forward for approval by the Delegate Assembly in 2004, the ATE President and Executive Director will be authorized and empowered to represent the tenants of the Policy Framework to internal and external constituencies. This Policy Framework will also be annually reviewed and updated by the Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee, the Council of Unit Presidents, and the ATE Board of Directors to reflect current knowledge bases, best practice, and a unified ATE voice.

The ATE Mission

Members of the Association of Teacher Educators are dedicated to the improvement of teacher education. This fundamental mission takes place through leadership in: (1) the development of quality programs to prepare teachers, (2) the analysis of issues and practices related to the preparation and career-long professional development of teachers, and (3) the provision of opportunities for the professional and personal growth of Association members. Each of these three components of the ATE mission are enacted through the following ATE policy framework based on the ATE Mission Statement and the association Purposes under Article I, ATE Corporate Bylaws, February, 2002.

The Association of Teacher Educators' Policy Framework

(1) Develop quality programs to prepare teachers.

Address the need to prepare a sufficient supply of highly qualified, well-prepared teachers for all children, in all states, geographic regions, and for all types of schools.

Prepare and disseminate ideas, innovations, best practices, and quality teacher preparation programs.

Establish and foster strong, university-district/consortium partnership support programs for teachers at all stages of their careers, particularly at the beginning stage, to help attract and retain high quality teachers.

Promote, initiate, and engage in quality teacher education program development and research.

Advocate for multiple, high-quality, research-based approaches to the admission, credentialing, induction, and re-

tention processes that ensure equity and access for all prospective teachers.

Work toward the integration of the professional preparation of educators into career-long professional development involving sound theory and effective practices at all stages.

Advocate for reliable, valid, and reasonable assessment requirements, instruments, and processes for preservice and inservice teachers, as well as for pre-K-12 students.

Foster the strong and balanced preparation of teachers in subject matter content, foundational studies, multicultural and multilingual education, and sound pedagogical practice at all levels of the professional development continuum.

(2) Analyze issues and practices related to the preparation and professional development of teachers.

Provide leadership through issuance of position papers, development of guidelines for excellence in professional preparation, and the framing and promotion of state and national legislation, rules, and regulations.

Advocate for definitions, policies and procedures related to "highly qualified teachers" that are solidly grounded in rigorous, valid, reliable research on teacher education.

Cooperate with other educational agencies, organizations, and institutions.

Work to establish a climate conducive to the growth and development of public education in the United States, including public and political support for public education at all levels, pre-K to university.

Assure that the guidelines, regulations, and laws govern-

ing the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel are based on, and are continually informed by, research and best practice; and that these guidelines, regulations, and laws reflect the considered opinions and voices of experts in the educational field.

Serve as a coordinating vehicle through which related teacher education organizations may engage in dialogue, collaborate on publications and research, and develop educational policy through collaborative action.

Assure that professional programs include both scholarly study and school-based practice involving collaborative exchanges and cooperation between university and school personnel.

(3) Provide opportunities for professional and personal growth.

Participate in meetings (annual/February and summer/August) of the Association.

Offer leadership opportunities.

Assume a leadership role in supporting research that leads to important understandings related to teaching and learning.

Prepare publications and other media, paper and electronic.

Access Association publications and other media.

Network with other teacher educators.

Further the development of ethical standards of practice in teacher education.

Provide leadership, vision, and dialogue among teacher educators across the United States.

An Abridgement of Linda Darling-Hammond's Response to the U.S. Secretary of Education Report on Teacher Quality

By Ann L. Wood
Member of CCTE Board of Directors,
California State University, Los Angeles

This past summer my ATE colleagues Mary Belke, James Alouf, and Sally Botzler, and I had the opportunity to write a draft of the ATE Policy Framework, based largely on the CCTE Policy Framework and the Master Plan for Teacher Education developed by the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators (PAC-TE), as well as other governmental and educational manuscripts. As part of preparing this document for the Summer ATE Conference, we reviewed Linda Darling-Hammond's article, "Research & Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered,'" in the September 6, 2002 Education Policy Analysis Archives (http://epass.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html). In this article, Darling-Hammond systematically addresses the inadequacies, un-

truths, and misleading information in the U.S. Department of Education report, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality* (www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/teacherprep/index.html).

I contacted Linda and secured her consent to write an abridged version of the article that we could publish and circulate among the ATE and CCTE memberships. Our goal was to create an abbreviated version of the 56-page article that would capture essential concepts and motivate readers to analyze the entire Darling-Hammond article, as well as utilize its wealth of references on quality teaching. We hoped that our abridged version of Linda's article might keep teacher educators more aware of the blatant attack on teacher education and untruths being named "research" by the U.S. Department of Education.

The task was exhilarating, fun, and arduous. *Teacher Certification Reconsidered* is dense in content and grist for

reflection. At times, it seemed impossible to abbreviate any paragraph, sentence, or even phrase without giving up to much of Linda's offerings. Our goal of a 1-2 page bulleted summary quickly transformed itself into a 5-6 page brief and finally into a 10-page abridged article that Linda approved wholeheartedly. We offer it to you as "an appetizer." We hope it will motivate you to read and reread her entire article. We hope it will help you understand the inherent problems in the U.S. Department of Education report, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality* and inspire you to speak out against them. The time to stand up and speak for teacher education and pre-18 education is now. As Freire states, "*To speak a true word, is to change the world.*" It is time for us to name the truth of what is happening in and to education today. We hope our abridged article helps you do that!

A Summary of Linda Darling-Hammond's Article, "Research & Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered"
Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10(36)
(September 6, 2002)
or retrieve at: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html

Abridged byAnn Wood, Mary Selke,
Sally Botzler, & James Alouf

Part I.
A Response to the Abell Foundation Report (pp. 1-17)

The Abell Report

In October, 2001, the Baltimore-based Abell Foundation issued a report purporting to prove that there is "no credible research that supports the use of teacher certification as a regulatory barrier to teaching" and urging the discontinuation of certification in Maryland. The report argued that large inequities in access to certified teachers for poor and minority students are not a problem because research linking teacher education to student achievement is flawed. It proposed that Maryland should (1) "eliminate the coursework requirements for teacher certification" and require only a bachelor's degree and a passing score on an appropriate teacher's exam; (2) report the average verbal ability score of teachers in each school district and of teacher candidates graduating from the State's schools of education;" and (3) "devolve its responsibility for teacher qualification & selection to its 24 public school districts," delegating all hiring authority to individual school principals (pp.vii-viii).

In July, 2002, the U.S. Secretary of Education cited the Abell Foundation paper & echoed these recommendations in his Annual Report on Teacher Quality (USDOE, 2002) as the sole source for concluding that teacher education does not contribute to teacher effectiveness. The report says that its recommendations are based on "solid research," but only one reference among its 44 footnotes is to a peer-reviewed journal article. Although written as a local rejoinder to Maryland's efforts to strengthen teacher preparation and certification, it

appears to have become a foundation for federal policy.

In order to support her agenda, Walsh attacks all research that has found relationships between teachers' preparation & their measured effectiveness, including students' achievement. She characterizes much of the education research as "flawed, sloppy, aged and sometimes academically dishonest" (p. 13), a characterization that more aptly describes her own paper, which consistently misrepresents the statements of researchers, the findings of studies, and the evidence base for her claims.

What Are the Arguments against Walsh's Assertions?

Walsh's paper does not actually review most of the studies it mentions. It is littered with inaccuracies, misstatements, and misrepresentations and sheds little light on the research or its implications for teacher education and certification. In this article, Darling-Hammond refutes Walsh's claims and points out each time a misrepresentation, omission or other error has occurred in her analysis.

According to Walsh, the teacher attribute consistently related to raising student achievement is verbal ability. She also suggests that subject matter knowledge may be an additional criterion for hiring secondary teachers, but not for elementary teachers. Walsh tries to dismiss all studies that find evidence that knowledge about teaching make a difference for teacher performance. She often does this by misrepresenting the studies' actual methods and findings.

Part I offers five major issues regarding the Abell report and its research base on teaching and teacher education.

Evidence Ignored

Evidence about student learning in reading and other areas documents the need for teachers to have professional knowledge that includes and extends beyond subject matter knowledge. The Abell Foundation report does not take into consideration this evidence or answer the question of how teachers are to acquire this knowledge if they are not professionally prepared.

While the Abell Foundation report claims that teachers do not need professional knowledge in order to teach, the field has been moving rapidly to codify the ways in which teaching knowledge makes a difference in student learning. For example, the National Reading Panel of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development last year published a major review of carefully controlled research which found that children's reading achievement is improved by systematic teaching of phonemic awareness, guided repeated oral reading, direct or indirect vocabulary instruction with careful attention to readers' needs, and a combination of reading comprehension techniques that include metacognitive strategies. It recommends that teachers be provided with evidence-based preservice training and ongoing inservice training to select (or develop) and implement the most appropriate phonics instruction effectively (p. 11). The Panel adds that "extensive formal instruction in reading comprehension is necessary, preferably begin-

ning as early as preservice" (National Reading Panel, 2000, pp. 15-16).

There are similar findings from recent analyses of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) which state that students whose teachers have majored in mathematics or mathematics education, who have had more pre- or in-service training in how to work with diverse student populations and more training in how to develop higher-order thinking skills, and who engage in more hands-on learning do better on the NAEP mathematics assessments.

A recent review commissioned by the Department of Education disagrees with the Abell Foundation's conclusions. This review, which analyzed 57 studies in peer-reviewed journals published after 1980, states that evidence demonstrates a relationship between teacher education and teacher effectiveness (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini, 2001). Walsh ignores all the information and suggests that we truncate teacher education and end the certification policies that would encourage and enable teachers to acquire this knowledge. The question is, *How are teachers to learn what is known about how to teach well, if there are no expectations, incentives, or supports for them to do so?*

Unfounded Claims

No evidence supports Walsh's claim that either verbal ability or subject matter knowledge alone makes teachers effective. She lacks supporting evidence — and fails to consider contradictory evidence — for her claims about the relative effectiveness of certified and uncertified teachers, the outcomes of teacher education, the primacy of verbal ability as "the" or the most important measure of teaching, the effectiveness of private and public schools and the preparation of their teachers, and the attributes of individuals who enter teaching without certification.

Walsh makes a number of claims that are not supported either by the research she presents or by other evidence in the field. These include the following:

New teachers who are certified do not produce greater student gains than new teachers who are not certified.

There is little evidence that the content and skills taught in preservice education coursework are either retained or effective.

Verbal ability and subject matter alone are sufficient to produce effective teachers.

Private schools do not hire certified teachers; private schools are more effective than public schools.

Individuals with higher academic ability will be recruited to teaching if certification standards are eliminated.

Misrepresentations of Research

Walsh's claim that she has reviewed 100 to 200 studies cited in support of teacher education and found that "none of them holds up to scrutiny" is not true. Most of the studies she mentions do not concern teacher education or certification directly; at most 80 of the nearly 200 studies listed in the

study or appendix are focused on teacher education or certification.

Methodological Issues and Double Standards in Using Research

Walsh misunderstands some fundamental research design issues, including the difference between experimental and correlation studies and the interpretation of research conducted at different levels of aggregation. She eliminates from consideration, studies that have been cited regarding the contributions of various measures of teacher qualifications to teacher effectiveness if they have small sample sizes, if they were published more than 20 years ago, or if they were published as dissertations, technical reports, or conference papers rather than in peer-reviewed journals. She also eliminates all studies that use measures of teacher effectiveness other than student achievement.

Illogical Policy Conclusions

While it is clear that teacher certification systems are not perfect, and there are many weak teacher education programs, it does not follow that the response to these problems should be to eliminate expectations for teachers to acquire the knowledge they need to teach students effectively. The more appropriate policy response is to improve the quality of teacher education — a process that has been underway with important results in a number of states, and a process of accreditation and certification that provide policymakers with levers for change and improvement.

The Effectiveness of Certified and Uncertified Teachers

Walsh cites seven studies, none of which supports her proposition that "new teachers who are certified do not produce greater student gains than new teachers who are not certified." Five studies actually contradict her claim. Three studies (Bliss, 1992; Stoddart, 1992; Lurtz & Hutton, 1989) include no data on student achievement at all, although Walsh elsewhere dismisses all other studies that do not use student achievement data as the dependent variable.

Six studies that Walsh cites actually deal with alternatively certified (AC) rather than uncertified teachers. The findings across the studies are mixed, but none show that uncertified teachers do as well as certified teachers. The more positive findings are found for the alternatives that provide more complete preparation.

(1) Bliss (1992) Actual findings: This report on a two-year Connecticut alternative program does not examine uncertified teachers and includes no data on teacher effectiveness.

(2) Stoddart (1992) Actual findings: Stoddart reports on subject matter qualifications and attrition rates of recruits to the two-year Los Angeles Teacher Trainee Program. Content qualifications were comparable to those of traditionally trained recruits, except for math recruits, who had lower GPAs. Attrition rates for those who entered were relatively low the first two years but higher than national rates after 5 years.

(3) Lutz & Hutton (1989) Actual findings: This study

compares the Dallas Public School's alternative certification recruits with other first year teachers from the district; it did not examine student achievement gains. It found significant differences between AC recruits and other first year teachers. It found significantly lower rates of expected long-term continuation in teaching for the alternative credential (AC) recruits (40% vs. 72% for other first year teachers). Walsh does not accurately report the low rates of successful program completion, planned retention in teaching, and the mixed reviews of their performance.

(4) Miller, McKenna, & McKenna, (1998). Actual findings: Reflecting the characteristics of alternative routes endorsed by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996), this program offered 15 to 25 credit hours of coursework before interns entered classrooms where they were intensively supervised and assisted by university and school-based supervisors while they completed their certification coursework. The study is well designed but uses a small sample of 18 (which Walsh usually discounts). The authors note that their studies "provide no solace for those who believe that anyone with a bachelor's degree can be placed in a classroom and expect to be equally successful as those having completed traditional education programs . . . the three studies reported here support carefully constructed alternative credentialing programs with extensive mentoring components, post-graduation training, regular in-service classes, and ongoing university supervision" (p. 174).

(5) Bradshaw & Hawk's 1996 study Walsh views favorably, even though it does not meet her criteria of being an empirical study. It is a literature review based on a mix of unpublished papers and studies that do not examine student achievement. They list five papers that discuss outcomes for differently trained teachers. In the first study (Barnes, Salmon, & Wale, 1989), "the alternative group" includes programs providing extensive graduate level training. A second study (Denton & Peters, 1988) actually studies two versions of a university's college-based teacher education program. The remaining two studies found that student achievement gains were higher for student of traditionally prepared teachers in language arts and mathematics. These studies do not support the statement that uncertified teachers are as effective as certified teachers. Walsh's review of these studies confuses alternative certification — a strategy that provides candidates with preparation that is differently packaged form what various states deem "traditional training" with lack of certification.

(6) Goldhaber & Brewer's study (2000) found that high school students who had a certified teacher in mathematics did significantly better than those who had uncertified teachers. The same trends were true in science, but the influences were somewhat smaller. Another analysis of these data (Darling-Hammond, Berry, & Thoreson, 2001) showed that in this sample, most of the teachers on temporary/emergency certificates were experienced & most had education training comparable to that of the certified teachers.

(7) Walsh cites a Teach for America (TFA) study by Raymond, et. al. (2001). This study did not compare certified to uncertified teachers, as Walsh claims. The comparison was between TFA recruits and an extraordinarily underprepared set of Houston teachers (50% of Houston's new hires are uncertified, and about 35% hold no bachelors degrees.) Reviewers of this report have noted that it should have compared TFA teachers to certified teachers. One study that did that was conducted by Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002. They found significantly higher scores for students of certified teachers. The Raymond report indicates that Houston's minority students are disproportionately taught by these underprepared teachers, and these students lose ground academically each year. Only 50% of Houston's African American & Latino 9th graders graduate from high school four years later.

Raymond's study also found that TFA teachers have a high attrition rate. Over a three year period, between 60% and 100% of TFA candidates left after their second year of teaching. Among Baltimore's TFA recruits, 62% had gone by the third year of teaching. These high attrition rates resemble those found in other studies of short-term alternative routes (Darling-Hammond, 2000c) and suggest another important outcome of teacher preparation policies. Both the Houston study and Walsh's own review indicate that experienced teachers are more effective than inexperienced teachers (Walsh, pp. 5-6), and many short-term alternative program recruits leave the profession quickly. Other research (Andrew & Schwab, 1995: Darling-Hammond, 2000b) indicates that those who complete 5-year teacher education programs enter and stay in teaching at much higher rates than 4-year teacher education graduates, who stay in teaching at high rates than teachers hired through alternative teacher preparation programs.

Student teaching appears to make a strong difference in teacher retention. In a longitudinal study of recent college graduates who entered teaching in 1993, a recent NCES report notes that recruits without student teaching leave teaching at rates nearly twice as high as those who have this clinical training (Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000). This raises questions about the cost-effectiveness of a recruitment strategy that relies on teachers with little preparation who are likely to leave teaching. A recent Texas study shows that teacher attrition costs school systems at least $8,000 for each recruit who leaves. It is estimated that the high attrition of beginning teachers in Texas costs the state more than $200 million per year. This and other studies of teacher attrition suggest that policymakers should consider both teaching effects and retention patterns when they think about how to recruit and prepare teachers.

(8) Walsh chooses to ignore other studies showing that certified teachers do better than uncertified teachers. One (Hawk, Coble, & Swanson, 1985) — in contradiction to Walsh's citation above — shows that teachers' certification in mathematics has a large and statistically significant effect

on student achievement gains in both general mathematics and even greater in algebra. Walsh uses her double standard for sample size and rejects this study for review as being too small even though she cites other studies with equally as small sample size. This reasonably well-controlled, matched comparison study of 36 teachers supports the idea that subject matter knowledge matters to teaching. Walsh misrepresents this find & suggests that *only* subject matter knowledge matters.

This and other studies reviewed here suggest, content knowledge in combination with content pedagogical knowledge — that is knowledge about how to teach the content, which, together with student teaching, constitute the major components of certification — appear to make contributions to student learning that exceed the contributions of either component individually. An important policy point from this and other studies of certification is that fact that teachers would not have been guided or encouraged to acquire the content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge represented by in-field certification unless there were existing certification requirements. Walsh and the Fordham Foundation manifesto she endorses would turn all hiring decisions over to principals, even though it was principals across the United States who assigned out-of-field teachers to teach mathematics as well as other subjects (Ingersoll, 1998). If teacher certification is eliminated, there would be no barrier to that practice occurring on a more widespread basis.

(9) After controlling for student poverty rates and test participation rates, Fetler (1999) examined the relationship between school scores on the state's mathematics test and teachers' average experience levels and certification status in 795 high schools, Fetler states, "after factoring out the effects of poverty, teacher experience and preparation are significantly related to achievement" (p.13). This study is cited but never discussed in Walsh's revised report. Walsh applauded the study's method but dismissed its findings with inaccurate assertions. First, she suggested, incorrectly, that the study's results pertained to subject matter knowledge alone, not to the combination of subject matter and teaching knowledge represented by certification. She misread both the study and the requirements of California's credentialing system to make this claim, appearing to believe that individuals who have passed only the subject matter requirement of a content test are granted full credentials in California (they are not), that individuals who are certified through internship programs (California's alternative route) do not have to complete pedagogical requirements (this is false), and that individuals are hired on emergency permits solely if they lack content knowledge (this is also false). Walsh also suggests, incorrectly, that the study may have some methodological problems, by reaching conclusions using aggregated statewide data. All of the study's data are aggregated to the school level. In responding to Walsh's statements about his research, Fetler wrote, "Both math subject knowledge and math pedagogy are essential. I believe that my study is consistent with these statements…My study supports the impor-

tance of appropriate credentials." He also notes that, "The unit of analysis in my paper is the school. It is not based on statewide aggregated data."

After controlling for student socioeconomic status and other school characteristics, two other school-level studies in California (Betts, Rueben, & Dannenberg, 2000; Goe, forthcoming) have found significant negative relationships between average student scores on the state examinations and the percentage of teachers on emergency permits. These studies also found smaller positive relationships between student scores and teacher experience levels, with negative effects on student achievement associated with the proportion of beginning teachers. California's experience is a good example of what happens when pressures and supports for hiring credentialed teachers are relaxed. After nearly a decade of inadequate and unequal salaries, easy access to emergency permits and waivers, and few incentives for the training and equitable distribution of qualified teachers for high-need fields and locations, California, now one of the lowest-achieving states in the nation, by 1999-2000, found itself with more than 40,000 teachers teaching on emergency permits or waivers. The vast majority of these teachers were teaching in urban school systems in schools with the highest proportion of low-income students and students of color. High-minority schools were nearly seven times as likely to have uncredentialed teachers as low-minority schools. Low-achieving schools were nearly five times as likely to have uncredentialed teachers as high-achieving schools (Shields, et. al., 2000, pp. 41-43).

These results mirror those already noted in Baltimore, Houston, and other cities. The pattern appears across the county. For example, a recent series in the Chicago "Sun Times" (Note 26) documented that "children in the state's lowest-scoring, highest-minority and highest-poverty schools were roughly five times more likely to have teachers who had flunked at least one certification test" and were least likely to have teachers who were "correctly certified." The burden should be on those who argue against efforts to ensure minimally qualified teachers for all students to prove that the confluence of race, poverty, and low achievement with the presence of untrained and uncertified teachers does not further disadvantage our nation's most vulnerable students.

Part II.
Evidence about Preservice Teacher Education (pp. 17-36)

Evidence about Preservice Teacher Education

Walsh's proposition: "There is little evidence that the content and skills taught in preservice education coursework is (sic) either retained or effective " (p. 7). Cited in support:

Veenman (1984). Although this is an article about preservice teachers, it does not address teacher effectiveness or teachers' retention of what is learned in pre-service education. Veenman's article cites findings in favor of intense stu-

dent teaching, competency-oriented ed. coursework; mentions that outcomes of teacher education may vary by characteristics of individual programs.

Murnane (1983). This is not an empirical study but rather a commentary on work of another author proposing doctoral degrees for teacher leaders. The value of doctoral education for developing pedagogical skills is questioned. Lack of evidence in large data sets regarding the effects of pre-service education may be due to lack of data collected on the topic at that historical period of time rather than lack of effects observed.

Walsh cites the following studies elsewhere but ignores their relevant findings regarding evidence about pre-service education: Andrew and Scwab (1995); Begle (1979); Begle and Geeslin (1972); Denton and Peters (1988); Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik (1985); Monk (1994).

Begle (both studies) reported results for 112,000 students studied through the National Longitudinal Study of Mathematical Abilities: coursework in math methods had a stronger effect on student achievement than higher-level coursework in math. (Walsh's criticisms of the study include "possible aggregation bias", and "too many variables in the data set.")

Monk found coursework in the subject field is positively related to student achievement in math and science but the relationship is curvilinear with diminishing returns above five content area courses. Also methods courses had "more powerful effects than additional preparation in the content area." Monk's subsequent communications with Walsh are described.

Evidence of Verbal Ability on Teacher Effectiveness

Verbal ability and subject matter knowledge do influence teacher effectiveness. However, there are three areas of concern: (1) Walsh "tries to set up a straw man" by suggesting researchers, including LDH, have argued otherwise, (2) verbal ability alone is not the only or best measure of teacher effectiveness, and (3) evaluating the size of relative contributions of various kinds of knowledge to teacher effectiveness remains a challenge. Related issues:

Data sets on standardized test scores have been available for years whereas data sets on coursework patterns or teacher education program experiences have come available starting in the 1990's. Obviously there are more studies available on variables that have been the longest and most often measured.

Most studies that have included measures of verbal ability or content knowledge have not included measures of teacher education or certification, including the following, which were inaccurately cited by Walsh:

(1) Murnane (1983). Actual finding: evidence about the influence of verbal ability was partly a function of teachers' standardized test scores being one of the few variables in large-scale databases at the time and the resulting "limitations in the available data" (Murnane, p. 565).

(2) Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine (1996). Actual finding: "magnitudes (of the effects) for teacher education and teacher experience are higher than, but of the same magnitude, as PPE" (Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine, p. 380).

(3) Schalock (1979). Walsh seeks to dismiss findings re: limited evidence regarding relationships between teachers' measured intelligence and other indicators of effectiveness because the review is too old and cites "more recent research" (including studies from 1971 and 1977) that suggest intelligence as measured by SAT scores, verbal ability tests, and college selectivity is more important. Two of the studies cited (Ferguson, 1991; Strauss & Sawyer, 1986) are dismissed elsewhere for aggregation bias or for no stated reason (Ferguson & Womack, 1993).

(4) Ferguson (1991). Actual finding: analysis of nearly 900 Texas school districts after controlling for SES status found large disparities in achievement between black and white students were almost entirely attributable to differences in their teachers' qualifications. LDH reviewed the same study and found the strongest teacher qualification variable was teachers' scores on the TECAT which not only measures basic literacy skills, as Walsh claims, but also logical thinking, research skills, and professional knowledge. LDH makes suggestions for analyzing variables pertinent to expertise.

(5) Strauss & Sawyer (1986). Actual finding: in 45 school districts in North Carolina, teachers' scores on the National Teacher Examinations had a strong influence on average S.D. test performance. Subareas of the test used at that time included not only verbal ability (the only area Walsh acknowledges) but also general knowledge and professional knowledge. LDH further cautions that the correlation studies Walsh relies upon do not establish a cause-effect relationship.

(6) Ferguson & Womack (1993). Actual finding: The amount of a teacher's education coursework explained more than four times the variance in teacher performance than did NTE scores or GPA in the major. (Elsewhere in her report, Walsh seeks to dismiss this study because it is limited to a single institution and uses superiors' evaluations as the measure of performance.) Strong, positive relationships between teacher education coursework performance and teacher performance were also found by Guyton and Farokhi (1987).

(7) Hanushek (1992). Actual finding: "The closest thing to a consistent finding among the studies is that "smarter" teachers who perform well on verbal ability tests do better in the classroom. Even for that, the evidence is not very strong" (Hanushek, p. 116).

The Academic Ability of Teachers who Lack Certification

While some may choose careers for which they do not have to prepare, it is unclear that such entrants would be more academically able, better teachers, or be retained longer in the profession:

Grey (1993) found GPAs of newly qualified teachers in

1990 to be higher than GPAs of the average college graduate with 51% earning GPAs of 3.25 or above as compared to 40% of all grads. For uncertified new graduates entering teaching, 57% had GPAs below 3.25 and 20% were below 2.25. Only one-third of the uncertified entrants had been retained a year later.

Gitomer, Latham, & Zimek (1999) found that the lowest college admissions, Praxis I, and Praxis II test scores were held by individuals who entered teaching without preparation.

Several studies of early alternative certification programs over a decade ago found academic records of recruits varied substantially by teaching field with teachers in highest demand fields often holding lowest scores (Lutz & Hutton, 1989; Natriello & Zumwalt, 1992; Stoddart, 1992).

The Private School Argument

Opponents of teacher certification, including Walsh, argue that private schools are more effective because their teachers are not certified. There are two key problems with this: (1) conflicting evidence about the relative effectiveness of private/public schools [deeper, more relevant variables may be in play] and (2) most private school teachers are certified with an even larger majority having experienced specific preparation for teaching even if they have not sought state certification.

Coleman, Hoffer, & Kilgore (1982). Actual finding: Higher student performance in Catholic and other private schools has been attributed to variables such as lower absenteeism, less fighting, and more time spent on homework. Achievement was actually higher in public schools that had the same characteristics. Subsequent studies point to variables of school and class size, school organization, and curriculum differentiation as critical factors for public or private school student success (Bryk & Lee, 1992; Lee & Bryk, 1988; Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991).

NCES 1997 statistics show that public and private school teachers in 1993 were almost equally likely to have received an undergraduate degree in education. Overall, 87.1% public and 71.6% private school teachers had taken education courses with public school teachers completing an average of 37.4 credits compared to private school teachers completing 35.2 credits. Public school teachers (66%) were also more likely than private school teachers (58%) to have completed a subject matter degree rather than an education degree.

Summary of Part III — Methodological Issues (pp. 36-56)

Walsh suggests it is inappropriate to cite studies that are older, have smaller sample sizes, use measures of performance other than student achievement scores, are aggregated at a level above the classroom, or are published in venues other than peer-reviewed journals, but does the same herself when it is convenient to her position.

Sometimes she represents the studies' findings accurately; sometimes not. Many of the studies she cites for various propositions do not contain the findings for which they are cited — or, in several cases, any data on the question at all.

Study Size and Design

Walsh's critiques of research methodology show her own lack of knowledge about the usefulness and effectiveness of different experimental designs & the most helpful approaches to take in analyzing results across a variety of studies.

Level of Aggregation

Walsh dismisses some studies' findings as irrelevant based on a charge of "aggregation bias." She dismisses studies that include favorable findings about the value of teacher education in which data are aggregated at the level of the school or district, although she, herself, cites similarly aggregated data for her conclusion that verbal ability matters most. Walsh's critique misses a crucial point about how research results accrue and are triangulated to look at possible relationships among conditions and outcomes.

Walsh herself cites highly aggregated data as well as less aggregated data on the question of the influences of verbal ability, yet studies cited by Darling-Hammond and others reveal influences of measures of teacher education and certification on student achievement at the levels of state (Darling-Hammond, 2000c), school district (Ferguson, 1991; Ferguson & Ladd, 1996; Strauss & Sawyer, 1986), school (Ferguson & Ladd, 1996; Fetler, 1999), & individual teacher (Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Hawk, Coble, & Swanson, 1985; Monk, 1994), which Walsh discounts.

Measures for Assessing Teacher Performance

Walsh argues that studies using various ratings of student performance other than student achievement test scores should be discounted, noting that supervisory ratings ". . . can be too subjective to measure teacher quality accurately" (p. 20). As support for this, she cites in her appendix a review of research on teacher evaluation Darling-Hammond conducted with colleagues at the Rand Corporation (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983).

While her statement of why Darling-Hammond cited the review in another article is completely *inaccurate*, Walsh is correct when she notes that teacher evaluations by principals and other school-based supervisors have been found to lack strong reliability. The study of evaluation practices noted that this has been a function of principals' lack of time, inadequate expertise for evaluating all teaching situations, insufficient evaluation training, and inappropriate instrumentation. However, this critique does not extend to ratings of performance that are based on structured observations conducted by trained, expert raters that have been developed and demonstrated to have high reliability.

Some of the studies Walsh dismisses use systematic ratings systems by trained observers (e.g. Ferguson &

Womack, 1993; Guyton & Farokhi, 1987). The extent to which ratings of performance should be considered or discounted depends on who conducts the rating process, with what training and instrumentation, under what conditions, and with what efforts to enhance reliability.

Age of Studies

The age of studies is also a legitimate but not determinative issue. Studies do not become invalid merely because they are old. Walsh argues that many older studies using large data sets lacked certain kinds of variables as controls, but this does not stop her from citing many of these studies for propositions with which she agrees.

More important, the designs of some older studies are at least as strong as some of the more recent studies, and weak studies exist now as then. There is not a strong relationship between study vintage and quality.

It is certainly true that teacher education programs and certification requirements have changed over time, so that inferences from studies conducted in one era do not automatically generalize to others; the extent to which one can learn something of use from a study depends on how well the variables are defined and on a knowledge of their relevance to more recent conditions as well as on the strengths and limits of its methodology.

Vintage does influence the prevalence of studies of certain kinds. A large number of studies were conducted in the high-demand era of the 1960s and '70s when there was great variability in entry pathways and much interest in the topic. Federal funding for educational research was substantially larger before 1980 than it was during the severe budget cuts of that decade. In addition, in times of relatively low demand, like most of the 1980s, virtually all teachers were certified, and there was too little variability to find effects of this variable in large-scale studies. Few studies were concerned with these issues, and few data sets had measures of teacher education variables.

Interest and data on this topic have just begun to return in the 1990s. Those who are interested in the extent to which — and the ways in which — different kinds of preparation may matter for teacher performance and student learning can and should be informed by earlier studies where they are applicable to the questions under study.

Publication Venue

Although Walsh is *incorrect* in her statement that dissertations are not retrievable (although sometimes less than convenient, there are library systems for doing so), it is legitimate to suggest that the kind of review they have received is often more variable, and may be less strenuous depending on the university and department, than for many peer-reviewed journals.

There are certainly some universities whose dissertation review process is more rigorous than some journals, but the reverse is also certainly true. The same variability in review stringency is true for conference papers and technical reports.

However, Walsh herself cites a substantial number of unreviewed papers in support of various positions she takes.

I [Darling-Hammond] accept the point that it is a useful common ground to rely on research published in peer-reviewed journals, and I restrict the analysis in this paper to those studies. Even with this criterion, there is substantial evidence to be weighed & discussed.

Who Is Affected by This Debate?

The critical issue here is not the protection of researchers' reputations or the turf of schools of education but the protection of students, especially low-income students and students of color who are disproportionately taught by unprepared and uncertified teachers.

As Walsh's paper shows in her references to data on the disparities in access to qualified teachers for students in Baltimore, the children most affected by these arguments are economically and educationally disadvantaged children in central cities who are substantially abandoned by the funding and hiring protections that should operate to provide a foundation for their education.

What the statistics on the lack of certified teachers actually mean on the ground is that many of Baltimore's most educationally vulnerable children — most of them African American — are taught in their elementary school years by teachers who have had no training in how to teach them to read, much less to develop other basic and higher order skills they must have to succeed in school and life.

In today's economy, these young people are fated to become part of the growing criminal justice system, as incarceration is increasingly linked to inadequate education. More than half of the growing number of inmates in the United States are functionally illiterate and cannot gain access to today's labor market.

This is not unrelated to the fact that so many low-income students have been taught by teachers who never learned how to teach them to read.

Illogical Policy Conclusions

The disparities in access to qualified teachers in Maryland and are a function of a state school finance system that has underfunded Baltimore's schools for decades, along with inadequate incentives — for example, service scholarships, forgivable loans, and recruitment attractions like salaries and housing assistance — to encourage individuals to acquire strong training and then teach in high-need fields and locations.

The Abell Foundation report argues that the enormous disparities in resources and qualified teachers between Baltimore and other districts are not a problem because teacher

certification does not mean anything, and that in fact the solution is to do away with certification altogether.

In suggesting that devolving all hiring decisions to principals is the answer to the problem of recruitment for the schools serving minority and poor children, Walsh ignores the fact that, even if all principals had infinite information at their disposal about the likely effectiveness of teachers and made wise, fully informed choices (two assumptions that have been challenged by some research on teacher selection practices). In addition, eliminating certification requirements would eliminate evidence about disparities in students' opportunities to learn, for if there are no minimum standards, there will be no evidence of differences in the extent to which they have been achieved by teachers working with different groups of students. This would in turn reduce pressures for the creation of policies to rectify these inequities.

Certification is but a proxy for the subject matter knowledge and knowledge of teaching and learning embodied in various kinds of coursework and in the evidence of ability to practice contained in supervised student teaching. It is true that certification is a relatively crude measure of teachers' knowledge and skills, since the standards for subject matter and teaching knowledge embedded in certification have varied across states and over time, are differently measured, and are differently enforced from place to place. The quality of preparation in both university programs and other alternatives has varied as well, although a number of states have made substantial recent headway in strengthening teachers' preparation and reducing this variability. Given the crudeness of the measure, it is perhaps remarkable that so many studies have found significant effects of teacher certification.

There are questions about the quality of tests, courses, and institutions that are the subject of study and action across the country (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Klein, 1999). The answer to flaws that may be perceived, however, is not to eliminate or undermine the pathways that enable and require teachers to gain knowledge and students to have access to teachers who have the knowledge they need. If teacher knowledge and skill about both content and how to teach it is important, as substantial evidence suggests it is, the most sensible policy goal is to work to improve preparation opportunities and certification standards so that they increasingly approximate what teachers need to know and do in order to be successful with diverse students.

Conclusion

Kate Walsh has dismissed or misreported much of the existing evidence base in order to argue that teacher education makes no difference to teacher performance or student learning and that students would be better off without state efforts to regulate entry into teaching or to ensure certain kinds of teachers' learning.

While this proposal is couched as the elimination of "barriers" to teaching, evidence suggests that lack of preparation actually contributes to high attrition rates and thereby becomes a disincentive to long-term teaching commitments and to the creation of a stable, high ability teaching force.

While she argues for recruiting bright people into teaching . . ., her proposals offer no incentives for attracting them into teaching other than the removal of preparation requirements.

Lack of preparation also contributes to lower levels of learning, especially for those students who most need skillful teaching in order to succeed.

The evidence from research presented here and elsewhere makes clear that the policies Walsh endorses could bring harm to many children, especially those who are already least well served by the current system.

Those who make such arguments for eliminating one of the few protections these children have should bear the burden of proof for showing how what they propose could lead to greater equity and excellence in American schools.

From the Desk of the CCTE Executive Secretary . . .

Here are a few updates on California Council on Teacher Education activities at this point of the year:

Memberships for 2003-2004: Membership renewals notices for the 2003-2004 membership year were mailed to all institutional and individual members in early July. To date we have received renewals for the new year from over half of last year's members, and we hope to get all institutions and individuals renewed by the Fall Conference. A membership form and information appears on page 22.

CCTE Publications: The Summer 2003 issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly* was mailed to all members and delegates in early July, and the Fall 2003 issues of *Teacher Education Quarterly* and *Issues in Teacher Education* will both be mailed to members and delegates next month. The next issue of *CCNews* will be published in December.

If you wish additional information about any activities of CCTE, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

—**Alan H. Jones**
CCTE Executive Secretary

3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275
San Francisco, CA 94118
Telephone: 415/666-3012
Fax: 415/956-3702
E-mail: caddogap@aol.com

Join the California Council on Teacher Education

If you are not already an institutional delegate or individual member of CCTE, you can join now. All members and delegates receive Spring and Fall Conference announcements, the *CCNews* newsletter, and issues of *Teacher Education Quarterly* and *Issues in Teacher Education* (the two journals are an $85 value themselves). While it is not necessary to be a member or delegate in order to attend the Spring and Fall CCTE conferences, membership will provide ongoing contact with CCTE as well as assuring that you receive all of its publications.

Individual Membership for 2003-2004 Academic Year (July 2003 to June 2004)

Individual membership dues are $80 per year (with a special $60 rate available for retired individuals and $50 rate for students). To join please complete this form and follow the directions at the bottom of this page.

Member Name _____

Institutional Affiliation _____

Mailing Address _____

City and ZIP _____

Telephone Number (include area code) _____

E-mail address _____

Type of membership:
> Individual ($80)
> Retired ($60)
> Student ($50)

Please send the above completed individual membership form and CCTE dues (by check payable to CCTE) to:

> Alan H. Jones, Executive Secretary
> California Council on Teacher Education
> 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275
> San Francisco, CA 94118
>
> Telephone 415/666-3012; Fax 415/956-3702; E-mail caddogap@aol.com

Institutional Membership

Institutional memberships in the California Council on Teacher Education are available to colleges and universities, school districts, county offices of education, state education agencies, professional educational organizations, and other institutions interested in teacher education. Institutional memberships are $480 per year, and entitle the institution to designate six delegates, each of whom will receive all CCTE mailings (including issues of *Teacher Education Quarterly* and *Issues in Teacher Education*).

If you wish to take out an institutional membership please contact CCTE Executive Secretary Alan H. Jones (see contact information above) to obtain a set of institutional membership forms.

Quick Notes:

Previewing the Fall 2003 Conference

Reports on CCTE Activities

In This Issue
of *CCNews* . . .