

CHAPTER 1

Teacher Education on the Leading Edge: Learning With and From One Another

Gary A. Griffin and Patrice R. Litman

INTRODUCTION

The Leading Edge project sponsored by the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) and generously supported by The Pew Charitable Trust with matching funds from the Joyce Foundation and The AT&T Foundation has demonstrated the power of institutional collaboration to influence how we think about and enact teacher education. We believe that the work reported in this volume is especially timely as a number of concerns about the quality of the nation's teaching force and the preparation of women and men to become teachers come together in powerful and unprecedented ways (Griffin, 1999).

The purposes of the Leading Edge project that have guided our efforts are deceptively simple and easy to understand. We intended to support the enhancement of already exemplary teacher education programs in their work with professional development schools around issues of standards for teacher education. We did this toward the end of providing models of outstanding practice that could contribute ideas for other institutions to study and adapt to their own contexts. To do this, we hoped to provide sufficient evidence of these successful practices so that policymakers, teacher educators, and school-based partners would be persuaded to experiment and to change longstanding but sometimes questionable practices of teacher preparation and school collaboration. Finally, we sought to document the work of the project in sufficient detail and with ample attention to the complexities, dilemmas, and possibilities of

achieving excellence in teacher education such that we could join others in shattering the image of learning to teach as a simple, easy-to-accomplish mastery of a set of techniques and proven practices (Oakes & Lipton, 1998).

This book is our collective response to the purposes we set out to achieve. We provide an overview of our work, describe our several institutional settings, present pictures of our individual programs, illustrate how our work together is more powerful than our work alone, and demonstrate many of the policy and practice dilemmas that must be faced by those of us who are serious about ensuring that our nation's children are not shortchanged in their encounters with educational professionals over the course of their years in elementary, middle, and high schools.

We believe that the work presented here is especially timely for a number of reasons associated with teaching and schooling and because of a number of conditions currently confronting our society. Among the issues that spark our intellect and engage our practice are (a) guaranteeing that all students, independent of personal and cultural characteristics, receive education that is rooted in serious conceptions of equity (Cochran-Smith, 1999); (b) responsibly formulating and enacting educational standards as guides for teaching and learning rather than using them as sorting mechanisms to determine success and failure (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium [INTASC], 1992); (c) testing rigorously the degree to which school-university relationships, historically claimed to be important linchpins for effectiveness in teacher preparation, can realize that claim (Whitford & Metcalf-Turner, 1999); (d) understanding and ameliorating the tensions that exist naturally and expectedly between policymakers and practitioners (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996); (e) making wise decisions about which of the newly advanced practices related to teacher preparation are most worthy of experimentation and implementation; (f) linking technology more directly to the work of preparing teachers; and (g) coming to understand the possibilities and limitations of change in teacher education during times characterized by criticism, disillusionment, and disappointment with the consequences of schooling for large numbers of citizens (Howey & Zimpher, 1999). It is increasingly clear that the intellectual, social, and life-enhancement prospects of children and youth are affected directly by the character and quality of the teachers they encounter and the schools in which they are provided opportunities to learn. Consequently, our work has aimed at making individual and collective sense of the interactive and often confusing dilemmas about how best to ensure that teaching and schooling, influenced as they are by how teachers are prepared, can and should be positive forces for the students who encounter them.

What we discovered in the course of the Leading Edge work will not come as a surprise to those who have come to understand learning to teach and

teaching as intellectually complex and institutionally difficult work. An analogy that may be apt is that of opening a long-held and well-remembered trunk in an attic. We have known the trunk was there, we have some memory of its contents, it has been in view each time we needed something near it. But when we finally open it and examine its contents with concentrated attention, we come to new understandings about the layers of objects, the historical antecedents that accompany those objects, and the relationships between what we find and our new perspectives on what we thought was familiar. In teacher education, as with the objects from the trunk in the attic, there are the familiars—methods, content, understandings about the nature of students in educational situations, placements for practica, the longstanding traditions of student teaching, the nature of knowledge and curriculum making, and the like. But again, as with the contents of the attic trunk, the times we live in and the understandings and perspectives we now hold cause us to see the familiar in new and often surprisingly different ways.

The Leading Edge institutions all have strong reputations for their preparation of teachers, have histories of excellence, and are known as leaders in constructing theory, engaging in research, and demonstrating outstanding practice. Yet, as we worked together and reexamined, in community, our work and our thinking about that work, we came to realize that we were facing challenges that pushed us to reconsider our individual and collective past and our current engagement with teacher preparation. We recognized that our understandings needed both reexamination and reconstruction. We acknowledged that the societal contexts, particularly in terms of state and regional policy arenas, were often in conflict with how we conceived of our work. We became conscious of new demands and new realities that must be given attention. And we realized that these new engagements with how we participated in the preparation of teachers could be enhanced considerably by sharing our ideas, critiquing our practices, and engaging one another as critical friends. This book is the story of that journey, of the reseeing and remaking of what many of us once acted out as well-honed and carefully constructed ways of helping women and men realize their ambitions to become exemplary teachers.

WHO ARE WE? THE LEADING EDGE INSTITUTIONS

Six teacher preparation schools, departments, and colleges of education participated in the Leading Edge effort from 1996 to 1999. Each of the programs is described in detail in the chapters that follow. As introduction, though, a brief picture of the settings is provided here.

The Preservice Program in Childhood Education at Teachers College, Columbia University is a graduate level teacher preparation program. The Preservice Program works in collaboration with three elementary schools in New

York City. All of these schools serve students characterized by cultural, linguistic, developmental, and economic diversity. The Teachers College initiatives involve prospective teachers in developing interdisciplinary learning experiences, conducting research, and working as student teachers and interns in restructured urban school settings.

The elementary teacher preparation program at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) is a minimum 13-month program culminating in a master's degree and state certification after a year-long internship. The program works in collaboration with seven elementary schools in Goleta and Santa Barbara, all of which have substantial immigrant (primarily Spanish-speaking) populations and one of which is a California charter school. UCSB's program emphasizes preparation and practice in support of linguistic and cultural diversity (in particular, a bilingual and cross-cultural emphasis), family and community involvement, professional collaboration, and thematic instruction using authentic assessment.

The University of Louisville's Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership involves seven elementary, two middle, and six high schools in three school districts serving urban, rural, and suburban schools. The Partnership works to a lesser degree with an additional twelve schools that are members of the Greater Louisville PDS Network. The unifying theme of the Partnership work related to teacher education and professional development is "teachers as learners and leaders." This network is a member of The Holmes Partnership¹ and is engaged in a wide array of reforms mandated by the groundbreaking Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990. The University of Louisville (UL) has been at the forefront in launching models of professional development schools explicitly aimed at school restructuring for greater student success.

The University of Southern Maine (USM) works in partnership with approximately thirty K-12 schools representing a diverse cross-section of Maine schools collaborating in supporting the initial preparation and professional development of teachers. The professional development schools are organized into five sites centered in Portland, western Maine, Gorham, Yarmouth, and southern Maine (Sanford, Wells-Ogunquit, York) as part of the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP). ETEP includes (a) an undergraduate degree in arts and sciences and an education minor; (b) a graduate level, full-time, year-long, school-based internship for initial certification; and (c) course work emphasizing assessment in the beginning years of teaching culminating in a master's degree. All sites share a common focus on implementing the recently approved Maine Learning Results, K-12, developing local formative assessments to both inform instruction and document and report students' progress toward and attainment of the standards, and piloting performance-based intern assessment and initial certification.

The University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee (UWM) partnership includes four elementary and two high schools. All of these are urban schools in the Milwaukee Public School system serving students characterized by cultural, linguistic, developmental, and economic diversity. Teacher preparation programs are being restructured under the umbrella of teacher education for urban communities using INTASC standards as a framework. UWM is part of the Four Cities Network funded by the Joyce Foundation, which includes school–university partnerships among five universities and ten schools in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Milwaukee.

Wheelock College in Boston has established partnerships with eleven public elementary and K–8 schools in Boston, Brookline, and Cambridge. Of these partnerships, six are in Boston, which is a designated Empowerment Zone. Each partnership provides an opportunity for candidates to immerse themselves in exemplary practices that expand the notion of child-centered pedagogy in new directions that are particularly relevant to students in urban communities. In addition, the programs are engaged in transforming preparation and practice to build on knowledge that will enable greater inclusion of special needs children in mainstreamed settings and that will enhance curriculum and teaching practices which are responsive to diversity across all dimensions. Part of the Massachusetts Learning/Teaching Collaborative, Wheelock's work is at the cutting edge of early childhood teacher preparation.

WHAT DID WE SET OUT TO DO AND WHY?

The sponsoring organization, NCREST, has an intense interest in and firm commitment to understanding how educational organizations can be structured to provide both outstanding educational opportunity for students and meaningful and stimulating work environments for educational professionals. NCREST has been a leader in bringing together institutions and individuals concerned with new ways of working toward educational excellence. Whether through research activity, technical assistance, national conferences, demonstration projects, or other collaborative work, NCREST has focused on restructuring and redefining schools. Part of that work has necessarily attended to the nature of teaching as important social and intellectual activity and to conceptualizing, adapting, and inventing school places that support such a view of teaching (National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, 1993).

Increasingly, it became clear to NCREST that the preparation of teachers for these newly conceived school organizations must be given solid attention. Clearly, too, professional development schools, which are new organizational vehicles for teacher preparation, would provide opportunities for fruitful research and development work. Consequently, NCREST set out to understand

better than was the case at that time how teacher preparation programs worked with elementary, middle, and secondary schools in productive ways and to support that work through providing opportunities for collaborative activity across institutions. The goal initially, then, was twofold: to learn about professional development school cooperative work and to document that work in ways that would help others better cope with the often shrill and harshly critical calls for better teachers and better schools.

At the same time, it was clear that the so-called standards movement was in full swing. New standards for students were claimed to be a powerful way to promote deeper and more serious learning. Similarly, professional organizations, states, and regional alliances were promulgating standards for teacher licensure and assessment to be enforced over entire teaching careers. The Leading Edge work, then, originally proposed to focus on standards and how they were implemented, achieved, adapted, or otherwise dealt with by the participating institutions, with particular reference to this implementation in relation to professional development school partnerships.

We were, and continue to be, particularly interested in how new models of teacher preparation programs work, how they are influential upon and are influenced by teaching and teacher education policies, and how they impact all parties involved—prospective teachers, teacher educators, teachers in schools, and, most important, children and youth. We believe that this greater understanding can be used as leverage toward realizing systemic change in teacher education and in widespread improvement of educational opportunity. In short, we believe that work like that presented in this volume, when aggregated with similar efforts, can provide intellectual and practical bases for altering both professional practice and the preparation of those who engage in it.

However, we also believe that individual instances of exemplary practice are often just that—single cases that can be ignored because of a variety of “we can’t do that here” perspectives held by observers. Therefore, we set out to provide evidence of individual as well as collective practice and the power that results from a community of interest. In our case, the community is made up of the six institutions described earlier.

The six institutions with, of course, their professional development school partners made up the larger community. Representative university- and school-based teacher educators met regularly over the course of the project to share ideas, puzzle out dilemmas, provide intellectual and psychic support, formulate plans for the future, reflect upon current and past experiences, participate in national and regional professional meetings (e.g., The Holmes Partnership and the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association), and, importantly, develop personal and professional relationships that were both supportive and critical. We came to understand the sub-

stantive and practical conditions that helped us to connect our work, as well as acknowledge and accept the individual context features that often showed how different we were. Our times together were important features of the Leading Edge work.

In addition to the larger community, each of the six settings paired with another around issues of common interest. Remembering that we were all focusing on professional development school partnerships and standards, the dyads chose additional aspects of teacher preparation that we believed were important to explore within this framework of PDSs and standards. Teachers College and the University of California, Santa Barbara focused on standards and assessments with particular attention to the inquiry process. Wheelock College and UWM emphasized diversity and equity while attending to the issue of inclusion. USM and UL cooperated around the issues of evidence-based assessments through standards and using technology for program improvement. The dyad chapters later in this volume provide much greater detail about how this work moved forward, what was discovered, and what issues emerged from the cooperative work in the three pairs of programs.

How Can Our Work Inform the Field of Teacher Preparation?

It is obvious to even the most naïve observer that teacher preparation as it has been practiced historically is in need of serious revision (Holmes Group, 1986). A number of assumptions and beliefs about learning to teach—and teaching—well simply do not hold, if they ever were valid, as we move into a new millennium. These assumptions and beliefs, along with their associated practices and program features, are being challenged in a number of settings and from a variety of perspectives. The Leading Edge work offers a set of related issues for examination, critique, and review. The chapters that follow illustrate in detail how these issues influenced and were influenced by participation in the effort. Several are briefly noted here.

First, our work challenges the one-size-fits-all brand of teacher preparation. It is still assumed by many that teaching is a kind of follow-the-rules activity; that if one knows a set of teaching behaviors, students will respond and learning will take place. Although additional information to challenge this assumption is not needed for the expert teacher educator, there are still educational professionals and policymakers who persist in holding such a view. The work reported here both acknowledges and advances the understanding that teaching is a multifaceted decision-making process, that persons preparing to teach need opportunities to learn how to examine contexts for important features in order to decide how to move ahead with effective teaching, and that the growing diversity of student populations demands that teachers bring to their important work a well-developed repertoire of ways of

thinking and acting. Although a number of models of teaching continue to be useful, holding one as absolute rather than knowing how to use a number of them simply does not match the reality of today's classrooms (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997).

Second, our work reveals the dilemmas associated with the presumed fit (some say fidelity) between institutional priorities and policy decisions. For example, states have become increasingly active in instituting accountability measures for both students and teachers. Leading Edge has begun to examine how these measures influence professional development and teacher education. The Leading Edge institutions, as noted earlier, were selected for this project because of their exemplary status. That is, the programs are acknowledged by peers in the field to be outstanding in the ways they work with prospective teachers, in the manner with which they organize and implement their professional development school partnerships, and in the excellence of their graduates. One might assume, then, that there would be few tensions between these programs and their participants and the policy arenas, state and regional, where they are located. We demonstrate and report in this book that this simply is not the case. Points of view about teaching and what is fundamental to learning to teach, from the perspectives of university- and school-based teacher educators in the Leading Edge settings, are often in conflict with policy directives that are formulated by state agencies, for example. It is striking to discover that excellence, substantiated by both peer review and the demonstrated quality of graduates, continues to be insufficient to guide policy decisions. Several such examples of this conflict appear in the chapters that follow.

Third, our work moves inside the professional development school in intellectual rather than simply structural ways. Although the notion of the professional development school has been part of our thinking about teacher education for more than a decade, there are still only a few serious reports about what they are and how they work from the inside (Whitford & Metcalf-Turner, 1999). Instead, we have observers' reports that most often focus on the structural characteristics and features (e.g., public intentions, hours spent by teacher candidates, role descriptions). The Leading Edge work, by definition, is in large part an inside-out perspective on the professional development school and provides substantial evidence and multiple stories about the prospects, possibilities, and problems of making PDSs work.

Fourth, our work reveals the important impact of long-term relationships among critical friends at the institutional as well as the personal level. It has long been known that, as individuals, we are sustained and supported by our relationships with persons who know us and care about us. The presence of confidants whose judgment we trust and whose critical eye reveals what we sometimes cannot see for ourselves is helpful and sustaining, particularly

when that presence persists over time. What the Leading Edge work reveals is that critical friendships can have professional and institutional bases. In the dyad-oriented chapters that follow, a variety of ways of maintaining this broader based set of relationships are described and their impact is presented. Teaching, of course, has been called the lonely profession. Likewise, the work of preparing teachers, even in the company of one's program-based colleagues, can be isolated activity, absent what we believe are important external and supportive sources of inspiration, ideas, criticism, and review. In effect, we came to common cause across institutional boundaries and our work benefitted from it.

Fifth, our work illustrates how recommendations from national organizations and movements can be transformed and translated when considered seriously by leaders in local contexts (Yinger, 1999). In large part because the Leading Edge project focused directly on standards for teaching and teacher education, we were sensitive to and thoughtful about the recommendations for achieving excellence in both of these areas. What we came to understand with greater clarity was the need to be sensitive to the struggles that are inherent in presenting sensible but distanced recommendations for change in our own workplaces. There were no cases in our settings where we simply adopted and implemented recommendations for altering our practices. Instead, we illustrate in this book the difficult work of transforming conceptualizations of teacher preparation so that they made sense where we do our work, whether those places are colleges, universities, or elementary and secondary schools. Similar to the transformations that must occur when we make school subjects out of the traditional disciplines, the construction of local meaning from national recommendations is difficult, time-consuming, and complex intellectual and practical activity.

Sixth, our work adds to the understandings about the power of context to influence ideas and ideas to influence context (Hargreaves, 1994). Directly related to the transformations noted above is our observation that ideas from outside our own contexts are changed as they are shaped to make sense in our ongoing work and that our contexts are changed as a consequence of the introduction of the externally formulated ways of thinking and acting. We came to understand clearly the concept of mutual adaptation, the importance of ideas shaping contexts and contexts shaping ideas.

Seventh, our work helps to focus directly on the political aspects of learning to teach. As can be seen from the chapters that follow, the work of preparing teachers is political activity in larger measure than is typically understood. Although some see teacher education generally as a relatively neutral effort, in political terms, we are aware more sharply than ever before of the ideological struggles around issues of how teachers should be taught, what they should know and be able to do, and especially how they should conceive of their work

in terms of influence upon children and the larger society. Whether we are experiencing the tensions associated with competing claims about preparing teachers for multiple language settings or to work with students around the construction of meaning rather than simply passing along what has been called “funded knowledge” or some other similar example, we realize that the assumptions and dispositions that support conflicting perspectives must be understood and, in some cases, opposed in direct as well as subtle ways. Here, particularly, our network of critical friends has been an ongoing source of intellectual and personal, as well as political, support.

Eighth, our work suggests how we can conceptualize the relationship between professional development schools as new organizations and the ongoing professional development of experienced teachers and teacher educators. The history of school–university relationships can probably best be characterized by the statement, “The university teaches prospective teachers *about* teaching and the schools teach them *how* to teach.” That is, the theory and propositions related to what teaching is all about are the province of higher education but the “real” learning to teach takes place in elementary, middle, and high schools. Often, however, learning about and learning how have been in conflict. This is perhaps best represented in the oft-repeated claim by new teachers, “I didn’t really learn to teach until student teaching. All that theory at the university was a waste of time.” Notwithstanding that this claim may have some basis in reality in certain instances, we believe that the closer relationships between higher education and the schools as represented by professional development schools diminish enormously the possibility that such a representation can continue with any vitality. In large part, this is because of the close proximity of university-based and school-based teacher educators. The professional development school provides a meeting ground and an intellectual and practical space for members of both groups to come together to face important questions like these: “What is exemplary teaching?” “Where and when is the best time and place to learn to teach this way?” “Who are the strongest candidates for teaching and why?” “Where is the required knowledge and skill to assist the prospective teacher?” The Leading Edge work pushed us to understand more directly and to appreciate more deeply the power of school–university interactions in this new context of the professional development school.

Ninth, our work adds to the growing inventory of what is needed to be a teacher educator in times of social and cultural conflict and tension (Cochran-Smith, 1999). Throughout this volume, but particularly in those sections dealing directly with issues of equity in teaching and schooling, we provide examples of the ways that teacher educators must directly face the differences that characterize our society and our schools. Difference manifests itself in many ways, but the most common and, in many cases, the most volatile ways

are in relation to ethnicity, race, and social class. In some ways, the fact that teachers are increasingly middle class and white while their students are increasingly neither middle class nor white is exacerbated by the overwhelmingly middle class and white teacher educators who prepare teachers. Our experiences demonstrate the tensions that teacher educators must encounter to come to terms with preparing teachers for the so-called new populations of students in schools. Similarly, as teacher educators, we face the political issues noted above and must develop serious agency to do so with greater power than has generally been the case. Also, now that teacher education once again assumes a central fiscal role in higher education as enrollments burgeon, we must learn how to balance our beliefs about quality preparation with the extraordinary national demand for new teachers. Much of the subtext of this volume is focused on redefining the role of teacher educator, whether that role is played out in a higher education setting, a conventional public school, or a professional development school.

Last, our work provides a framework for thinking of learning to teach as a community preoccupation rather than an individual vocational path. This can be conceptualized in several ways. Because of our focus on professional development schools, we are able to speak about communities of interest that include university- and school-based teacher educators working together to bring greater power and authority to the experience of learning to teach. This is in sharp contrast to the historical (and, in all too many cases, current) practice of separating sharply and irrevocably the teacher education practices in higher education from those in cooperating teachers' classrooms, as noted earlier. In addition, however, we can testify to the benefits that are derived from participating in the overlapping multiple communities that characterize the Leading Edge project. We believe that the prospective teachers we work with have received stronger opportunities to learn to teach because of our interactions with one another, because of the multiple realities we have faced together, because of the program initiatives that we have learned with and from one another, and because of the focus the Leading Edge opportunity has given to our work. In effect, this book is largely about how these communities intersect to provide these benefits for our students and for ourselves.

ORGANIZATION OF THE VOLUME

This chapter has introduced the Leading Edge participants, described what we intended to do together, and suggested some of the reasons that we believe the experience was worthy of our time and effort and of others' attention. These advance organizers provide only the briefest of glimpses into the complexity of our experience and the benefits we derived. The remainder of

this book describes in detail how our work proceeded and what we learned from that work.

The authors of Chapter 2, *Standardization or Standards for Professional Practice? Public and Private Theories of Teaching in Professional Development Schools*, argue that standards are most useful when coconstructed in partnership with other local stakeholders. The tension between proscriptive standards and contextualized standards is exposed both by reflective processes and by PDS work. To frame their discussion, the authors define teaching by examining public theories of teaching and those held by university faculty and interns. How do public theories manifest themselves? How do teacher education faculty and teacher candidates negotiate public and private theories of teaching? How does public discourse inform teaching practice? The mission of teacher education to assist students to develop their own theories of teaching is challenged by public theories of teaching embodied in state and national standards, which may not be adapted to local conditions or carefully analyzed by those implementing them. In the context of Kentucky's policies, the authors report that the standards and accountability movements have limited curriculum and student learning opportunities by focusing exclusively on strategies that raise test scores, rather than framing efforts around students' learning needs. Thus, policy levers limit rather than enhance the scope of improvement efforts.

Chapter 3, *Assessment and Standards for Professional Improvement*, describes the evolution of the collaboratively developed and implemented Extended Teachers Education Program at USM. Collaboration between school- and university-based educators has significantly shaped assessment and standards, the framework in which the program approaches issues of teaching competence and ongoing program development. The authors use three themes to illuminate intern assessment—authenticity (accurate and useful), continuity (developmental, continuous, and explicit), and fairness (genuine circumstances and multiple opportunities to demonstrate). Attention to standards and outcomes encourages a tighter alignment of program expectations, with intern assessment informing teaching practice and providing a unified conception of what interns and teacher educators are working toward. Embedded in this assessment system is the opportunity to use evidence defined by good teaching for continuous program improvement. The authors conclude with a discussion of assessment strategies used to review evidence of teaching quality, showing how technology is used to support interns' interaction and access to information.

In Chapter 4, *Getting Beyond the Talking and Into the Doing*, the first dyad chapter, a team of authors from USM and UL trace the evolution of a significant and influential "critical-friend" relationship. State policy had consequences for program structures and behaviors. UL found that the imple-

mentation of high stakes accountability legislation challenged not only the ethos of experimentation that had marked the teacher education program but also the nature of the PDS as a teacher education model. While USM also experienced recently implemented state standards, school districts develop their assessment systems locally and interns are able to develop lesson plans broadly in response to state standards. USM experienced internal challenges as the program sought to establish consensus across faculty in multiple sites about assessments aligned with candidate performance indicators and corresponding course work. As a dyad, the two sites work to develop their intern assessment systems by sharing program documents and acting as critical friends. Technology is being used at both sites for communication and to share student teacher products.

Researchers at Teachers College describe in Chapter 5, *A Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership for Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools*, the program structures that actualize the program philosophy in the context of the schools and state policies. The program engages PDS interns in field-related experiences that closely resemble the real life of teaching. Candidates are encouraged to engage in a reflective process about their instruction and learn about multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs so that they become deliberative practitioners. Domains of knowledge or program-specific standards are reflected in both the program structures and course assignments, and emphasize what the program believes is good teacher education. The authors describe how standards are articulated and enacted through structures and processes.

The author of Chapter 6, *Elementary Teacher Education Program at University of California, Santa Barbara*, uses three lenses to describe work in teacher education at the UCSB: values, state policy context, and programmatic structures. In the early '90s, the program engaged in a process to make their existing program values more explicit. These explicit values statements served to provide a direction for the redesign of the program, their research agenda, and the nature of the relationship with their school-based partner. Resulting program structures and processes seek to help teacher candidates grow and develop in six interrelated themes that weave through course work, field experiences, and all interactions candidates have with the program. Over the course of the *Leading Edge* work from 1996 to 1999, externally developed state-mandated policies challenged the existing internally developed values, structures, and processes. This chapter describes how state policies confronted and influenced the program structures and policies.

In Chapter 7, *What We Learned From Site Visits*, the dyad team from Teachers College and the University of California, Santa Barbara describe how the state policy contexts of each of their institutions affect the teacher candidate experience. To illustrate how "who decides and how?" influences learning

opportunities for teacher candidates, the authors present vignettes of practice and three policy contexts that serve as a backdrop to discuss how these policies play out in teacher education programs and in schools. While examining each other's programs, and the role of standards and assessments within those programs, the authors discuss the issues of centralized and decentralized decision making and the role of professional trust in the standards-setting movement. The chapter concludes with a discussion of policy values matching or mismatching, the role of negotiating space in constructive communication, and the need for permeable and open systems of policy making.

The authors of Chapter 8, *Beyond Standards: Creating Depth in Teacher Education Reform*, professors at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, draw attention to the "distance between standards and reform" to stress that it is the actions taken beyond the adoption of standards that will improve teacher preparation and create long-lasting reform. The UWM process toward action is reported through a description of "dialogue spaces" and a belief that talk reflects knowledge and beliefs that become "fuel for our actions." The chapter describes "a recursive cycle of dialogue and action" including the structures and processes used to develop public and shared commitments to action that are informed by national standards as well as locally defined core values that define what it means to prepare teachers for urban schools.

As reported in Chapter 9, *Visions and Outcomes: Developing Standards and Assessments in Wheelock College Teacher Preparation Programs*, Wheelock College in Boston, with its funding from Leading Edge, set out to develop standards and assessments appropriate to a small private college whose graduate and undergraduate programs are specifically devoted to preparing professionals for the fields of education, social work, and child-centered work in medical settings. The Wheelock group took as its framework standards developed by INTASC, and adapted them to fit the unique requirements of early childhood and elementary teachers committed to teaching all of the nation's children effectively. Wheelock's experience suggests that standards and assessments are an important but not singular aspect of transforming teacher education. As the nation's school population becomes increasingly diverse, the pool of teachers is likely to remain largely white, female, and middle-class. Therefore, standards must be part of a system that includes a multicultural approach to curriculum and pedagogy, a carefully crafted sequence of field experiences for students, and a campus culture that supports continuing dialogue about equity and diversity. The authors recount the "messy" process of working toward faculty consensus on relevant standards and they explain the specific differences between Wheelock's and INTASC's formulations.

The authors of Chapter 10, *Equity in Teacher Education Standards and in Our Practice*, describe institutional and state policy contexts of their teacher

education programs at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Wheelock College. Similarities between these dissimilar institutions include a commitment to equity, teacher preparation in urban settings, and PDS partnerships. These commonalities form the basis of their discussions about equity as cross-institutional research partners. The authors argue that the national standards movement does not adequately address issues of equity but instead substitutes a multicultural diversity perspective, and thus falls short of supporting the preparation of teachers able to address the persistent achievement gaps among students. They identify program structures and activities that address teacher education in urban settings.

NOTES

1. The Holmes Partnership, founded in 1986 as the Holmes Group, is a consortium of research universities, public school districts, and professional organizations which is committed to high quality teacher preparation, continued faculty development, and the renewal of public schools through identifying best practices, research, and professional development school partnerships. [<http://www.holmespartnership.org/>]

REFERENCES

- Cochran-Smith, M. (1999). Learning to teach for social justice. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The Education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1* (pp. 114-144). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Griffin, G. A. (Ed.). (1999). *The Education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, Changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1999). Pervasive problems and issues in teacher education. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The Education of Teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (pp. 279-306). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensure and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching. (1993). *Vision statement: Professional development schools network: Purposes, commitments, and enabling conditions for professional development schools*. New York: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York: Author.

- Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1998). *Teaching to change the world*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Whitford, B. L., & Metcalf-Turner, P. (1999). Of promises and unresolved puzzles: Reforming teacher education with professional development schools. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The Education of Teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 257–278). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yinger, R. (1999). The role of standards in teaching and teacher education. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The Education of Teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (pp. 85–113). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.