DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 757 SO 031 822

AUTHOR	Schwartz, Donald; Shedd, John A.; McBride, Lawrence W.; Puklin, Diane
TITLE	Why and How Should History Departments Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers? Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION	National Council for History Education, Inc., Westlake, OH.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	10p.; Excerpts from four papers presented at the National Council for History Education's Panel at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association (Chicago, Illinois, January 8, 2000).
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council for History Education, 26915 Westwood Road, Suite B-2, Westlake, OH 44145.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Higher Education; *History Instruction; *Knowledge Base for Teaching; Reflective Teaching; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This paper evolved from a conference panel presentation on the preparation of prospective high school history teachers. The four papers excerpted here are entitled: "Using History Departments to Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers: A Challenge for the Profession in the 21st Century" (Donald Schwartz); "Why and How Should History Departments Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers?" (John Shedd); "Recent Developments in History Education: A View from Illinois" (Lawrence W. McBride); and "Comment from the Classroom" (Diane Puklin). Schwartz's paper contends that solutions must be found to problems in public education at all levels and suggests that the challenge of training effective teachers should be addressed not only by school of education faculty but by faculty in all other disciplines as well. Shedd's paper cites advantages history departments might have over education departments as more effective producers of good teachers since secondary social studies teachers teach a subject and too many specialists in education are caught up in fruitless arguments about teaching in general. The paper's second part discusses the way in which history departments prepare secondary teachers better, citing the program at the State University of New York, Cortland. McBride's paper discusses the development of national and state content standards, and bases suggestions about how history departments should prepare teachers on a distinction between the systematic preparation of a reflective practitioner on the one hand and the education of a person in content and techniques on the other. Puklin's paper envisions a continuum of teacher training with one end advocating teacher education anchored in history departments and the other end favoring education departments. The suggestion is to work from both ends of this continuum. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 757

Why and How Should History Departments Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers? Occasional Paper.

by

Donald Schwartz, John A. Shedd,
Lawrence W. McBride, Diane Puklin

SO 031 822

E.W. Reed

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

National Council for History Education, Inc.,
Westlake, OH

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCHE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR HISTORY EDUCATION

OCCASIONAL PAPER

March, 2000

WHY AND HOW SHOULD HISTORY DEPARTMENTS PREPARE SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS?

Excerpts from four papers presented at NCHE's Panel at the American Historical Association Conference
January 8, 2000 • Sheraton Chicago Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

by Donald Schwartz, John A. Shedd, Lawrence W. McBride, and Diane Puklin

Editor's Note: In the Fall of 1995, the National Council for History Education brought together a group of history educators at The Abbey, on Lake Geneva in southern Wisconsin.The topic for that meeting was the preparation of school history teacl ers during both their pre-service course work in college and through professional development throughout their professional lives. Out of that conference came the report: ***Enlarging the Profession: Scholars Teaching History*** *which offered specific actions that could be taken to improve history teaching preparation by six different groups of stakeholders: Teachers; Education School Faculty and Deans; University Historians and Department Chairs; Local School Administrators and School Committee/Board Members; Representatives of State Departments of Education; and Members of State Education and University Governing Boards.*

This panel for the American Historical Association Convention grew out of the portion of the ***Enlarging the Profession*** *report directed to University Historians and Department Chairs. Each of our authors is a historian who works in conjunction with an Education Department to prepare prospective school history teachers. and each explains a different aspect of the advantages and the difficulties of having historians be an integral part of the preparation of school history teachers. The panel was Chaired by NCHE Executive Director Elaine Wrisley Reed and the Commentator was University of Chicago Lab School history teacher Diane Puklin.*

[The complete text of these panel presentations is planned for a future issue of **The History Teacher** with the programs of other institutions also represented. For further information contact THT Editor William Weber via email at: <wweber@csulb.edu>.]

Using History Departments to Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers: A Challenge for the Profession in the 21st Century

by Donald Schwartz
California State University, Long Beach

Over the past decade we have heard that there is a crisis in education, that scores on standardized tests are declining, that newly minted teachers have difficulty passing basic examinations. These reports are particularly alarming in that more than two and a half million teachers must be developed in the next decade to meet the demand created by retirements and new enrollment. There is no question that education in general, and teacher education in particular, is in crisis. More than two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson cautioned that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." At the beginning of this new century, it is imperative that we find solutions to problems in public education at all levels. I suggest that the challenge of training effective teachers should be addressed not only by school of education faculty, but by faculty in all other disciplines as well.

CSULB is one of the relatively few universities that place single subject credential programs in the academic disciplines rather than in the School of Education.

As coordinator of the social science credential program at CSULB, I am also a member of the history faculty. At a recent department meeting, discussion centered on a report concerning how poorly new teachers are prepared, particularly in subject matter mastery. One colleague in history turned to me, and in a rather baiting tone, asked me to explain why students in the social science credential program were so deficient in their knowledge and understanding of history. "I'm not sure," I responded, "but I do know that many of the students in the credential program have taken your U.S. history courses."

I do not bring up this unpleasant interchange to pass along responsibility for what many observers recognize as an increasing problem in the preparation of new teachers. But I think the exchange focuses the question, to what degree history departments are, or should be, responsible for the training of secondary school social science teachers. The fact is that many history professors do not feel any connection, personally or academically,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to K-12 education in general, or to educating those who will teach on the pre-collegiate level. And there is some justification for that position. History department search committees do not consider teacher education as a criteria for hiring new faculty; teaching and research responsibilities of most history professors do not address educating school teachers; and the Review/Tenure/Promotion evaluation process does not focus on a professor's concern for preparation of K-12 social studies teachers. Nevertheless, the purpose of my address here today is to underscore the need for change, for history faculty to take responsibility for the preparation of those who teach history at all levels of education, not only those who will seek positions at universities or community colleges.

The American Council of Education has released a study entitled, *To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught*. It represents the findings of a task force on teacher education composed mostly of college and university presidents and calls for a dramatic transformation in the way universities educate teachers. The report highlights the following:

- The quality of the teacher is the single most important factor in improving student performance, more important than the socio-economic background of the child or the condition of the school, or the teacher-student ratio;
- A thorough grounding in college level subject matter is an essential ingredient for good teaching. The task force cites an earlier study which found that to be effective, teachers must "explain content to their students from different perspectives, respond accurately to their questions, plan lessons intelligently, qualify assertions appropriately, and choose wisely what to include, exclude, and emphasize in the curriculum," all of which requires subject mastery;
- The report cites a 1999 investigation which concludes that "virtually all who have examined the education of prospective teachers have stressed that more attention must be given to the education provided by subject matter faculty."
- A review commissioned by the task force found that "arts and science faculty and education faculty [which] have developed an effective way to combine their contributions" is a primary characteristic of a successful teacher training program. It recommended the tight articulation of subject matter and clinical training of practice and theory.

To repeat Lenin's query made almost a century ago,"what is to be done?" Can history faculty be made to recognize the importance of their efforts in improving the quality of prospective teachers? What specific roles can history professors play in teacher training? Is articulation with education departments feasible? These questions must be answered if the recommendations of the American Council on Education and the NCHE are to be taken seriously. While I have no definitive solutions, I can share with you what one history department is doing to address the problem.

CSULB is one of the relatively few universities that place single subject credential programs in the academic disciplines rather than in the School of Education. Our history faculty is involved with the teacher education program in several important areas. When credential candidates are given their student teaching assignments, they are supervised by members of the history department rather than by faculty from education. The rationale for enlisting historians for supervision is that knowledge of subject matter is at least as important to effective teaching as pedagogy. It is easier to prepare a history professor in clinical supervision than it is to familiarize an education professor in world and U.S. history. Consequently, history faculty so trained regularly visit secondary school classrooms to observe and evaluate the effectiveness of student teachers. They meet in post-observation conferences to give necessary feedback to teaching candidates, and to suggest ways of improving the lesson under discussion.

History faculty contribute in other ways as well. Policy for the social science credential program at CSULB is determined by faculty from history, political science, geography, economics, and education. This committee reviews program requirements and considers ways to improve them. Members of the history department assess pre-service students. Candidates must take a prescribed series of courses to insure subject matter mastery in the courses they will teach on the K-12 level. Those who fail to achieve required minimum grades must undergo an oral interview before a panel of faculty from history and other social sciences. Thus history professors play a decisive role in determining whether a student is adequately prepared in subject matter to accept a student teaching assignment.

It is easier to prepare a history professor in clinical supervision than it is to familiarize an education professor in world and U.S. history.

The history department is involved in other aspects of teacher preparation. It offers courses in world history, United States and California history which combine content and pedagogy. These are courses specifically designed for history majors who seek a social science credential, and they are taught by those members of the department who have had experience teaching on the secondary school level or who have supervised student teachers. These faculty are fully conversant with state standards and they model varied teaching styles such as group work, cooperative learning, and periodic assessment.

History departments from junior college to university can support seasoned teachers as well as novices to the profession. History faculty at CSULB have served as project directors and teachers in summer institutes for secondary school teachers. These programs, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, bring teachers from throughout the nation to study topics such as "The Enlightenment Revisited," "Understanding Revolutionary Russia and the Soviet Union through History and Literature," and "Tradition and Change: East Central Europe in the 20th Century." Furthermore, the department has hosted statewide summer institutes for teachers such as those sponsored by the California History Project and by the Center for International Studies. Such projects introduce issues and interpretations in history

for school teachers who have had little time to keep current with historical scholarship. Working with professional historians helps to re-kindle the intellectual fervor which may have dimmed over the years since they completed their college courses.

Another avenue through which CSULB history faculty serve teachers in the surrounding community is the Seamless Education Project. Since 1996, monthly meetings are held to bring together teachers of history from kindergarten through graduate schools in the Long Beach area. At these sessions educators in elementary school, middle school, high school, community college and CSULB discuss their experiences and common concerns related to teaching history/social science. Although they teach at different levels, these teachers realize they address the same audience of students, most of whom are of working class backgrounds, many with limited English proficiency but who are motivated to become the first in their families to attend college. Topics addressed at the monthly conclaves include how to motivate students in the study of history, how to integrate skills and content, and how to use traditional and non-traditional means of subject matter assessment. The overriding goal of the Seamless Education Project is to improve history education at all grades, not just K-12. In it, Cal State history professors have learned about instructional strategies familiar to school teachers but not to university faculty, such as cooperative learning and portfolio assessment. Colleagues who have attended Seamless meetings have successfully employed such approaches for both lower and upper division college courses.

I have spoken at some length of what history faculty can contribute to the development of new teachers. But college and university chancellors, presidents, and deans must recognize, support, and honor those efforts. Working with pre-service and veteran K-12 teachers should be valued in considerations for retention, promotion, tenure and salary increases. If administrators fail to reward such services, then all the efforts of the American Council of Education, and of the National Council for History Education, will have little impact on better teacher education.

Thomas Jefferson's admonishment about the importance of education in a free society is no less critical today than it was in the early days of the Republic. The report by the American Council on Education concludes that "the opportunity to transform schools by improving the quality of new teachers has never been as great." I submit that this challenge must be addressed by educators at every level. I call on those of you in this audience, on professors of history nationwide, as well as the AHA, NCHE, and OAH, to play a vital role in this critical mission.

Donald Schwartz is a Professor of History and the Social Science Credential Coordinator at California State University, Long Beach. He has also taught history and social studies in the New York City Public Schools. He can be reached via email at: <dschwart@csulb.edu>.

Why and How Should History Departments Prepare Secondary Social Studies Teachers?

by John Shedd
State University of New York at Cortland

The title of this session implies that history departments, under certain conditions, can be more effective producers of good teachers than those programs where instruction is entirely in the hands of departments of education. There are several reasons why I think this is so, but for the sake of time will emphasize two advantages, one practical and one philosophical, of greater involvement in teacher education programs by historians. The first advantage has to do with the simple fact that secondary social studies teachers teach a subject. Although various factors make a good teacher, among the most important traits outstanding teachers possess is knowledge of subject matter. In my view, the curriculum typical to American education departments stays on the generic level of teaching in general too long, with treatment of social studies content coming late, if ever, in the program. To use an analogy for a different professional, namely a surgeon, it is of course true that much can be taught to the physician-in-training about surgery in general: how to scrub up; how to use a scalpel; how to make stitches, etc. But eventually, the novice surgeon must master knowledge and skills specific to a particular kind of surgery, be it intestinal or brain, for example. I have found that progress in teaching young people to become teachers is both more rapid and more effective when instruction in classroom methods and materials is done within the context of a specific topic, such as Civil War and Reconstruction, Ancient China, or Post Colonial Africa, to name a few. In short, history professors are experts in subject matter and possess skills relating to historical inquiry, which make them potentially better able to inspire a similar expertise among fledgling teachers.

> ***Experts on teaching...too often condemn teaching practices different from their own...***

The second advantage I want to emphasize is philosophical. Too many specialists in education are caught up in fruitless arguments about teaching in general. Certainly, no one needs to remind an audience at the AHA conference that historians like to argue among themselves. Yet, historians participating in even the most vehement of disputes should, and mostly do, acknowledge that their research is built upon the findings of others in the field. Experts on teaching, however, too often condemn teaching practices different from their own as a way of explaining why those not following their advice produce students who do not learn enough. In my view, experts in pedagogy are often eager to mount crusades asserting their own viewpoint as the only valid one, thereby condemning educational methodology to a cycle of fads. Educators who deny the credibility of other perspectives break the tenets of sound scholarship. Hence, I believe history departments which have on staff professors who have been successful secondary teachers and who are willing to study and try out various instructional methods and materials, stand a better chance of putting together effective teacher training

BEST COPY AV

programs for their colleges.

The second part of this paper discusses how history departments can better prepare secondary teachers, and thus I turn our attention to SUNY-Cortland's program, which was recently cited for its excellence by the Teacher Education Council of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, as a suggested model. Students entering our program are history majors with a minor in social sciences consisting of six hours each in geography, political science, and economics. They must achieve at least a B average in the major to be admitted to the certification program. During the fall semester of their senior year, our history-secondary social studies dual majors enroll in the Professional Semester. The Professional Semester is an immersion program which provides both preparation and student teaching over the fall term for a total of eighteen semester hours of credit. The semester is divided into three parts: a Pre-Session, which meets for six hours a day, five days a week for six weeks, followed by Student Teaching, and concluded with a brief Post-Session.

This grades seven through twelve student teacher preparation semester attempts to be as practical as possible. We make student teaching placements over the summer, so that as they begin the Professional Semester in the fall, they already have had contact with their soon-to-be master teacher, who has informed them of at least one unit of instruction--for example, medieval Europe, New York state government, or the Gilded Age--which they will be required to teach as part of their student teaching experience. Accordingly, students are expected to arrive on campus already having used part of their summer reading about the topic they will soon teach. We also have students visit their future student-teaching placements during the Pre-Session so as to begin collecting materials and instructional ideas from their master teachers and, perhaps more importantly, to start getting to know their field placement school and its students. Besides teaching methods and lesson planning, other topics treated during the Pre-Session include: the state curriculum; computer instruction; multicultural issues; classroom management and discipline; students with special needs; educational journals; the assessment movement; learning styles; and teaching materials, from charts and graphs to literature.

Recently, we have had to give more attention to the new standards handed down by the New York State Board of Regents as reflected in changing Regents Exams, the successful completion of which will soon be required of all students before they can receive a high school diploma. One important change on the history exams, for example, is more document analysis. We can count on motivation among our students in the Pre-Session not to be a problem, since they have visited at school the students they are about to teach and realize that in order to be effective, they must use the six weeks of preparation time as wisely as possible so as to hit the ground running once student teaching begins. Also, having our students together working alongside each other all day quickly leads to a healthy camaraderie which goes a long way in building confidence and dispelling the anxieties a young person naturally and justifiably feels prior to student teaching. Students in the Pre-Session most often work in groups, discussing topics and issues related to schooling before turning in individual and group responses, and also providing peer critiques for the lesson objectives, lesson plans, and unit plans they are each constructing.

Having the methods instruction occur just prior to student teaching and identifying actual topics our prospective teachers will soon teach at a middle school or high school are two of the many strengths of the program. The Professional Semester instructors both hold Ph.D. degrees in history and have had secondary teaching experience. We supervise our seniors during their student teaching, but since we average approximately forty-five students per fall semester, we hire adjunct supervisors (usually excellent secondary teachers in retirement) who frequently visit the Pre-Session to establish a rapport with students they will soon supervise in the field, while helping them prepare lesson plans for their student teaching unit. Student teachers are never told when their teaching will be observed by college faculty and are required to keep a binder containing all of their past lesson plans, written out in full, as well as supporting teaching materials, to share with supervisors during visits. Instruction on teaching philosophy is saved for the Post-Session, after our students have spent time in front of their own classrooms and can, therefore, think more concretely about themselves as teachers.

Having the methods instruction occur just prior to student teaching and identifying actual topics our prospective teachers will soon teach at a middle school or high school are two of the many strengths of the program.

In conclusion, the theme of our teacher education program, which amounts to a list indicating the classroom traits our new teachers are expected to exhibit, is: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, and task-oriented behavior. I have noticed, as a high school teacher of ten years in Oak Ridge, Tennessee and since, that secondary teachers who love both students and the subject they teach do a good job and seldom burn out. We, therefore, try to assist our students in becoming thoughtful, patient, and reflective teachers who enjoy helping their students as individuals and in groups, while concurrently upholding academic achievement as the first priority in their classrooms.

John Shedd teaches history at State University of New York at Cortland. He also taught social studies at Oak Ridge High School, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. He can be reached via email at: <Sheddj@Cortland.edu>.

6

Recent Developments in History Education: a view from Illinois

by Lawrence W. McBride
Illinois State University

This session at the American Historical Association's annual meeting has two objectives: first, to supply a rationale for why departments of history should prepare social studies teachers; and second, to address how departments of history can best prepare teachers to reinvigorate history in the schools. My remarks regarding the first objective take the development of national and state content and performance standards for students and teachers as a point of departure. My suggestions about how history departments should prepare teachers are based on a distinction between the systematic preparation of a reflective practitioner on the one hand, and the education of a person in content and technique on the other. As I proceed, I will point out how the questions of why and how are related, drawing on the program at my university and developments in my home state for examples.

An initial answer to the question of **why** is as obvious as it is assertive: the subject of history occupies the central place in the social studies curriculum. Those hired to teach the social studies are usually teachers of history. Moreover, the other social studies courses in the curriculum can never maximize their potential if the topics that students encounter are not placed in a historical context. Simply put, social studies teachers need the knowledge and understanding of content that university history faculty provide: a major course of study for secondary teachers, and at least a minor for middle school teachers. Teacher candidates in the pre-school--grade 5 social science sequence should complete a battery of survey courses in United States history, world history, world geography, political science, and economics. These minimums in course content will provide some assurance that all candidates for employment know the subjects they hope to teach, and thereby counter the national scandal wherein school officials assign teachers to particular classrooms without due regard to their preparation.

Additional answers to the why question require departments of history to recognize their self-interest, accept their civic responsibility, and exercise educational leadership. Students do not list history among their favorite subjects; there has been a decline in their understanding of history; and for many, the high school history class will be their last formal study of the past. History departments must work closely with others who are interested in reversing these trends to prepare teachers who can do something about it.

Faith (or perhaps more charitably, hope) is now placed in the content and performance standards for both students and teachers as the means to remedy this historical illiteracy and its attendant civic incompetence. School districts across the country are busy aligning their curricula to state standards. Districts are under immense pressure to do so, as their students are beginning to be assessed through standards-based 'high stakes' examinations and their scores duly reported in the local press. State officials are similarly worried about their national ranking on NAEP examinations. Lately, accrediting agencies and professional organizations have been setting standards to assess what new social studies teachers as well as experienced teachers seeking continuing recertification must know and understand about content and how they perform in the classroom. About half the states have teacher standards either in place or under construction. Soon, college and university history (or social science or social studies) education programs, and indeed departments of history and colleges of education, will take their turn under the 'high stakes' assessment spotlight. Will their 'report cards' indicate that their prospective candidates for licensure have sufficient knowledge and understanding of history and pedagogy to ensure that students in grades K-12 will be prepared to meet or exceed the state's learning and performance standards?

To provide this assurance history departments will have to address how they prepare teachers, that is, how they are going about the business of meeting the content standards required of teachers. Departments of history, together with their partners in the college of education, will have to check the alignment of their teacher education curriculum--the content of the major and the education sequence--with the content of the state's K-12 learning and performance standards. Survey courses will have to be standardized within a department; world history courses, where they do not yet exist, will have to be created. Departmental advisors will have to place teacher education students in upper division courses with long chronologies and wide geographic reach. Narrow or idiosyncratic courses, however interesting they may be to individual students who want to be teachers, may not be in their best interest.

Faith (or perhaps more charitably, hope) is now placed in the content and performance standards for both students and teachers as the means to remedy this historical illiteracy and its attendant civic incompetence.

There is, however, a more immediate problem for history departments that lies beyond the preparation of social studies teachers to teach specific content. The source of this problem is located in the rupture between the advocates of the social studies as a field of study and those who promote a history-centered, disciplinary approach to the social studies curriculum. Some brief narrative: After the governors' education summit meeting in 1989, history and geography were included among the five core subjects requiring national standards. That the term 'social studies' was pointedly excluded as a school subject created a crisis of confidence within the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). While historians and geographers (and, later, political scientists and economists) struggled to fashion their discipline based national standards, NCSS fashioned its own standards, **Expectations of Excellence: Curriculum Standards for Social Studies** (1994). The NCSS standards promote a thematic approach to the curriculum, noting that one theme of ten, 'Time, Continuity and Change,' can stand in directly

for history, although all of the others have the potential to inform a given topic in history. NCSS also developed a series of scope and sequence models for curriculum design, and a definition of the social studies that buried history as a discrete school subject within a field of study arranged alphabetically by social science disciplines and others unnamed. To those who believe that history is **the** integrative discipline, one with clearly defined aims, objectives, and methods of inquiry, the NCSS definition of social studies, its ten themes, and its suggested social studies curricula set teachers and their students academically adrift with neither chart nor compass.

Illinois is about to implement teacher standards that are derived from the discipline-based student standards. History standards that should be met by all social science generalists, as well as the specific standards for history specialists, are organized by the conceptual frameworks and model content standards put forward in 1998 by the National Council for History Education (NCHE). But the real challenge for history departments which prepare prospective teachers of history and the social sciences arises from the tripartite alliance forged by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Accreditation Support Consortium (INTASC), and NCSS. This means that all colleges and universities in Illinois, regardless of whether they seek national accreditation from NCATE, must now meet ten knowledge, performance and disposition standards proposed by NCATE. The first standard focuses on a teacher's knowledge of both content and pedagogy. That standard is controlled by NCSS, because NCSS reviews the folios compiled by history/social science/social studies education programs within universities seeking NCATE accreditation. History and social sciences education faculty will find themselves in the position of documenting how both their program's philosophy and their colleagues' courses meet the state's discipline-based standards, an NCSS 'history-as-methodology' standard, as well as the NCSS social studies curriculum standards, now unhappily misused as content standards. The call and response between history and social studies educators in the American Historical Association's **Perspectives** (May, September, October, and December, 1999) seems to indicate that to achieve national accreditation, teacher preparation programs will have to embrace the NCSS's **Expectations of Excellence** and also satisfy the curricular world-view of an NCSS-designated folio reviewer.

Neither I nor my department is at war with NCSS: I have served a five year term as the executive director of the Illinois Council for the Social Studies; my colleague in history education has just begun a term as executive director. We are not at war with INTASC: the history and social sciences education program at Illinois State University was the only secondary program in Illinois to pilot-test over a three year period the INTASC principles; that experience helped us improve the preparation of our students. Nor are we at war with NCATE: our university and its programs are proud to be NCATE-approved; the self-study that accompanied the review process also benefited our program. But we cannot accept the NCSS approach to the standards issues. Perhaps it is time for the National Council for History Education, the leading advocate of the history-centered curriculum, to approach NCATE with the proposition that NCHE and those who adhere to its principles are the most appropriate folio reviewers for programs in both history and social science education.

Let me continue now to address the **how** of university history departments involvement in the preparation of school history teachers. These suggestions apply not only to the preparation of new teachers but also to the continuing education of experienced teachers.

First is a suggestion directed toward the faculty of history departments. All members of departments of history that prepare history teachers need to consider themselves as both historians and history educators. As such, they have a number of roles to play. They should see themselves as active partners in the university's program to prepare school history teachers. Historians should recognize the interests they hold in common with K-12 history teachers, and with faculty in community colleges. These common interests should lead to dialog between teachers and historians on historical research, history curriculum/standards, and methods of presenting that material. The goal is to develop a sense of community between university history scholars and school history teachers, both of whom care about the discipline of history and want to improve the way history is taught to American students at all levels—this is a conversation already begun by NCHE in its *History Education Colloquia* around the country. A modest proposal to start this type of learning process was recently put forward in the journal **Teaching History** (Fall 1999) by its venerable editor, Stephen Kneeshaw, who asked: *Is it not possible for every historian to set aside just one day to observe a local history classroom?* Another possible role for historians: teacher Betty Franks described in a recent issue of ***History Matters!*** the excitement at her school's in-service workshop when her colleagues discussed the subject of history, and not a pedagogical issue that often fails to fire teachers' enthusiasm. Nearby historians are in an excellent position to offer local schools, like Dr. Franks', content-driven, customized in-service workshops and thereby put an end to 'the Great American Spectator Sport' that masquerades as professional development.

Nearby historians are in an excellent position to offer local schools content-driven, customized in-service workshops and thereby put an end to 'the Great American Spectator Sport' that masquerades as professional development.

My second suggestion for how history departments should prepare school history teachers is: re-conceptualize the relationship between faculty in colleges of education and faculty in departments of history. On most campuses, and in public perception, teacher education is viewed as the responsibility of departments of education. Professors of history

convey content knowledge in one building, while in another, professors of curriculum and instruction or professors of social studies education proffer teaching methods courses and supervise field experiences and student teaching. Let us begin to bridge this gap by utilizing the skills of college of education faculty who can provide history/social science education students with substantial background in the methods of teaching reading and the precepts of learning theory. History faculty could return the favor by working in the K-5, middle and high school curriculum in the college of education. Let us then go further by integrating into these methods teams of local cooperating teachers who are fluent with the aims and objectives of the history department, and adding our own history faculty members when specific topics are selected as case studies for teaching.

At Illinois State the department of history joins with a local school district to create a Professional Development School (PDS), where each prospective teacher completes pre-service requirements under the watchful eye of a mentor teacher. The PDS also serves as the site for the department of history's teaching methods course and provides guest faculty who collaborate with history faculty and their adjuncts from education. Later, history faculty and their adjunct partners observe student teachers at work with the mentor teachers from the PDS or other cooperating teachers (supervising the student teacher's capstone performance should never be farmed out to someone trained in another discipline).

My third suggestion for how history departments should prepare school history teachers is: expand the techniques available to assess teacher education students and, by extension, their teacher education programs. In these days when the popular call in education is for "accountability," school and university administrators, politicians, and tax-payers often call for evidence that teachers are well-prepared and competent to teach their subjects. Meeting content standards is certainly one aspect of being a competent history teacher. And one piece of evidence that might indicate the competence of a prospective teacher is a multiple-choice examination; but that kind of test measures the skill of mimetic recollection of specific bits of content yet fails to measure with any degree of reliability or validity a teacher's ability to reflect systematically on the trans-formative processes involved in both the learning and teaching of history. I suggest that it is the historian's discipline that can provide true "accountability." The historian routinely assembles evidence from a wide range of sources, the historian evaluates the validity of the various pieces of evidence, and ultimately comes to a judgment about what has happened, how, and why—based on the evidence. It would seem fitting and proper that the historian's methodology be used to make judgments as to the quality of a teacher at any stage of his or her career. Teachers could compile portfolios that contain evidence of their knowledge and understanding of content, pedagogical skills in the classroom, and disposition for the profession. That evidence might include, but should not be limited to, 'bubble tests' and 'report cards.' The teacher's portfolio can serve as the basis for a historian's kind of judgment and true "accountability." It is the historians who can make the case for assessing teachers and programs in this way; after all, it is what they do.

In conclusion, I believe it is crucial that historians work with both pre-service and in-service teachers to help them keep abreast of the expanding research within our discipline. We should be able to help them determine what is most important for their students to know, and demonstrate for them ways that history's *vital themes and narratives* and its *habits of mind* can organize, process and synthesize new information with old. We should model for them survey courses in U.S. and World History that are based on sound instructional practices and employ a variety of assessments allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge, reasoning, and the ability to communicate.

...it is crucial that historians work with both pre-service and in-service teachers to help them keep abreast of the expanding research within our discipline.

Lawrence McBride is Professor of History at Illinois State University in Normal, Illinois. He has worked in elementary and secondary schools in Chicago and in the metropolitan area, both as a teacher and as the Program Director of the Chicago Metro History Fair. He can be reached via email at: <LMCBRIDE@ILSTU.EDU>.

Comment from the Classroom

by Diane Puklin
University of Chicago Laboratory School

Picture a continuum of teacher-training: one end advocates teacher education anchored in history departments; the other end favors education departments, although with history department participation. A middle ground falls somewhere near the history department end, but leaves room for input from the education field. Our panelists all fall within that spectrum and concur on the singular importance of discipline knowledge in teacher preparation.

I want to suggest how we can work from both ends of this continuum. My argument for embracing both ends of the continuum rests upon my experience as a classroom teacher: the classroom influences what and how I teach. On the surface, this statement reflects the position generally assumed by education departments, which are currently under criticism for emphasizing classroom tactics rather than the disciplines taught in them. I encountered education's position when I moved from college to high school teaching. My doctorate in history presented an obstacle. I was advised to return to graduate school for my 4th degree, a M.Ed., which I did. As one faculty member in the education department, a former history teacher, advised, with this degree in hand, I would be viewed by principals as one who could "teach kids history, not history to kids."

While I found a teaching position shortly after receiving my M.Ed., the skills and knowledge I brought to the classroom came from my training in history, not in education. As a class-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

room teacher, what I relied upon was my understanding of how we do history. I distinguish how we do history from our content knowledge, because I was not steeped in the content of the subjects I taught. I was trained in the history of science and medicine but began secondary education teaching American history (America being a foreign country to me, professionally) and then early and modern world history. I found, however, that knowing how to do history easily led to determining what content knowledge I needed and then to mastering it sufficiently.

It also helped meet the challenges of the classroom. Whether engaging heterogeneously-grouped students, guiding students to replace opinion with relevant evidence, pulling student understanding up from events to ideas—knowing how to do history gave me both the direction and the instructional guidance to frame the necessary lessons that kept students on task.

One does not need a Ph.D. to know how to do history. A major research project will help beginning teachers to learn the essential habits of mind in history---how to frame questions and how to frame questions that materials can answer; what resources will help find the answers; how to critique sources; how to compile narratives from seemingly disparate materials; how to move discursively between evidence and ideas; how to develop cogent arguments, and so on. All those important skills we would like our students to learn are best imparted when we have had solid experience using them ourselves. These skills also allow us the flexibility necessary to keep classroom discussions on track, to prod a student in the right direction, to tie impromptu discussions to general themes, to capture the teachable moment. Well-prepared history teachers can work flexibly with history---flip it one way then another; turn it inside out and squeeze a few drops on an unsuspecting student. These teachers use history to drive the curriculum rather than allow classroom influences to do so.

> ***—knowing how we do history easily led to determining what content knowledge I needed and then to mastering it sufficiently.***

But what about the other end of the continuum, the education department? Education professionals have produced a wealth of research on learning in general and learning history, in particular. I urge education and history departments to work together to channel this research to classrooms, where it will best serve those involved in learning. I also urge education professionals to focus their expertise on helping history (and the other disciplines) address the pressures upon classrooms that present serious challenges to all teachers, not just beginning ones. These pressures threaten to compromise the curriculum by consuming teacher time and constraining professional judgment, by setting high expectations without providing necessary resources, and by requiring that classrooms accommodate certain students without funding relevant support systems. As experts in investigating and defining classroom issues, education professionals can help the disciplines find realistic measures to protect classrooms from these untoward pressures.

My second topic today addresses one of the specific pressures on classrooms: academic standards. As one education researcher put it, "There is a proliferation of standards in the content areas. Teachers have a five-foot high pole of standards and are overwhelmed." (**ASCD**, Winter, 1999, 2) Proliferating standards present one set of problems; the failure of standards to be sufficiently prescriptive so teachers know what to teach, presents another, far more telling difficulty. My experience with Illinois Standards is with the academic standards. In Illinois, after the preliminary draft of the academic standards in history went through 2 separate revisions, the final document offered broad curricular directives, but failed to provide specific content guides. For example, we have **State Goal 16:** *Understand events, trends, individuals and movements shaping the history of Illinois, the United States and other nations.* **Learning Standard B.** *Understand the development of significant political events.* **Benchmark: Early High School 16.A. 4a.** *Analyze and report historical events to determine cause-effect relationships.*

Illinois standards are sufficiently broad that they exist as a type of background noise in classrooms. Teachers can acknowledge them when it becomes compelling to do so. In a teachers' workshop on implementing Illinois academic standards, teachers were comfortable using the standards as backward checks. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development advised this approach, as well, in its booklet on how to apply the standards: develop your lesson, this booklet explains, and then determine which standard(s) it meets. Teachers take standards seriously when a test is attached to them.

Implementing standards involves testing. In Texas, 53% of students met standards in 1994 when a similar testing system began. This year, 78% did. Education officials explain the rise in scores as resulting from teachers adjusting their lesson plans to prepare students, that is, teaching to the test. In the Chicago Public Schools, this predictability has been built into the curriculum, by the "optional" scripts, which almost word for word dictate the daily lesson. While the Chicago example may be the extreme, it does suggest that the standards movement—well-intended as most education reforms—has the potential to push schools back to the Thorndike era when prepackaged curriculum rendered classrooms teacher-proof. The question is how the history-educated beginning teacher, capable of initiative and creativity, will fare in a culture that holds this teacher accountable for a single, centrally defined goal: higher scores on the statewide test.

A second question concerns recent events in Illinois in which districts, given the option by State legislation, have declined to implement this year's state testing of 10th graders. As New Trier Superintendent Henry Bangser said, *We are going to use that test time for other purposes, instructional time or staff development. We believe it's a better use of time for our students.* (**Chicago Tribune**, January 4, 2000, p. 4.) If this reaction signals growing local resistance to state and nation-wide reform efforts, assuming a worst-case scenario—does it signal the fading of the standards movement and, if this might be, will it affect the involvement of history departments in teacher training?

I end my comments with this question.

Diane Puklin teaches U.S., early world, modern world, and women's history at The University of Chicago Laboratory Schools. She previously taught at DePaul, Loyola, and the University of Hartford. She is the Illinois Liaison to the NCHE. Diane can be reached via email at: <dpuklin@Midway.uchicago.edu>.