Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
CCAS Annual Meeting
Nov. 9, 2000
Nancy L. Zimpher

It was a great privilege for me to address the 2000 Annual Meeting of CCAS, especially on a topic as important as the education of our nation's teachers. And further, to speak to the leadership of those working in schools and colleges of the arts and sciences simply underscores the centrality of the teaching disciplines to the education of teachers.

My thanks to Dean Sally Frost Mason, CCAS President-elect, for your kind invitation, and to my UWM dean of letters and science, Marshall Goodman. Both gave me invaluable advice about the interests of the membership relative to teaching and learning in the disciplines.

Much has happened in the years since the initial warning signal of "A Nation at Risk" was sounded, including the compilation of standards for what students should know and be able to do in many of the disciplines subsumed under the arts and sciences. Initiatives such as Project 30 and the Ford-funded STEP project have successfully brought together representatives of the teaching disciplines with those in the pedagogy of teaching to foster more integrative approaches to teacher education.

In the fall of 1999, U.S. Department of Education Secretary Richard Riley convened more than 100 university presidents to impress upon them the all-university interests in the education of teachers. Bemoaning the results of a 1999 report on teacher quality, Riley observed that universities should do a better job of preparing prospective teachers and particularly in the subjects they plan to teach, and further evoked, "the entire university ought to be involved in the college of education." When teachers fail, Riley admonished, "it's not the teacher's fault; it's the university's fault."

Vartan Gregorian, now head of the esteemed Carnegie Foundation, once observed that universities that have schools of education "...should place them in the intellectual mainstream of the university, or else shut them down." In short, he adds, "schools of education should not be isolated, degraded, apologized for; rather, the central mission of any university ought to be ...to educate a new generation of citizens."

Two issues remain troublesome in this equation. Is there evidence of the powerful connection between good teaching and good learning? And, if so, why is it still so challenging to accept the centrality of teaching to learner success?

To the latter point, expertise in teaching is still shrouded in the myths or commonplace assumptions about the act of teaching. Some still believe that good teaching is a function of the genes; that is, that women are gender-bound to teach and teach well, a profession based mainly on nurturing capacities. Others believe that good teaching is a function of the literally thousands of hours logged in just watching other

teachers. What results is that good teaching when delivered masterfully has the uncanny effect of making teaching look "easy;" the result being, "I can do that!" Still others, often those who teach the disciplines, ascribe to the mantra, "show me someone who knows their discipline, and I'll show you a good teacher!" This assumption rests on the notion that there is no science of pedagogy; only the science of the discipline.

Veteran teachers provide another view, often characterized as OJT—on-the-job training. In other words, as teachers mature, they tend to believe that everything they know about teaching stems only from their experiences in real, live classrooms; universities represent a theoretical view of teaching that no longer rings true to their experienced perspective. And universities add complication to complexity by denying the relevance of pedagogy to the curriculum of the doctoral program, choosing instead to focus the prospective professorate's training largely on issues of research methodology. This of course misses the point that most Ph.D.s are headed for institutions where the teaching load far exceeds opportunities or expectations to conduct research. In short, commonplace assumptions about teaching tend to deny "the scientific basis of the art of teaching," making the science of teaching everybody's yet nobody's work.

Juxtapose these assumptions to the emerging evidence that clearly links teacher quality to learner outcomes. Here I refer to studies initially conducted by University of Tennessee researchers William L. Sanders and June C. Rivers, and subsequently replicated in other large urban school districts, wherein students with repeated access to high quality teachers considerably outperform students consistently exposed to less competent teachers. This kind of research design is called a "within subjects" design, where each pupil serves as her or his own point of comparison. Further, according to the careful analysis offered by Dan Fallon at the U.S. Secretary of Education's 1999 Conference on Teacher Quality, "this kind of research also controls for all the variables unique to pupils, such as their intrinsic motivation, their work habits, the influence of their parents, and their socioeconomic status. The only variable that can explain this outcome is the quality of the teacher." Thus, while there continues to be much denial about the soundness of content-specific pedagogical understandings as a necessary ingredient in teacher preparation, evidence to the contrary serves to underscore the importance of colleges of the arts and sciences working collaboratively with their education colleagues to produce high-quality teachers.

This brings us squarely to the issue at hand: What is our role in recruiting, preparing and supporting the continuing professional development of teachers, and as importantly, what is at the core of quality teaching? Some things we know. The effects of teacher preparation must be felt at all levels of the continuum of teaching: who we recruit to teaching, what preprofessional and professional experiences temper their process of "learning to teach," who and how are we engaged in the critical early years of teaching, and what are the most effective learning experiences for veteran teachers. Here are three axioms that should guide our thinking:

1. Good learning is a function of good teaching.
2. Good teaching is a function of good teacher education.

3. Good teacher education is a function of a seamless and interactive relationship between educators in the arts and science with those in pedagogical studies and those who teach in elementary and secondary schools.

The remainder of my remarks will focus, therefore, on what's to be gained by a university partnership between the arts and sciences and education, and the linkage of that partnership to elementary and secondary education. In the interest of time, I will share a set of actions that could guide cooperative university partnerships across academic units, and school-university partnerships that could more effectively link higher education with K-12 education.

Action No. 1: Teacher Recruitment. We must first be committed to the challenge of recruiting a high-quality and diverse cohort of prospective students into careers in teaching. Candidates for careers in teaching are in our midst daily, but still most teacher candidates represent a highly homogenous cadre of middle class, Anglo females who travel less than 100 miles away from home to attend college, and who aspire to teach in settings close to home. These candidates are often monolingual and exude a cultural myopia not reflective of the modern day melting pot that characterizes urban education, where the demand for teaching is the most intense. Our collective goal should be to recruit more high-performing students into teaching, and especially from cultural and ethnic backgrounds more reflective of urban society and our global context.

Action No. 2: Preprofessional Education. The early years of teacher preparation are typically perceived, as for many students who engage in general liberal studies, as a "pass through" phenomena; that is, how quickly and painlessly can "I" get these general studies requirements under my belt? Often courses are selected based on the time of day offered, or the reputation of the instructor, and not for the intrinsic values of truly becoming liberally educated—a prerequisite to good teaching, no matter what the discipline or grade level. So, how can colleagues in the arts and sciences and education effectively frame a set of foundational courses that will broaden the intellectual horizons of prospective teachers and at the same time build an important intellectual foundation for appreciation of diversity and cultural competence? [See UWM's Milwaukee Idea experiment on the redefinition of the general education requirement, called "Cultures and Communities," at www.uwm.edu/MilwaukeeIdea/.]

Action No. 3: Integration of Disciplinary Knowledge with Pedagogy. Too often our deliberations about teaching and learning hinge on the "tyranny of the OR"; that is, good teachers either know their discipline or know pedagogy. On the contrary, we need improved techniques for enabling prospective teachers to better integrate disciplinary knowledge with pedagogical knowledge. One vehicle for such would be to offer a sequence of courses wherein professors co-design and co-deliver such courses, involving on a selective basis teachers from elementary and secondary contexts as well. At the very least, forming integrated disciplinary teams across colleges of the arts and sciences and education would be a start in the right direction.

Action No. 4: A Shared Conception of Teaching and Learning. The "charm of teacher education" (Clark, 1985) characterizes the field as "...easily accessible in every sense of that term: geographically proximate to the consumer, easy to enter, short in duration, optimally convenient to the remainder of the college student's academic program, easy to complete, inexpensive, non-exclusive (i.e., does not rule out other career options), etc." In short, teacher education programs are rarely "conceptually coherent;" that is, designed to reflect common understandings among program designers (let alone, schools that subsequently employ candidates) of what teachers should know and be able to do. In the best case, programs would reflect a shared conception of good teaching so clearly understood by all participants that teacher graduates, cooperating teachers, professors and school hiring officials would be able to recognize these qualities in the graduates they hire. [See Standards from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education for more on this topic.]

Action No. 5: Professional Development Schools. While integration of the teaching discipline with pedagogical understandings is an important factor in program design, the integration of didactic, on-campus course experiences with campus and school-based laboratory experiences is yet another imperative of our partnership. The most pervasive analogue is found in medical education. Since the depression-era Flexner Report, it has been simply understood that medical education must increasingly be both research-based and experientially-based. Thus came the beginnings of the concept of the "teaching hospital," and no prominent medical education program exists today without one. But field experiences in teacher education have been riddled with deficiencies for years: inadequate selection and oversight of assignments, ill-prepared and rarely involved veteran teachers who understand the program and the import of the field experiences, and few attempts on campus to create video laboratories or Internet connections with live teaching sites in local schools. Campuses must step forward to create intensive laboratory experiences as testing sites for the intellectual and applied dimensions of their programs.

Action No. 6: Cross-role Preparation. As increasing demands are placed on teaching schools, called Professional Development Schools, to assist in improved preparation of teachers, so also must the sites consider the relationship between the preparation of teachers and other professionals who serve schools, like principals, guidance counselors, art specialists, and those involved in physical education and coaching.

Action No. 7: Interdisciplinary Teams. No less important than cross-role training is to teacher preparation is the interdisciplinary nature of schools. High schools, especially, are no less segregated by discipline than are higher education institutions, so it ought to be no wonder that high schools are as challenged to integrate the disciplines as are we in higher education. Designing block curriculum and streams of content integration both in the arts and sciences and in education would go a long way to enable prospective teachers to gain appreciation for the value added in interdisciplinary studies, and hopefully provide a model for high school and middle school integration concurrently.

Action No. 8: PDSs as Places Where Teachers Keep on Learning. So long as the concept of a "teaching school" or Professional Development School is gaining in popularity and recognition as a vital element of teacher preparation, it should also be understood that these sites are models of adult learning as well as demonstration sites for student learning. So why not create in the PDS a profound respect for the importance of teacher growth and development as well as a student learner-centered school? Schools that value teacher learning would readily display announcements for professional development opportunities, certificates of accomplishment by teachers as well as students, and create spaces reserved for teacher learning and study, just like for kids. Professional teachers should also be afforded special recognition within the academy through special titles, like "clinical faculty" or the designation used at UWM, "teacher in residence." Accordingly, professors who participate in schools should carry special designation as contributors to the learning environment of that school. Yet the "hustle and bustle" of contemporary life for teachers leaves little time for professional consultation and reflection, witness this hypothetical "want ad," contrived by Linda Darling-Hammond for the 1996 National Commission on Teaching & America's Future Report:

WANTED -- College graduate with academic major (master's degree preferred). Excellent communication/leadership skills required. Challenging opportunity to serve 150 clients daily on a tight schedule, developing up to five different products each day to meet individual needs, while adhering to multiple product specifications. Adaptability helpful, since suppliers cannot always deliver goods on time, incumbent must arrange for own support services, and customers rarely know what they want. Ideal candidate will enjoy working in isolation from colleagues. This diversified position allows employee to exercise typing, clerical, law enforcement, and social work skills between assignments and after hours. Typical work week: 50 hours. Special nature of work precludes amenities such as telephones or computers, but work has many intrinsic rewards. Starting salary $24,661, rising to $36,495 after only 15 years.

Action No. 9: Institutional Changes. Schools are said to be hide-bound; controlled by the imperatives of the lunch hour ("the banana"), the clock ("the bell"), transportation problems ("the bus"), and infrastructure issues like access to the school depending on when the janitor unlocks the doors ("the broom"). In alliterative fashion, universities are controlled by the institutional imperatives of "term, traffic, tenure, etc." By education any time, any place, or just-in-time delivery of instruction is changing higher education and elementary and secondary education. So we have to see our role in the education of teachers as preparing for these new and novel learning environments, beginning with creating more flexibility in the way we design and deliver our programs, and encouraging our school partners to do the same.

Action No. 10: A Redesign Model. Several years ago, physicist Ken Wilson published Redesigning Education (1996) in which he challenges educators to create redesign models as discoveries and educational breakthroughs begin to change our practices and our understandings of the consequences of education. We have no such redesign models. The little red schoolhouse still rules and insights about educational innovation are still not well documented. Thus, to our partnerships, we are obliged to

study the changes we are making in our programming, assess the consequences of these changes, benchmark them against best practices elsewhere, toward the redesign of educational practice.

Ending where we began, the "common places of education" must give way to emerging empirical evidence that good teaching matters in the learning lives of America's youth. The imperative of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) compelled us to place a competent, caring and qualified teacher in every child's classroom by 2006. In a time of the greatest turnover of teachers in our nation's history, the opportunity to truly enable quality teaching is finally a real possibility. Lee Iacocca said it best, "In a truly rational society, the best of us would be teachers, and the rest would have to settle for something less" (NCTAF, 1996).