The Right to Learn and the Advancement of Teaching: Research, Policy, and Practice for Democratic Education

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND

Educational Researcher, Vol. 25, No. 6, 5-17

In the darkening days of the early McCarthy era, W. E. B. DuBois (1949/1970) wrote these words:

Of all the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for 5,000 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental... The freedom to learn... has been bought by bitter sacrifice. And whatever we may think of the curtailment of other civil rights, we should fight to the last ditch to keep open the right to learn, the right to have examined in our schools not only what we believe, but what we do not believe; not only what our leaders say, but what the leaders of other groups and nations, and the leaders of other centuries have said. We must insist upon this to give our children the fairness of a start which will equip them with such an array of facts and such an attitude toward truth that they can have a real chance to judge what the world is and what its greater minds have thought it might be. (pp. 230-231)

DuBois knew, as did Thomas Jefferson when he conceived our public education system, that America's capacity to survive as a democracy relies not only on the provision of free public education, although that is a crucial foundation; it rests on the kind of education that arms people with an intelligence capable of free and independent thought. In addition, it rests on an education that helps people to build common ground across diverse experiences and ideas. As Maxine Greene (1982) reminds us, if we are to create a public space for democracy, schools must consciously create community from the sharing of multiple perspectives and develop "the kinds of conditions in which people can be themselves" (Greene, 1984, p. 4). This is an education that seeks competence as well as community, that enables all people to find and act on who they are, what their passions, gifts, and talents may be, what they care about, and how they want to make a contribution to each other and the world.

These days, it is not fashionable to talk about education that is humane as well as rigorous, about the importance of caring for students and honoring each one's potential. These days the talk is tough: standards must be higher and more exacting, outcomes must be measurable and compa-

The Struggle for Democratic Education

Providing most Americans with such an education has always been a struggle, and it remains one today. From the time southern states made it a crime to teach an enslaved person to read through decades of separate and unequal schooling that continue to the present, the right to learn in ways that develop both competence and community has been a myth rather than a reality for many Americans. The struggle was articulated in the great debates between DuBois and Booker T. Washington about whether black children must be trained as laborers or might be educated in ways that could allow them to think for a living (DuBois, 1930/1970); it was also enacted in the ideological battles that shaped urban schools for the children of immigrants at the turn of the century (Tyack, 1974).
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Factory model schools with highly developed tracking systems that stressed rote learning and unwavering compliance for the children of the poor were counterposed against small elite schools—and carefully insulated special tracks within comprehensive schools—that offered a stimulating curriculum, personalized attention, high-quality teaching, and a wealth of intellectual resources for an advantaged few. Some of these have been democratic schools that have worked to create an "equity pedagogy" (Banks, 1993), seeking to construct a thinking curriculum for diverse students who learn to live and work together. However, most "good" schools have secured their advantages by excluding—by... economics, neighborhood, achievement scores, or racial codes—those who represent the other half (or more) of children.

That unhappy resolution remains in force today. International assessments reveal that America's schools are among the most unequal in the industrialized world in terms of spending, curriculum offerings, and teaching quality (McKnight et al., 1987; ETS, 1989b) and are only slightly less disparate today than when Arthur Wise wrote Rich Schools, Poor Schools a quarter century ago (Wise, 1972). Differential spending ratios of more than 10 to 1 show up most vividly in the quality of teaching children experience (ETS, 1989a, 1991). Recent research illustrates that money makes a difference in the quality of education, especially as it is used to pay for more expert teachers, whose levels of preparation and skill prove to be the single most important determinant of student achievement (Armour-Thomas, 1989; Ferguson, 1991). Students' right to learn is directly tied to their teachers' opportunities to learn what they need to know to teach well.

Surprisingly, in the United States of America, children who are required by law to attend school are not guaranteed the right to a knowledgeable teacher. Underprepared teachers constitute more than 25% of those hired each year (NDRC, 1993), and they are assigned disproportionately to schools and classrooms serving the most educationally vulnerable children (Darling-Hammond, 1990a, 1992a; Oakes, 1990).

Studies have consistently found that, with little knowledge of learning or child development to guide them, teachers who lack preparation are more reliant on rote methods of learning, more autocratic in the ways they manage their classrooms, less skilled at managing complex forms of instruction aimed at deeper levels of understanding, less capable of identifying children's learning styles and needs, and less likely to see it as their job to do so, blaming students when their teaching is not successful. (For a review, see Darling-Hammond, 1992a). Because of the capacities of their teachers, most classrooms serving poor and minority children continue to provide students with significantly less engaging and effective learning experiences (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Dreeben, 1987; Oakes, 1985).

The Challenges We Face
These are especially critical times for democratic education. The pace of economic, technological, and social change is breathtaking. Peter Drucker (1994) calls the rise and fall of the blue-collar class between 1950 and the year 2000 the most rapid of any class in the history of the world. From half of all jobs at mid-century, blue-collar employment will comprise only 10% of the U.S. total by the end of this decade. People trained for these routine forms of work are often unable to move into the more intellectually and interpersonally demanding jobs the new economy has to offer, which require more capacity to take initiative, to organize work with others, and to deal with novel problems.

With knowledge-work jobs now comprising nearly half of the total, those with low levels of education can rarely find jobs at all. High school dropouts, for example, now have less than one chance in three of finding work, and, if they can find any job, they earn less than half as much as high school dropouts did 15 years ago (W. T. Grant Foundation, Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1988). They increasingly become part of a growing underclass cut off from productive engagement in society. These changes are provoking fiscal limitations, growing tensions between races and classes, and fears about the future.

Meanwhile, the growth in the U.S. population and its potential for social renewal is largely among immigrants and people of color who have long struggled for voice and educational opportunity in this country. As we incorporate the largest wave of immigration ever in our history, our success in embracing and enhancing the talents of all of our new and previously unincorporated individuals will determine much of our future. Repairing the torn social fabric that increasingly arrays one group against another will require creating an inclusive social dialogue in which individuals can converse from a public space that brings together diverse experiences and points of view. This suggests not only education for democracy, in the sense that we think of students needing to learn trades and good citizenship, but education as democracy (Glickman, 1995)—education that gives students access to social understanding developed by actually participating in a pluralistic community by talking and making decisions with one another and coming to understand multiple perspectives.

Most schools, however, are poor places in which to learn democracy: They often illustrate authoritarian and coercive forms of social control, as well as social stratification both across schools and among tracks within schools. Two thirds of minority students, for example, still attend predominantly minority schools (Orfield, Monfort, & Aaron, 1989), and of the remainder, another two thirds are isolated in lower tracks that provide a separate and unequal educational experience that is qualitatively different in form, function, and content from that offered to "high track students" (Oakes, 1985, 1990). This experience too often fails to prepare them to participate fully as democratic citizens or to meet the requirements of contemporary economic life.

For all of these reasons, schools are under enormous pressure to change. All around the world, demands for higher levels of education for much larger numbers of citizens are being imposed upon educational institutions designed a century ago for different purposes. The enormous complexity of today's world and the even greater complications of tomorrow's signal a new mission for education, one that requires schools not merely to deliver instruction but to ensure that students learn—and to do so in more powerful ways than ever before. If schools are to meet this new challenge, they must dramatically increase the intel-
lectual opportunities they offer while meeting the diverse needs of students who bring with them varying experiences, talents, and beliefs about what school means for them.

This is the first time in history that the success, perhaps even the survival, of nations and people has been so tightly tied to their ability to learn. Because of this, our future depends now, as never before, on our ability to teach. Two years ago, in her presidential address titled "The Advancement of Learning," Ann Brown (1994) described our progress over the last century in understanding human learning. In tandem with these advances, I will argue that the problem of the next century will be "the advancement of teaching," and its resolution will depend on our ability to develop knowledge for a very different kind of teaching than what has been the norm for most of this century. If we want all students to actually learn in the way that new standards suggest and today's complex society demands, we will need to develop teaching that goes far beyond dispensing information, giving a test, and giving a grade. We will need to understand how to teach in ways that respond to students' diverse approaches to learning, that are structured to take advantage of students' unique starting points, and that carefully scaffold work aimed at more proficient performances. We will also need to understand what schools must do to organize themselves to support such teaching and learning.

Robert Glaser (1990) has argued that 21st-century schools must shift from a selective mode—"characterized by minimal variation in the conditions for learning" in which "a narrow range of instructional options and a limited number of ways to succeed are available"—to an adaptive mode in which "the educational environment can provide for a range of opportunities for success. Modes of teaching are adjusted to individuals—their backgrounds, talents, interests, and the nature of past performance" (pp. 16–17). Adaptive education focuses on developing the potential of each individual to a high extent, a critical mission for a pluralistic society with increasing needs for talent development. Such powerful teaching and learning require schools that value and evaluate serious intellectual performances, that support responsive teaching, and that allow teachers to build strong, long-term relationships with students and their parents. If we cannot build such schools at this moment in history, I believe that a deeply stratified society—one divided by access to knowledge and the opportunity to learn—could undo our chances for democratic life and government.

The Contributions of Research

I have some confidence that our efforts can contribute in important ways to this work. Throughout my own life, I have profitted from the work of researchers and educators who sought to enact the ideals of democratic education. During the 1960s, in the days when school systems were expanding and reforming, my parents moved and sacrificed many times to ensure that my siblings and I secured the right to learn. They managed to find schools where we profitted from programs stimulated by educational research and funded by a government eager to catch up with the Russians. I was the beneficiary of curriculum informed by Jerome Bruner, Joseph Schwab, and Jean Piaget as well as the efforts of folks like Kenneth Clark. I studied and loved the "new math," "hands-on science," and new approaches to foreign language instruction. I was enchanted by experiments with open education that gave students choices and opportunities to tackle rich, interesting projects. I had great teachers who were the products of Teacher Corps programs and National Science Foundation investments in teacher preparation. Under another federal program, I had a chance to serve as a teacher's aide, an opportunity that triggered my zeal for teaching and, as it turned out later, sealed my fate. I was enabled to attend an Ivy League college because of financial aid policies aimed at equal access, and I entered teaching myself on a National Defense Student Loan.

I knew enough to be grateful for these opportunities, because I had seen something of the alternative in schools we passed through—a teacher who, on her good days, used erasers rather than the books she usually employed to hit children on the head; several who counted as teaching reading directly from the teacher's manual and assigning workbook pages by the hundreds; an occasional encounter with behaviorist curriculum innovations of the times (those that evolved from the studies of rats and pigeons Ann Brown (1994) described so vividly). I remember being dumbfounded by programmed instructional texts that were intended to teach English grammar in endless series of one-sentence skill bites with mini tests after each. And I could not imagine why someone would make students stop reading books to march their way through color-coded SRA reading kits. (I remember putting Dostoyevsky aside to demonstrate that I could make my way from green to purple cards featuring short, decontextualized passages followed by multiple-choice questions.) I also saw how my brother, who had a number of disabilities, had a much less supportive experience in these same highly tracked schools than I did.

But I had not seen the full extent of American inequality in education—or the backwardness of curriculum policy for the poor—until I began student teaching in Camden, New Jersey, many years later. In this grossly underfunded district that has been a subject of school finance lawsuits for more than 25 years, I found a crumbling warehouse high school managed by dehumanizing and sometimes cruel procedures, staffed by underprepared and often downright unqualified teachers, an empty book room, and a curriculum so rigid and narrow that teachers could barely stay awake to teach.

Although all of my 12th-grade students had flunked English the year before and many had barely learned to read or write, the curriculum instructed me to spend several weeks teaching them to memorize the Dewey decimal system. When I instead engaged them in reading and writing about material they cared about, I was warned about the penalties for failing to "follow the curriculum." I began to understand what it was my parents were escaping as they moved in search of good schools. Not incidentally, I found some brilliant students in that classroom and many others who were thoughtful, serious, and willing to work, hard. When given a chance to do so, virtually all of them learned to read and write. Having been regularly denied the right to learn did not render them incapable of learning. However, I have since seen the same confluence of underfunding, underqualified teachers, and rigid, thoughtless curriculum mandates in my later teaching and re-

AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 1996 7

Downloaded from http://aera.net at AERA on March 7, 2014
search in many other cities. Today as then, the education offered the children of the poor is one equally uninformed by educational research and democratic principles.

An Agenda for Research, Practice, and Policy

The challenges of today’s society pose difficult questions for us as researchers, teachers, and agents of democratic schooling. What would it actually mean to teach all children to the high standards politicians talk about and educators are trying to fashion? What kinds of teaching practices support learning that enables higher levels of performance and understanding for different kinds of learners? What kinds of knowledge and skills would teachers need to have to develop such practice? What kinds of school organizations would need to be developed to allow this kind of teaching to occur? How can this be done in ways that also build greater cross-cultural understanding and cooperative possibilities across individuals and groups? What would our policy system and our schools of education have to do to make this possible?

These are central research questions for the contemporary reinvention of democratic education. Their answers rest in part, I believe, on our growing ability to produce knowledge for and with educators and policymakers in ways that provide a foundation for a more complex form of teaching practice, one that attends simultaneously to students and their diverse needs on one hand and to the demands of more challenging subject matter standards on the other. This kind of practice must manage the devilishly difficult dialectic between a set of high common expectations for learning and a constructivist learning process through which students take different pathways to achieve these understandings. If well tended, this process should also enable students to go beyond these common expectations to develop their unique talents in ways that allow for “individually configured excellence” (Gardner, 1991).

Building this kind of democratic education is extremely knowledge intensive for all actors in the educational system. It cannot be accomplished by top-down mandates or teacher-proof curricula of the sort most policies have relied upon throughout this century. To build the kind of schools I have described, educators must know a great deal about learning and teaching, school organizations, and educational change. These schools will need to be supported by policies that are grounded in similar kinds of understandings. Thus, when I talk about increasing “our” understanding of teaching, I am not referring only to the community of researchers who work with and write for one another, but also to the community of educators and policymakers who are trying to improve teaching and learning. If research is to be meaningful to them, it must address their concerns and “mindframes” (Shavelson, 1988), acknowledging the realities they face and creating knowledge from the inside out as well as the outside in (Lieberman, 1992).

We need to worry more intensely and more productively about how research connects to policy and practice; how productive change occurs, and what must happen to move schools from where they are to where research suggests they could be. We know a great deal more than we once did about the problems and dilemmas of change, and we know more about the ways that people develop and use knowledge in support of their actions as practitioners and policymakers. The days of assuming that research knowledge will be put into practice by disseminating findings through journal articles, report mailings, or even bulleted synopses of study findings are long gone.

We will need to continue to build forms of scholarly activity that span boundaries (Lieberman, 1992) so that practitioners’ concerns and dilemmas can influence our work and, consequently, our work can influence work in schools. We need what David Cohen and Carol Barnes (1993) have called not only a new “policy for pedagogy”—that is, policies that support improved teaching—but also a “new pedagogy for policy”—that is, more productive ways of informing and shaping the policies that inform and shape schools. Creating a broader community of knowledge producers and users among teachers, teacher educators, administrators, policymakers, and researchers—a community that makes knowledge itself more democratic—is an important agenda that AERA has begun to assume by expanding its audiences and its participants.

While this is a tall order, we have a great deal of prior experience to learn from—experience that illuminates the possibilities for democratic education and the fundamental dilemmas of knowledge and change. Over the course of the last century, there have been recurring efforts to create schools that can offer an empowering education for all students. At the turn of the last century, in the 1930s, and in the 1960s, progressives banded together to invent schools that enabled all of their students to develop high levels of competence within democratically run communities. Many similar reforms were pursued in each of these eras: a “thinking” curriculum aimed at deep understanding; cooperative learning within communities of learners; interdisciplinary and multicultural curricula; projects, portfolios, and other “alternative assessments” that challenged students to integrate ideas and demonstrate their capabilities. Indeed, with the addition of a few computers, current scenarios for 21st-century schools are virtually identical to the 20th-century ideal offered by John Dewey in 1900.

Many of these schools were extraordinarily successful. Dewey, Ella Flagg, and many others created and studied hundreds of schools at the turn of the century that stood in glorious contrast to the factory-model alternatives that one study found were viewed by dropouts as more horrible than the sweatshops they worked in. In the 1930s, the famous Eight-Year Study, led by Ralph Tyler, documented painstakingly through a variety of creative measures how students from experimental progressive schools were more academically successful, practically resourceful, and socially responsible than matched samples of peers from traditional schools (Smith & Tyler, 1942; Chamberlin & Chamberlin, 1942). Research from some of the experiments of the 1960s found similar successes where reforms had permeated deeply but much unevenness because most schools and teachers called upon to enact new ideas did not understand them and did not know how to bring them to life. (For reviews, see Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Glass et al., 1977; Horwitz, 1979; Peterson, 1979).

To the astonishment and chagrin of educational researchers, the fact that research pronounced such efforts successful was not enough to ensure their continuation. In all of these periods, thousands of highly successful schools
were created, yet they failed to replicate their successes and most vanished in the succeeding decades. Lawrence Crem-
in's (1961) analysis was that the successes of progressive ed-
ucation reforms never spread widely because such practice
required "infinitely skilled teachers" who were never pre-
pared in sufficient numbers to sustain these complex forms
of teaching and schooling. The lack of investment in pro-
fessional education that would allow teachers to acquire the
knowledge they would need to undertake this kind of prac-
tice was one problem. Another was the lack of investment
in policy development that could encourage the growth of
such schools rather than maintaining them—as they exist
today—as exceptions, on waiver, and at the margins.

Today a growing number of schools are once again re-
inventing teaching and learning, roles and responsibilities,
and relationships with parents and communities so that
they can help a greater range of students learn more pow-
erfully and productively. They are focusing on more chal-
lenging and exciting kinds of learning and helping
students to actively construct, use, and generate their own
knowledge. They are creating communities of learners en-
gaged in research and reciprocal teaching that empower
students to seek their own answers and to pose their own
questions. And they are finding new ways to reach diverse
learners more effectively and developing personalized
structures and more adaptive teaching strategies to sup-
port their success.

Research from the Center on Organizational Restructur-
ing of Schools, the Center for Research on Teaching in
School Contexts, the National Center for Restructuring
Education, Schools, and Teaching, and elsewhere is begin-
nning to produce findings like those of earlier eras: that
more performance-oriented pedagogies and more commu-
nal school organizations support higher levels of student
success (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995; Darling-Hammond,
Ancess, & Falk, 1995; Lieberman, 1995; Cohen, McLaugh-
lin, & Talbert, 1993).

However, as we enter the second decade of a school re-
form movement that will undoubtedly continue well into
the next century, I am persuaded that, if these initiatives
are to survive and spread, we need to give serious research
attention to understanding the professional knowledge
needed as well as the practical and political requirements
of building a system full of such schools. As in earlier eras
of reform, many schools and classrooms are beginning to
display the inevitable dilution and misapplication of ideas
that are poorly understood by those asked to enact them.

In particular, teachers and administrators often find it
difficult to develop settings that are both learning-cen-
tered—that is, focused on challenging curriculum goals for
all students—and learner-centered—that is, attentive to
the needs and interests of individual learners. They often
tend to lose one in the course of pursuing the other, trying
to be more child-centered by letting go of teacher influence
and core curriculum goals or trying to be more subject-
centered by ignoring students while the curriculum
marches on ahead. In the 1960s, educators' inability to
manage these complex goals led to the perception and,
often, the reality that schools had lost any sense of acade-
ic rigor in their eagerness to be relevant and attend to
students' needs.

Successful democratic practice maintains both sets of
concerns, allowing neither to overwhelm the other. It sets
up a dialectic that requires enormously thoughtful and
flexible teaching grounded in deep knowledge of both sub-
jects and students. Teachers must maintain two intertwin-
ning strands of thought at all times: How am I doing at
moving the students toward high levels of understanding
and proficient performance, and how am I doing at taking
into account what students know and care about in the
process of moving them toward these curriculum goals and
developing their individual talents? They must continu-
ously evaluate what students are thinking and understanding
and reshape their plans to take account of what they've
discovered as they build curriculum to meet their goals.

They need to do this in a school context where challenging
curriculum goals are widely shared and support systems
that allow attention to student needs are widely available.

Transmission teaching, on the other hand, offers a sim-
pler way of moving through the curriculum. Teachers can
go through texts and workbooks. Classroom routines are
straightforward, and controls are easier to enforce. There is
a sense of certainty and accomplishment when a lecture
has been given, a list of facts has been covered, or a chap-
ter has been finished, even if the result is relatively little
effective learning for students. When a teacher is lecturing,
it is easy to say, "I taught that," even if students did not
learn it. Structuring active learning situations for students
infuses more uncertainty in the learning process from the
teacher's point of view. When a student is constructing his
or her own understanding through a research project or
experiment, a teacher does not know what he or she is
learning without well-designed strategies for eliciting the
student's thinking and probing for understanding. Many
teachers' preparation has not taught them to evaluate how
and what kids are learning or how to create situations in
which learners can have real breakthroughs in under-
standing. Especially in settings that are not structured for
or supportive of this kind of endeavor, it seems a very risky
business indeed.

Even today, most curriculum reforms do not consider
what teachers and schools need to learn to put them into
effect (Cohen & Barnes, 1993). They fail to consider that
teachers teach from what they understand and believe
about learning, what they know how to do, and what their
environments will allow. Investments in professional de-
velopment for teachers are extremely small, and inside-
the-school supports for collegial experimentation and
learning are rare.

Research findings on the fate of the 1960s reforms are
already being reiterated in studies of the implementation
of California's new mathematics curriculum framework
aimed at promoting deeper understanding. This kind of
curriculum requires sophisticated knowledge of subject
matter and pedagogy and well-developed abilities to make
complex judgments about what students are learning that
most teachers have not had the opportunity to develop. As
a set of case studies conducted by researchers from Michi-
gan State University found, teachers striving to use the
new framework struggled to figure out how to teach in
new ways (Cohen et al., 1990). One teacher commented to
a researcher, "My biggest hurdle to doing all these new
methods . . . is my knowledge of what I've done all these
years." Another asked plaintively, "Still, how do you teach
problem solving? I do not know" (Darling-Hammond,
1990b, p. 239).
It is possible that, as in the past, the inability of schools to enact a complex set of reforms will cause progressive practices to give way to a backlash of standardizing influences such as those that occurred in the efficiency movement of the 1920s, the teacher-proof curriculum reforms of the 1950s, and the "back to the basics" movement of the 1970s and 1980s. The capacity of teachers and other educators to deeply understand teaching and learning, to produce and use knowledge on behalf of their practice, I would argue, is central to the realization of a genuine right to learn. And our capacity as researchers to develop knowledge that empowers teachers in these ways is equally central to democratic education.

Building Knowledge for Teaching

How do we build knowledge for powerful teaching? I have come to believe that our chances for helping teachers develop a wide repertoire of teaching strategies that responds to the demands of subject matter as well as to the needs of students depend on putting more usefully framed and contextualized knowledge directly into the hands of teachers—contributing to their education as teachers and researchers rather than trying to derive broad-gauged generalizations to control their actions. This suggests some major shifts in how knowledge is disseminated as well as how it is produced.

Knowledge in Support of Adaptive Teaching

Ellen Lageman once observed that the history of American education in the 20th century is best understood if one knows that E. L. Thorndike won and John Dewey lost. She was contrasting the focus of behavioral psychology on developing laws for teachers to follow with what John Dewey (1929) had in mind in *The Sources of a Science of Education*, where he described knowledge of methods, students, and subjects that would empower teachers to make more intelligent, flexible, and adaptive decisions—knowledge that would make teaching less routine rather than more so.

Thorndike's work—and that of other psychologists who have illuminated much about learning and teaching—cannot be faulted for the misguided scientism that gripped schools. But, as Lageman noted, Dewey's interest in empowering teachers with knowledge for thoughtful, adaptive teaching did not win out with policymakers. The confluence of behavioral learning theory and bureaucratic-organizational theory led to simultaneous efforts to de-skill and control teaching by limiting both teachers' autonomy and their levels of education. Throughout this century, the thin and greatly uneven preparation of educators—and the systematic distribution of the least well-prepared teachers to the children of the poor—has meant that educators who are not themselves deeply knowledgeable about teaching and learning or about research have been unable either to use research well or to engage in the powerful kinds of thinking and problem-solving needed to transform schools.

For most of this century, policymakers sought knowledge that could become the basis for control of curriculum and teaching rather than for the support of sophisticated teaching decisions. Researchers typically produced knowledge for administrators and outside experts who used it to create the design specifications for teaching: texts, curriculum packages, and teaching formulas. This trickle-down theory of knowledge envisioned that teachers could get what they needed to know from these tools and by following the teachers' manuals and procedures that had been designed: five rules for a foolproof classroom management system or seven steps to a perfect lesson. When these proved inadequate to the real complexities of teaching, teachers were left to their own knowledge base, largely composed of how they themselves were taught.

Early research on teaching was more helpful to researchers than to teachers trying to understand their practice. Correlational studies that found modest associations between certain generic teaching behaviors and multiple-choice achievement test scores mostly reified already established prescriptions—fairly straightforward routines moving students through texts, workbooks, homework reviews, and the like. These studies were useful in establishing signposts that suggested what researchers should look at more closely. As David Berliner (1986) explained, later studies of teaching expertise were able to build on measures—such as the fact that homework reviews are important—to find out what expert teachers actually do to make them so.

However, lists of "teachers should" statements that derived from this research were not directly helpful to teachers in helping them build a sophisticated, learner-responsive kind of practice. Furthermore, simplistic applications of such research have proved to be positively dangerous as a guide for policy. "Research-based" teacher evaluation instruments and teacher education requirements in many states have enforced a set of uniform teaching behaviors (often trivial but easy to measure, such as "keeps a brisk pace of instruction," "manages routines," and "writes behavioral objectives") with no regard to subject matter, curriculum, or student learning (Darling-Hammond, 1992b). These policy tools, which continue to shape teacher education and evaluation in a large number of states, largely ignore the guts of teaching and learning. This has often had the bizarre effect of promoting teaching that is insensitive to learning while undermining good teaching.

A school board member in Arizona once proudly confided to me that the board had just adopted a new "research-based" teacher evaluation scheme that had led them to fire one of the district's most popular teachers—"widely requested by parents and esteemed by colleagues"—because he did not use the seven-step lesson plan required by the instrument. In another part of the country, Florida's 1986 Teacher of the Year (also a runner-up in NASA's Teacher in Space program) found that he could not pass review for a merit pay award according to Florida's Performance Measurement System (FPMS), another "research-based" checklist, because his principal could not find enough of the required teaching behaviors to check off during the laboratory lesson he observed. Furthermore, the form required that the teacher be marked down for answering a question with a question, a practice forbidden by FPMS, though popular with Socrates and some other popular teachers. Like that favored by many other such instruments, the approach to teaching is distinctly ill-suited to the development of students' critical thinking abilities and out of sync with most recent research on student cognition.
The Implications of Teaching for Understanding

Since the time this early research on teaching was incorporated into many policies, we have learned that teaching routines that impart information and enforce highly structured drill and practice may produce good scores on multiple-choice standardized achievement tests, but they do not generally enable students to transform and apply what they know in new circumstances or to develop competence in complex performance tasks. So while many states are urging teachers to teach to new, high standards that seek greater understanding, the kind of teaching needed to do this is actively discouraged by many state and local policies governing curriculum and testing, teacher evaluation and supervision, and teacher education. These policies, in turn, restrict teachers' capacity to build and use knowledge about teaching as they discourage teachers from inquiring into their practice or from adapting their instruction to their students and subjects (Darling-Hammond, 1992b).

There is a great deal of work to do to develop measures of teaching effectiveness that evaluate learning for understanding rather than for the superficial mastery of algorithms or recall of information. The disputes during the 1960s and 1970s between the relative effectiveness of direct instruction and indirect instruction illustrate how important it is to be clear about the kind of learning that is being sought and evaluated. These two streams of research looked at very different kinds of teaching and evaluated them against very different measures of learning. As it turned out, the kinds of teaching behaviors that produce high scores on tests of recall and recognition were decidedly different from those that produced high scores on assessments of writing, problem solving, student independence in learning, and critical thinking (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Glass et al., 1977; Horwitz, 1979; Peterson, 1979).

What's more, teaching for understanding cannot be packaged for teacher-proof implementation. This kind of teaching is more complex and uncertain that the rote forms it aims to replace. It requires deeper knowledge of subjects and more flexible forms of pedagogy, as well as tools that access student thinking so that teachers can understand it and build upon it. The kinds of knowledge useful for this task—knowledge about cognition and development, assessment and curriculum building, and the structures of the disciplines—have been available to only a relatively few teachers in a relatively small number of teacher education programs (Goodlad, 1990).

There has been such a large divide between research and practice in education that knowledge that exists in one part of the school of education has often been unable to jump the great wall that separates teacher education from the rest of the enterprise. This has been a function of the low status of teaching and teacher education, the divide in the professorate between those who do research and those who educate practitioners, and the belief that teachers do not need sophisticated knowledge for their work: they need only to be able to follow the texts, packaged curriculum, and simple recipes distilled for them by others. So while many researchers were producing systematic knowledge about teaching and learning, many teachers—and teacher educators—were wholly unaware of it.

Thankfully, this has begun to change as schools of education are beginning to pay more attention to the preparation of teachers, as research and teacher education are increasingly conducted in collaborative ways—sometimes by the same people—and as research on teacher learning and teacher education are becoming major lines of study in more universities and schools.

The Implications of Diversity Among Learners and Contexts

Careful work over the past two decades on teaching thinking and decision making (Clark, 1983), comparisons of expert and novice teachers, (Berliner, 1986), studies of the nature of pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), and teachers' practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Grinnell & Mackinnon, 1992) are beginning to build a rich case knowledge of teaching that examines teaching actions and decisions in different contexts and for diverse kinds of learners. As these studies cumulate, they are beginning to allow for generalization not by ignoring context but by building a body of case knowledge that can be read and interpreted across contexts.

In his most recent work, Lee Shulman and his students are investigating pedagogical reasoning through the development of teaching cases that derive from serious conceptual problems that arise in subject-matter teaching—the concept of geological time, for example, or the teaching of ratio and proportion. In analogous work at Teachers College, some colleagues and I have developed similar cases that derive from challenges that arise in teaching diverse learners (Darling-Hammond, Ancess, & Falk, 1995; MacDonald, 1995; Joseph, 1995). We are examining how expert teachers consciously build forms of practice that seek to draw upon students' experiences, interests, and approaches to learning as they also aim to teach for understanding and highly developed performances. We are studying such teachers in urban schools that include a wide range of language, cultural, economic, and family diversity and in classrooms that are heterogeneously grouped in terms of previous academic achievement.

Across these cases, we are finding that teachers who seem to succeed at developing real understanding of challenging subjects—and who appear able to do so for an array of students who include those traditionally thought to be at risk—have developed a practice with some common features:

- They develop engaging tasks that give students meaningful work to do; projects and performances that use the methods of a field of study and represent a whole piece of work within that field: doing historical research, writing and "publishing" a short book, developing a computer simulation or scale model.
- They design these to allow students choices and different entry points into the work. This helps motivate effort and allows students to build on their strengths and interests as they reach for new and more difficult performances.
- They develop what I call "two-way pedagogies" to find out what students are thinking, puzzling over, feeling, and struggling with. The tools of these pedagogies include student presentations, skillful discussions, journals and learning logs, debriefings, interviews, and conferences. Teachers consciously develop pedagogical knowledge about the specific learners in their classroom while relying on knowledge about learning generally.
• They constantly assess students to identify their strengths and learning approaches as well as their needs and to examine the effects of different instructional efforts. They understand assessment as a measure of their teaching as well as a measure of student learning. They publicly point to students' different strengths and accomplishments, creating a platform for legitimation and growth for each student in the classroom.
• They painstakingly scaffold a process of successive conversations, steps, and learning experiences that take students from their very different starting points to a proficient performance—including a great many opportunities for approximation and practice, debriefing and conversing, sharing work in progress, and continual revision.
• They pay attention to developing student confidence, motivation, and effort and to making students feel connected and capable in school. They teach from the heart as well as from the head. Strong relationships with students and with parents become especially important because the work is harder and riskier. Successful teachers' strategies for supporting learning extend beyond technical teaching techniques. They practice what John Dewey called “manner” as method: Their voiced and enacted commitment to student learning and success supports students in the risky quest for knowledge.

Our work is not unique. Many other researchers in Canada and the United States are looking closely at the contexts and textures of teaching. In combination, these kinds of inquiry are beginning to illustrate how teachers use knowledge about learners and learning, subject matter, curriculum, and teaching; how they construct pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical learner knowledge in ways that ultimately meet at the intersection of subjects and students; and how they vary their practice in different contexts depending on their instructional goals, the demands of challenging content, and the needs of particular students and classes.

Building Knowledge With Teachers

Much of this research has been constructed with preservice and in-service teachers who are involved in developing cases of practice, who help to develop and interpret data in detailed studies of their classroom work, or who think aloud about their reasoning and decision making. This engagement of teachers in research is, in fact, a powerful way of learning about both teaching and research. It can improve the responsiveness of research to the realities of teaching while also developing the kind of thinking good teachers must engage in as they continually evaluate information about their students, their practice, and its effects.

In another set of studies, some colleagues and I are looking at teacher education programs that prepare teachers so distinctively that their practice is identifiable and highly developed from their very first years in teaching. In this work, we are finding that such programs carefully and explicitly prepare teachers to be observers and documenters of children and researchers of learning rather than consumers of dicta for practice. They are learning to use research by becoming researchers rather than by reading synopses of research results translated into “teacher should” statements. Teacher engagement in research helps create a clientele for profession-wide knowledge while it also builds teachers' personal knowledge of students and learning in ways that are often transformatory for teaching.

This training in inquiry also helps teachers learn how to look at the world from multiple perspectives, including those of students whose experiences are quite different from the teacher's, and to use this knowledge in developing pedagogies that can reach diverse learners. Learning to reach out to students—those who are difficult to know as well as those who are easy to know—requires boundary crossing, the ability to elicit knowledge of others and to understand it when it is offered. This takes social and intellectual work.

Embracing Perspectives

Lisa Delphit (1995) reminds us that "we all interpret behaviors, information, and situations through our own cultural lenses; these lenses operate involuntarily; below the level of conscious awareness, making it seem that our own view is simply 'the way it is'" (p. 151). As both teachers and researchers concerned with democratic education, we must develop an ever keener awareness of the perspectives we bring and how these can be enlarged to avoid "communitarcentric bias" (Gordon, 1990), which limits our understanding of what we study and of those we teach.

This capacity for expanded perspective is also critical for building a democratic profession—one that creates alliances with students, parents and communities rather than achieving professional status by sequestering knowledge and insulating practitioners from those they serve. More inclusive kinds of knowledge-building are also central to the development of schools that are successful in preparing a wide range of students for success.

Crossing boundaries is essential to social learning. This is true for learning across disciplines and methodologies, for learning across communities and cultures, for learning across ideas and ideologies, and for learning across the many groups of individuals—parents and teachers, staff and students—who make up a school. Educative institutions actively strive to construct and manage diversity rather than trying to suppress it.

The basic idea of the common school was to create a public space within which diverse people could communicate and forge a joint experience that would allow them to build a broader community. The early university was designed to bring people together from around the world who could build knowledge by sharing different cultural experiences and areas of study. There is no doubt that this is uncomfortable and problematic: It is always easier to talk with those who think as we do, who have had common experiences—and who agree with us. That is one appeal of homogeneous neighborhoods, private schools, and tracking systems. However, it is essential to try to expand our associations and experiences beyond the boundaries that initially define them if we are to create new and larger common ground, which is the foundation for democratic life. Democratic-schools seek out diversity in people, perspectives, and ideas and construct educative means to learn from those multifaceted experiences and expertise.

Building Democratic Schools

Modern schools were developed to limit diversity, to create as much homogeneity as possible in the ideas under study, the methods of instruction, and the students convened to study together. Like manufacturing industries, they were
This is an important difference from many European and good months with \( \text{giff} \) students, between start-ups and more than one year and teach them multiple subjects as Asian schools, where teachers stay with their students for designed as highly specialized organizations—divided wind-downs, before they have to pass their off to another press). These strategies help them to know their students well as serving as counselors (Darling-Hammond, in press). These strategies help them to know their students well enough to teach them effectively.

Teachers work in isolation from one another with little time to plan together or share their knowledge. Students, too, work alone and passively, listening to lectures and memorizing facts and algorithms at separate desks in independent seat work. Rarely do teachers have the opportunity to work with any group of students for longer than that daily 45-minute period or for more than a year of their school careers. Rarely do students have the chance to learn to work together.

Growing research evidence illustrates the success of alternative organizational arrangements—smaller, more communitarian structures fostering more cooperative modes of learning, less departmentalization and tracking, a more common curriculum for students, stronger relationships between teachers and students that extend over multiple years, greater use of team teaching, and participation of parents, teachers, and students in making decisions about schooling (Braddock & McPartland, 1993; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Fine, 1994; Lee, Bryk, & Smith, 1993; Wehlage et al., 1990). This participation appears to be most productive when schools create many opportunities for developing shared knowledge among teachers, administrators, parents, and community members and when they create joint work in which this knowledge can be used and deepened.

In our work at the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), we have been studying how these features are sustained in city schools that produce dramatically unexpected outcomes for low-income and minority students and for others typically labelled at risk. Many of these schools are affiliated with the Coalition of Essential Schools. (Case studies of these schools are included in Darling-Hammond, Ancess, & Falk, 1995, and Darling-Hammond et al., 1993). If these students attended the comprehensive high schools in their neighborhoods, over half would drop out, and very few would go on to college. Instead, in the high schools we are studying, over 90% of students graduate and go on to post-secondary education, and the vast majority of them succeed at college. Following an untracked common core curriculum, students are challenged to meet high standards embodied in graduation requirements requiring research papers, scientific experiments, mathematical models, essays and literary critiques, and oral defenses of their work—the kind of work these same students in most schools would be presumed unable to attempt, much less master.

Our research has tried to understand what enables them to meet these standards and what enables their teachers to help them do so—in other words, how their schools support powerful teaching and learning. We are trying to document and co-dissect practice (seeking to understand it from the outside in and the inside out) and to understand how people handle its many problems and dilemmas.

Rather than asking “what are the correlates of marginally greater success within the parameters of traditional schools?” we are asking “what entirely different parameters for schooling appear to enable far greater numbers of students of all kinds to succeed in ways that are not found within traditional schools?”

We have identified several factors that seem to be important:

(a) Structures for caring and structures for serious learning—that is, structures that enable teachers to know students well and to work with them intensely. In addition to the personalization made possible by smaller school size, all of these schools cluster students and teachers together in ways that allow teachers to work for longer periods of time over the day, week, and years with a smaller number of the same students. These structures range from interdisciplinary clusters to multi-year advisories, but they all allow teachers to know more about how their students think and learn, to undertake more ambitious chunks of curriculum work, and to have the time to develop difficult performances that require intense work and sustained effort. These structures are especially important for more challenging and indeterminate forms of learning that ask students to construct knowledge rather than having it fed to them. Our analysis suggests that to manage the risks of teaching for understanding, teachers need school structures that provide them with more extended time with individual students enabling deeper knowledge of students’ learning, as well as stronger relationships that can leverage motivation and commitment.

(b) Shared exhibitions of student work that make it clear what the school values and how students are doing. Symbolically, the walls of these schools are literally plastered with student work. Student writing, designs, models, and artwork cover hallways, classrooms, and offices. Teachers work collectively to create assessments and set standards and to document and evaluate student learning within and across classrooms. This serves to decentralize information about student learning and about teaching in other classrooms. As teachers look at the work of their own students, they learn what is working as they had hoped and what is not. As they look at the work of other teachers' students, they have a window into the curriculum and teaching strategies used in other classrooms.

(c) Structures that support teacher collaboration focused on student learning. The higher levels of skill and expertise required by teachers to do this work must be continually
developed. A very strong organizational feature of many of these schools is that faculty work in two kinds of teams: one that focuses on curriculum planning within subject areas and another that focuses on a shared group of students and their needs. In houses, teams, or divisions, groups of teachers assume common responsibility for a number of students, working with them across multiple subjects and counseling them over multiple years. These structures allow teachers to become more accountable for student success. They also motivate teachers by increasing their expectancies of success: As team structures increase, teachers’ reach over students’ lives and their control over the total learning process, they reduce uncertainty and thus increase teacher willingness to invest even more effort (Darling-Hammond, 1996).

The schools have also constructed shared curriculum and assessment work that cuts across teams. This work includes collective assessments of student learning and analyses of student progress that require teachers to focus together on academic issues across the entire school. All of these strategies help to develop knowledge about students as well as about subjects and help to develop shared standards of practice as well as incentives for ongoing change. As one teacher explained:

With my colleagues, we’ve had to work together on curriculum and look at each other’s work. We’re forced to be more collaborative. So there’s a loss of freedom to some extent, but I think it’s compensated for by the lack of isolation and by the feedback you get. With feedback, there’s growth. It’s kind of hard at first, but it’s good for you.

(d) Structures for shared decision making, and shared discourse about teaching and learning among teachers, often with students and parents as well. Teachers are engaged in hiring their colleagues, developing evaluation systems, conducting peer reviews, making curriculum decisions, setting standards for assessing student and teacher work, and deciding on professional development. Students and parents are frequently included in these activities. Each school has articulated its own set of educational ideals that is a touchstone for organizational decisions. This provides the coherence that enables decentralization to operate responsibly. Because the schools are deliberately small, governance engages every teacher and many parents and students; this enables the collective decision making that provides a sense of empowerment and access for more voices. These in turn create a greater sense of shared purpose, commitment, and effort and allow education to function as a democracy.

There are challenges in conducting this kind of inquiry: Researchers must have deep knowledge of teaching and schooling to be able to ferret out what’s important among the many variables that can be examined. Emerging hypotheses must ultimately be tested in more formal ways to find out if and where they hold up. Co-constructing meaning with those whose work is being studied raises issues about how to attend honestly to unpleasant realities or contradictory evidence, while honoring the importance of multiple perspectives and the fragility of practice.

Perhaps the most important challenge is to try to understand how such practice is built, what obstacles and conundrums it encounters, what context-specific solutions and compromises are made, what features of school and classroom life, of teachers’ and parents’ learning opportunities, and of community circumstances provide the supports that allow it to be built and sustained. For at the end of any process of understanding successful practice, we cannot reduce our findings to a set of dicta to be imposed on other schools that must confront difficult obstacles and that may lack the conditions that are prerequisites for success. If we succumb to the urge to boil our findings down to formulas that are passed on through policy mandate, we will undoubtedly feed another generation of failure and cynicism characterized by practitioners’ views that “Yes, we tried that and it doesn’t work.” It is as important to understand what can be done to create the conditions that enable good practice to grow and take root as it is to understand what the practices themselves are.

Building New Partnerships Between Research, Policy, and Practice

It is clear that ordinary schools can succeed in extraordinary ways when they refocus their work on the needs of students rather than on the demands of bureaucracies. The work of restructuring is difficult but not impossible. However, much of this work is being done on waivers from existing policies; schools like those we study exist in constant tension with the central offices and state agencies that oversee a regulatory system invented for a different time and a different set of educational purposes. Creating widespread change will require an infrastructure for adaptive, learning-centered education: policies that develop more intelligent professional preparation; that support appropriate teaching, learning, and assessment practices; and that provide educators with continuous opportunities to learn and with the resources to enable them.

It seems to me that building knowledge and capacity in schools will require constructivist relationships between research, policy, and practice that allow reciprocal learning to occur. We cannot hand knowledge to policymakers to enact in new mandates. We must work with policymakers to develop strategies for professional development that will infuse greater knowledge in schools and with schools of education to strengthen their ability to transmit and develop knowledge for practice.

In our search for what works, we must also be prepared to deal with the dilemmas of change, to acknowledge that getting there is extremely hard work that requires massive learning from us all. “Schools should” statements will not get us from research to practice. As Milbrey McLaughlin observed, “you cannot mandate what matters most,” and trying to do so, without building capacity for new practice, leads to certain failure.

For example, while substantial research suggests that tracking tends to harm low-tracked students without greatly benefiting high-tracked students (Oakes, 1985, 1990; Hoffer, 1992; Kulik & Kulik, 1982), there are profound problems of pedagogy, organization, and community politics to be solved by schools that would like to invent alternatives to tracking. We cannot take these lightly. Otherwise, we will, once again, have “tried reform” and found that “it doesn’t work.” Similarly, while a large body of research indicates that retaining students in grades actually slows down their learning and dramatically increases dropout rates (Holmes & Matthews, 1984; Shepard & Smith, 1986; Wehlage et al., 1990), we need to help schools...
think and work productively on the question of what are the alternatives. How can schools develop powerful pedagogies and school organizational forms that will allow productive attention to the needs of students who are not succeeding? The same issues arise with new teaching strategies and forms of assessment, and they are as troublesome at the state and district levels as at the school level. If we have learned anything about change, it is that all of the actors in the system need to develop firsthand deep understanding of new ideas and of the complex kinds of practice needed to carry them off.

Partnerships for what we might call dilemma-ridden research are being formed in many places across the country to address these concerns. These often feature hyphenated roles for researchers, teachers, and policymakers who are doing policy, school reform, and teaching as well as looking at it. I think of the rolled-up-sleeves work of folks like Tony Bryk, James Comer, Ted Sizer, Michael Fullan, Michelle Fine, Maggie Lampert and Debra Ball, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Lee Shulman, Ann Brown, Jeannie Oakes, Lauren Resnick, Ann Lieberman, and my colleagues at NCREST. These efforts are part of building a profession that is less balkanized and school organizations that are less “Taylorized.” Many activists are moving beyond a world in which those who think and plan are separated from those who teach and do the work; they are working to understand schooling, teaching, and change by engaging in the work as well as by studying it and by creating collaboratives for democratic work and action.

For all of us who are doing the inside-out and outside-in work of research, teaching, teacher education, standards building, assessment development, and policy development, the struggles often seem endless and insurmountable, and the insights and epiphanies are always accompanied by difficulties and setbacks. I want to close with the words of another great democrat Langston Hughes, who talked about the work of building democracy in a poem called “Freedom’s Plow”:

When a man starts out with nothing,
When a man starts out with his hands
Empty, but clean,
When a man starts out to build a world,
He starts first with himself
And the faith that is in his heart—
The strength there,
The will there to build.

First in the heart is the dream.
Then the mind starts seeking a way.
His eyes look out on the world.
On the great wooded world,
On the rich soil of the world,
On the rivers of the world.

The eyes see there materials for building.
See the difficulties, too, and the obstacles.
The hand seeks tools to cut the wood,
To till the soil, and harness the power of the waters.
Then the hand seeks other hands to help,
A community of hands to help—
Thus the dream becomes not one man’s dream alone,
But a community dream.

Not my dream alone, but our dream.
Not my world alone,
But your world and my world,
Belonging to all the hands who build.

America is a dream.
The poet says it was promises.
The people say it is promises—that will come true.
The people do not always say things out loud,
Nor write them down on paper.
The people often hold
Great thoughts in their deepest hearts
And sometimes only blunderingly express them,
Haltingly and stumbling say them,
And faultily put them into practice.
The people do not always understand each other.
But there is, somewhere there,
Always the trying to understand,
And the trying to say,
“You are a man. You are a woman. Together we are building our land.”

America!
Land created in common,
Dream nourished in common,
Keep your hand on the plow! Hold on!
If the house is not yet finished,
Don’t be discouraged, builder!
If the fight is not yet won,
Don’t be weary, soldier!
The plan and the pattern is here,
Woven from the beginning
Into the warp and woof of America:
ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL.
NO MAN IS GOOD ENOUGH TO GOVERN ANOTHER MAN WITHOUT THAT OTHER’S CONSENT.
BETTER DIE FREE, THAN LIVE SLAVES.
Who owns those words? America!
FREEDOM!
BROTHERHOOD!
DEMOCRACY!

A long time ago,
An enslaved people heading toward freedom
Made up a song:
Keep Your Hand On The Plow! Hold On!
That plow plowed a new furrow
Across the field of history.
Into that furrow the freedom seed was dropped.
From that seed a tree grew, is growing, will ever grow.
That tree is for everybody.
For all America, for all the world.
May its branches spread and its shelter grow
Until all races and all peoples know its shade.
KEEP YOUR HAND ON THE PLOW!
HOLD ON!
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President-Elect Invites Suggestions

Each year, the AERA president appoints a number of members to committees that are important to the association. The committees are Publications, Professional Development and Training, Governmental and Professional Liaison, Special Interest Groups, Role and Status of Women, Role and Status of Minorities, Nominations, Freedom of Inquiry and Human Rights, International Relations, JEBS Management, Annual Meeting, Professional Outreach Liaison, and seven annual award committees.

This year, President-Elect James A. Banks hopes to form many of the committees before the annual meeting in Chicago. He urges members to supply names, including their own, if they are interested in the committees. Please send a resume if volunteering (or a statement about qualifications if nominating someone else) and state which committees are of interest.

He also welcomes suggestions about existing programs and new initiatives. Please write to him at AERA, 1230 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036-3078.

Division L: Educational Policy and Politics...

is a new division created to stimulate informed and systematic debate, analysis, research, evaluation, and recommendations concerning education policy, along with the political, legal, and fiscal issues involved. Its vice president is William L. Boyd from Penn State University. To join Division L, please indicate that you would like to do so when you are sent a renewal notice or send us a note, enclosing a $1 divisional membership fee ($2 for two years).