

## Subject Matter Counts: The Pre-Service Teaching and Learning of Historical Thinking

Tim Keirn and Eileen Luhr  
*California State University, Long Beach*

OVER THE PAST FEW DECADES, the rich and expanding scholarship of history teaching, learning, and cognition has done much to surface and promote the development of historical thinking skills amongst students in secondary, and even elementary, schools. Associated with the works of Robert Bain, Keith Barton, Peter Lee, Linda Levstik, Stéphane Lévesque, Bruce VanSledright, and Sam Wineburg—to name but a few—a scholarly “canon” of sorts has developed that addresses the means by which students learn and understand history; this literature also promotes inquiry-based instructional practices that shift student “habits of mind” to authentic and discipline-based forms of historical thinking and understanding. This focus upon discipline-based practice and historical thinking has generally been situated upon primary source analysis and asks K-12 students to create as opposed to receive (passively) historical knowledge.<sup>1</sup>

The historical thinking movement has been aligned with—and contributes to—the pattern of increasing collaboration between university historians, teacher education professors, and K-12 teachers to improve the teaching of history. These collaborative efforts, given a significant boost by Teaching American History grant funding, have been almost entirely focused upon professional development efforts with in-service teachers.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the research basis of the historical thinking movement is almost entirely situated upon the pedagogic and cognitive implications of in-

service history instruction with K-12 students.<sup>3</sup> Relatively little research attention has been paid to the university training of history teachers, and such scholarship that does exist in this regard focuses upon the pedagogic preparation—rather than subject matter preparation—of pre-service candidates. Moreover, scholars at prestigious universities such as Stanford University or the University of Michigan, where the numbers of pre-service history teachers are small, highly selective, and cohort-driven, generate much of the scholarly research associated with historical thinking.

However, as evidenced in the articles in this edition of *The History Teacher*, or from a quick Google search with the terms “social science social studies history teaching methods syllabi,” the historical thinking approach is becoming well established in the pre-service preparation of secondary history teachers. Building upon the aforementioned expansion of collaboration in in-service history teaching professional development, professional associations such as the American Historical Association (AHA) and the National Council for History Education (NCHE) have recently advocated for raising the visibility of historians—and the significance of history coursework and subject matter preparation—in pre-service history teacher education. In 2006, NCHE adopted a position statement on history teacher qualification that established minimum levels of history coursework for pre-service teachers, and additionally called for methods courses to be taught by historians or instructors with an M.A. in history and for student teaching to be guided by experienced history teachers with at least a B.A. in history.<sup>4</sup> In 2007, the AHA endorsed the NCHE position statement on history teacher qualification.<sup>5</sup>

In the essay that follows, we will make the claim that, despite these best intentions, in California, it would appear that the role of history departments in the training of pre-service history-social science teachers has declined markedly in recent years. Given that California certifies one out of every eight teachers in the United States, this trend may also have national implications. We will make the case that the focus upon historical thinking requires pre-service teachers to have deep and sophisticated procedural historical knowledge (relative to factual historical knowledge), and that this signifies and accentuates the importance of the quality of subject matter preparation in a process that traditionally and institutionally privileges pedagogic training in history education and factual historical knowledge in terms of state certification. We will provide evidence that novice teachers with greater procedural knowledge and discipline-specific subject matter preparation in history perform better in student teaching than candidates without this level of rigor and disciplinary-focus in their undergraduate education. However, the deeper procedural knowledge required of novice practitioners by the expanding historical thinking movement, when

juxtaposed with the diminished role of history departments in pre-service teacher preparation, has created curricular trajectories at cross-purpose. We will share the means by which the History-Social Science Credential Program at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) has addressed these challenges and developed curricular interventions to ensure that candidates—no matter their undergraduate academic background—acquire and develop the procedural knowledge of history that is required both to think and to teach historically. In doing so, this essay also seeks to contribute to the greater understanding and agency of the university classroom in improving the teaching of history in the schools, as well as to promote and represent means and examples of high-quality pre-service history teacher preparation that is provided on larger scales.<sup>6</sup>

### **Historical Knowledge and Historical Thinking**

The focus upon historical thinking has raised the significance of the pre-service candidate's disciplinary training and, by implication, surfaces the importance of the historian's role in teacher preparation. The NCHE's position statement notes, "History teachers at all levels need a thorough understanding of the processes of historical thinking and a deep immersion in a wide range of historical content." It goes on to state that history teachers in the schools should have completed coursework that "develop[s] history's habits of mind by providing a thorough grounding in the skills required for historical thinking, including an in depth understanding of how to read and utilize primary sources, significant experience in historical writing, significant experience in historical research and an understanding of the principles of historiography."<sup>7</sup> Robert Bain and Jeff Mirel have argued that novice history teachers need to acquire "robust content and disciplinary knowledge in history." According to Bain and Mirel, pre-service teachers "must understand how historians frame historical problems, select and organize factual details, analyze and construct historical stories," and they must also be "conversant in historiography, looking carefully and critically at ways various historians have organized and created historical understanding. Without such understanding, history for most prospective teachers is, at best, a story well told and at worst, merely a collection of facts."<sup>8</sup> In this sense, the discipline-based procedural knowledge of history is a requisite frame for novice teachers to develop the more complex matrix of "pedagogic content knowledge" needed to appropriately design and configure learning and instruction to promote historical thinking and understanding with their students.<sup>9</sup> Of course, pedagogic content knowledge would also require understanding of the student pre-instructional notions of history that informs what they

learn. A novice teacher's access to the large body of research, within the aforementioned canon, on student epistemologies of history alerts them to the challenge of confronting mistaken student historical concepts and meanings. However, as David Neumann has recently pointed out, it cannot replace the knowledge in this regard "that practiced teachers have acquired through experience."<sup>10</sup>

Despite the recognition of the importance of deeper procedural and content knowledge in history that is associated with the historical thinking movement, national data demonstrates that history teachers have had less academic preparation in their discipline than teachers in other core subjects. The majority of secondary teachers of history have neither majored nor minored in history. Moreover, the bulk of those history teachers with undergraduate degrees in history concentrated their study in American and/or Western history, and this poses a particular problem for the teaching of the fastest growing course in social studies—world history.<sup>11</sup> In addition, the university teaching of undergraduate history—even within the major or minor—often addresses the depth and breadth of historical content knowledge without transparent curricular attention to the constructed nature of historical knowledge and understanding. Where courses in historical methodology or historiography are required, too often there is little consideration of the sequence of learning, and students are introduced to these notions only at the end of their course of undergraduate study.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, for many novice history teachers nationally, their discipline-specific subject matter preparation is likely to be thin, with little if any focused coursework in history. In addition, for novice history teachers with B.A. degrees in the discipline of history, it is mostly the case that their subject matter preparation, both in terms of curriculum and institutionally, is disconnected from their pedagogic training. Here, the role of the historian in teacher preparation is in effect "invisible," and pre-service teachers acquire both historical content and procedural knowledge without connection to the context of teaching. This bifurcation between the subject matter and pedagogic preparation of novice history teachers and the institutional disconnect between history and teacher education departments has always been much lamented in the scholarly literature, but the historical thinking movement accentuates this curricular weakness and obstacle to the pre-service development of pedagogical content knowledge. Moreover, in all these varying curricular contexts, and without due attention to the subject matter preparation of candidates, the burden of obligation for providing the procedural knowledge necessary to teach historical thinking falls even more heavily upon the history-social science methods course.<sup>13</sup>

### California Contexts

While the state of California provides multiple pathways for obtaining a secondary credential in history-social science, the vast majority of candidates gain certification through entry into an institutionally based, state-accredited college or university program. In California, there are seventy-five accredited college and university single subject credential programs in history-social science currently in operation. These are broken down as follows:

- Eight campuses of the University of California (UC) that are public Research I institutions.
- Twenty-two campuses of the California State University System (CSU) that are public comprehensive institutions.
- Forty-five private colleges and universities, ranging from Research I universities (e.g., Stanford University and the University of Southern California), Liberal Arts colleges (e.g., Chapman and Whittier Colleges), and satellite and online universities (e.g., National University and the University of Phoenix).<sup>14</sup>

The California State Curriculum Framework and Standards for History-Social Science is very much focused upon history (with some embedded geography) as opposed to social science.<sup>15</sup> The curriculum in grades 4 through 8, and 10 through 11, are specific to California, American, and world history. In grade 12, students learn economics and government.<sup>16</sup> With this history emphasis, California accreditation and certification in history-social science is not aligned to the National Council for Social Science standards.

State-mandated standards for certification and accreditation in teacher preparation are designed, implemented, and overseen by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), which takes directives from the state legislature and Department of Education. Secondary teaching candidates in history-social science must complete an accredited teacher preparation program and also demonstrate subject matter mastery either through completion of a state-accredited Subject Matter Preparation Program (SMPP) in history-social science or through passage of the California Subject Matter Examination for Teachers (CSET) in social science. Candidates must also hold a bachelor's degree and have completed thirty post-graduate credit hours in the process of their teacher preparation.<sup>17</sup> Hence, with the CSET pathway, the state does not require that the bachelor's degree be in any specified discipline to teach history-social science, nor does it require that candidates take any undergraduate coursework in history.

The standards for teacher preparation accreditation, and pedagogic training and assessment of candidates, are stated in the CTC's *Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Program Standards*.<sup>18</sup> This document was revised in 2009 and includes nine standards common to the entirety of an institution's multiple and single subject certification programs and an additional nineteen standards that are specific to single subject preparation. Of the latter, only one is subject-specific, insisting that accredited programs effectively prepare candidates to plan and deliver instruction aligned to state standards and the "general principles of the discipline," and that candidates demonstrate in fieldwork and coursework that they enable students to learn and use analytic thinking skills in history and social science and to connect essential facts and information to broad themes, concepts, and principles.

In most cases, state certification mandates are implemented through an institution's College of Education because the accreditation process and coordination with the CTC comes through that body. The credentialing requirements in the state of California are extensive and rank among the most stringent (and most numerous) in the nation. In 2009, the CTC implemented new Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) and Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA) that require all candidates—in addition to completing satisfactorily coursework, fieldwork, and subject matter requirements—to pass four state-mandated TPAs. These TPAs are high-stake assessments that are aligned to the TPEs and are evaluated by the state independent of the teaching preparation program. Only TPA 1 is subject- and discipline-specific, requiring candidates to submit a lesson plan in history-social science that demonstrates effective subject-specific pedagogy. While the state does not mandate that the TPEs and TPAs be incorporated within the curriculum of the teacher preparation program, the reality is that programs must do so to ensure that their candidates pass the four TPAs to receive preliminary certification. The de facto implementation of the TPEs and TPAs within the curriculum has come at the expense of time afforded to history content and discipline-specific instruction in teacher preparation programs. The TPEs and TPAs impose an additional burden of obligation upon the history-social science methods course.

In sum, the CTC does not mandate a specific curriculum—let alone specific courses—for accreditation of secondary history-social science teacher education programs. Consequently, the institutional structure and curriculum of pedagogic training varies widely across the state. But what is common is a general disregard in terms of state accreditation for discipline-specific subject matter or pedagogic preparation in history that provides the curricular and instructional support for promoting historical thinking amongst novice history teachers.

### **Subject Matter Preparation in History**

As noted above, candidates for a secondary social science teaching credential in California must demonstrate subject matter competence by either passing the aforementioned CSET in social studies or by completing an accredited history-social science SMPP that serves as a waiver for the CSET. The certification of subject matter competence is demanded by all teacher preparation programs—some requiring this competence prior to entrance into the program, and others requiring this prior to the onset of student teaching.

The CSET is designed and administered by the Pearson Group under contract with the CTC, replacing the PRAXIS examination (designed and administered by Educational Testing Services) in California in 2004. Concerned that the PRAXIS examination was not aligned to the content of the California state curricular standards, and seeking to lower the entry threshold for potential certification candidates, the CSET was developed to test content knowledge that is directly associated with the California state curriculum. The CSET is divided into three subtests addressing World History and World Geography; U.S. History and U.S. Geography; and Government, Economics, and California History. Each subtest consists of only thirty-five multiple-choice questions, two short focused essays (one paragraph), and one “extended” response (two paragraphs). Hence, the CSET focuses entirely on (mainly rote) factual knowledge and does so in a cursory manner, without evaluation of a candidate’s disciplinary understanding and disposition, or of their procedural knowledge of history—the essential constituents for historical thinking.

There is plenty of anecdotal evidence that supports the notion that the CSET does not provide a rigorous assessment of a candidate’s historical knowledge, skill, and disciplinary thinking.<sup>19</sup> An internal study of CSULB candidates reveals that pre-service teachers without History majors are more likely to take the CSET (as opposed to the coursework in the CSULB’s accredited history-social science SMPP). This suggests that weaker students gravitate toward the force of least resistance in demonstrating subject matter competence. The state of California defends the rigor of the CSET in social science by claiming that the failure rate does not differ from that in other subject areas. However, it is reasonable to assume that candidates with little or no academic preparation in the specified subject matter (e.g., a Communications Studies major) are far more likely to “try their luck” on the CSET in history-social science as opposed to that in science, math, or even language arts.

Candidates who demonstrate subject matter competence through completion of a CTC-accredited history-social science SMPP have

undergone a far more rigorous evaluation and have taken extensive coursework in history and the social sciences. Accredited subject matter programs in history-social science require that candidates take a minimum of forty-five units in history and social science courses that are aligned with the content of the California state framework and standards. Given the nature of the state curriculum, the vast majority of units in the history-social science SMPP are in history. Some universities have utilized the SMPP curriculum to form the basis of a social science major, whereby the degree also confers subject matter competence and a waiver for the CSET. More commonly, and is the case at CSULB, the SMPP is aligned with the History major and general education requirements to ensure that pre-service students complete the degree and subject matter program concurrently.

Completion of an accredited history-social science SMPP is clearly more rigorous than the CSET, and it moreover ensures that novice teachers have had considerable undergraduate coursework in history, regardless of their major. However, the vast majority of history-social science credential candidates in California demonstrate subject matter competence by way of the CSET. This is a consequence of a number of factors.

- The CSET is simply easier.
- For “late deciders” (i.e., candidates who decide to enter credential programs after completion of their undergraduate degrees), the extra units required in the SMPP (in addition to those in the actual credential program) are a disincentive and make the CSET attractive.
- The vast majority of accredited teacher education programs in California do not have a SMPP in history-social science and thus require the CSET upon entry.

The decline of SMPPs in history-social science is a serious detriment to the quality of history teacher preparation in California, and it is a significant marker of the decline of the role of history departments in the training of pre-service teachers. Currently, there are only seventeen accredited SMPPs in history-social science within the state.<sup>20</sup> Two of these programs are in private universities (Azusa Pacific University and Loyola Marymount University) and the remaining fifteen are in the CSU system. None of the UC campuses or private Research I institutions have such programs. The most recent accreditation round for SMPP in history-social science was completed in 2009. Between 2002 and 2009, thirty-four institutions dropped or lost accreditation for their SMPP in history-social science. The decline of the SMPPs is partly a consequence of candidate demand, as pre-service teachers seek the easier option for demonstrating subject matter competence. However, the burden of the CTC accreditation process is also a significant factor in the ending of SMPP.<sup>21</sup> The CTC's *Social Science Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness*

*for Subject Matter Programs* (2003) demands that programs meet nineteen standard domains (each with a number of sub-domains) and do so with extensive documentation. More often than not, the responsibility for the creation and revision of the accreditation document falls to the faculty in history, and this is seen as an unfunded mandate from the College of Education for history departments that are not directly involved in teacher preparation. It is notable that most of the history departments that do have direct roles in teacher preparation (discussed below) are found within the CSU system, where in fact most of the surviving SMPP programs reside. In the UC system, where history departments have little if any direct involvement in teacher preparation, there are no longer any SMPPs in history-social science, and teaching candidates are required to take the CSET. There is no formal or guided pre-service subject matter preparation and the pedagogic training of history teachers takes place entirely within the College of Education. Hence, in the UC system and almost all private universities and colleges, there is a traditional bifurcation between the Department of History and the College of Education. Entry into—and completion of—the history-social studies credential program is based on passage of the CSET, and, hence, history departments have no direct or formal linkages to the credential program even in regard to subject matter preparation. Instruction and fieldwork supervision are within the College of Education.

The CSU system generally provides an exception to the rule. History departments in the majority of CSU campuses have a specified role in secondary teacher preparation. A number of social studies credential programs are coordinated within the Department of History (e.g., at CSULB and California Polytechnic San Luis Obispo). In some cases, student teaching supervision and the teaching of the history-social science methods course is a responsibility of faculty within the Department of History. As noted, the majority of CSU programs have SMPPs in history-social science and these are normally housed in the Department of History and incorporated either as a track within the History major or an interdisciplinary Social Science major.

### **Subject Matter Counts**

As noted, the History-Social Science Credential Program at CSULB is housed in the Department of History and is the largest program in the state. Candidates in the program meet their subject matter certification either by CSET or by completion of our accredited SMPP. Swimming upstream against the ease of the CSET option, maintaining enrollments in the SMPP requires extensive and effective faculty advising of pre-service

<b>Summary for CSET Candidates (n=155)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.290
Category C Evaluation	3.290
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.425
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.443
<b>Summary for SMPP Candidates (n=194)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.521
Category C Evaluation	3.613
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.643
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.608

**Figure 1:** Analysis of CSET and SMPP candidates.

<b>Summary for History Degrees (n=223)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.426
Category C Evaluation	3.502
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.556
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.584
<b>Summary for Non-History Degrees (n=126)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.405
Category C Evaluation	3.412
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.524
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.448

**Figure 2:** Analysis of History and Non-History degree candidates.

<b>Summary for Non-History Degree CSET (n=84)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.298
Category C Evaluation	3.310
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.477
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.429
<b>Summary for Non-History Degree SMPP (n=42)</b>	<b>Score</b>
Category A Evaluation	3.619
Category C Evaluation	3.619
Supervisor Overall Evaluation	3.619
Cooperating Teacher Overall Evaluation	3.488

**Figure 3:** Analysis of Non-History degree CSET and SMPP candidates.

teachers so that they recognize the significance and importance of rigorous subject matter preparation. In our program at CSULB, we have increased faculty assigned time in the Department of History for history-social science credential advising and have seen greater consistency in student preference for the SMPP, with upwards of sixty percent of candidates usually opting for subject matter each semester.

We have also implemented an internal evaluation of how CSET and SMPP candidates performed in student teaching between 2005 and 2010. The CSULB assessment instrument for evaluating student teachers is a generic one for all single subject programs. We collected data from the final evaluation categories that we felt best reflected discipline-specific pedagogy. These were:

Category A: Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students

Category C: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

Supervisor's Overall Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance

We collected data from Category A and C only from University Supervisors, as we felt they were better calibrated in these categories. As for the overall evaluation, we collected data from both the University Supervisor and Cooperating Teachers. Performance on the instrument is scored on a four-point scale described as:

1 = Not Consistent with Standard Expectation for Beginning Practice

2 = Developing Beginning Practice

3 = Proficient Beginning Practice

4 = Excellent Beginning Practice

Because the data is drawn from the final evaluations, few candidates received scores of 2, and no candidates received a score of 1 (because they failed student teaching and, thus, there is no evaluation extant).

We were able to collect data on the performance of 349 novice teachers—155 were CSET certified and 194 completed the SMPP.

The results of our internal assessment clearly point to the significance of subject matter preparation in student teaching performance. On average, SMPP candidates outperformed those who took the CSET (see Figure 1). On average, candidates with a History B.A. outperformed those with non-history degrees in their student teaching performance (see Figure 2). Moreover, on average, SMPP candidates without history degrees outperformed those CSET candidates without history degrees in their student teaching performance (see Figure 3).

Clearly, the data may point to the fact that stronger and more motivated students are drawn to the rigor of the SMPP as opposed to the CSET. Nonetheless, the significance of the form of subject matter preparation—whether by majoring in history or completing the SMPP—is clear.

## Interventions to Promote Historical Thinking

More importantly, reflection upon this data has motivated us to construct curricular means for scaffolding and supporting the acquisition of historical procedural knowledge and historical thinking within our program, regardless of the CSET or SMPP status of our candidates. Given the size and scale of our program, the diversity of the subject matter preparation of our candidates, and the challenges of not having a cohort model, the faculty in our program—who include full-time CSULB history faculty as well as full-time secondary practitioners—have agreed upon a common taxonomy of five historical thinking skills to be embedded and sequenced within specific courses in the program—all of which are taught through the Department of History at CSULB. These five historical thinking skills are: 1) Historiography; 2) Periodization; 3) Interpretation and Evidence; 4) Comparison; and 5) Cause and Consequence. All five historical thinking skills are initiated in the introductory history-social science teaching class (EDSS 300) and capstone course for the SMPP (HIST 401). The former course concentrates upon skills three through five, while the latter addresses one and two. Students are introduced to these historical skills through selected and sequenced readings from the aforementioned “canon” of scholarship in historical teaching, learning, and cognition. In the EDSS 300 course, candidates are introduced to lesson planning and construct two standards-based lessons, each addressing a different specific historical thinking skill.

To heighten student awareness of the importance of historical thinking, we have adopted a common lesson plan format (see Appendix A) for candidates in the program that intentionally highlights and frames the construction of an inquiry-based lesson (see Appendix B), and that requires an objective that promotes a specified historical thinking skill within the context of teaching a state content standard.<sup>22</sup> This lesson plan template is introduced in EDSS 300. In the history-social science methods course (EDSS 450), candidates are not only required to use the lesson plan template, but their summative unit of study also must include specific lessons that address each of the five historical thinking skills. Finally, in terms of the field experience in student teaching, the lesson plan portfolio mandated in the history-social science student teaching seminar (EDSS 473) also requires evidence of successful lessons (with samples of student work) dedicated to each of the five historical thinking skills. We are also currently designing a program-specific instrument to assess the teaching of historical thinking to be calibrated and used by our university supervisors when evaluating student teachers in the field.

In the absence of complete control of candidate subject matter preparation, these curricular interventions aim to deepen and develop pre-service teachers' procedural and pedagogic content knowledge to support the teaching of historical thinking in middle and high schools. However, we also hope to use these interventions to leverage even more students into the SMPP track to certification. We hope that students see the necessity of the SMPP—or at minimum, the capstone course (HIST 401) within it—as a necessity to meet the historical thinking expectations and requirements in our core, discipline-specific pedagogy courses.<sup>23</sup>

However, the disciplinary focus and level of involvement of history departments in teacher training, like that at CSULB and other universities in the CSU system, is becoming increasingly exceptional, and this trend in California is unlikely to change in the near future. In part, this is a consequence of the growing burden of state requirements, which in conjunction with rising financial pressure to shorten the time to degree completion in both public and private universities and colleges, limits the amount of instructional and curricular time to go beyond what is required to meet the demands of accreditation—and this comes at the expense of pre-service instruction devoted to deeper historical content knowledge and disciplinary understanding. In regards to history teacher training, the disciplinarity associated with the origins of the American research university in the late nineteenth century shows little sign of abating. History departments in California research universities are not associated with teacher training or familiar with the limited means by which the historical knowledge that they create is understood by students in secondary schools. Of more recent historical vintage, it is the comprehensive public university, like the CSU, which is tasked not only to train teachers, promoting disciplinary thinking and mediating historical knowledge to enhance learning in secondary schools, but also to do so on large scales.<sup>24</sup> However, even within the CSU, six campuses have dropped their SMPP programs since 2003, and, with it, formal affiliation between history and teacher education departments. Our program at CSULB faces serious budget cuts that will more than likely lead to substantial reductions in advising and declining numbers in the SMPP. The rapid expansion of CSET authorization within the state certification process, and with the History major no longer mandated for secondary history teaching, the historical thinking movement still faces significant challenges.

## Notes

1. Works associated with this “canon” include Robert B. Bain, “Into the Breach: Using Research and Theory to Shape History Instruction,” in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 331-352; Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Peter Lee, “Putting Principles Into Practice: Understanding History,” *How Students Learn History in the Classroom*, ed. John Bransford and M. Suzanne Donovan (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2004), 31-77; Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2008); Bruce VanSledright, *In Search of America's Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002); Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2001).

2. Linda Symcox, “Forging New Partnerships: Collaboration between University Professors and Classroom Teachers to Improve History Teaching, 1983-2011,” *The History Teacher* 45, no. 3 (May 2012): 359-382; Kathleen Anderson Steeves, “Building Successful Collaborations to Enhance History Teaching in Secondary Schools,” published by the American Historical Association in 2007, <<http://www.historians.org/pubs/free/steeves/index.htm>>. See also the essays in *The Teaching American History Project: Lessons for Historians and History Educators*, ed. Rachel Ragland and Kelly Woestman (New York: Routledge, 2009).

3. For exceptions, see Robert Bain and Jeffrey Mirel, “Setting Up Camp at the Great Instructional Divide: Educating Beginning History Teachers,” *Journal of Teacher Education* 57, no. 3 (2006): 212-219; Chauncey Monte-Sano and Melissa Cochran, “Attention to Learners, Subject, or Teaching: What Takes Precedent as Preservice Candidates Learn to Teach Historical Thinking and Reading?” *Theory and Research in Social Education* 37, no. 1 (Winter 2009): 101-135; Cinthia Salinas, M. Elizabeth Bellows, and H. Leonard Liaw, “Preservice Social Studies Teachers’ Historical Thinking and Digitized Primary Sources: What They Use and Why,” *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* 11, no. 2 (June 2011): 184-204.

4. National Council for History Education, “Teacher Qualifications,” statement adopted by the NCHS Board of Trustees, 21 December 2006, <<http://www.nche.net/teacherqualifications>>.

5. American Historical Association, “AHA Council Endorses the National Council for History Education’s Statement on Teacher Qualifications,” press release, 4 June 2007, <[http://www.historians.org/press/2007\\_06\\_04\\_StatementOnTeacherQualifications.cfm](http://www.historians.org/press/2007_06_04_StatementOnTeacherQualifications.cfm)>. See also Edward Ayers, “The Next Generation of History Teachers: A Challenge to American Colleges and Universities,” published by the American Historical Association in 2007, <<http://www.historians.org/pubs/Free/historyteaching/index.htm>>.

6. With the exception of National University, CSULB certifies more teachers than any other institution in California. The Single Subject History-Social Science Credential Program at CSULB is the state’s largest and currently has about 375 active students enrolled and certifies roughly 75 secondary history teachers per year. The majority of candidates in the CSULB History-Social Science Credential Program are students of color and are working full- or part-time jobs. Additionally, a significant percentage are first-generation college students.

7. National Council for History Education, “Teacher Qualifications.”

8. Bain and Mirel, 213.

9. Ibid., 217. For pedagogical content knowledge, see Lee Shulman, "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching," *Educational Researcher* 15, no. 2 (February 1986): 4-14.

10. David Neumann, "Training Teachers to Think Historically: Applying Recent Research to Professional Development," *The History Teacher* 45, no. 3 (May 2012): 390.

11. Richard Ingersoll, "The Problem of Under-Qualified Teachers in American Secondary Schools," *Educational Researcher* 28, no. 2 (March 1999): 26-37; Diane Ravitch, "Educational Backgrounds of History Teachers," in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 143-155. For the particular challenges in terms of world history, see Robert Bain and Lauren McArthur Harris, "A Most Pressing Challenge: Preparing Teachers of World History," *Perspectives on History* 47, no. 7 (October 2009), <<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2009/0910/0910tea1.cfm>>.

12. Bain and Mirel, 213-214; Tim Keirn and Brett Mizelle, "The QUE Project and History Learning and Teaching: The Case of Long Beach State," in *Faculty Development for Student Achievement: The QUE Project*, ed. Ronald J. Henry (Hoboken, NJ: Anker Publishing Company, 2006), 121-144.

13. G. Williamson McDiarmid and Peter Vinten-Johansen, "A Catwalk across the Great Divide: Redesigning the History Teaching Methods Course," in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, ed. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 156-177.

14. Data drawn from "Program Sponsors" at the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing website, <<http://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/ProgramSponsors/recordlist.xml>>.

15. The California State Curriculum Framework and Standards for History-Social Science can be found at <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/>>. For the creation of the California history-social science curriculum, see James LaSpina, *California in a Time of Excellence: School Reform at the Crossroads of the American Dream* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2009).

16. Despite the state curricular emphasis on history instruction, California students perform poorly, and well below national averages, on various standardized state and national assessments in U.S. and world history. In 2009, on the California Standardized and Reporting (STAR) test, 53% of tenth graders were below proficient in world history, and 58% of eighth graders and 56% of tenth graders were below proficient in U.S. history, California Department of Education, "2009 STAR Test Results," <<http://star.cde.ca.gov/star2009/SearchPanel.asp>>.

17. Candidates may start their teacher preparation program as undergraduates, but preliminary certification is completed as a post-graduate process.

18. Commission on Teacher Credentialing, "Accreditation Handbook," <<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>>.

19. At CSULB, one candidate with a degree in Leisure Studies recently stated that she had never taken a college-level history or social science course and yet passed all the CSET subtests in one sitting, having studied from *U.S. History for Dummies* and *World History for Dummies*. Another candidate with a degree in Communications Studies noted in an exit interview that he had passed the CSET easily, having taken only one undergraduate American history survey course—that being "U.S. History before the Reformation [sic]."

20. Data drawn from the CTC website, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, "Approved Subject Matter Programs," <[http://134.186.81.79/fmi/xsl/CTC\\_NewSubject/](http://134.186.81.79/fmi/xsl/CTC_NewSubject/)>

AllSubjects.xml>. See also Lisa Hutton, Tim Keirn, and Dave Neumann, "The State of K-12 Teaching: Challenges to Innovation," *Perspectives on History* 50, no. 5 (May 2012): 27-30.

21. This was acknowledged by the CTC in its October 2009 meeting, when it announced that it was going to work to streamline the submission process for the future accreditation of the SMPP, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, "Meeting Agenda, October 1-2, 2009," <<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-agenda.html>>.

22. This lesson plan format that privileges inquiry-based instruction and historical thinking was developed by Tim Keirn for Providence Schools in Rhode Island, where he serves as history-social science consultant. It is found in Appendix B.

23. History 401 provides pre-service teachers in both the History major and SMPP with an intensive examination of the key components of the means by which historical knowledge is constructed, and with specific focus upon historical methodology, historiography, and periodization, with an emphasis upon their roles in world history. A very early rendition of History 401 is found on the American Historical Association website, "Training Teachers to Teach History in K-12 Schools: Introduction," <<http://www.historians.org/teaching/Methods/introduction.htm>>. While the current budget scenario is creating an obstacle, we are also trying to dedicate the generic secondary reading and literacy to history-social science credential candidates. For justification of this approach, see Jeffery Nokes, "Preparing Novice History Teachers to Meet Students' Literacy Needs," *Reading Psychology* 31, no. 6 (2010): 493-523.

24. Through its doctoral programs, the research university produces historians in its own image, and it is they who become the faculty at the comprehensive university without the training, or perhaps the disposition, to acknowledge and embrace the truly interdisciplinary value of working with pre-service teachers and advocating for teacher training and history education. Louis Menard, *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University* (New York: Norton, 2010).

Appendix A

**CSULB History-Social Science Lesson Plan Template**

Lesson Title:		Date:
Unit Central Historical Question:		

Subject / Course:	
Grade:	
Lesson Duration:	

Lesson Objective; Historical Thinking Skill; and Literacy Strategy:

Narrative Summary of Tasks / Actions:

Materials / Equipment:

## Appendix B

**Inquiry-Based Lesson Plan for History-Social Science**

1. Anticipatory Set:	Time:
2. Learning Objective and Central Historical Question:	Time:
3. Teacher Input:	Time:
4. Student Activity and Investigation (w/ differentiation):	Time:

5. Formative Assessment (w/ differentiation):	Time:

6. Closure:	Time:

7. Student Reflection:	Time:

Copyright of History Teacher is the property of Society for History Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.