WHY NEW TEACHERS STAY
Susan Moore Johnson and the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, American Educator, Summer 2006.

This summary of a four-year study of 50 first- and second-year teachers probes the why’s and wherefore’s of their choice to teach, their preparation, their career plans, how they fared on the job, and whether or not they chose to stay in teaching. What the authors found is that key to the success of the enterprise for these newcomers was their ability to teach and the conditions they felt they needed to make that possible—mainly the availability of ongoing help from colleagues, administrators and mentors. Irrespective of this ideal, half started teaching with the intension of switching careers. And, permeating their stories after they started “were accounts of inattentive or abusive principals, inappropriate or unfair assignments, inadequate supplies, and insufficient opportunities to grow.” New teachers who stayed in the profession over time were much more likely to work in schools where veterans and novices “worked together sharing information and fresh ideas.”

THE WRONG TARGET
Albert Shanker, September 15, 1996

In this historic “Where We Stand” column, Al Shanker briefly explains tenure and due process rights, then goes on to outline the inadequacies of teacher evaluation practices. Peer assistance and review programs in three districts are explored as a more rigorous and effective means of teacher evaluation.

PEER ASSISTANCE AND/OR REVIEW: SAMPLE CONTRACT LANGUAGE
American Federation of Teachers, 2003

Contract language on peer assistance and review negotiated by five different union locals.

PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS
A Resolution of the American Federation of Teachers, 2002

A 2002 AFT resolution that recognizes the limitations of the traditional salary scale, outlines the requirements of a “professional compensation system,” and describes a range of union-supported plans that involve differential pay.
Learning Policy: When State Education Reform Works (Chapter 8, “Policy and Learning”)
David K. Cohen and Heather C. Hill, Yale University Press, 2001

Education reformers and policymakers argue that improved student achievement requires stronger academic standards, stiffer state tests, and accountability for students’ scores. Yet these efforts seem not to be succeeding in many states. Here, the authors draw on a decade’s detailed study of a California program to improve mathematics teaching and learning to argue that effective state reform depends on conditions which most reforms ignore: coherence in practice as well as policy and opportunities for professional learning. The authors report that state policy influenced teaching and learning when there was consistency among the tests and other policy instruments; when there was consistency among the curricula and other instruments of classroom practice; and when teachers had substantial opportunities to learn the practices proposed by the policy. When these conditions were met for teachers, their students’ test scores rose. Unfortunately, this was the case for only a small minority of teachers.